The University’s FY15 Budget Framework for reallocation and compensation were taken into consideration when determining the final recommendations for the unit.

Aurora Center for Advocacy & Education

Fiscal Year 2014-2015
Off-Year Update

Majority Opinion

Requested Allocation: $309,443  Recommended Allocation: $273,340

Comments: The Committee appreciates how the call center has expanded into texting. We believe that this will allow students more access to Aurora’s services. We appreciate the increased effort that Aurora has delivered given the uptick in crimes in the surrounding area.

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

1) The Aurora Center provides an essential service to students in times of need.  GDM: 1
2) The Aurora Center has been reaching out to greater numbers of students across the University, consistent with the broad need for their services.  GDM: 4, 5

Directives: Going forward, the Committee would like the Center’s staff to look into grant funding to alleviate the stress on the Student Services Fee. Not too long ago, the Aurora Center was entirely grant funded. Since then, it has become mainly Fee funded. Given the Center’s expressed interest in expanding their programming, we do not want them to totally rely on the Student Services Fee.

Furthermore, the Committee would like to see data on the effectiveness of the Aurora Center’s programming. In particular, the Committee requests data on the effectiveness of the Step-Up program. While the Committee has set aside funds to launch the program in the past, we do not want these to become assumed costs that will be covered year-to-year without an accurate measure of their effectiveness.

Finally, the Committee would like to see programing targeted toward men, as they comprise almost half of the student body. Possible programing could include men groups or speakers talking about the role of men in sexual education, health, and safety.
Boynton Health Service

Fiscal Year 2014-2015
Off-Year Update

Majority Opinion

Requested Allocation: $8,696,333
Recommended Allocation: $8,434,508

Comments: The Committee was pleased to hear about the range and excellence of services that Boynton continues to offer to students. We commend Boynton’s recognition of the need to utilize technology to continually improve efficiency. The Committee also supports Boynton’s efforts to secure external funding, recognizing that grant-funded initiatives will benefit students.

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

1) Boynton provides an essential service to the entire student body. GDM: 1, 2, 4
2) Boynton’s services benefit those students with a need for on-campus health services. GDM: 5
3) There have been efforts to secure external funding for new initiatives. GDM: 7
Boynton Health Service - Gopher Chauffeur

Fiscal Year 2014-2015
Off-Year Update

Majority Opinion
Requested Allocation: $88,870          Recommended Allocation: $86,426

Comments: The Committee was pleased to hear of Gopher Chauffeur’s continued success. We commend Boynton for augmenting this service in response to an increase in crime around campus while utilizing funds and resources outside of the Student Services Fee.

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

1) Gopher Chauffeur is an invaluable service to the entire student body. GDM: 1
2) There is a clear demand for Gopher Chauffeur. GDM: 3
3) The service is accessible by students across all academic units and departments. GDM: 4, 5
Boynnton Health Service - Mental Health Expansion

Fiscal Year 2014-2015
Off-Year Update

Majority Opinion

Requested Allocation: $402,150
Recommended Allocation: $297,515

Comments: The Committee commends Boynton for its efforts to increase access to mental health resources on campus. We are pleased to hear that Student Services Fee-funded staff are helping Boynton to operate with greater capacity. However, the Committee is concerned that, despite expansion, wait times for access to mental health specialists are still rather long. We ask that Boynton seeks ways to address this problem.

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

1) Boynton’s mental health resources are an invaluable service to the entire student body.
   GDM: 1

2) There is a clear demand for mental health services.
   GDM: 3

3) Mental health services are accessible by students from across all academic units and departments.
   GDM: 4, 5

Directives: Although the Committee recognizes that there has been an increase in demand for mental health services, we ask that Boynton look for ways to decrease wait times in its mental health clinics.

The University's FY15 Budget Framework for reallocation and compensation were taken into consideration when determining the final recommendations for the unit.
Learning Abroad Center

Fiscal Year 2014-2015
Final Recommendation

Majority Opinion
Committee Vote: 6-1-0
Requested Allocation: $119,568  Recommended Allocation: $118,214

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Directives: The Committee showed concern for the lack of commitment of the LAC toward serving graduate-level students, who are included amongst Fee-paying students. At the same time, we appreciate clarifications regarding programming and advising access for graduate students. Aside from this initial concern, the Committee believes the LAC demonstrated the appropriate information to validate their request, aside from the request for ‘Student Aid’ due to its lack of benefit for Fee-paying students on the whole.

The University's FY15 Budget Framework for reallocation and compensation were taken into consideration when determining the final recommendations for the unit.
Learning Abroad Center

Fiscal Year 2015-2016
Final Recommendation

Majority Opinion
Committee Votes: 6-1-0
Requested Allocation: $119,568  Recommended Allocation: $118,214

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Directives: The Committee showed concern for the lack of commitment of the LAC toward serving graduate-level students, who are included amongst Fee-paying students. At the same time, we appreciate clarifications regarding programming and advising access for graduate students. Aside from this initial concern, the Committee believes the LAC demonstrated the appropriate information to validate their request, aside from the request for ‘Student Aid’ due to its lack of benefit for Fee-paying students on the whole.

The University's FY15 Budget Framework for reallocation and compensation were taken into consideration when determining the final recommendations for the unit.
Learning Abroad Center

Fiscal Year 2014-2015
Final Recommendation

Minority Opinion
Committee Vote: 6-1-0
Requested Allocation: $119,568
Recommended Allocation: $118,214

Comments: While the Minority agrees with the elimination of the $1,500 ‘Student Aid’ expenditure, we maintain a couple of additional concerns.

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

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

2) The Minority is concerned that the SSF is used to subsidize normal administrative costs for the Learning Abroad Center. Specifically, the Fee is currently funding $18,166.56 in undergraduate peer advisors. Likewise, the Minority was not provided data that demonstrated that the “partial funding” for 7 full-time professional staff members was providing benefits consistent with the amount of funding provided. GDM: 3, 8

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

The Minority would like the LAC to explore alternative funding for these programs. Vetting programs through reliable online providers could reduce labor costs. Alternatively, charging volunteer/internship program users a nominal fee for these services could reduce Student Services Fee dependence.

The Minority would also like to see a commitment to engaging graduate and professional students. If it is determined that such benefits can’t be provided to these students based on their unique needs and/or the capacity of the unit, then the Minority would encourage the elimination of graduate and professional students from this particular fee requirement.

The University's FY15 Budget Framework for reallocation and compensation were taken into consideration when determining the final recommendations for the unit.
Learning Abroad Center

Fiscal Year 2015-2016
Final Recommendation

Minority Opinion
Committee Vote: 6-1-0
Requested Allocation: $119,568
Recommended Allocation: $118,214

Comments: While the Minority agrees with the elimination of the $1,500 ‘Student Aid’ expenditure, we maintain a couple of additional concerns.

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

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

   GDM: 2, 4, 6

2) The Minority is concerned that the SSF is used to subsidize normal administrative costs for the Learning Abroad Center. Specifically, the Fee is currently funding $18,166.56 in undergraduate peer advisors. Likewise, the Minority was not provided data that demonstrated that the “partial funding” for 7 full-time professional staff members was providing benefits consistent with the amount of funding provided.

   GDM: 3, 8

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

The Minority would like the LAC to explore alternative funding for these programs. Vetting programs through reliable online providers could reduce labor costs. Alternatively, charging volunteer/internship program users a nominal fee for these services could reduce Student Services Fee dependence.

The Minority would also like to see a commitment to engaging graduate and professional students. If it is determined that such benefits can’t be provided to these students based on their unique needs and/or the capacity of the unit, then the Minority would encourage the elimination of graduate and professional students from this particular fee requirement.

The University's FY15 Budget Framework for reallocation and compensation were taken into consideration when determining the final recommendations for the unit.
The Minnesota Daily

Fiscal Year 2014-2015
Final Recommendation

Majority Opinion
Committee Vote: 7-0-0
Requested Allocation: $505,000
Recommended Allocation: $397,425

Comments: The Committee commends the Daily for continued service to the University and recognizes the breadth of the Daily’s impact. The unit aids the fostering of community among students. Moving forward, we are in favor of the Daily developing their proposed mobile app and believe the unit’s excess of reserves should be put toward that task. There is concern that budgeted travel does not directly impact a broad enough range of students. Moreover, while we recognize the Daily is proposing a decrease in papers printed, the current 43% rate of paper returns is too large considering the costs of printing and distribution. Lastly, we recognize the goal to maintain 6 months of reserves; however, the Committee is not in support of allocating excess funds in preparation for a mandated office relocation as no such change is foreseen within the University’s current six-year plan for building development.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Directives: The Committee hopes to see the Minnesota Daily move forward with the development of its mobile app. The Committee would like to see a printing and distribution budget that targets a decreased rate of returns. Finally, the Committee would like to see the Daily commit to its reserves budget plan as was discussed through this year’s process. The Committee will review the budget proposal for FY 2015-2016 to determine an appropriate allocation.

The University's FY15 Budget Framework for reallocation and compensation were taken into consideration when determining the final recommendations for the unit.
Northrop Concerts & Lectures

Fiscal Year 2014-2015
Final Recommendation

Majority Opinion
Committee Vote: 5-2-0
Requested Allocation: $480,630       Recommended Allocation: $171,421

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

The Committee decided to keep Northrop at its base level of funding for a number of reasons. Given that Northrop’s space has not been open for use and has no demonstrated history, we could not justify funding new programs. Additionally, the Committee determined that some of the new programs could be funded by diverting funds from events with relatively small student impact, such as the summer concerts. The Committee will leave fund reallocation to Northrop’s discretion, and we encourage the unit to discuss the demonstrated success or popularity of any new initiative with future Committees.

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

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

2) In addition to events, Northrop offers a variety of internships to students across departments.     GDM: 4

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

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

The University's FY15 Budget Framework for reallocation and compensation were taken into consideration when determining the final recommendations for the unit.
Northrop Concerts & Lectures

Fiscal Year 2015-2016
Final Recommendation

Majority Opinion

Committee Vote: 7-0-0
Requested Allocation: $483,061  Recommended Allocation: $0

Comments: The Committee was pleased to see and hear about Northrop’s newly renovated space and the opportunities it will offer for students. We commend Northrop for its continued engagement of students through internships and the U-CAN internship program.

In order to effectively gauge the appropriate allocation beyond the grand reopening, we felt that Northrop should have the opportunity to utilize their new space for a year. We therefore allocated $0 for Fiscal Year 2015-2016 in order to allow Northrop to present a new request to the next Committee.

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

1) The Committee allocated $0 for fiscal year 2015-2016 in order to allow Northrop to demonstrate the benefit of their programs to students and present a new request.
   GDM: 3, 4, 5, 6

Directives: The Committee asks that Northrop reevaluate the proposed structure for subsidized rush tickets and subsidized space rentals. We felt that it was not prudent to use the Student Services Fee to make Northrop’s spaces cheaper than other locations on campus. We also felt that Northrop could adopt a system for rush tickets — such as dedicated student seats per event — that would not require a subsidy from the Student Services Fee. The Committee encourages Northrop to fund any new programs by reallocating funds from current events with small student impact and to continuously gauge the levels of demand, impact, and student satisfaction of their programs. Finally, the Committee asks that Northrop presents a new request to the 2015-2016 Student Services Fees Committee.
Northrop Concerts & Lectures

Fiscal Year 2014–2015
Final Recommendations

Minority Opinion
Committee Vote: 5-2-0
Requested Allocation: $480,629.76
Recommended Allocation: $171,421

Comments: While the Minority agreed with the Majority that the request of $480,629.76 was not consistent with the SSF GDM, we believe that there exists sufficient flexibility within the budget to reallocate certain expenses to allow for the increase of programming and other services. The opening of the $88 million renovation will allow Northrop to provide its services with a higher marginal value to a greater number of students. Additionally, we consider funding for new projects to be important in adequately analyzing their success and considering long-term implementation.

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

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

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

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

Directives: The Minority finds value in many of the proposed programming initiatives and would encourage Northrop to consider cutting one or both of the summer concerts to help pay for year-round programming options that offer considerably better value for money.

The University's FY15 Budget Framework for reallocation and compensation were taken into consideration when determining the final recommendations for the unit.
Radio K

Fiscal Year 2014-2015
Final Recommendation

Majority Opinion
Committee Vote: 6-0-0
Requested Allocation: $246,644
Recommended Allocation: $244,211

Comments: The Committee is pleased with Radio K’s engagement of student volunteers. The Committee believes this is both fiscally responsible and provides value for students.

The Committee appreciates the commitment from Radio K to secure $10,000 in funding through an alternative source for their radio tower’s inspection. However, we remain concerned about the potential future implications a tower replacement would have on Student Services Fee requests.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The University's FY15 Budget Framework for reallocation and compensation were taken into consideration when determining the final recommendations for the unit.
Radio K

Fiscal Year 2015-2016
Final Recommendation

Majority Opinion
Committee Vote: 6-0-0
Requested Allocation: $250,344
Recommended Allocation: $244,211

Comments: The Committee is pleased with Radio K’s engagement of student volunteers. The Committee believes this is both fiscally responsible and provides value for students.

The Committee appreciates the commitment from Radio K to secure $10,000 in funding through an alternative source for their radio tower’s inspection. However, we remain concerned about the potential future implications a tower replacement would have on Student Services Fee requests.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The University's FY15 Budget Framework for reallocation and compensation were taken into consideration when determining the final recommendations for the unit.
**Student Conflict Resolution Center**

Fiscal Year 2014-2015

Final Recommendation

**Majority Opinion**

*Committee Vote: 6-0-0*

*Requested Allocation: $315,000*  
*Recommended Allocation: $311,422*

*Comments:* The Committee finds that the SCRC provides a good value to students and provides excellent services. The Committee believes that the SCRC provides an essential service to the student body. The Committee also believes that the SCRC is using the budget it is given wisely.

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

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

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

3) The SCRC has provided data giving ample justification of their success in serving students.  
   GDM: 3

*Directives:* While we like the way the SCRC has reduced their reserves and we acknowledge that they need more funding, we would like them to continue to keep their reserves down because we believe future Committees will fully fund the SCRC. The only comment made is that the SCRC should try and promote SCRC services more on campus. That said, the Committee acknowledges that SCRC is at capacity. We think that adding SCRC services to syllabuses in uniform language (like the plagiarism, disability services and mental health sections are currently) would help increase awareness to the students. Finally, adding a small section about the services provided during Teaching Assistant trainings would be another way to market the SCRC. We think the SCRC is an important service that is very important to the student body.

*The University's FY15 Budget Framework for reallocation and compensation were taken into consideration when determining the final recommendations for the unit.*
Student Conflict Resolution Center

Fiscal Year 2015-2016
Final Recommendation

Majority Opinion
Committee Vote: 6-0-0
Requested Allocation: $322,000  Recommended Allocation: $322,000

Comments: The Committee finds that the SCRC provides a good value to students and provides excellent services. The Committee believes that the SCRC provides an essential service to the student body. The Committee also believes that the SCRC is using the budget it is given wisely.

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

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

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

3) The SCRC has provided data giving ample justification of their success in serving students.  GDM: 3

Directives: While we like the way the SCRC has reduced their reserves and we acknowledge that they need more funding, we would like them to continue to keep their reserves down because we believe future Committees will fully fund the SCRC. The only comment made is that the SCRC should try and promote SCRC services more on campus. That said, the Committee acknowledges that SCRC is at capacity. We think that adding SCRC services to syllabuses in uniform language (like the plagiarism, disability services and mental health sections are currently) would help increase awareness to the students. Finally, adding a small section about the services provided during Teaching Assistant trainings would be another way to market the SCRC. We think the SCRC is an important service that is very important to the student body.
Student Union and Activities - Operating

Fiscal Year 2015-2016
Off-Year Update

Majority Opinion
Requested Allocation: $5,553,710
Recommended Allocation: $5,437,098

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

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

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

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

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

Fiscal Year 2015-2016
Off-Year Update

Majority Opinion

Requested Allocation: $1,250,000
Recommended Allocation: $864,137

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

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

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

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

Fiscal Year 2015-2016
Off-Year Update

**Majority Opinion**

*Requested Allocation: $3,716,516  Recommended Allocation: $3,716,516*

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

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

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

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

Fiscal Year 2015-2016
Off-Year Update

Majority Opinion

Requested Allocation: $9,186,157
Recommended Allocation: $8,846,699

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

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

1) The Committee recognizes that the various facilities managed by Recreational Sports require staff and other resources to operate and provide programming to the student body. These resources are used to maintain the quality of the programs and foster the student experience with URW.  
   GDM: 1, 2, 3
2) The new expansion requires more staff to operate the facilities and programs. URW is the largest employer of students on campus and the growing number of students and professionals employed by the program justifies the increase in operational fees that was approved the previous year.  
   GDM: 3

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

The Committee would also request that URW provide details on the feasibility of collecting revenue through member health care plans. We realize every health care plan is different, but the Committee would like to understand if there are ways to better situate URW membership or services fees to allow students and other URW members to apply for reimbursements through their own health care plans. This could potentially allow URW to increase certain fees with the knowledge that many fee-paying members are eligible for reimbursements through their health care plans. This would have the potential to reduce the demand on future Student Services Fee requests.

The University's FY15 Budget Framework for reallocation and compensation were taken into consideration when determining the final recommendations for the unit.
University Recreation & Wellness - Advancement Program

Fiscal Year 2014-2015
Final Recommendation

Majority Opinion
Committee Vote: 6-0-0
Requested Allocation: $122,400  Recommended Allocation: $0

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

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

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

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

1) The Committee felt that the Advancement Program had not demonstrated a benefit to students.  
GDM: 4, 5, 6

The University's FY15 Budget Framework for reallocation and compensation were taken into consideration when determining the final recommendations for the unit.
University Student Legal Services

Fiscal Year 2015-2016
Off-Year Update

Majority Opinion

Requested Allocation: $1,076,000

Recommended Allocation: $1,073,417

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

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

1) The benefits to students outweigh the fees students pay. GDM: 1
2) USLS effectively serves a large number of students annually. GDM: 5
3) Most students might not be able to access professional legal advice without USLS. GDM: 3
4) USLS provides services to students that are high quality. GDM: 2, 4

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