The Aurora Center For Advocacy & Education
Fiscal Year 2016
Committee Vote: 6-0-1
Requested Allocation: $433,569  Recommended Allocation: $286,142

Fiscal Year 2017
Committee Vote: 5-0-2
Requested Allocation: $434,611  Recommended Allocation: $286,142

Comments:
The committee commends The Aurora Center for its broad range of programs and services to the campus community. We also applaud the Center’s increased efforts to reach more men on campus, as was directed by the committee.

Aurora requested an overall increase of $160,569 in fiscal year 2016, and $1,042 in fiscal year 2017. The requested increase was to cover the cost of fringe benefits for Aurora’s 6 Full Time Employees, and the addition of a new “Men’s Engagement Coordinator” staff position. The committee decided that Aurora should continue to fund fringe benefits from their Operations and Maintenance funds as they have in the past. While the committee fully supports Aurora’s goal of targeting more men on campus with their programs, we felt that the creation of an entirely new staff position – that would be completely fees-funded going forward – was not the best approach.

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

1) The Aurora Center provides a valuable service to all University students, offering numerous training, informational, and sensitization sessions that supplement the academic curriculum.
   GDM: 1, 2

2) Aurora’s programs are open to students across all academic units and departments.
   GDM: 4

3) Aurora’s programs are targeted towards the largest number of students consistent with the need.
   GDM: 5

4) The committee felt that Aurora’s requested increase was not fully justified.
   GDM: 9

Directives:
The committee asks that Aurora continue to look for additional sources of funding.
The Aurora Center For Advocacy & Education

Fiscal Year 2015-2016

Committee Vote: 6-0-1
Requested Allocation: $433,569
Recommended Allocation: $286,142

Fiscal Years 2016-2017

Committee Vote: 5-0-2
Requested Allocation: $434,611
Recommended Allocation: $286,142

Minority Opinion

Comments:
The Minority commends the Aurora Center for the valuable and indispensable services it provides to the student body. In that spirit and the need for more staffing at the Aurora Center the Minority respectfully dissents for the reasons that follow.

The Male Engagement Coordinator serves a need that’s been designated by the Aurora Center & Campus population. Greek Life leaders have expressed an interest in better male engagement and the Minnesota Student Association unanimously supported the funding of the position. To say that this position is not yet “federally mandated” is an argument not worthy of consideration; I’d point to the millions of dollars in student fees paid to other administrative units for salaried positions--not held by students--that claim to provide necessary services to the student body though are not federally mandated.

In fact, the White House’s Not Alone Report recommends increasing men’s engagement in issues the Aurora Center specializes in. Thus, this is a federal best practice, regardless if it is law. The White House viewed it as the second most important recommendation in their executive summary.

The increase in student fees (approximately one dollar) is negligible when weighed against the outcomes an investment in the Aurora Center will render. The value of the investment is worth the following:

- Increased safety from sexual assault to students by being able to more effectively engage men.
- Increased value of a degree from an institution that hasn’t been blacklisted for sexual assault cases.
- Increased engagement by fraternities, athletics, and other male based organizations that have been traditionally underrepresented in these roles before.
It must be noted that increased attention to sexual assault means we will likely have more reports, which is a very good thing, but this requires more staff for a greater capacity. Regardless the title of an additional position, the Aurora Center needs additional staff to continue providing services to victim-survivors and the student body at large in an effort to shift the culture of this campus.

The Minority holds that an investment in the Aurora Center is of the utmost importance and recommends that this and future committees think carefully before choosing to neglect the needs of the student body by refusing to provide additional funding for expansion to a much needed service.

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

1) The Aurora Center provides a valuable service to all University students, offering numerous training, informational, and sensitization sessions that supplement the academic curriculum.
   GDM: 1, 2
2) Aurora’s programs are open to students across all academic units and departments.
   GDM: 4
3) Aurora’s programs are targeted towards the largest number of students consistent with the need.
   GDM: 5
Boynton Health Service – Operational Fee
Fiscal Year 2016
Committee Vote: 7-0-0
Requested Allocation: $8,515,948  Recommended Allocation: $8,551,724

Fiscal Year 2017
Committee Vote: 7-0-0
Requested Allocation: $8,691,615  Recommended Allocation: $8,734,312

Comments:
The Committee continues its appreciation and congratulates the management of Boynton Health Services (BHS). We feel they provide critical services to the well-being of the student body. Likewise the committee understands the reduction in unrestricted revenue vis-à-vis the change in students’ insurance and the Affordable Care Act. We recommend an increase in SSF allocation for compensate this change in market conditions.

The following points explain the recommended allocation figure and include the SSF handbook guidelines for decision-making reference (GDM) numbers supporting each point:
1) BHS provides services to students that are of the highest quality and is known to almost all students on campus.
   GDM: 2, 4
2) BHS provides services that benefit those students with a need for on-campus health services.
   GDM: 5

Directives:
The Committee asks BHS to find ways to increase revenue from non-University clients through profit centers such as the dental clinic, the travel clinic and the pharmacy.

Boynton Health Service – Facility Support Fee
Fiscal Year 2016
Committee Vote: 7-0-0
Requested Allocation: $696,428  Recommended Allocation: $686,877

Fiscal Year 2017
Committee Vote: 7-0-0
Requested Allocation: $705,608  Recommended Allocation: $686,877

Comments:
The committee appreciates the wide array of services and programs offered at Boynton Health Services. We were pleased by BHS’ efforts to secure funding in addition to the Student Services Fee. Boynton plays a pivotal role on campus as both the primary institution responsible for the well-being of students’ health, and as a source of many informational programs that supplement the academic curriculum.
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 Health Services is consistent with its mission by providing an invaluable service to all students as a campus health center.
   GDM: 1, 2

2) Boynton Health Services has reached out to a greater number of students on campus with programs consistent with student needs.
   GDM: 4, 5

3) Boynton has worked to secure funding in addition to the Student Services Fees. GDM: 7

4) Boynton established a financial need that cannot be fulfilled with alternative sources of income.
   GDM: 8

5) Boynton has fully justified its fee request.
   GDM: 9

**Boynton Health Service – Gopher Chauffeur**
Fiscal Year 2016
*Committee Vote: 4-3-0*
Requested Allocation: $116,873  
Recommended Allocation: $116,873*

Fiscal Year 2017
*Committee Vote: 7-0-0*
Requested Allocation: $119,132  
Recommended Allocation: $116,873*

**Majority Opinion**

*Comments:*
The Committee recognizes the importance and success of the Gopher Chauffeur at the U of M. Student usage of this service was increased recently as public safety has become a continuous issue on campus. The committee applauds Boynton’s efforts to continue to keep students safe during their studying and free time on the weekends.

The Committee granted Boynton the full requested increase of $30,447 for FY16 but declined the increase of $2,259 for FY17. The majority of the requested increase was to be used for an additional vehicle that Gopher Chauffeur began operating in response to a surge in demand last year and for additional student staff positions to help with vehicle operations.

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 Health Services is consistent with its mission by providing an invaluable service to all students as a campus health center.
   GDM: 1, 2
2) Boynton Health Services has reached out to a greater number of students on campus with programs consistent with student needs.
   GDM: 4, 5
3) Boynton has worked to secure funding in addition to the Student Services Fees. GDM: 7
4) Boynton established a financial need that cannot be fulfilled with alternative sources of income.
   GDM: 8
5) Boynton has fully justified its fee request.
   GDM: 9

*Included in Boynton Health Service’s Operational and Facility Support Fee

**Boynton – Gopher Chauffeur**
Fiscal Year 2016
Committee Vote: 4-3-0
Requested Allocation: $116,873
Recommended Allocation: $116,873*

Minority Opinion
Comments:
The minority differed in opinion with the majority on the expansion of the Gopher Chauffeur service. While the minority recognizes, and appreciates, the service this program offers to students, we did not feel as though an expansion of the service was fully justified in the unit’s request. Additionally, there were some concerns as to whether the service is in line with the mission of the organization in promoting a safe and healthy campus environment.

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

1) Demand for increasing service was not fully demonstrated.
   GDM: 1, 3
2) Benefit for students who do participate in the service was not fully demonstrated.
   GDM: 6
3) There were concerns that this service inadvertently promotes excessive drinking among students.
   GDM: 1

Directives:
The minority is concerned that the service is being used – predominantly – by students who have spent the night drinking to excess. We request that Boynton attempt to determine whether this is the case. The minority feels that the Chauffeur service would be best handled by UMPD – in the same way the department offers the escort service – as it is addressing a public safety issue, and encourages the unit to look into this possibility.

*Included in Boynton Health Service’s Operational and Facility Support Fee*
**Boynton Health Service – Mental Health Service**

Fiscal Year 2016

*Committee Vote: 7-0-0*

Requested Allocation: $426,115  
Recommended Allocation: $426,115*

Fiscal Year 2017

*Committee Vote: 7-0-0*

Requested Allocation: $523,315  
Recommended Allocation: $523,315*

**Comments:**

The committee recognizes the wide range of services that Boynton Mental Health provides for the University of Minnesota. Boynton requested an increase of $128,600 in fiscal year 2016 and an increase of 97,200 in fiscal year 2017. The increase is to fund 3.5 new full-time employee positions over the next two years. The increase is to also fund the implementation of a behavioral texting service. The committee feels there is a need for the Mental Health Service on campus and as such granted the full requested increase for both fiscal year 2016 and 2017.

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

1) Boynton Health Services is consistent with its mission by providing an invaluable service to all students as a campus health center.
   
   GDM: 1, 2

2) Boynton Health Services has reached out to a greater number of students on campus with programs consistent with student needs.
   
   GDM: 4, 5

3) Boynton has worked to secure funding in addition to the Student Services Fees.  
   
   GDM: 7

4) Boynton established a financial need that cannot be fulfilled with alternative sources of income.
   
   GDM: 8

5) Boynton has fully justified its fee request.
   
   GDM: 9

**Directives:**

In the future, the Student Services Fee committee would like more information about the texting services implementation in regards to costs and effectiveness. The committee showed concern about the wait-list for patients seeking services at Boynton.

*Included in Boynton Health Service’s Operational and Facility Support Fee*
**Learning Abroad Center**
Off-Year Update

*Committee Vote: 6-1-0*

Requested Allocation: $119,568  
Recommended Allocation: $119,356

*Comments:*
The committee commends the Learning Abroad Center’s (LAC) commitment to the enhancement of the campus community’s global and cultural awareness. We applaud the LAC’s goal and continued efforts to increase the number of students studying abroad. The committee also recognizes the LAC’s efforts to increase the participation of minority students – who are currently underrepresented – in learning abroad programs.

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

1) The LAC provides a valuable service to all University students. Additionally, all of the center’s programs supplement the academic curriculum.
   GDM: 1, 2

2) Programs and services offered by the LAC are open to students across all academic units and departments.
   GDM: 4

*Directives:*
The committee asks that the Learning Abroad Center better publicize their other offerings, such as trip advising for non-academic travel.
The Minnesota Daily
Fiscal Year 2016
Committee Vote: 7-0-0
Requested Allocation: $505,000         Recommended Allocation: $491,824

Comments:
The committee commends the Daily for its decades of service to the campus community, and
appreciates the high level of professionalism that is characteristic of the organization. We were
glad to hear that the Daily has adhered to the directives of the committee to make investments in
technology, has also implemented a decrease in distribution. We were very concerned about the
extremely high return rate – which stood at close to 60% in 2014.

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

1) The Daily provides a valuable service to the campus community, and has a stated goal of
   supplementing the academic curriculum in Journalism.
   GDM: 1, 2

2) The paper is available to students across all academic departments and units.
   GDM: 4

3) The Daily benefits students who are not part of the organization.
   GDM: 6

Directives:
The committee asks that the Daily formulate a concrete plan for addressing the return rate. We
also ask that the unit discuss the impact of the 25% weekly reduction in printing on advertising
revenues with the committee.
Northrop
Fiscal Year 2016
Committee Vote: 6-1-0
Requested Allocation: $407,894
Recommended Allocation: $179,362

Comments:
Northrop requested an increase of $236,473 in funding over its previous allocation. This represents a 138% increase in funding. The committee feels that such a large increase was not at this time a prudent use of Student Services Fee funding. However, the committee has approved an increase in funding of 5%. The committee is impressed by Northrop’s commitment to increase its outreach to the student body through new and imaginative programming. The committee questions, however, whether some of Northrop’s expenditures contribute to the campus community as a whole, as opposed to a small, select group of students. On the whole, the committee was quite impressed by Northrop’s presentation and by its commitment to bring innovative arts programming to students on campus. The committee hopes that Northrop maintains this high level of excellence into the future, while continually striving to serve all students on campus.

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

1) Northrop programs provide a valuable service to University students, supplement the academic curriculum, and help foster a sense of community on campus.
   GDM: 1, 2

2) The committee felt that Northrop’s request was not fully justified.
   GDM: 9

Directives:
The committee asks that Northrop divert funds currently budgeted for facility expenses, such as extended hours security and furniture, to cover the costs of student programming. The committee does not feel that spending on furniture and security in Northrop Auditorium is an appropriate use of Student Services Fee funds.

The committee questions the use of Student Services Fee funds by Northrop to pay for Master Classes and Artist Residencies. The committee feels that such expenditures would benefit only a select group of students on campus and that Northrop did not adequately demonstrate otherwise. The committee would strongly suggest that funds be diverted from such programs toward programs that have the potential to impact the campus community as a whole.
Radio K – KUOM
Off-Year Update
Committee Vote: 6-0-0
Requested Allocation: $246,644  Recommended Allocation: $249,554

Comments:
The committee commends Radio K for being a resource and center for teaching students interested in broadcast media. The committee wishes to stress, however, that Radio-K’s primary mission is to serve the campus community as a whole, and not to serve as a training program in broadcast media. The committee asks Radio-K to do more in increasing its visibility on campus, and to strive to become a more integral part of the campus community. We congratulate Radio-K on its numerous awards for excellence, both local and national, and hope that Radio-K will continue to maintain the high standards of quality for which it is known.

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

1) Radio K provides a valuable service to the campus community, and supplements the academic curriculum for students interested in broadcast media.
   GDM: 1, 2
2) Radio K has made efforts to secure and increase funding other sources, including underwriting and their annual pledge drive.
   GDM: 7

Directives:
The asks that Radio-K make more effort into taking into account student preferences and suggestions in producing its programming, so as to better serve the needs of students on campus.
Student Conflict Resolution Center
Off-Year Update
Committee Vote: 6-0-0
Requested Allocation: $322,000  Recommended Allocation: $323,484

Comments:
The committee commends the Student Conflict Resolution Center (SCRC) for its efforts in assisting students resolve difficult situations. We were especially impressed with SCRC’s quantification of the amount of money the unit has saved students – $350,247 in school year 2013-2014. SCRC’s role on campus as arbitrators and advocates for students is invaluable.

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

1) SCRC provides an important service to the campus community, and with a high degree of student satisfaction.
   GDM: 1, 2
2) SCRC’s services are open to students across all academic levels and departments.
   GDM: 4

Directives:
The committee requests that SCRC determine the level of student awareness of services offered by the unit. Additionally, we ask that SCRC collaborate with USLS and the Aurora center in reaching out to students.
**Student Unions & Activities Facility Support Fee**

Fiscal Year 2016  
*Committee Vote: 7-0-0*

Requested Allocation: $4,257,312  
Recommended Allocation: $4,135,518

Fiscal Year 2017  
*Committee Vote: 5-2-0*

Requested Allocation: $4,257,312  
Recommended Allocation: $4,189,487

*Comments:*

The committee appreciates the opportunities offered to students by Student Union and Activities (SUA). The committee feels that SUA provides a sense of community on campus with facilities such as Coffman Memorial Union and St. Paul Student Center. The committee understands that facility maintenance and repairs are essential for providing a unified, on-campus space and requires increased funding.

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

1) Student Union and Activities contributes to helping foster a sense of community on the campus by providing quality and quantity of programs to the student body.  
GDM: 1, 2

2) Student Union and Activities demonstrates a financial need of student fees that cannot be fulfilled with alternative sources of income.  
GDM: 7

**Student Unions & Activities Operational Fee**

Fiscal Year 2016  
*Committee Vote: 7-0-0*

Requested Allocation: $2,193,161  
Recommended Allocation: $2,157,413

Fiscal Year 2017  
*Committee Vote: 7-0-0*

Requested Allocation: $2,193,161  
Recommended Allocation: $2,157,413

*Comments:*

The committee appreciates and recognizes the service that SUA provides to the student body. The committee understands SUA’s need to bring all wages in compliance with the increasing state mandated minimum wage. However, we did not feel as though SUA’s request – which
would have allowed for entry-level employees to be paid above minimum wage – was reasonable.

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

1) Cost of raising SUA worker’s wages above minimum wage would only benefit a relatively small number of students. Additionally, if SUA feels this is a top priority the possibility of reallocating funds within the unit is a potential course of action.
   GDM: 3, 6, 8

2) SUA helps to foster a sense of community on campus through their various programs, the demand for which was demonstrated.
   GDM: 1, 3
**University Recreation and Wellness – Facility Support Fee**

Fiscal Year 2016  
*Committee Vote: 7-0-0*

Requested Allocation: $6,048,200  
Recommended Allocation: $5,980,097

Fiscal Year 2017  
*Committee Vote: 7-0-0*

Requested Allocation: $6,048,200  
Recommended Allocation: $5,980,097

**Comments:**
The Committee commends University Recreation & Wellness (URW) for their proper use of the newly expanded and renovated facilities. Members also recognized and appreciated URW’s sustained focus on obtaining alternative revenues, both external and internal. Most importantly, the Committee applauds URW for their continued concern for the health and wellbeing of University students on both the Minneapolis and St. Paul campuses.

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

1) URW provides a valuable service to all students, and supplements the academic curriculum by providing training opportunities for students interested in sports and exercise science.  
GDM: 1, 2

2) Participation of students in activities offered by URW is relatively high.  
GDM: 3, 4

**University Recreation and Wellness – Operational Fee**

Fiscal Year 2016  
*Committee Vote: 6-1-0*

Requested Allocation: $3,123,499  
Recommended Allocation: $3,136,040

Fiscal Year 2017  
*Committee Vote: 7-0-0*

Requested Allocation: $3,298,499  
Recommended Allocation: $3,300,040

**Comments:**
The Committee commends the University Recreation and Wellness Center for providing excellent service and a healthy, welcoming atmosphere for the university community.

With regard to the required minimum wage increase--which will be raised to $9.00 per hour for FY 2016 and to $9.50 per hour for FY 2017--the committee voted to grant an increase in the unit’s operational budget to adhere to the federal mandate. Additionally, while the unit utilizes a stratified salary level for its employees, which allows for a salary increase for more senior members with greater responsibility, the Committee decided to grant appropriations equal to the
federally mandated minimum wage increase leaving the unit to cover the cost of its stratified salary levels internally.

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 acknowledges the wide breadth of services Recreational sports provides to the student body and the growing number of members served is a testament to the operational excellence of the unit.
   GDM: 1, 2, 3

2) The Committee also commends Recreational Sports for its efforts to attain revenue in addition to student services fees while adequately demonstrating a need for student fees.
   GDM: 7, 8, 9
University Student Legal Services
Fiscal Year 2016
Committee Vote: 7-0-0
Requested Allocation: $1,260,000  Recommended Allocation: $1,268,426

Fiscal Year 2017
Committee Vote: 7-0-0
Requested Allocation: $1,260,000  Recommended Allocation: $1,268,426

Comments:
The committee appreciates the wide range of services offered by University Student Legal Services (USLS), and the unit’s consistent efforts in advertising their services to the student body. We especially applaud USLS’ effectiveness in resolving tenant-landlord disputes, issues related to immigration, and USLS’ participation in the discourse regarding the University Police Department’s relationship to the campus community. The committee understands USLS’ need to replenish its reserves, and therefore approves the unit’s requested increase to its Student Services Fees allocation.

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

1) USLS provides a valuable service to all students, and helps foster a sense of community on campus.
   GDM: 1, 2, 4

2) USLS has increased its outreach efforts as directed by the committee.
   GDM: 5

3) Students not seeking legal assistance benefit from USLS’ auxiliary offerings – such as the Careers in Law Fair, and “Start Me Up” forum.
   GDM: 6