The Aurora Center For Advocacy & Education
Fiscal Year 2016
Committee Vote: 7-0-0
Requested Allocation: $433,569  Recommended Allocation: $285,526

Fiscal Year 2017
Committee Vote: 7-0-0
Requested Allocation: $434,611  Recommended Allocation: $285,526

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. The committee’s decision to not allocate an increase with regards to fringe benefits is not a budget cut, as it is currently being funded in the Center’s budget. Furthermore, the committee is aware that non-fees funding will be award to the Center to fund the “Men’s Engagement Coordinator” by the University. That is why the position was not included in our allocation for fiscal years 2016 and 2017.

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 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

Directives:
The committee asks that Aurora continue to look for additional sources of funding
**Boynton Health Service – Operational Fee**

**Fiscal Year 2016**

*Committee Vote: 7-0-0*

Requested Allocation: $8,515,948  
Recommended Allocation: $8,501,277

**Fiscal Year 2017**

*Committee Vote: 7-0-0*

Requested Allocation: $8,691,615  
Recommended Allocation: $8,683,865

**Comments:**
The Committee continues its appreciation and congratulates the management of Boynton Health Services (BHS). We feel they provide critical services to the wellbeing 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. Also the Committee recommends BHS to increase the promotion of its student health insurance for reducing the burden of high copay insurance contracts.
**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
**Boonyton Health Service – Gopher Chauffeur**

Fiscal Year 2016  
*Committee Vote: 4-3-0*  
Requested Allocation: $116,873  
Recommended Allocation: $86,426*

Fiscal Year 2017  
*Committee Vote: 7-0-0*  
Requested Allocation: $119,132  
Recommended Allocation: $86,426*

**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 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 initially granted Boynton the full requested increase of $30,447 for FY16 but Boynton Services will use other funds to facilitate this increase, as requested by the provost office. Therefore, the final recommended amount will be $86,426 instead. The Committee declined the requested increase for FY17.

The Committee had a few concerns regarding the Gopher Chauffeur. Some members expressed concerns that Gopher Chauffeur was being used as a “drunk bus,” and therefore requested that Boynton attempt to investigate the validity of this concern. Some Committee members also felt that the service should be handled by UMPD as the service was intended to solve a public safety issue. Under UMPD, it could be handled similarly to the escort service that the department currently offers. The Committee requested that Boynton also do research to see what the impact and cost would be to expand Gopher Chauffeur’s hours and the areas it reaches.

* Included in Boynton Health Service’s Operational Fee
Boynton Health Service – Mental Health Service
Fiscal Year 2016
Committee Vote: 7-0-0
Requested Allocation: $426,115  Recommended Allocation: $414,505*

Fiscal Year 2017
Committee Vote: 7-0-0
Requested Allocation: $523,315  Recommended Allocation: $511,705*

Comments:
The committee recognized the wide range of services that Boynton Mental Health provides for the University of Minnesota. We were pleased to hear about Boynton’s push towards technological advances to improve their outreach and decrease the wait time for patients. The committee also recognized Boynton’s efforts to increase internal revenues.

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 (Majority)
Fiscal Year 2016
Committee Vote: 5-1-1
Requested Allocation: $505,000 Recommended Allocation: $481,824

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 recommendation allocation figure and include the SSF 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.

The Minnesota Daily (Minority)
Fiscal Year 2016
Committee Vote: 5-1-1
Requested Allocation: $505,000 Recommended Allocation: $450,000

Comments:
The Minority appreciates the important role that the MN Daily plays by being the newspaper of the University. Although the Minority considers that their financial reserves are still high. When saying high, the minority understands it as above six months of expenses subtracting rent & utilities (a conservative approach that previous committees have agreed) equal to $731,305. Likewise the Minority shows a high concern vis-à-vis the extremely high return rate of 60% in 2014 and currently of 34.03% (after a 25% cut in circulation). The Minority sees this high return rate as an irresponsible use of student service fees and of paper considering its repercussions in the 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) The Daily does not demonstrate does justify their fees request in regard to print and distribution as well as financial reserves.
2) The Daily benefits students by providing a service and fostering a sense of community
GDM: 1, 2
Northrop (Majority)
Fiscal Year 2016
Committee Vote: 6-1-0
Requested Allocation: $407,894  Recommended Allocation: $178,362

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 certain 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.
Northrop (Minority)
Fiscal Year 2016
Committee Vote: 6-1-0
Requested Allocation: $407,894  Recommended Allocation: $251,900

Comments:
Although the minority understands the financial pressure that the committee has vis-à-vis keeping the fees under a rational increase, no more than 3%. The minority considers that the current allocation leaves too much underused capabilities for programming and services within Northrop. Although Northrop and SUA are considerably different in principle, they do have certain similarities in service. And when comparing Northrop’s to SUA’s budget, it only consists of 2.85%.

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) Northrop demonstrates financial need and has fully justify its request.
   GDM: 8, 9
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 committee asks that Radio-K make more of an effort into taking into account student preferences and suggestions in producing its programming, so as to better serve the needs of students on campus. We also ask that Radio-K better publicize its mobile applications.
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. Additionally, we recommend the SCRC collaborate with the Minnesota Student Association and other relevant student groups for outreach efforts and university policy discussions.
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: 7-0-0
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.

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:* 6-0-1  
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

**Directives:**
We ask the SUA focus on events that give a great rate of return for students, like the free movies in Coffman and the St. Paul Student Center.
University Recreation and Wellness – Facility Support Fee
Fiscal Year 2016
Committee Vote: 7-0-0
Requested Allocation: $6,048,200
Recommended Allocation: $6,000,456

Fiscal Year 2017
Committee Vote: 7-0-0
Requested Allocation: $6,048,200
Recommended Allocation: $6,005,956

Comments:
The Committee commends the University Recreation and Wellness Center (URW) 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 state mandate. Due to President Kaler’s proposed limit of a 3% increase in all student services fees the committee decided to decrease URW’s operational funding from the initial recommended allocation.

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

1) The 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

Directives:
The committee asks that URW maintain records of the number of students utilizing each class and program offered.
University Recreation and Wellness – Operational Fee
Fiscal Year 2016
Committee Vote: 7-0-0
Requested Allocation: $3,123,499
Recommended Allocation: $3,095,681

Fiscal Year 2017
Committee Vote: 7-0-0
Requested Allocation: $3,298,499
Recommended Allocation: $3,254,181

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 Committee would like URW to provide better information for future years on the distribution of student employees including, the number of students who are employed in each area, what time of year they are employed, and the duration of their employment. This will address the Committee’s concerns about URW’s possible inefficient use of student workers. The Committee would also like to request further information on who and where URW is helping students, meaning who is utilizing the group classes and exercise equipment and where they are doing so.

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 Student Legal Services
Fiscal Year 2016
Committee Vote: 7-0-0
Requested Allocation: $1,260,000  Recommended Allocation: $1,267,426

Fiscal Year 2017
Committee Vote: 7-0-0
Requested Allocation: $1,260,000  Recommended Allocation: $1,267,426

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’s Police Department’s relationship to the University. 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

Directives:
The committee asks USLS to explore the possibility of hosting the Careers in Law fair at a different venue in order to maximize student participation.