



**To:** Melissa Vito  
Vice President for Student Affairs

**From:** The Student Services Fee Advisory Board

**CC:** Joel Hauff  
Teresa Whetzel

**Date:** March 22, 2017

**Subject:** SSFAB Recommended Funding Allocations for FY18

The Student Services Fee Board met on February 27th and March 3rd to discuss and vote on the 32 proposals submitted by the Student Affairs Departments. The Board reviewed the merits of each proposal and after careful consideration we are pleased to recommend funding for 18 of the 32 projects next year; two proposals were approved for 2 year funding and zero proposals were approved for 3 year funding. The recommended allocations as well as the rationale for these allocations are on the attached pages.

We respectfully request your approval of our recommendations.

Thank you.

**Student Services Fee Project Proposals - FY 2018**

Proposal #	Projects	Dept	# Yrs Requested	Requested FY18 (Year 1)	Requested FY19 (Year 2)	Requested FY20 (Year 3)	Total Requested	Funded FY18 (Year 1)	Funded FY19 (Year 2)	Funded FY20 (Year 3)	Total Funded
SF18.01	ASA Peer Mentors	Academic Success and Achievement	3	\$ 231,400	\$ 241,000	\$ 250,800	\$ 723,200	\$ 110,000	\$ -	\$ -	110,000
SF18.05	Common Ground Alliance	Dean of Students	3	494,700	494,700	494,700	1,484,100	345,000			345,000
SF18.07	DOS Graduate & Professional Student Program	Dean of Students	2	454,900	454,900		909,800	390,000	390,000		780,000
SF18.10	Family Weekend 2017	Dean of Students	1	25,300	-	-	25,300	-			-
SF18.11	Fostering Success	Admissions	3	42,900	43,300	43,500	129,700	-			-
SF18.12	Gallagher Theater Free Movies for All	Student Union	1	30,900	-	-	30,900	-			-
SF18.13	Gallagher Theater Seating and Projector Replacement	Student Union	1	62,300	-	-	62,300	-			-
SF18.14	Games Room eSport Viewing Area	Student Union	1	7,600	-	-	7,600	-			-
SF18.15	GPSC Childcare	GPSC	1	100,000	-	-	100,000	100,000			100,000
SF18.18	GPSC Research and Project Grants	GPSC	1	117,700			117,700	75,000			75,000
SF18.19	GPSC Travel Grants Program	GPSC	1	293,600	-	-	293,600	195,000			195,000
SF18.21	Immigrant Student Resource Center - 2	Early Academic Outreach	3	75,500	119,400	121,600	316,500	75,500	119,400		194,900
SF18.22	Innovate UA	Office of Student Engagement	3	83,200	90,200	91,200	264,600	35,000			35,000
SF18.23	Marketing for Success	Academic Initiatives and Student Success	1	37,500	-	-	37,500	-			-
SF18.24	Native Rise	Early Academic Outreach	3	112,900	114,100	115,900	342,900	-			-
SF18.26	PASS Probation Program	Academic Success and Achievement	3	201,000	207,100	213,200	621,300	136,100			136,100
SF18.29	Rooftop & Pangea Garden	Student Union	1	17,900	-	-	17,900	17,900			17,900
SF18.02	ASUA Club Funding	ASUA	1	151,500	-		151,500	126,700			126,700
SF18.04	Campus Pantry	Student Union	2	58,500	62,800		121,300	15,000			15,000
SF18.06	Customized Connections for Career Readiness	Career Services	1	39,300	-	-	39,300	-			-
SF18.08	Enriching Student Nutrition Knowledge	Student Union	1	10,700	-	-	10,700	-			-
SF18.09	Faculty Engagement Programs	Student Affairs & Enrollment Mgmt	1	121,400	-	-	121,400	-			-
SF18.17	GPSC Professional Opportunities Development	GPSC	1	20,200	-	-	20,200	10,000			10,000
SF18.20	Hub for Financial Education	Academic Success and Achievement	3	51,100	51,900	52,700	155,700	-			-
SF18.25	Off-Campus Housing Sustainability	Residence Life	1	12,100	-	-	12,100	7,800			7,800
SF18.27	Power Up	Student Union	1	17,100	-	-	17,100	-			-
SF18.28	Project Rush FY18-20	Financial Aid	3	247,000	267,800	269,800	784,600	90,000			90,000
SF18.30	Safe Ride	ASUA	2	217,100	217,100		434,200	150,000			150,000
SF18.31	Scholarship Universe	Financial Aid	2	78,800	84,000		162,800	35,000			35,000
SF18.32	Student Engagement Skills Training & Scholarship	Office of Student Engagement	1	53,300	-	-	53,300	-			-
SF18.33	University Emergency Medical Services	ASUA	2	260,200	256,200		516,400	65,000			65,000
SF18.34	Volunteer and Civic Engagement Initiative	Dean of Students	2	51,500	49,900	-	101,400	-			-
SF18.16	GPSC Club Funding - Withdrawn!	GPSC	1	15,200			15,200	-			-
<b>Total Project Proposals</b>				<b>\$ 3,794,300</b>	<b>\$ 2,754,400</b>	<b>\$ 1,653,400</b>	<b>\$ 8,202,100</b>	<b>\$ 1,979,000</b>	<b>\$ 509,400</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 2,488,400</b>
											\$ -
<b>Projected Funds Available to allocate</b>				<b>\$1,979,000</b>				<b>\$1,979,000</b>			
<b>Deficit of Available Funding</b>				<b>(\$1,815,300)</b>				<b>\$ -</b>			

## **SSFAB 2016-2017 Funding Recommendations**

### **SF18.01 ASA Peer Mentors**

The board voted to recommend funding to ASA Peer Mentors for \$110,000 for one year. The board feels as though this is a great resource to have on campus given that retention numbers consistently need to be increased and are a priority for the university. Additionally, the hiring of student peer mentors to facilitate this is great career and professional development experience. However, limited funds were available, causing us to not be able to fund it to the degree we had hoped. It also seems as though ASA itself consists of so many separate programs, mentoring opportunities, and workshop/teaching experiences that streamlining these, in addition to combining it with other programs like PASS, would hopefully make it more efficient and get to the heart of what students need to succeed on campus. We recommend a reshuffling of this department, and hopefully this will allow future boards and years to look at it differently.

### **SF18.02 ASUA Club Funding**

The board voted to recommend funding to ASUA Club Funding for \$126,700 for one year. ASUA is a priority for the board, and has been funded many times before. We have not been able to offer it full funding recently, including this year, because of budgetary restraints when comparing it to other programs, and this proposal in particular is scalable in that lessening the funding given to it will not substantially change the way that it is handled. The board does see an enormous benefit from ASUA having partnered with GPSC and conglomerated their club funding efforts, and is very willing to provide increased funding this year in the hopes that this effort can continue throughout the year. We hope to see graduate students represented in ASUA allocations this year, but given the increase in applications, it may be time to consider looking for outside sources of funding, central funding, or other options if the Student Services Fee does not provide enough to meet the demand. We shall take our cue from ASUA on this matter in the future.

### **SF18.04 Campus Pantry**

The board voted to recommend funding the UA Campus Pantry for \$15,000 for one year. The board recognized the necessity of funding a program such as this that seeks to provide a critical service for food insecure students. Thirty percent of undergraduate students and ten percent of graduate students are food insecure at the UA. The board decided to fund this grant in partial due to the limited funds available for allocation this year, acknowledging the successes the Pantry has had up to this point without paid student positions. The board also decided to fund this grant

for one year in the event that more funds are made available for allocation next year, enabling the Pantry to return to the board next year for increased funding. We also see new partnerships forming that may make the Pantry non-reliant on SSF funds such as the Rooftop Gardens, Market on the Move, and the UA Foundation.

#### **SF18.05 Common Ground Alliance**

The board voted to recommend funding to the Common Ground Alliance for \$345,000 for one year. This was a top priority for the board this year, as discussions around campus with administration, students, MSUA and more have shown us that diversity and inclusion efforts on campus need to be taken seriously and prioritized. While we do not have the funds to allow for the full funding of this request, the board still wishes for this project to succeed in every way, in a hopefully equal way (with every cultural center being given the opportunity to have an extra staff member on hand, not simply half of them or any number less than the full amount). We hope that by providing funding to get this off the ground then future boards would be willing to sustain it or increase it when the time comes. In addition, one year allows for these projects to begin, so that assessment can be put in place to determine if more or less is needed for the future.

#### **SF18.06 Customized Connections for Career Readiness**

The board voted against recommending funding for Customized Connections for Career Readiness. While the board does recognize the need for an interactive platform for alumni and students to connect in regards to career-related experiences, we were unable to fully grasp the scope of this platform. Because the University of Arizona already sponsors the popular Wildcat Joblink, we believe this program would demand strong and potentially expensive marketing efforts. In addition, the board was skeptical about the extent of reach to alumni that could provide externships and internships to all majors of study and types of students. In the future, the board would like to see how Career Services is making connections with alumni and marketing this program to students in order to ensure that it is put to good use and improving the career opportunities of all students.

#### **SF18.07 DOS Graduate & Professional Student Program**

The board voted to recommend that the Dean of Students Office of Graduate & Professional Students Program receive partial funding in the amount of \$390,000 for two years. This is a valuable program to help prepare graduate and professional students for careers in higher education administration, but also provides services to the entire student body. This program directly engages students and supports the core tenets of Student Services Fee: providing student services, and helping retain and graduate students.

### **SF18.08      Enriching Student Nutrition Knowledge**

The board voted against recommending funding for Enriching Student Nutrition Knowledge. The board did appreciate that there was an effort on campus to teach students how to cook in a healthy way, as this is a good idea to tackle on a college campus. The online nutrition calculator was not seen as a priority however, as there are not too many metrics provided on it and the calculator itself does not seem to have many options available on it from non-union restaurants, which may be nothing the Unions can fix themselves, but is still a concern for its effectiveness. Because of limited funds and the need to provide a safety net for programs the board believes are mandatory and important for the running of the University, we were not able to fund this proposal.

### **SF18.09      Faculty Engagement Programs**

The board voted against recommending funding for Faculty Engagement Programs. The board definitely sees the merit of this program when faculty fellows are placed in rewarding areas that share their interests and allow them to have a relationship with students, such as the cultural centers and at different resources on campus. However, we see the scope of this program to be too large currently, and not necessarily useful in most cases, such as in the residence halls. The types of activities provided are not necessarily engaging sometimes, and have devolved in some cases to providing food for a population of students without too much context. It seems that the mission of the program does not translate to the student perspective, which may be a problem in the long run. We saw that this proposal was funded through other sources as well, which allows the board to feel as though it will be sustained beyond our funding. In addition, the Student Services Fee cannot handle expansion of its programs currently, which led us to not recommend funding for this proposal.

### **SF18.10      Family Weekend 2017**

The board did not recommend funding for Family Weekend 2017. We did find merit in the argument that Family Weekend served as a valuable experience to help connect students to the University of Arizona. We also liked that the proposal sought to make Family Weekend more affordable and accessible for attendees. However, we were not sure that the program fully fell under the purview of the Student Services Fee. Program metrics demonstrated that it is an event heavily attended by freshmen and individuals from fraternities and sororities, and we would like to see increased outreach to the rest of the student population on campus.

### **SF18.11      Fostering Success**

The board did not recommend funding for Fostering Success. While the board recognized the clear need and benefits of this program, previously funded or established programs were generally given priority funding due to the sheer lack of student service fee dollars available for allocation. This proposal was seen by every board member as a valuable and needed program to aid the portion of students that are currently or have formerly been involved in the foster care system. The board suggested that Fostering Success submit another proposal for the next available funding period in hopes that the amount of available funds will be larger and better equipped to fund new proposals.

#### **SF18.12 Gallagher Theater Free Movies for All**

The board did not recommend funding for the Gallagher Theater Free Movies for All. While the board sees merit in allowing students to relax and see movies for free in the union, we do not see how this proposal falls under the purview of the Student Services Fee, which is mostly centered around improving students' access to career-related education or experiences, opportunities to give back to the university or local community, and providing support for underrepresented or underserved communities through programs designed to better students' lives on campus. While we do think this program would provide benefit to students on campus (mostly those who live on campus), we are not able to fund it for these reasons.

#### **SF18.13 Gallagher Theater Seating and Projector Replacement**

The board did not recommend funding for the Gallagher Theater Seating and Projector Replacement. The board did not know that the Gallagher Theater was a classroom that does not receive classroom funding from UA. This seems like something should be prioritized by the Student Union itself, given that the space is also used during orientations and large campus events. The board sees merit in the funding of this proposal, but believes that it falls outside of the purview of the Student Services Fee. However, one particular part of the proposal, the hearing assistance equipment, is very important, and if the theater will continue to operate, it should absolutely provide this equipment for students who are deaf or hard of hearing, in order to be inclusive in its approach to supporting students.

#### **SF18.14 Games Room eSport Viewing Area**

The board did not recommend funding for the Games Room eSport Viewing Area. If the goal of this proposal is to bring together students with an interest in e-gaming and to provide a safe and comfortable space for them, then the Student Union itself should be the one to create that space. The board feels as though funding this proposal fall outside of our duty to students, and while we

see the merit of having a space like this on campus as some other universities are creating, we do not feel as though students should be the ones funding it.

#### **SF18.15 GPSC Childcare**

The board voted to recommend GPSC Childcare receive full funding in the amount of \$100,000 for one year. The board has received this proposal for a few years now, and has always made it a top priority for funding. Since we are the only PAC-12 school without a central childcare facility on campus, we see this proposal as extremely important for helping our parent students and employees with childcare costs. We hope that the university is able to provide this centrally in the future, since having this program come up for funding every year does take away from the amount that we have to give to others, and the Student Services Fee should never be seen as a permanent or reliable source of funding for long-term programs.

#### **SF18.17 GPSC Professional Opportunities Development**

The board voted to recommend that GPSC Professional Opportunities Development receive partial funding in the amount of \$10,000 for one year. Using similar logic to other proposals submitted by GPSC and ASUA, we saw this as scalable in its design, where the small pool of money would become more competitive instead of being eliminated entirely. In addition, the board would like to see a larger number of requests and students using this funding type, as it did not seem as though it was something that students were aware of (the board was not as well). Though we see a benefit in providing this funding source on campus, it will have to change or be redefined in future years to justify continuing on.

#### **SF18.18 GPSC Research and Project Grants**

The board voted to recommend GPSC Research and Project Grants receive partial funding in the amount of \$75,000 for one year. This is an important program to help fund graduate and professional student research. It also contributes directly to University of Arizona goals concerning visibility, recognition, recruitment, retention, and graduating students prepared to enter the job market. We recommended partial allocation because we'd like to see more marketing to encourage program growth and competitiveness.

#### **SF18.19 GPSC Travel Grants Program**

The board voted to recommend GPSC Travel Grants receive partial funding in the amount of

\$195,000 for one year. This is a foundational GPSC program and serves the largest number of graduate students. It is an absolutely necessary and vital program to allow graduate students to travel to conduct and present their research. We cut the allocation because of limited funds, but we recognize this is a highly competitive program and it deserves more funding.

#### **SF18.20      Hub for Financial Education**

The board voted against recommending funding for the Hub for Financial Education. The board saw a clear and growing need for increased financial literacy and fully supported this proposal, however with the lack of available funds for allocation the board concluded that existing programs should carry more weight in terms of funding consideration. Due to this the board recommended that the Hub for Financial Education submit proposals in subsequent funding periods. The need for a program of this nature is sure to continue increasing as student loan debt follows suit. The amount of student service fee dollars available for allocation this current funding period provided extreme difficulty when considering new proposals and programs.

#### **SF18.21      Immigrant Student Resource Center - 2**

The board voted to recommend funding to the Immigrant Student Resource Center for two years, with \$75,500 for year 1 and \$119,400 for year 2. This is a proposal that is very important to the board, as we were happy to fund its initial year's amount last year, and asked the center to come back to us if any increases were desired for the future. Since that time, the importance of this resource on campus has increased exponentially, and the board is more than happy to provide increased funding in order to expand the reach and programming of the center. Seeing as they simply cannot provide their services to the campus community fast enough, we hope that this increase in funding will provide the ability to accomplish everything that the Center hopes to see.

#### **SF18.22      Innovate UA**

The board voted to recommend that Innovate UA receive partial funding in the amount of \$35,000 for one year. The board sees the merit in a program such as this, as it fulfills some of the tenets of the Student Services Fee, in expanding student opportunities outside of the classroom, and can see that the program is expanding its reach into many different types of events for the future. However, we are not able to provide full funding for this request because of limited funds. The board does appreciate that we are not the sole source of funding for this proposal as well however, and looking to the Student Innovation Fund and other sources would be a good



step for the future.

### **SF18.23      Marketing for Success**

The board voted against recommending funding for Marketing for Success. While the board did see potential in the program, the metrics provided to explain the viability and effectiveness of the program were lacking. In addition, the board believes that there are several sponsorships and funding opportunities through local and corporate organizations that Residence Life can pursue in order to further market to students in an interesting way. The board did not see the direct correlation with Marketing for Success and student retention, which was one the major missions of this proposal.

### **SF18.24      Native Rise**

The board voted against recommending funding for Native Rise. This is a proposal that the board is saddened to have to cut this year, given its impact on the campus community and its importance to the Native American population on campus. We appreciate that the proposal is mostly run through student efforts, and that it helps to create a pipeline for Native American students to come to the university. We do put this on the top of our priority list, and with an increase in the Student Services Fee incoming, we hope that this program will still be funded in its entirety anyways. We do hope to see this proposal back again in the future.

### **SF18.25      Off-Campus Housing Sustainability**

The board voted to recommend funding to Off-Campus Housing Sustainability for \$7,800 for one year. The board recognized the need for increased education in sustainability for UA students in off-campus housing. The board acknowledged the SSF survey's results that 67% of UA students support sustainability initiatives and the relatively small ask for the impact created by this program. The board also appreciated the experiential learning and engagement aspects of the student positions. Again, due to allocation restrictions this year, the board voted to fund this grant in partial for one year in order to maximize the opportunities for students employed through the program while balancing other grants.

### **SF18.26      PASS Probation Program**

The board voted to recommend that the PASS Probation Program receive partial funding in the amount of \$136,000 for one year. The board sees the definite benefit of this program, and recognizes that it serves as one of the last barriers for students who are having academic or personal trouble at the university. The use of student peer mentors just like ASA Peer Mentors is

also a great experience for career and professional development. The Student Services Fee is unable to fund this proposal in full because of budgetary concerns. We also do not fully understand the perspective of the PASS Punctuated part of the program as well, and hope that this will be handled effectively as well, so that this program can continue for years to come.

### **SF18.27      Power Up**

The board voted against recommending funding for Power Up. Just as with other proposals, we do not believe it is the duty of the student services fee to upgrade the physical environment of the Union. That being said, we had other concerns about this proposal as well, including the fact that wireless charging is not a technology that is available to everyone, is additionally not available to everyone that has a smartphone, and can become outdated very quickly. The board believes that the technology may be on its way out currently, and if a newer version is to hit the market, then the charging stations in place in the union would need to be upgraded again. As for the secure charging stations, we are unsure whether or not they would be used for the most part, but saw more merit in this plan than the wireless stations. Overall, we are unable to fund the proposal because of these reasons and a limited budget.

### **SF18.28      Project Rush FY18-20**

The board voted to recommend funding Project Rush in the amount of \$90,000 for one year. This program responds directly to the 84% and 78% of undergraduate and graduate respondents who wanted increased access to scholarships and financial aid information (Student Services Fee, Fall 2016). The board supports the student jobs component of this program. However, we also recognized that Project Rush experienced a budget cut last year and still decreased wait times. Given this information, we feel confident that Project Rush will succeed in remaining a fast, useful service to students.

### **SF18.29      Rooftop & Pangea Garden**

The board voted to recommend that the Rooftop and Pangea Garden receive partial funding in the amount of \$17,900 for one year. While the board was unable to fund the project in whole, we still want to show our absolute support of the program and our hope that the gains from it impact the campus community in the most effective way possible. Though we realize that the garden may have been built without our funding anyways (since the competition to design it happened apparently without knowing where the funding was going to come from to construct it), the board still believes that this can impact campus culture in a positive way and provide natural, fresh food for both the Union, and who the board thought was the absolute priority, the Campus Pantry.

### **SF18.30      Safe Ride**

The board voted to recommend partial funding for one year in the amount of \$150,000 to SafeRide. This program is a staple of the University of Arizona. It provides not only a convenient way to transport students around campus, but also acts a safety measure for those who are still on campus during later hours. Because of the wide student base it serves, the boards feels its commitment to adapting to technological changes and improving its services makes it a great recipient of Student Services Fee funding. In addition, the growth and potential this program has presented in the past few years demonstrates the funds previously allocated to SafeRide have been put to good use.

### **SF18.31      Scholarship Universe**

The board voted to recommend that Scholarship Universe receive partial funding in the amount of \$35,000 for one year. While we are unable to allow for funding this project in full, Scholarship Universe is a definite priority for the board, and a service we hope will continue for years to come. It does help that the proposal has changed drastically from previous years', and it seems to have done so at the right year luckily. The board is more than happy to provide work for students on campus in order to give them the professional and job-related skills they will need in the world, and provide students in general with access to financial aid information and opportunities. Scholarship Universe is also now a UA staple, being mentioned at orientations, used by thousands of students, and being known on campus as the place to look. For these reasons, we hope that we are indeed able to offer more to the program in the future in order to help alleviate its large workload.

### **SF18.32      Student Engagement Skills Training & Scholarship**

The board voted against recommending funding for Student Engagement Skills Training and Scholarship. The board was a tad confused about the scope of this proposal and what it hoped to accomplish, as it seemed to be marred in 'engagement,' following the UA party line, but not provide us with information about how it will outreach to students in fields that may need extra skills training or give out both its teachings and its scholarships. We do see a benefit to providing for students whose choices of study might not allow them to learn the types of skills necessary to succeed beyond conceptually in the real world, such as with excel, email, or data management however. We are unclear if this is a service that this particular department should put on as opposed to an academic one or somewhere more closely aligned with teaching or student success such as Think Tank, or if the department is going to attempt to provide the service anyways if they do not receive funding from the Student Services Fee. That being said, it is also a new program in a year that does not allow the board much leeway in terms of funding new proposals.

### **SF18.33 University Emergency Medical Services**

The board voted to recommend that University Emergency Medical Services receive partial funding in the amount of \$65,000 for one year. This proposal is very important to the university and Tucson community as a whole, but it is one that the board itself is conflicted on. While we see an absolute benefit to providing students access to lightning-fast medical care from other students training in the profession, we do not believe that this service is one that falls completely within the bounds of the Student Services Fee, as it helps to serve the larger community and a large portion of its budget goes to a hospital contract and medical supplies. We as a board would be happy to fund the student involvement aspect of the service, such as paying the directors or allowing students to not need to work multiple jobs in unrelated fields in order to be involved, as we believe that providing students with this experience is very important to their professional development, but since the program itself is relying on us as a source of funding and is not tied to other community functions or the Banner hospital, we hope to simply keep the program on its feet until it can make a change in how it is funded and handled. While we see UEMS as a very important community service that UA students are involved in, we struggled with budgetary restrictions this year and how we hope to see the program in the future.

### **SF18.34 Volunteer and Civic Engagement Initiative**

The board voted against recommending funding for the Volunteer and Civic Engagement Initiative. With the lack of funds this year, it was not a high priority for the board. We want to see the program collaborate with more departments on campus (ASUA/GPSC, Fraternity and Sorority Programs, Dean of Students Office) to have a higher engagement with students. We also felt that the program should focus more on the local community in Tucson than using funds to impact other communities around the country. The board wants to see the program restructure their priorities to receive future funding in the upcoming years.

