

Health and Recreation Fee Student Advisory Board
Academic Year 2013-2014
Meeting 1 Minutes
December 6, 2013
(5pm – DeArmond Conference Room)

Members Present:

1. Courtney Campbell – Off-Campus Housing, Chair
2. Jasmine Sears – GPSC, Vice-Chair
3. Caeli Barker – SHAC
4. Zachary Miller – Greek Life
5. Aaron Tatad – CHS Student Employee
6. Cory Eifert – CRC Student Employee
7. Nathan Tack - RHA
8. Lysette Davis – GPSC
9. Noel Hennessey – At-Large
10. John Lloyd – Associate Director, Campus Rec
11. Heath Vescovi– Campus Health
12. Dr. Harry McDermott – Executive Director, Campus Health Services
13. Jody Moll – Interim Director, Campus Health Services

Welcome and Introductions

Courtney Campbell, Chair, called the meeting to order at 5:05pm. The members present introduced themselves.

Purpose

Courtney summarized the history of the Health and Recreation Fee and associated Student Advisory Board (see Governing Document). The Board does not make decisions – it exists for the purposes of disseminating information and collecting student feedback. The Board meets three times per year.

Dr. McDermott added that, even though the Board is advisory, it still carries a lot of weight. For example, during the fee transition period, the board wrote a letter supporting the implementation of the full fee.

The current fee level was set at an amount expected to be sufficient for the next 4-5 years of Health and Recreation operations. The fee took the place of all of the state and University funding that was being provided to Campus Health and Campus Recreation.

Funding Detail

Dr. McDermott and Jody Moll shared breakdowns of how last year's fee money was spent by Campus Health Services, this year's proposed budget, and how the fee money compares to the overall budget (see figures on website).

Two audits have been done since the fee was implemented. The first was an internal UA audit done in 2012, and found no concerns with how the fee money was being used. This year (2013), ABOR audited the Campus Health portion of the fee. No recommendations for improvement.

Major changes between the 2012-2013 budget and 2013-2014 projected budget:

- Employee Related Expenses (ERE) rates increased significantly, causing an increase in the amount allocated for Salary/ERE.
- Fund Balance Contribution is projected to decrease significantly to compensate.
- Summer fee may contribute roughly \$165k in addition to projected fee income.
- Capital allocation (for purchasing expensive individual items) increased slightly.

Jody explained that Campus Health's PnC (electronic medical record) system allows for analysis of services requested over time, informing budget decisions. Lysette asked whether this information could be used to look for imbalances in Campus Health resource use between certain groups, such as undergraduates versus graduate students, and to adjust the fee accordingly. Jody replied that a single fee amount is used for all students, and that there are no plans to change that. Dr. McDermott added that Campus Health has consistently seen 50% of students on campus for the past several years, and that, in addition to seeing students who directly request services, Campus Health keeps immunization records for all students and spreads information about services and preventive care.

Lysette asked about Campus Health's plan in the event of large unexpected expenses. Jody replied that Campus Health could request that some of the Fund Balance be used to cover budget overruns.

John Lloyd presented projected 2013-2014 expenses for Campus Recreation (see figures on website). The final 2012-2013 expense report was not included.

Explanation of Cherry Field Loan Payment: Standards recommend one acre of field space per thousand students. UA is currently at one acre per four or five thousand. Due to Title IX, a field previously jointly shared between Athletics and Recreation was given to Athletics. Cherry Field was on the master plan for campus development, so to replace the lost field space, the field was constructed. Athletics paid roughly half the cost of Cherry Field to make up for the half-field taken from Recreation.

Zach asked whether Recreation had plans for any other new fields. John responded that there was currently no space for additional fields.

Caeli asked about Recreation's plan for replacing the parking lost due to the construction of Cherry Field. John responded that the loss of 200 parking spaces is impacting revenue, and that Recreation is actively working on a solution with Parking and Transportation.

Zach asked whether students can opt out of the Recreation portion of the fee. John replied that, currently, only students not physically in Tucson for the semester can opt out. Local students with disabilities cannot opt out.

Lysette asked if part of the fee goes towards a fund to sponsor students who otherwise couldn't afford services with additional costs. John responded that there is a separate "Program Fee" that offsets program costs, but that low-income students aren't specifically subsidized.

Nate asked about the current status of Bear Down Field. John explained that Bear Down Field is jointly shared between Athletics and Recreation. Athletics temporarily took the field offline to improve facilities, and has priority time on the field. Recreation pays maintenance costs and has full discretion over field use the remainder of the time.

Nate asked about the current status of Bear Down Gym. John explained that the three-court gym was converted into office space due to renovation of Old Main. The space will not be returned to Recreation. Gittings Gym was given as a “replacement”, but consists of only one court that cannot be safely used for basketball. The loss of Bear Down Gym has caused a space crunch for Recreation programs.

Jasmine asked whether Recreation had a plan for avoiding sudden loss of facilities in the future, considering the financial impact of the losses. John suggested that Lynn Zwaagstra (Director of Campus Recreation) be asked, but said that Recreation had no control over the Bear Down Gym situation and that the fund balance is intended to reduce the impact of such events..

Dr. McDermott and John presented side-by-side comparisons of Health and Recreation fee spending. Jasmine asked whether the distribution of the fee matched the distribution of the non-fee portion of the budget. Dr. McDermott and John responded that the non-fee funds were not necessarily spent identically.

Discussion

The Board discussed what students meant when they requested transparency.

Lysette said that the question she hears most often is, “How is the Rec Center class schedule set?” Often, students run into time conflicts. An explanation of why certain times were chosen could help reduce frustration.

Nate suggested that Health and Recreation could indicate programs and equipment paid for by fee money with a logo, similar to the Student Services Fee. Dr. McDermott pointed out that, for Campus Health, the bulk of the fee goes towards paying salaries, making visual indication difficult. Noel suggested that programs such as intramurals be explicitly listed as subsidized by the Recreation fee.

Heath asked where an explanation of the fee could be found. Courtney said that the fee was explained on the Student Affairs Website. Heath suggested that the breakdown be posted somewhere more intuitive, such as Campus Health’s and Recreation’s respective websites.

Jasmine asked why the Health and Recreation fees were always presented as a combined fee, even though the money was rigidly split between the two departments. Dr. McDermott explained that getting a single fee request approved by ABOR was simpler than requesting two separate fees.

Nate suggested that Health and Recreation send out e-mails or flyers each semester listing all services and noting which ones are subsidized by the fee. Zach agreed that e-mails are a useful way to disseminate information to students, but suggested that information less relevant to students, such as salaries, be left out in favor of information such as the number of students employed by the departments. Dr. McDermott noted that the effectiveness of such e-mails would hinge on timing.

Lysette suggested that the immunization e-mail to new students be rephrased to make it simultaneously a greeting from Campus Health with information on other services provided.

Other Business

Courtney noted that the Secretary position was unfilled. She and Dr. McDermott gave a brief summary of the position.

Lysette volunteered to run for the position. She was elected unanimously.

The next Board meeting will be in late January. Departments will present projected budgets for the 2014-15 fiscal year before they are submitted to the University in February 2014. The final Board meeting will be near the end of Spring semester and cover submitted budgets and officer elections.

Meeting adjourned at 6:30pm.