

**From:** [markow](#)  
**To:** [Secretary of the Faculty](#)  
**Cc:** [Jane Richard](#); [REINDL, DOUGLAS](#); [HORN, John](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Fwd: Re: Recreational Sports Board and Classified Staff Representation  
**Date:** Tuesday, September 9, 2014 8:09:56 PM  
**Attachments:** [copier@aims.wisc.edu\\_20140909\\_084630.pdf](#)

---

Dear Steve,

Thank you for facilitating this consideration. John Horn was able to retrieve a document from storage that was circulated in 2012 that shows the change from 5, 5, 5 to what we now know as the later version of the configuration. This is the first we've been able to see any documentation related to this change.

Embedded within this document are many of the same points that I'm making today about Board configuration. And, of course, the reasoning for why the more even distribution was rejected. Our current projections for share of funding for recreation sports facilities, reflecting our best guesses based on the passage of the funding referendum this past spring are:

2012-2013: Student Funding made up 58% of the recreation sports budget

2013-2014: Student Funding increased to 63% of recreation sports funding with a \$6.00 increase per semester

2014-15: Student Funding will increase this year to approximately 68% with the approved \$6 increase per semester by SSFC in Spring 2014.

2015-19: Student Funding will remain at approximately 68% as recreation sports is committed to no new segregated fee increases until the SERF opens.

2019-20: A projected \$89 seg fee increase will result in the recreation sports budget being funded by students to about 81% (estimated). The \$89 increase will be dedicated to debt service that we are projected to pay over a 30 year bond.

2021-22: A \$12 per semester increase of the seg fee will finalize the NAT project and result in Rec Sports being funded approximately 85% by student seg fees. This \$12 increase will also be dedicated to debt service for the NAT.

These estimates are, of course, subject to change due to bond rates, debt service requirements, state changes to scope or timing, bid amounts, and other factors.

And, while both the usage rates and funding data point to the level of student participation in Recreation Sports facilities and services, they are also indicators of Recreation Sports fulfilling its mission.

Finally, the first section of the duties of the Recreation Sports Board is that it "Advises the administration concerning the development, programming, staffing, maintenance, and financing of recreational sports facilities for faculty, staff, and students." It is critical that recreation sports staff and board hear from the constituency that most uses and finances the endeavor so that development, programming, etc., can be performed to the best of our abilities.

Thanks again,

Jesse

On 9/2/2014 5:00 PM, Secretary of the Faculty wrote:

Dear Jesse,

The UC has reviewed the request from the Rec Sports Board and has asked me to get some follow-up information from you.

Their first question is a factual one relating to your assertion that the percentage of student representation has decreased relative to participation from other governance units. You note in your letter that the configuration went from 5 faculty, 5 staff, and 5 students (or 33% students) to 5 students, 2 faculty, 2 academic staff, 1 classified staff (or 50% students). As you also note, the Faculty Senate in 2012 changed the configuration to 2 faculty, 3 academic staff, 3 classified staff, and 4 students (or 33% students). However, it doesn't appear that the second of those configurations was ever in effect. That is, when the Faculty Senate made the change in 2012, the committee went from 5 faculty, 5 staff, and 5 students to the current configuration. Both of these configurations include 1/3 students and 2/3 faculty and staff.

As you may know, there has been a lot of turnover in this office, so it's entirely possible that the middle configuration (with 50% student representation) was in effect and has not been adequately documented. Could you please let me know where these numbers came from?

A related question from the UC is why increased student representation is desirable or needed. What would more students on the board bring to the table? It is clear that they represent heavy users of the facilities, but what would be the rationale for increasing their voice and changing the balance beyond usage statistics?

Thank you for any information you can provide. Best, Steve

On 8/19/2014 2:36 PM, markow wrote: