Results: Student Development Funding Committee Survey

Conducted in May 2008
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Introduction

This survey instrument was used to assess the work of the Student Development Funding Committee (SDFC). The procedures for this committee were restructured during the 2007-2008 school year, and the Division of Student Life is assessing the effectiveness of and satisfaction with the changes. The feedback in this report will provide data for making improvements to the funding distribution system.

The survey was administered via Surveymonkey.com in two different manners. First, an invitation to participate in the survey was sent to 305 students via e-mail. These students were either student organization presidents, or they were e-mail addresses of individuals or groups that had requested funding from the SDFC at some point during the 2007-2008 academic year. Of these 305 students, 97 responded to the survey (about 32%). Second, there was an open invitation to respond to the survey placed on the Student Fee Distribution Web site (http://fees.iupui.edu) and on the SDFC Web site itself (http://funding.iupui.edu). These open links were promoted through JagNews, JagTV, and various e-mail listservs. This open promotion of the survey garnered 51 additional responses, bringing the total number of respondents up to 148.

IMPORTANT NOTE: In addition to responding to Likert-scale questions, the student respondents also provided a very rich set of qualitative comments. For a full understanding of the responses, please take your time to read the written feedback very carefully, beyond the simpler thematic summaries provided at the beginning of each section.

A final note about the survey instrument itself: This was a logical survey, meaning that the manner in which certain early questions were answered determined the later questions that would be available to the respondent. See the diagram below to see the design of the survey.

---

**Diagram:**

1. Q1: Did you request funding from the SDFC?
   - Q2: If no, why not?
   - Q3: If yes, did you receive funding?
     - Q4: Procedures simple?
     - Q5: Transparency in decision-making?
     - Q6: Communication?
     - Q7: Fair guidelines?
     - Q8: Impact?
     - Q9: Seeking volunteers for committee
Question 1
“Did you or your student organization request funding from the student organizations grant or the Education Enhancement Grant during the 2007-2008 academic year?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 148
skipped question 0

41.2% Yes
58.8% No

Question 2
“If no, why not?”

Analysis:
There were five major themes among the 55 responses to this question:

1. No knowledge of the availability of funding sources
2. No need for funding (for various reasons)
3. The student organization was recently formed and is not yet organized to know if it needs funding assistance or not
4. Perception of problems with funding requests
5. Perception that the process was not worth the time for the amount of available funding

The full list of responses follows (with no edits for grammar or spelling):

- Didn’t know it was available.
- Did not need extra funds.
- The main organization I am involved in is Undergraduate Student Government and we are given a budget at the beginning of each semester and not allowed to apply for funding through this source. I will be applying for the EEG soon.
- Did not know that the money was available.
- Just getting up and running, so nothing to really request monies for just yet.
- We were in the beginning stages of developing our group and just were not at a point in which we needed it.
- We didn’t know it was available.
- We did not have any activities this year as we had just started our organization.
- No enough information about SDFC and the amounts granted is too low as I heard
- The application process is too difficult, and I have heard of many failures of other organizations to request funding.
• We became official late in the semester, so we didn't have time to review the details on how to do it, or to come up with an event in time.
• One of the requirements demanded for an student organization member to attend all meetings. For our organization that requirement was impossible to met because it was on weekends. All members work during the weekends.
• process too complicated. Process not user friendly, didn't know who made decisions
• Once I realized that I would only be able to get $500 towards attending a conference, it didn't seem to have the ROI for the process. Why bother, when it wouldn't even get me there and back.
• Individuals in the student organization requested funding, but the organization itself did not. We had enough funding this year.
• I don't think we did as I thought the money allocated to the schools to disperse among the organizations comes from the Student Activity Fee.
• i did not know how i could or in what ways i would be aloud to request the money.
• Did not think would get the money
• was not in a group
• I didn't know about it.
• We were just recently created! :)
• No need this year, was not President of Circle K at the time.
• Did not know about the funding.
• The president did not take advantage of the funding.
• We request most of our funding through our school council.
• Had not organized yet.
• We did not have any program that required funding.
• We received funding from another budget through Greek Life
• We did not know about it
• We started late in the semester and are still dealing with the national NBS office in establishing an official chapter. We will apply for funding next fall as a chapter.
• Planned to but didn't for some reason
• not applicable
• My organization, Dumbledore's Army, didn't have regular meetings and the amount of members to attend any given meeting was small enough to accommodate.
• We were able to get our funds from another source.
• We were not fully informed of the process. We also didn't believe we would receive funding since we didn't use all of our funds that were allocated.
• We had to use our surplus, but next year with the cut in funding, the student organization is going to need more assistance. We spent about $10,000 dollars this year and next year, our organization will only be getting about $4,000. Therefore, they will need more funding.
• We facilitate our funds from membership dues and sponsorships through local companies.
• didn't know that the graduate group could do so
• why am I only getting #s 1, 2 and 9 on this survey?
• not sure
• I do not think that they knew about it.
• just started
• No funding was needed. Money for the program comes through the place we are volunteering.
• gosh
• We did not need funding because it is provided to us by our parent organization.
• We realized that someone has to go to the meetings every month and our committee is not that large yet.
• Our project doesn’t start until next year.
• didn’t need any
• The MSC gave us funding for the 07-08 school year. Thank goodness. Applying for funding for next year has been unorganized on the part of IUPUI. I have applied two separate times to get an email address for my group and no one will get back to me. How is my group going to have events if we are not respected enough to get a simple email address?
• They did not tell us
• The process requires too much work and the chances of it being approved are slim to none. It is easier for our group to fund raise our own money.
• I don’t know

Question 3
“If yes, did you receive funding?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question*</td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Many of those who skipped questions 3-8 were forced to do so. Respondents answering “no” to question 1 could respond only to questions 1, 2, and 9. See the introduction of this report for a map to the survey structure.
NOTE: Results of responses to the remaining questions in this report are split between those respondents who received funding ("funding recipients") and those who were denied ("non-recipients").

Question 4
“The procedures for requesting funding were simple and easy to understand.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Recipient % (n)</th>
<th>Non-recipient % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>16.1% (9)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>37.5% (21)</td>
<td>13.0% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>16.1% (9)</td>
<td>26.1% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>17.9% (10)</td>
<td>34.8% (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>12.5% (7)</td>
<td>26.1% (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% (56)</td>
<td>100% (23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis:
There is a positive relationship between agreement with this statement and funding status. In other words, those who received funding from the SDFC tended to agree more with the statement in Question 4 than those who did not receive funding. However, almost one third of funding recipients (30.4%) indicated they did not agree that the procedures were simple and easy to understand.

Twenty-two funding recipients provided additional feedback. There were 4 themes among their responses:

1. The Web site was either not functioning properly or was out of date
2. The process was either too complex or too difficult to follow
3. Some complained about not hearing a response in a timely manner
4. Others expressed no problems with the current system

The full list of responses from funding recipients appears below (with no edits for grammar or spelling):

1. I understand accounting principles and knowing where money is being spent, however I had to fax, scan, email, and provide hard copies of all "bids, and previous receipts" to satisfy the procedures. Also; when something came up later in the event planning I was unable to receive reimbursement on the items I wanted because we did not submit that into the bid, even though we were under budget.
2. The group had to apply two times for funding - the overriding issue is the events must be open to all students -- when in reality, no events are open to all students.
3. All instructions were given on the application. It was very easy to apply and very easy to submit.
4. The website to submit the funding request sucks! I accidentally did not answer one of the required questions; when I tried to submit the proposal it told me an error had occurred, and then when I hit the "back" button to correct my mistake, the entire form was cleared out and I had to rewrite my entire proposal. It was extremely frustrating.
5. The quoting process is too difficult for the people trying to get quotes.
6. Asking for money is difficult when you have to ask in a month in advance, but then the meetings are set in advanced so you can't have money. Also when trying to apply for travel expenses for
conferences, the information we were given was no longer available, making it difficult to understand what we needed to do. We all got so frustrated that we finally gave up.

7. Self explanatory.
8. I only filled out a part of the request.
9. I had to ask a lot of questions before I successfully received money. The instructions were not detailed enough in my opinion.
10. We were not formally informed about Chartwells rules. We had to find that out from other people.
11. We did not have any trouble applying for an EEG. The requirements were clearly stated and the online process was very helpful.
12. The process isn't explained anywhere that I could find, the forms are overly complex, you want way too much information, and how the heck are we supposed to get bids for mundane materials?
13. The review process seems unorganized and is not clear to applicants.
14. I am not sure which funding source we used for our trips and general funding but some of the process is challenging, understanding the bureaucracy and the procedures for repayment, etc.
15. The website may have been updated since but I thought the site for the forms and instructions was difficult to find.
16. Many links on the Office of Student Life website were not working for MONTHS on end. The Nuts and Bolts guide is out of date and invalid. There is no "how to" guide to getting funds; instead students are asked to jump through as many hoops as possible to arrive at a decision from a non-democratically selected committee that bases their decisions on their own opinions of the value of events rather than on a rock-solid policy.
17. The procedure to apply was fairly simple once I was finally able to locate the information. I had to do quite a bit of searching to find it. This information should have been easy to find.
18. We did not receive timely responses to our questions. The few instructions that were listed were confusing and unclear.
19. Of the dozen or so student organizations that have attempted to register with IUPUI over the past three months, none has been officially recognized yet.
   a. The Division of Student Life's site contains contradictory and incorrect information. Many of the links on the site are broken, even though the Division was informed of the problem in February.
   b. All student organization events must now be advertised to the ENTIRE IUPUI campus, including undergraduates. All students, regardless of class year, school, etc. must be welcome at all events.
   c. Students attempting to contact the Division of Student Life have received only silence in response. I've contacted them on multiple occasions myself, only to receive a message a month or two later - if at all - answering my question.
   d. Deadlines appear and disappear from the Division of Student Life website on a whim.
   e. Events must be planned in detail at least 1 month in advance. If any documentation is incomplete or incorrect, IUPUI will decline your request and you will not be able to hold that event until 30 days after you fix the paperwork or whatever they decided is wrong with your event.
   f. IUPUI does not guarantee a timely response on funding requests. You may submit your request 30 days before an event, but they can only promise a response by one week prior to the event - not enough time to cancel or reschedule a speaker.
   g. Student organizations must now register for an organization email account, StudentLink account, and recognition by the Division of Student Life by writing and producing for
them a constitution and bylaws, which must be re-approved annually when new officers are elected.

h. The StudentLink registration site has been down for 3 weeks now; new student organizations cannot register even if they desire to do so.

i. The funding committee at IUPUI ""takes the summer off,"" and we are unable to schedule or hold events over the summer, since they use the undergraduate academic year to schedule their meetings, even though the medical school and other colleges are in class year round.

j. There is no single document identifying what funds can and cannot be used to purchase, or the process to acquire funds.

20. Some of the requirements seemed a bit over the top. For instance we were required to provide signatures for all of the attendees to our formal function. Also the process didn't allow for an adjustment in our head count as it increased, additionally the process didn't cover tax or service charges to the tune of $1600.

21. We tried to get funding in the fall but we didn't receive it because the process was confusing. It doesn't make sense that students groups have to basically pay for events (off campus) and then get reimbursed. Students don't have the funds to do that.

22. I did not do it.

Ten non-recipients provided additional feedback to this question, and among these responses there were 3 common themes:

1. Low Web site functionality
2. Inconsistent or confusing information
3. Did not fully understand the guidelines

The full list of responses from non recipients appears below (with no edits for grammar or spelling):

1. The simplicity wasn't the issue, it was the individuals behind the scenes whom made it difficult
2. There were fairly easy to understand, but far from simple.
3. website poorly laid out and documentation not easy to find or understand
4. Not everything was laid out, in terms of due dates and all forms needing to be submitted seperately. This made it difficult and resulted in our organization submitting a couple documents in 'late'.
5. I felt that the procedure was easy to understand, but I never got funding, I applied for the IUPUI College Democrats 5 times and received nothing... not even saying they rejected my request
6. They are ridiculous, getting an invoice or estimate for posterboard is un called for!!
7. One person told me one thing, another something else. When all was said and done I got the wrong info and was unable to provide the info required to receive my reimbursement.
8. The rules seem to change every day ... we've been working on applying for funding for months now but before we can submit anything the rules change again and we need new paperwork to fill out.
9. Of the dozen or so IUSM student organizations that have attempted to register with IUPUI over the past three months, none has been officially recognized yet. The StudentLink registration site has been down for 3 weeks now; new student organizations cannot register even if they desire to do so.
10. We did not know we would need such a detailed layout of our budget. When we began looking into why we did not get our funding there were all kinds of excuses from your committee about how our treasurer had incorrectly applied for funding.
**Question 5**

“The process through which the funding decisions were made was transparent.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Recipient % (n)</th>
<th>Non-recipient % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>16.1% (9)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>35.7% (20)</td>
<td>8.7% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>25.0% (14)</td>
<td>17.4% (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>17.9% (10)</td>
<td>34.8% (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>5.4% (3)</td>
<td>39.1% (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% (56)</td>
<td>100% (23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis:**

Similar to question 4, there appears to be a positive relationship between agreement with this statement and funding status. In other words, those who received funding from the SDFC tended to agree more with the statement in Question 5 than those who did not receive funding. However, almost one quarter of funding recipients (23.3%) indicated they did not agree that the decision process for funding was transparent.

Sixteen funding recipients provided additional feedback on a variety of topics. There were only two common themes among some of the respondents:

1. Wanted more clarity in procedures and supporting documents
2. Complained of not receiving timely status updates

The full list of responses from funding recipients appears below (with no edits for grammar or spelling):

1. I understand the decisions, just not the procedures.
2. Transparent to the point that the persons/comments about the funding were not shared with the group.
3. I don't understand this question
4. I wish the process could be made a little faster.
5. The team is not known to all those applying. We need to know bios.
6. Many statements need to be further explained and specific deadlines need to be better identified throughout the document.
7. I was told about what I individually had to do and did not read about the process, I was only told when we got the funding.
8. I do think the yes/no process was straightforward. Whether or not I agree with it is different.
9. The students were not apart of the funding decision in order to know how decisions were made about who was funded and for how much.
10. We weren't clear as to the status of our proposal, we had to continually ask for status reports, and even then it was unclear as to when we would know if we were approved or not. This was frustrating and makes planning an event very difficult. It is hard to plan an event when you are uncertain as to whether you will receive the funds needed.
11. I was not in charge
12. I totally disagree. There was no transparency in the funding process whatsoever. Posting a few documents on the website listing events that were approved or declined is not transparency. Having a document, a solid, approved by the IUPUI attorneys, document that states what we can and cannot use funds for, who must be included, how much we can receive, is necessary -
not a committee of undergrads and other hand-selected individuals who can approve and deny requests seemingly on a whim.
13. I am not entirely sure how they come to a decision about who does and does not get funded.
14. We did not receive timely or detailed responses to questions.
15. The process is a little too transparent. I don’t like how the proposals, whether accepted or rejected, are posted online for all to see. There is sensitive information on the proposals and it should be private.
16. I did not do it.

Six non-recipients provided additional feedback to this question, and among these responses there were 2 common themes:

1. Perceived personal problems or biases
2. Wanted a simple, more streamlined explanation of procedures

The full list of responses from non recipients appears below (with no edits for grammar or spelling):
1. It seemed that the committee had their personal picks; where certain guidelines were overlooked when it came to their picks but enforced when came to other organizations.
2. Funding committee not transparent to organizations, committee membership not fairly chosen.
3. I never received funds... frustrating considering I pay student activities fees and had to pay for my entire groups events myself.
4. Everything that we were told that was to take place during this year of transition has been nothing more than a smoke screen to funnel saf to ends!
5. No one at the medical school has been kept informed on how this process works. It is clear you do NOT care about the medical students.
6. There is no single document identifying what funds can and cannot be used to purchase, or the process to acquire funds. Deadlines appear and disappear from the Division of Student Life website on a whim.

**Question 6**
I received clear and consistent communication from the Student Development Funding Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Recipient % (n)</th>
<th>Non-recipient % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>28.5% (16)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>30.4% (17)</td>
<td>8.7% (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>16.1% (9)</td>
<td>30.4% (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>14.3% (8)</td>
<td>13.0% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>10.7% (6)</td>
<td>47.8% (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% (56)</td>
<td>100% (23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis:**
Once again, there appears to be a slight positive relationship between agreement with this statement and funding status. In other words, those who received funding from the SDFC tended to agree more with the statement in Question 4 than those who did not receive funding. However, 25% of the funding recipients indicated they did not agree that they received clear and consistent communication from the Committee.
Seventeen funding recipients provided additional feedback. There were 3 themes among their responses:

1. Slow response time or no response from the committee.
2. Tina Samuel, Assistant Director of CCL, is a very helpful resource for understanding the process.
3. Unclear procedures.

The full list of responses from funding recipients appears below (with no edits for grammar or spelling):

1. The communication was consistent, not always clear.
2. Honestly, the 30 days at the beginning of the year is not helpful -- come day 31 proposals are reviewed much differently than earlier in the year. It should be consistent.
3. Once the process had begun, I felt very informed and all of my questions were answered.
4. I received instructions that had no clear outcome.
5. Tina Samuel was very helpful and willing to answer my questions and keep me updated. Thanks!
6. NEver once when I emailed them did I receive a reply.
7. Communication was lulled every once in a while, and it always came from one person. Perhaps, more than one person should issue e-mails to expectant individuals/groups.
8. Whenever something went on someone got an email and that message was relayed to us.
9. Tina Samuel was very direct with answering my questions, which made the process efficient. She knows what she is doing.
10. We submitted our SOG on-line nine weeks before our event, but it was not finally approved until two weeks prior. We learned that the delay was b/c SDFC needed quotes for items that were in our budget though we were not even applying for funds to cover those items. This was very frustrating b/c this was not stated in the guidelines. The guidelines stated that we needed quotes for the items that our SOG was to cover.
11. I do not recall.
12. overall, it was a smooth process on both occasions that we requested funding. There needs to be a greater awareness of it’s availability.
13. This must be a joke - the committee's left hand had no idea what its right hand was doing 99% of the time. Instead of funding things that students need, requests were declined out of hand. Communication with the committee is ridiculously slow. Planning events and estimating their attendance months in advance is nonsense and is incompatible with the majority of events held at my school. When requests were placed with IUPUI for clarification of policies or to fix broken links or supply clarified information about things, often no response was received - or if one was received, it would arrive a month or two after a question had been sent to the funding group. You expect us to be timely in our submissions of requests, budgets, etc., but then refuse to return the favor. A complete and utter lack of respect and professionalism is all the committee is known for, in my opinion, not prompt, clear, or consistent information. When I send an email to someone, I want it answered within 24 business hours; not 2 months down the road or entirely ignored. Where is the accountability? Who is in charge? Or is it that the only decisions they make are "big things" like locking IUPUI into a contract with Chartwells for many years without EVER asking the student body at large what they thought of that restriction placed on their NON-TUITION, STUDENT ACTIVITY FEE FUNDS. I think this nonsense requires a state-level legal investigation into misuse of student funds, not a SurveyMonkey questionnaire to be read by people who appear to lack any real authority.
14. I have received NO communication directly from the Student Development Funding Committee. The information I have received through the MSC Treasurer has been very confusing and inconsistent.
15. After the event we were told that we needed to provide signatures before funds would be paid.
16. Communication wasn't clear but it occurred...
17. I did not do it.

Seven non-recipients provided additional feedback to this question, and among these responses there were 2 common themes:

1. Inconsistent information about the process
2. No communication from the committee

The full list of responses from non recipients appears below (with no edits for grammar or spelling):

1. My proposal was not read throughly, it was briefly looked over which caused our proposal to be denied.
2. Once we did not submit something in properly, then I received emails as to how to go about doing it properly.
3. No communication whatsoever.
4. I received no communication.
5. No! One person told me one thing, another something else. When all was said and done I got the wrong info and was unable to provide the info required to receive my reimbursement.
6. We receive conflicting information from IUPUI as to what needs to be done and when. This just drags out the whole process.
7. "The Division of Student Life's site contains contradictory and incorrect information. Many of the links on the site are broken, even though the Division was informed of the problem in February. Students attempting to contact the Division of Student Life have received only silence in response."

**Question 7**

“I believe the guidelines that the SDFC uses to make their decisions are fair.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer Options</th>
<th>Recipient % (n)</th>
<th>Non-recipient % (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>23.2% (13)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>26.8% (15)</td>
<td>13.0% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>30.4% (17)</td>
<td>39.1% (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>10.7% (6)</td>
<td>13.0% (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>8.9% (5)</td>
<td>34.8% (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% (56)</td>
<td>100% (23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis:**

There appears to be a positive relationship between agreement with this statement and funding status. In other words, those who received funding from the SDFC tended to agree more with the statement in Question 4 than those who did not receive funding. While 50% of the funding recipients indicated they agree that the decision-making guidelines are fair, a fairly high number in this same group, about 19.6%, indicated they disagreed with this statement.
Sixteen *funding recipients* provided additional feedback. There were 3 themes among their responses:

1. Perceived inconsistent and changing rules
2. Unclear or incorrect information
3. Confusion or difficulty with understanding limits for funding, such as the policy on including all students at SDFC-funded events

The full list of responses from *funding recipients* appears below (with no edits for grammar or spelling):

1. I don't know the guidelines, but I was happy with the amount granted.
2. It seemed as if SDFC kept trying to change the rules as we went along. I know that I brought changes to Kevin Walsh's attention and he then had to "reign" in the SDFC. The easiest solution is to have a rubric and use it to evaluate all proposals. Does CCL abide by the same rules as student organizations (i.e. $5.00 per person for food)? I think they should.
3. I was funded to attend an educational conference and it is my understanding that this fund was set up for students to take advantage of educational opportunities outside of the university setting.
4. I am unsure as we don't know what makes them tick.
5. I believe that the process requires groups to completely plan the event, even going as far as printing advertising, before they are granted money. Isn't this opposite of what really happens in the real world? shouldn't you know if you have money before you start planning?
6. Almost all groups cater to specific demographics of people, whether those interested in service, those interested in pre-med, or those interested in a particular language. It is important to let groups know that they can cater to specific groups, but that they just need to allow anyone to participate. Some confusion over this issue caused funding problems for a couple groups this year.
7. I haven't read them so I'm not sure.
8. Depends on the situation. I don't agree with some of the things they turn down. I do think that an organization should be responsible for turning in paperwork that is filled out completely and correctly.
9. We believe our traditional costumes should have been covered. We already sent an appeal to Dr. Ross with details.
10. I believe that students need to have more control over the funds and review process. To my understanding, student members of SDFC do not even see a proposal until every quote or part of the proposal has been received. Since these are student fees, it seems that any proposal, whether complete or not, should be received directly by students. At no time should a proposal be held by staff/faculty.
11. I would hope so, seeing how it is the students money. I question some of the constraints we ran into as it is hard enough trying to run an organization and keep people motivated. Lack of funding in some instances and the avoidance of the entire process in some cases for simple short-term requests excacerbates this problem. I am not sure how to fix the process but I feel it is important to work with and be generous with the student groups that do try to better the learning experience on campus.
12. Again, this must be a joke. "All students must be allowed to attend all events - unless you're a fraternity... or a professional society... or a gender limited group... or a... (input miscellaneous exemption here)." The fact of the matter is that the policies for funding are totally incompatible with IUPUI's multi-college environment. If the School of Law, Dentistry, Medicine, Nursing, or other school wishes to hold an event that only their students can attend, they should be allowed to use THEIR portion of the student activities fee to do so. It's unusual that these schools are even governed by IUPUI's policies, since IU School of Medicine has been in existence far longer.
than IUPUI and should be grandfathered out of any "all students must be included" policy.
Seriously - declining [our group's] need for desk supplies? That IS for the furtherance of student
activities, even if it isn't an Indian Cultural Dinner or sending students to a national convention
for their organization. Should students be asked to pay for a stapler, a hole punch, a tape
dispenser for their organization out of their own pockets? How about UPNGO's request to fund
an event being declined because they're a PROFESSIONAL STUDENT organization and didn't
exclusively invite undergrads to a talk that isn't relevant to them and shouldn't include them
anyway? The policies must be changed, and someone at IUPUI needs to realize that a "one size
fits all" policy will not work for such a diverse community.
13. I feel that while their current guidelines might work well for the undergraduate students, they
will NOT suffice to meet the needs of medical students. I feel that we have been abandoned
both by IUPUI and by the School of Medicine. A clear and logical set of guidelines should have
been established via collaboration between the SDFC and the [school funding committee]
BEFORE SIGs were required to submit to SDFC funding guidelines. This is a total disaster and will
have a significant, negative impact on the educational experience that I and my fellow students
will have over the next year. Additionally, I just received my summer bill which has a mandatory
student activity fee. I was also informed today that summer events will not be funded as the
SDFC operates on the undergraduate calendar year. I feel that if I am paying a student activity
fee, we should be able to have student activities that I am interested in.
14. It is completely unfair that we have no other catering options other than the official school
caterer. They offer much less selection and the prices are outrageous. Our organization is
considering outside fundraising rather then be forced to go through this inadequate and unfair
system.
15. Don't agree with the fact that students groups can't hold events for their own members, (i.e
grad students only, XYZ Club only), and have to open up events to the campus.
16. I was not a part of that.

Seven non-recipients provided additional feedback to this question, and among these responses there
were 3 common themes:

1. Procedures were confusing or difficult to follow
2. Guidelines were unclear
3. The expectation of including the entire campus in all funded programs seems impractical

The full list of responses from non recipients appears below (with no edits for grammar or spelling):
1. The event our organization wanted to do, we felt would highly benefit IUPUI, but SDFC did not
   feel that it would. It was an awareness event, after they denied us funding we received harsh
   messages on flyers, among other things that we feel could have been prevented through our
   awareness event. But they felt that it was not needed on campus....
2. I am very unsatisfied with this, and am planning on taking further action by contacting the dean.
3. The funds belong to the students to use as they believe they will best serve, not be held for
   others agendas.
4. It would help if I knew exactly what these were...
5. The medical students are so frustrated with this whole system. We're tired of being persecuted
   by IUPUI over funding. You have repeatedly decreased the amount of funding that we get,
   despite the fact that we pay huge activities fees (that we never get to see ever again ... who
   knows what activities they are funding for the undergraduates with our money). Your decisions
   are not fair and you clearly have no interest in providing financial support to the Medical
Student groups as you have yet to approve a SINGLE medical student group financial request under this new system.

6. Events must be planned in detail at least 1 month in advance and most of our speakers are physicians that have very busy and unpredictable schedules. Also, all student organization events must now be advertised to the ENTIRE IUPUI campus which is entirely unnecessary as most our our groups are geared towards medical students. Chartwells is the only caterer allowed from now on or our event will not receive funding from IUPUI. This is entirely unfair and judging from their menu it is illogical, we will be unable to feed students for $5/person. We also should not be charged a "service fee." The food is expensive enough.

7. Requiring an invoice, receipt or proof of purchase before purchase makes it difficult to obtain supplies, publicity, and to host events. We can't get any funding until we purchase something, but we cannot purchase anything until we get our funding.

**Question 8**

“What is the impact that the fee money has had, or would have had, on your organization?”

Analysis:

Fifty-three funding recipients responded to this question. There were 3 themes common among the responses:

1. Very positive impact on programming and development of organization
2. Unfair to graduate students (especially medical students)
3. Inconsistent administration of policies

The full list of responses from funding recipients appears below (with no edits for grammar or spelling):

1. Made events available to students
2. We are still waiting to be reimbursed, so it has had a negative effect on our organization.
3. The impact is very low on our org this semester. we usually split the profits between org and non-profit. This particular event was previously our biggest fundraiser, now we are not able to keep any proceeds so we must find new and different means of raising money.
4. Improved student participation
5. Without funding, no events can occur.
6. I had the opportunity to share my experience with other students enrolled in the anthropology program so that they are aware of this wonderful opportunity.
7. Receiving funding was essential for our organization to advertise its events and provide some free food to attract attendees. I believe that the funding greatly contributed to the success of our events.
8. Success!
9. It allowed for us to bring a lecturer to campus to speak on some critical issues on campus.
10. It allowed me to bring in a national speaker.
11. It allows us to have events that would be impossible to host on our own.
12. We were able to co-host an event in which we advertised ourselves and also offered an educational event to the student body.
13. Allowed us to put on an amazing event, but the turnout of students was less than expected.
14. Well if we could have had some help in financing, we would have been able to offer the opportunity for our students to attend professional conferences in our industry that provides an educational experience and give them an opportunity to network with industry professionals.
They could have also taken part of a mentorship program that started at this conference. Also, had we been able to find the funding for our programs, we could have brought in industry leaders to speak about the importance of getting a degree and how they can advance in their careers.

15. It has allowed for educational meetings with professionals in our particular field.
16. A semester’s worth of events were able to be funded.
17. Assisted with diversity.
18. The fee money helped us reach more students with our efforts. But it was a frustrating process.
19. Were able to put on more events.
20. The money we received was invaluable. We are very thankful for the money we received, and we feel that it positively affected many students on campus.
21. The fee money allowed new students to have opportunities in our organization and helped in training next years leaders so that we can be a better organization on campus.
22. The money we received for our event helped tremendously with advertising our new club and providing a fun event for the students on campus to enjoy.
23. Made our events much more educational, interesting, and easy to understand. The funding helped us bring more people to our events and leave them more satisfied.
24. Originally we were very disappointed that we received only 1/3 compared to the previous years. We struggled to allow all of our sub-organizations the proper funding needed. I did not like that they then would have to be approved by the IUPUI student government rather than our own head organization of ESAC.
25. It allows us to present speakers that give students access to broader sources of information and allows us to hold events that foster a greater sense of community among students.
26. Fee money = education + networking + professional growth.
27. Helped to cover expenses that we would not have been able to cover on our own.
28. This was for me personally, not an organization.
29. The funds helped to provide an activity that had a significant impact on the development of our organization toward our goals.
30. Due to receiving the funds, I was able to attend a women’s conference in Chicago that added tremendous resources and information to my studies.
31. It has a significant impact. It made our event financially viable to students whom probably would not have otherwise been able to afford it.
32. Without the money, some of the major events we planned would not have been possible. On the other hand, the process should be simplified to make access to our money easier and thereby more likely to be used for what it was intended for.
33. Helped us fund an extremely valuable seminar for our students and a good social event.
34. We were able to provide services that we would not otherwise have been able to do and bring awareness to students who would have otherwise never known.
35. More attendants.
36. Access to the fee money allows us to hold events relevant to our school’s mission.

Unfortunately, the policies that guide distribution of money are non-existent and consist of some undergrads answering emails in their dorm rooms about how they think an event should or shouldn’t qualify for funds based on their arbitrary criteria. Let the undergrads have THEIR money, and give the professional schools their own percentage of the money to manage and distribute amongst their own student organizations with oversight from IUPUI. IUPUI and their crack team of undergraduate financial and legal experts APPOINTED to the committee should not be the gatekeepers to all funds, professional and undergraduate.
37. If by this question, you mean what is the impact of switching to SDFC funding for events, we will have a significant decline in both the quantity and quality of the events we can hold. Several of our events that medical students have found to be very valuable, may not be possible any longer.

38. Negative overall. The former system was much more streamlined and reasonable, particularly for graduate schools.

39. Another hassle in a system that is overloaded and inept

40. We are very greatful to the committee for the funding. Without the funding we could not have put on such a memorable and quality event. It is important that our students participate in quality events like this.

41. Allowed us to provide an educational activity to students and guests, helped promote our group.

42. Helped us grow as an organization - vital for our expansion.

43. It allowed us to feed the participants of our activities!

44. Without the funding which helped us purchase all the food for our semester’s events) our events may not have been as successful because we were able to attract people with the food that we had.

45. The money has allowed us to host large events at lower costs to students and increased participation greatly. Our retreat in the Spring semester had 115 present this year, which was an increase of over 50 people.

46. Increased participation. Brought professional look. Improved educational aspect of events

47. The money allows us to operate and better serve our constituents.

48. I do not know.

49. It helped to allow 60 student volunteers make a difference in the Hurricane Katrina relief effort.

50. Gave students more incentive to rock the vote

51. It will enable me to go on my trip and bring it back to my organization.

52. c

53. Fee money helps us boost attendance at events and get our messages out.

Nineteen non-recipients provided additional feedback to this question, and among these responses there were 3 common themes:

1. Lower attendance at event
2. Incurred debt/had to pay out of pocket
3. Fewer number of events due to no or low funds

The full list of responses from non recipients appears below (with no edits for grammar or spelling):

1. Educating more students about the impact of culture and personal perceptions
2. n.a
3. It would have helped us more effectively recruit.
4. We are in debt!!!!!!! Due to someone's oversight.
5. funding makes or breaks organization.
6. We were not able to carry out our event as we had originally wanted. As a result of not getting funding and being told our event was not needed, we feel hurt and don't understand why it is not needed when our organization has repeatedly been stereotyped...
7. We could have did a lot more political awareness and had better turn out for meetings if we had money to support our group.
8. It would allow us to help more student participate in our program. Since financial circumstances are always a problem in students.
9. It would have helped us advertise and promote our organization, and build it up from the small group that it is.
10. My event was successful without the fee money, I think it would have helped, but it was still smooth.
11. It makes it hard for us to develop if we cannot get the funding we need.
12. money to do stuff
13. We could get alot more students involved in leadership positions if the guidelines were not so burdensome.
14. We would have been able to put on a concert and fun amusement atmosphere on the school grounds that a lot of students would have enjoyed.
15. I had to pay the money out of my pocket. The impact it had on my organization is that I would have been able to afford to stay longer at the conference and provide my group with a cache of lesson plans for future use. The time that saves future teachers is massive.
16. Considering the fact that IUPUI has slashed the amount of money they have given to the medical student group by 75% in the past two years (yes, we're only receiving 25% of what we received 2 years ago), that's a lot of money that the organizations now have to find other resources for. Additionally, our Activities Fee keeps increasing, but we don't get to see any of that money come back to us. There are many volunteer groups in the medical school that could have used that money for really good causes - medical mission trips over spring break to poor countries, building houses in Indianapolis, planting flowers in IUPUI neighborhoods, improving reading and literacy in low-income children, and yet you insist upon slashing our budgets even more and playing games with us so that our applications are never complete. More hoops to jump through - thanks, IUPUI.
17. negatively impacted the organization
18. What money?
19. Getting the runaround on our funding severely limited the events we hosted this year. We were only able to host two events, with minimal publicity, no food for our guests. We were also unable to obtain certain types of literature that we wanted to give away to students interested in joining our organization, which limited our membership capabilities.

**Question 9**

“We are looking for student volunteers to sit on the SDFC for the 2008-2009 academic year. If interested, please provide your contact information below. Note that your responses will be kept separate from your name and e-mail address.

There were 37 respondents who provided their name and e-mail addresses in response to this question. In addition, one comment was received from a funding recipient:

“You've got to be kidding. You don't need a committee to do this job; you need ONE paid staff member and a document that states in black and white what is and isn't possible for the use of funds. That's it. No committee nonsense - Just a solid, legal policy which explains the process. Your group doesn't meet the threshold, it's not funded. Opinion should have no place in funding decisions.”