

SETTING A PLACE AT THE TABLE FOR SRS

Report of the Review of UWO Sports and Recreation Services

Bob Crawford
Mike Mahon
Greg Moran

August 24-26, 2011

(Report submitted - September 12, 2011)

Background

A comprehensive description of the circumstances that gave rise to this review, commissioned by Western's Provost, Dr. Janice Deakin, was provided to the review team in the document "Outline and Terms of Reference for The Review of Sports and Recreation Services at Western" (Appendix A).

In summary, Sports and Recreation Services (SRS) at Western is a highly regarded operation whose substantial current and past contributions are broadly acknowledged and applauded within and beyond the university community. In spite of this success, there is a sense that SRS is hampered by circumstances that limit its flexibility, nimbleness and responsiveness, and impede the pursuit of opportunities that could further enhance its contributions to the University of Western Ontario and its students. Those closest to SRS, including its Director and the Dean of Health Sciences, have persistently argued this case. The Terms of Reference for the review directed attention to two key areas: first, the impact of the control of sports and recreation facilities on campus by units outside of SRS; and, 2) the consequences of the positioning of SRS within the School of Kinesiology for administrative and reporting purposes.

These two areas of focus were reflected in the questions posed in the terms of reference (edited for brevity here) and that guided our review:

1. What would be the impact on the School of Kinesiology / Faculty of Health Sciences if SRS moved to another administrative unit on campus?
2. Should SRS be given the responsibility for managing the University's athletic/recreational facilities?
3. What would be the impact on the Division of Housing & Ancillary Services and the Office of Institutional Planning & Budgeting (i.e. financial, human resources) if management of all athletic/recreational facilities were assumed by SRS?
4. How would SRS manage and balance the pressures of (a) addressing the self-funding nature of facilities, (b) putting student needs/priorities first, and (c) the need to generate revenues through entrepreneurial activities?

5. What are the implications for SRS in either scenario with regards to facilities (i.e. status quo or facilities transfer to SRS)?
6. If SRS was to be relocated under the Vice-Provost (Academic Programs and Students), is there a natural realignment or reorganization of that operation that would facilitate such a transition and assist in the alignment of those activities in a rational way? Are there synergies between SRS and those components of the Student Services portfolio for which the Vice-Provost is accountable that could enhance the student experience?

Observations

The review involved a series of meetings with members of the campus and London communities involved directly or indirectly with SRS (see Appendix B). Without exception, those with whom we spoke endorsed the importance of SRS to Western and praised their current contributions. All enthusiastically endorsed the efforts of SRS staff in addressing both internal and external needs and opportunities. Many, however, also spoke candidly of weaknesses in the current arrangements that limit SRS's, and indeed Western's, ability to realize its full potential. Our most important observations regarding these impediments can be summarized as follows:

1. The problems facing SRS are a function of organizational structure and process and do not stem from a lack of will to collaborate in a manner that optimizes SRS's operations. That is, those working within SRS and those with whom they collaborate within and without the university are uniformly enthusiastic about the unit and its role but some are equally frustrated and discouraged by the complexity and awkwardness of the current arrangements.
2. The recurring theme of our discussions was that SRS was "not at the table" when decisions were made that were crucial to its operations. It is not possible here to document the full range of examples provided to us to illustrate this problem but they can be characterized as falling into two broad categories: first, the management of facilities; and, second, impediments to engagement and collaboration with other units.
3. The separation of SRS from the management of the facilities that are central to their operations has had a detrimental impact on the unit's function. The division of responsibilities is based on a reasonable logic. That is, SRS possesses unique operational expertise and vast experience with meeting the recreational needs of students and successfully supporting varsity sports. For example SRS staff: are able to judge and respond to the shifting student needs and preferences for recreational activity and programs; are aware of the complex and very particular scheduling issues that arise within the student population; are sensitive to potential conflicts and the operational needs associated with the diverse usage of recreational and sports facilities; and are well-placed to recognize the potential for collaborations with the external community, while

being vigilant for the possibility that such partnerships can infringe on SRS's core responsibility to serve Western's students. On the other hand, different units at Western, including Ancillary & Hospitality Services (A&HS) and the Office of Institutional Planning and Budgeting (IPB), have experience and the associated expertise necessary for successfully managing large facilities and being responsible for their scheduling, in a cost-effective manner. These are onerous responsibilities, especially when involving the demands of cost-recovery (both operational and capital), as in the case with the Thompson Arena (TRAC) and the TD Waterhouse Stadium (TDWHS), and overseeing legally binding agreements, such as those which governs the operations of the new student recreation centre (WSRC) and the TDWS.

The model chosen at Western to respond to these challenges has been to restrict the units to their areas of expertise, i.e, SRS has responsibility in programming of sports and recreation while A&HS and IPB retain responsibilities for the scheduling, operations and management of related facilities. As awkward as this system of divided responsibilities may seem to an outsider, the model has worked with good success. It does, however, also have disadvantages.

Examples of such disadvantages are perhaps most readily apparent around the operations of the student recreation centre (WSRC). Here, decisions have clearly been driven by a concern to focus on the singular priority given to student recreational needs in the agreement between Western and the University Student Council. This restricted focus has prevented or imposed long delays on innovations that might well serve other important student needs without infringing on recreational use of the facility (e.g., use of the pool by the varsity swim team). Several with whom we spoke also compellingly described potentially important collaborations with groups outside the university community (e.g., high school basketball tournaments) that might be scheduled at times and dates when recreational use leaves the facility under-utilized, as well as other student-based activities outside of the mandate of the SRS (e.g. non-recreation-based clubs activities). The process for requesting permission to schedule non-SRS activities in the WSRC imposes lengthy, complex processes that easily foster miscommunication, frustration and missed opportunities.

Our observations suggest that many of these problems arise from an understandable - in fact, laudable - conservative approach to respecting the legal agreement with Western's students. A by-product of the approach, however, appears to have made it very difficult for SRS to become involved and to contribute its operational expertise to discussions regarding modifications to the use of the WSRC that go beyond direct SRS activity but could be embraced by the existing legal agreement. SRS's role might be better characterized as that of a user rather than a partner in the process.

Parallel problems also have arisen regarding the usage of the TRAC and TDWHS. In these cases, the constraints arise from both a legal agreement with the City of

London that guarantees a level of community access to the stadium, and the stringent and substantial challenges of the cost-recovery operations of both TDWHS and TRAC. Here, too, a focus on these legitimate fiscal demands appears to have resulted in SRS being treated as one of a number of users. They are, without argument, a favoured and predominant user – but still not a true partner in the operations of these two facilities that are so central to SRS's success. The consequences of this operator/user relationship not only involve an apparent failure to recognize the full range of SRS's needs but also an under-appreciation of the rigours of full cost-recovery operations. For example, the SRS operation often cited the apparent paradox of the unit, clearly a part of the university community, being charged for use of Western facilities. This practice, they argue, has made it impossible for Western to host provincial and national championships. Although their frustration is easily understood, it is also important to recognize the reality that, in a cost recovery operation, any loss of revenue to TRAC or TDWHS as a result of relieving SRS of such charges would need to be replaced by funds from another source. The University has made it clear that this other source would not be an increase in the existing subsidy to SRS.

The scheduling and management of other facilities, including Alumni Hall, Thames Hall Gym, Althouse Gym and the sports fields, also raise their share of similar issues. Here, there appear also to be impediments to the full optimization of SRS's operational needs and the –sometimes competing - academic demands on these spaces. Here, we were especially struck by examples of failures of communication between Facilities Management services (e.g., caretaking, grounds keeping, security) and SRS. Again, these miscommunications appear to arise, at least in part, from the fact that SRS is inevitably regarded as only a user of the facilities and has no easy direct contact with those responsible for these critical services in support of the operation of the facilities.

Many further examples could be provided but the overall picture was clear: the model of divided responsibilities – SRS with programming and other units responsible for facilities management – has inadvertently spawned a relationship that fails to fully integrate the operational expertise of SRS into the process of decision making, management and planning.

4. The second area which we observed to be an impediment to SRS's functions is its relative isolation in the School of Kinesiology. Put simply, SRS has university-wide responsibilities, i.e., it serves all Western's students and, by enhancing the quality of their experience, contributes to the well-being of the entire university. So, too, of course, the direct and indirect contributions that sports and recreation make to the external community also enhance Western's relationship with the city and beyond. And, yet, for administrative and reporting purposes, SRS is housed in a single academic unit. This association arises from a historic link between Kinesiology (previously Physical Education) and sports and recreation.

From a functional perspective, however, SRS would more appropriately be grouped with other student service-related organizations, such as the Student Development Centre, the Student Success Centre, and others.

Although we need again to stress that SRS has functioned well while housed in Kinesiology and the Faculty of Health Science, and have been well supported by the Dean and Director, we also suggest that this location has disadvantages. Most obviously, SRS does not have easy, naturally occurring access to other units with whom they might well partner to the university's advantage. In spite of this organizational misalignment, such partnerships have emerged, e.g., the Academic Success Program, developed in collaboration with the Student Development Centre, provides effective academic support to all varsity student-athletes. Similar innovative programs might easily be imagined in areas such as student recruiting, service learning, internships, etc. SRS's current placement within the organizational structure, however, impedes rather than facilitates such partnerships – SRS is not at the right table.

Not only might placement in a unit that included other university-wide functions promote innovative synergies with other units, it might also have unexpected efficiencies in areas of shared infrastructure, including information management systems, and communications, including websites.

Conclusions

Our conclusions can most efficiently be summarized by brief responses to the previously cited questions identified in the Terms of Reference for this review:

1. What would be the impact on the School of Kinesiology / Faculty of Health Sciences if SRS moved to another administrative unit on campus?
➔ *Our conversations did not suggest that the impact would be seriously detrimental.*
2. Should SRS be given the responsibility for managing the University's athletic/recreational facilities?
➔ *SRS must be provided with a direct and meaningful role in managing these facilities. As we indicate in our recommendations below, this objective might be achieved in a number of ways.*
3. What would be the impact on the Division of Housing & Ancillary Services and the Office of Institutional Planning & Budgeting (i.e. financial, human resources) if management of all athletic/recreational facilities were assumed by SRS?
➔ *The obvious impact on H&AS would be the need to transfer to SRS those personnel who hold direct responsibility for the management and operations of TRAC and TWHS, as well as any related operating funds that support these*

operations (recognizing that these are cost recovering facilities, so this is likely to be quite minimal).

4. How would SRS manage and balance the pressures of (a) addressing the self-funding nature of facilities, (b) putting student needs/priorities first, and (c) the need to generate revenues through entrepreneurial activities?
 - ➔ *Transfer of management authority of facilities to SRS would in no way diminish this challenge but would locate the two demands in the same unit where the nuances of the balancing act and possible solutions might be better evaluated and managed. In order to achieve this, however, SRS must develop a rigorous culture of fiscal responsibility to complement its obvious commitment to sports and recreational programming.*
5. What are the implications for SRS in either scenario with regards to facilities (i.e. status quo or facilities transfer to SRS)?
 - ➔ *The maintenance of the status quo will continue to give rise to frustrations within SRS and will limit its ability to pursue opportunities that might enhance their service to the community. If facilities are transferred to SRS, such opportunities are more likely to be able to be pursued but, on the other hand, the realities of managing substantial cost-recovery facility introduce new, very real threats to their operations.*
6. If SRS was to be relocated under the Vice-Provost (Academic Programs and Students), is there a natural realignment or reorganization of that operation that would facilitate such a transition and assist in the alignment of those activities in a rational way? Are there synergies between SRS and those components of the Student Services portfolio for which the Vice-Provost is accountable that could enhance the student experience?
 - ➔ *Yes – the natural home of SRS is within a pan-university unit with responsibilities for student services and the quality of student life. The repositioning is likely to promote a wide range of yet-to-be-recognized opportunities for synergy, efficiency and innovation.*

Recommendations

The Review Committee was asked to leave the Provost with a set of clear recommendations regarding:

1. The positioning of the management of sport and recreation facilities at Western – within the context of the financial arrangements outlined earlier.
2. The administrative home of Sport and Recreation Services at Western.

In response to this injunction we recommend that the Provost, consider the following:

I. **Sports and recreation facilities.** Mechanisms should be identified to ensure that SRS has direct authority and responsibility - or is meaningfully involved - in the control, scheduling and planning for facilities that are essential to its functions.

➔ Western Student Recreation Centre (WSRC)

- i. Given the experience of two years of operations, it should be possible to relax somewhat the stringent control of scheduling of the WSRC within a less conservative interpretation of the agreement between the university and the students. We suggest that:
 - i. SRS be assigned full authority and responsibility for all scheduling of the WSRC.
 - ii. This role be executed within a clear set of written guidelines for implementation of the legal agreement governing the use of the WSRC. These guidelines should provide maximum flexibility within the terms of the agreement while ensuring the central priority of that agreement, i.e., other activities should be scheduled in the WSRC only if they do not infringe on the recreational needs of Western's students. Specifically, the document *Booking of Facilities within the Western Student Recreation Centre*, November 26, 2008, should be revised / replaced.
 - iii. The current WSRC Advisory Committee be reconstituted as a monitoring or audit committee with two roles: first, to create the implementation guidelines referred to in the preceding clause; and second, to annually review a report of use of the WSRC to ensure that scheduling complies with the implementation guidelines and, thus, the spirit and letter of the agreement with Western's students.

➔ Thompson Recreation and Athletic Centre (TRAC) and the TD-Waterhouse Stadium (TDWHS)

The critical objective of any change related to the management of TRAC and TDWHS is that SRS's role be altered so that its professional expertise in recreational and sports programming be directly engaged to better serve the needs of Western's students and the university, while, at the same time, respecting the university imperative that these facilities be cost-recovery operations. We believe that there are a range of operational and organizational changes that could achieve these ends, ranging from a model that focuses on process change but retains the current organizational structure largely intact to a model that pursues the same objectives through relatively major structural change to the current organization

- i. *The Process Model.* Management and planning responsibilities for TRAC and TDWHS are retained by Ancillary and Hospitality Services (AHS) but SRS is engaged meaningfully in all aspects of decision making regarding the scheduling, operations and planning for the facilities, i.e., SRS and AHS become equal partners in overseeing the use of these facilities. This objective could be achieved by providing SRS with substantial membership on formal and informal groups and

committees and, perhaps, by having the manager of the TRAC and TDWHS report jointly to the Directors of Hospitality Services and SRS. This change would demand an evolution of the operational cultures and attitudes towards collaboration in both units as well as explicit changes to management process.

- ii. *The Structural Model.* Management and planning responsibilities for TRAC and TDWHS be transferred from A&HS to SRS. Such a direct change of responsibility and authority would require the transfer of personnel and whatever additional steps might be necessary to ensure that SRS provides a secure environment for the operations of this substantial cost-recovery operation.

As we have indicated, one might imagine variations involving aspects of both of these models.

Irrespective of the decision regarding management of the TRAC and TDWHS, we urge consideration of giving students more ready access to the Stadium for informal, casual activity when it is not in use for scheduled events. The facility is really quite superb and it would be a great service to the students if such access could be arranged.

- ➔ Alumni Hall, Thames Hall Gym, etc.
Other facilities should continue to be managed/controlled as they are, due to their range of use. Again, the importance of SRS being at the table for discussion of these facilities is critical; communications and cooperation need to be improved. A number of elements of the above mentioned process model could be employed as a means of ensuring that SRS has the appropriate level of engagement in the decision-making regarding the use of these two facilities.

II. **The position of Sports and Recreation Services within the university organizational structure.**

- ➔ As a unit with pan-university responsibilities that fall principally in the domain of student services affecting the quality of the student experience at Western, we suggest that consideration be given to repositioning SRS within the portfolio of the Vice-Provost (Academic Programs and Students). Further consideration might be given to establishing a sub-portfolio under the Vice-Provost with direct responsibility for student life activities and including, in addition to SRS, the Student Development centre and the Teaching and Learning Centre. We believe that this positioning will embed SRS in the network of contacts and communications of units with which it is most closely functionally affiliated. This positioning will naturally build relationships and contacts that are likely to reveal synergies and opportunities for cooperation that would be less likely to emerge from its current position.

- i. The formal positioning of SRS outside of the School of Kinesiology is consistent with the School's evolution from a traditional "Physical Education" unit to an academic entity whose clear focus is on research and degree program education at both the graduate and undergraduate level.
- ii. Although our conversations did not suggest that this organizational change would have an adverse impact on the School of Kinesiology, it is clear that any change should be made prudently, with due diligence and, especially, with careful sensitivity to the impact of the repositioning on all SRS staff, especially current coaches who have a close relationship with the Kinesiology program.
- iii. Moreover, steps should be taken to ensure that the new reporting structure does not impair current collaborations between SRS and the academic programs in Kinesiology and Health Sciences, nor impede future elaborations of these collaborations (e.g., service learning placements, teaching of kinesiology activity courses by SRS coaches) . The Directors of both Kinesiology and SRS indicated that there are important synergies between the two entities that must not be lost in the proposed reorganization. Both also indicated, however, that these synergies could be maintained under this new structure, given the appropriate level of attention.
- iv. Give the scale, complexity, and sensitivities involved in such an organizational repositioning, it might be wise to establish a Transition Management group to plan the details and oversee the process.

III. Related observations and recommendations.

- ➔ Although not explicitly parts of our terms of reference, a number of matters related to the operations of SRS arose in the course of our review. We identify these here and, in some case, offer related recommendations:
 - i. In spite of the fact that the outstanding new WSRC has opened only in the last few years, there is every indication that the facilities for IA at Western are not meeting the needs of the students. There is reason to celebrate the success that hides behind this problem but also a need to consider plans for expansion of indoor facilities and sports fields.
 - ii. Although now clearly integral parts of a single organization, Campus Recreation and Intercollegiate Athletics appear not yet to have been fully integrated operationally. This failure is associated with elements of unproductive competition within SRS and neglect of the potential for operational efficiencies. SRS itself needs to take steps to promote greater integration of these two internal operations. It must be said, however, that some of the competition and inefficiencies arise from the continuing separation of student fees into CR and IA components. SRS operations would be enhanced if these fees could be combined into a single SRS fee. We suggest that sufficient time has lapsed and trust generated to justify a reconsideration of this matter with the Student Services Committee. We recommend that this initiative be taken as soon as possible.

A further factor inhibiting the full integration of IA and CR is their current physical separation across buildings on campus. We recommend that the units be jointly housed in the same location.

- iii. It is clear that substantial gains have been made within Hospitality Services toward providing the external community with a single portal to the sometimes-bewildering challenge of working with the university community. Our conversations, however, suggested that further efforts would be well invested. It was our impression that the challenge here is largely related to creating an even more seamless culture of collaboration between the many units, including SRS, which must be involved in such cooperation with the community beyond the campus. A more user-friendly interface would go a long way towards improving even further relations with external groups and bring with it all the fiscal and non-monetary benefits associated with this relationship.
- iv. Along similar lines, there are barriers to always doing what is “best for Western.” For example, an event that might serve as a wonderful recruiting tool is not held because of cost issues or facility booking issues. Each unit fulfilling its specific mandate does not always lead to a result that is best for the institution. This is more than not having the right people at the table; it is uncertainty as to exactly where the table is at which such discussions should take place.
- v. We were struck by repeated references by SRS staff to an uneven and poorly understood risk management policy, practice and organization at Western. We were in no position to judge the veracity of these assertions but give the importance of the matter, mention it here. We recommend that a careful review be undertaken of risk management policy and its implementation in practice.

IV. Appendix A

Outline and Terms of Reference for The Review of Sports and Recreation Services at Western

Prepared April 15, 2011
Review Dates: August 25 and 26th, 2011
(NB Appendices internal to this document are not included here)

A. Preamble

We are very proud of our Sport and Recreation Services (SRS) at The University of Western Ontario. The programs that comprise SRS contribute to the success of our students and heighten campus and alumni pride in our University. We have one of the top Campus Recreation programs in the country – one that makes a major contribution to enriching the experience of students, faculty, and staff members as well as contributing to their total development. The addition of the Western Student Recreation Centre (WSRC) has allowed this program to develop to even greater heights.

The success and evolution of the SRS programs has led to the need for a review – both operational and organizational. A fundamental question that needs addressing is – *“What are the organizational, structural, and budgetary arrangements necessary to ensure that SRS at Western continues to be the leader among Canadian universities”?*

This issue of the need for a review is not a new one. A commitment of a review of the administrative structure and oversight of sport and recreation facilities was outlined in the reappointment letter of the Dean of Health Sciences in October 2008 where the then Provost stated: “We are committed to analyzing the sports and recreation facilities situation as part of the coming year’s planning process, including a revisiting of the administrative structure for intercollegiate athletics and campus recreation, and matters associated with the operations, control and usage of sports and recreation facilities”. This review will not only fulfill that commitment but will examine the broader question of where SRS should be housed and what other structural issues need to be addressed.

B. Background / the Western Context

1. Organizational Structure

Western takes its commitment to the broader learning environment very seriously. The University tag line: *the best student experience in a research-intensive university* is an explicit commitment to the provision of an outstanding academic, residence, and co-curricular experience for our students. Responsibility for the

vast range of student services is distributed across a number of portfolios/units to ensure that the commitment, integration, and accountability to that goal is embedded throughout the institution. The attached organizational charts (**Appendix A**) provide some sense of this inter-connected network of student service activities.

- **Sports and Recreation Services (SRS)** – under the leadership of its Director, Therese Quigley – reports through the Director of the School of Kinesiology to the Dean of the Faculty of Health Sciences. SRS manages and programs all aspects of Campus Recreation and Intercollegiate Athletics.
<http://www.westernmustangs.ca/>
<http://www.westernmustangs.ca/index.aspx?path=crh&tab=campusrecreationhome>
- **The Division of Housing & Ancillary Services (DHAS)** – under the leadership of Associate Vice-President Susan Grindrod – reports to the Vice-President (Resources & Operations). DHAS has overall responsibility for our residence system that is home to extensive educational, personal support, and study abroad initiatives (i.e. Western Heads East; alternative spring break week). The following fully self-funding very successful business operations are also part of the DHAS portfolio: Food Services, Computer Store, Book Store, Graphic Services, TD-Waterhouse Stadium (TDWHS), the Thompson Recreation & Athletic Centre (TRAC), Student Health Services, and Off-Campus Housing & Housing Mediation Services.
<http://www.uwo.ca/hfs/>
- **The Vice-Provost (Academic Programs and Students) Portfolio** – under the leadership of Vice-Provost John Doerksen – oversees many of the services that one often finds at other universities within the purview of a Student Affairs portfolio – including the Registrar’s Office, student recruitment, financial aid, the international exchange centre, counseling services, career services, and a range of teaching and learning resources. The portfolio’s programming and services support the personal, intellectual, emotional, and social development of students and provide opportunities for leadership development.
<http://www.sdc.uwo.ca/>
<http://www.registrar.uwo.ca/>
<http://www.uwo.ca/tsc/>
- **The Office of Institutional Planning & Budgeting (IPB)** – under the leadership of AVP Ruban Chelladurai – reports jointly to the Provost and the Vice-President (Resources & Operations). IPB oversees the University’s integrated planning and budgeting processes, which includes space planning, classroom management, course timetabling, and the oversight of centrally booked general university facilities.
<http://www.ipb.uwo.ca/>

This distributed arrangement is intentional and has been extremely successful – in large measure because of the very high quality personnel in leadership positions throughout the portfolios/units described above.

2. Space/Facilities

Space/facilities at Western are considered to be central university resources – and are addressed/allocated/re-allocated through the University’s integrated planning process.

Academic space at Western includes space controlled by the various Faculties (offices, student space, research laboratories, and program-specific instructional spaces), centrally-managed/booked instructional spaces (general university classrooms and computer laboratories), and larger university common/gathering spaces (Great Hall, Alumni Hall, Thames Hall Gymnasiums, Althouse Gymnasium, Althouse Auditorium, and the Western Student Recreation Centre). The central university is responsible for the operating costs, infrastructure support, and deferred maintenance for these facilities (including the Faculty-controlled spaces) – and therefore, the booking of these facilities to external groups is managed through IPB. The revenues from such bookings flow to the University’s general operating budget – and not to any particular unit.

Non-academic space includes space used by our non-academic units (which include all support units that report to the four Vice-Presidents), the residences, TD Waterhouse Stadium (TDWHS), and the Thomson Recreation & Athletic Centre (TRAC). As noted earlier, the residences, TDWHS, and TRAC are fully self-funding operations – and therefore their management, booking, and funding of all costs are the responsibility of the Division of Housing & Ancillary Services. Other non-academic spaces cannot be booked out to external groups.

Facilities used by SRS fall under the academic and non-academic categories – and include:

- **TDWHS and TRAC.** As indicated above, these are fully self-funding operations managed through the Division of Housing & Ancillary Services (DHAS), and therefore SRS books these facilities through DHAS – and pays “internal” rental charges which are substantially lower than the rates charged to external groups. The TRAC Advisory Committee and the Stadium Access Committee advise on fees and use of the facilities.
<http://www.has.uwo.ca/hospitality/waterhouse/>
<http://www.has.uwo.ca/hospitality/thompson/>
- **The Western Student Recreation Centre (WSRC).** The use of the WSRC is governed by a separate agreement between Western’s Board of Governors and the University Students’ Council (USC). The operation of this agreement (included as **Appendix B**) is managed by the WSRC Advisory Group – which is chaired by the AVP-IPB and includes the President of the USC, the Dean of Health Sciences, and the AVP-

Housing & Ancillary Services. The role of this advisory group is outlined in [Appendix C](#).

In terms of actual operations, SRS is the only user of the WSRC – but the uses must be aligned with the commitments in the agreement between the University and the USC. That is, SRS programs all the activities within the WSRC, and any activity not complying with the University/USC agreement must be approved by the WSRC Advisory Group. In addition, because the operating costs of the WSRC are shared between SRS and the University, any revenue accruing from WSRC rentals are shared by the University and SRS. [Appendix D](#) describes this revenue-sharing arrangement.

- Thames Hall Gymnasiums and Pool, Alumni Hall Gymnasium and Wrestling Facilities, and Althouse College Gymnasium. These facilities are used for academic activities, university functions/events, and by SRS for athletic and recreational activities. Since these facilities are used for a number of different activities, they are considered general university facilities and are managed by IPB. The scheduling of courses, the assignment of time for SRS, and the booking of University events, and the renting to external groups are all done through IPB. All activities in these facilities – except for the scheduled courses – involve facilities rental charges. In the case of SRS, the University occupancy charges apply.

C. Sports and Receptions Services (SRS) – Structure, Funding Model, and Issues Raised by SRS

1. SRS Structure

As noted earlier, SRS – which includes Campus Recreation and Intercollegiate Athletics – reports through the Director of the School of Kinesiology to the Dean of Health Sciences. Governance and oversight of SRS is the responsibility of the Advisory committee on Sport and Recreation Services.

http://www.uwo.ca/fhs/deansoffice/PDFs/SRS_advisory_committee.pdf

2. SRS Funding Model

The funding model for SRS at Western is similar that of our business units (i.e. a self-funded unit) – where the major portion of revenues come from sources outside the University’s operating budget. These non-operating sources include student ancillary fees, revenues from athletic events, fundraising, and camps offered to the London community. However, in recognition of SRS’s important role at Western, the University provides financial support in the form of a direct operating subsidy, the University’s work-study program (to cover salaries of students working for SRS), indirect subsidies through support for athletic events (e.g. family day events), and support from our ancillary operations in the form of reduced cost (or free) food for athletes and/or coaches. For information, [Appendix E](#) shows the sources of SRS’s revenues in 2010-11.

The student ancillary fee, which is the largest source of revenue for SRS, is approved each year by the Student Services Committee (SSC) – in the context of a number of other ancillary fees which support various other student services at Western (e.g. career services, first nations services, psychological counseling). The SRS fee itself is broken out into two separate fees – one for Intercollegiate Athletics (IA) and one for Campus Recreation (CR). At Western, the SSC has in the past been very supportive of CR – and not as supportive of IA. In fact, the decisions of the SSC had the IA fee frozen for 6 years – until an increase was provided in 2010-11. This student support/attitude of great support for CR – and not as much for IA – was also very clear during the negotiations, which led to the funding of the WSRC and the associated agreement regarding the operation of the facility.

Another important item of note regarding the IA/CR ancillary fees is that, when occupancy to these units was originally introduced, the associated costs were incorporated into the fees – and have been part of the annual adjustments since that time.

In terms of expenditures, SRS covers all costs – including staffing, facilities, equipment, travel, and all other non-salary items. For facilities where SRS pays occupancy, the deferred maintenance aspects of these facilities are the responsibility of the central university.

This funding model for SRS will continue into the future – and it should be noted that additional University support (direct or indirect) will not be possible, and therefore should not be a consideration in any review of SRS.

3. Issues Raised by SRS

It is the view of those who lead and work in SRS that they are at a competitive disadvantage when contrasted with other institutions in the OUA and CIS where SRS-equivalent program professionals manage the sport and recreational facilities. We are told by SRS that the current processes include administrative impediments that render SRS unable to respond to numerous opportunities for entrepreneurial activities that would not impede the Western student experience – i.e. the recreational demands of our students will be fully met. SRS contends that the alignment of programs with facilities, led by SRS program officials with the professional background, expertise, and contacts to manage the sport and recreation facilities would help us advance the quality and quantity of our facilities for campus use, and allow them to be more responsive to our coaches and program leaders.

Specific issues identified by SRS include:

- Too many administrative areas and levels need to be consulted in addressing any initiative that requires athletic/recreational facilities use at Western;
- There is not a clear mechanism through which external groups seeking partnerships/facilities use can make contact with Western to explore Athletic or Recreational opportunities;

- Outside stakeholders approach SRS with facility related complaints and opportunities to which they cannot respond;
- Facility expenses are not a recoverable expense from the OUA or CIS, making it more cost effective to play playoff games “on the road”;
- There is no incentive to be entrepreneurial in SRS;
- The current model pits Intercollegiate Athletics against Campus Recreation in spite of the fact that they are housed in the same unit and are led by a single Director;
- The user agreement for the WSRC restricts use of the facilities in ways that sees component facilities sitting vacant at times when it could be programmed (particularly the pool). SRS supports the revisiting of the agreement with the USC.

D. Considerations within the Western Context

The following elements must be taken into consideration in any discussion regarding SRS, athletic/recreational facilities, and student services at Western.

1. The current funding model of SRS will continue – with no additional direct or indirect support from the University. As part of this funding model, SRS will have to cover the full costs of the facilities it uses.
2. The agreement with the USC regarding the WSRC must be honoured – until the agreement is renegotiated/modified. At all times, our students’ recreational needs /demands should be given the highest priority in programming the WSRC. To be more specific, use of Western’s athletic/recreational facilities by external groups should not impact the availability of these facilities to our students.
3. As is the case as present, TRAC and TDWHS must continue as fully self-funded operations. It should also be noted that there is an agreement in place with the City of London regarding shared use and rental rates for TDWHS. This agreement must continue to be honoured.
4. The Division of Housing & Ancillary Services is responsible for the following activities on behalf of the University:
 - Management of the University’s liquor license
 - Management of the all food services operations (including catering)
 - Liaison with the City with regards to city-wide event planning and in the preparation of bids for major events (e.g. Canada Games, Special Olympics)
5. Western has a number of unions involving staff that work in SRS, Housing & Ancillary Services, and the Vice-Provost (Academic Programs & Students) Portfolio – including the various athletic/recreational facilities.

E. The Review

a. SRS Imperatives

The following SRS program imperatives must be central to the proposed review:

- The Sport and Recreation Programs will maintain their student focus and high ethical standards.
- Existing agreements related to programming will be honoured.
- The current WSRC agreement with the USC will be honoured – unless amended formally in agreement with the USC.
- Both IA and CR remain fiscally responsible and accountable. Annual budgets must be balanced.
- Outside groups and rental of facilities will not interfere with Western students' use of facilities and programs.
- The University's financial support of SRS (both direct and indirect) will not increase.

b. Questions to be Addressed by the Review Team

7. What would be the impact on the School of Kinesiology/Faculty of Health Sciences (i.e., teaching, research, and service missions; financial; human resources) if SRS moved to another administrative unit on campus?
8. Given the Western context and current arrangements, should SRS be given the responsibility for managing the University's athletic/recreational facilities?
9. If the answer to #2 were yes, what would be the impact on the Division of Housing & Ancillary Services and the Office of Institutional Planning & Budgeting (i.e. financial, human resources) if management of all athletic/recreational facilities were assumed by SRS?
10. Assuming the answer to #2 is yes, if SRS is to oversee Western's athletic/recreational facilities, it would do so with the understanding that it is responsible for the financial aspects of the facilities (i.e. the full operating and capital costs of the facilities must be covered by SRS) and the understanding that our community's (especially students') needs should be given the highest priority. How would SRS manage and balance the pressures of (a) addressing the self-funding nature of facilities, (b) putting student needs/priorities first, and (c) the need to generate revenues through entrepreneurial activities?

11. What are the implications for SRS in either Scenario with regards to facilities (i.e. status quo or facilities transfer to SRS)?
12. If SRS was to be relocated under the Vice-Provost (Academic Programs and Students), is there a natural realignment or reorganization of that operation that would facilitate such a transition and assist in the alignment of those activities in a rational way? Are there synergies between SRS and those components of the Student Services portfolio for which the Vice-Provost is accountable that could enhance the student experience?

c. Review Committee's Recommendations

The Review Committee is asked to leave us with a set of clear recommendations regarding:

3. The positioning of the management of sport and recreation facilities at Western – within the context of the financial arrangements outlined earlier.
4. The administrative home of Sport and Recreation Services at Western.

Appendix B

SRS Review Agenda

August 24 - 26, 2011

Mike Mahon, Greg Moran, Bob Crawford

Wednesday August 24, 2011

6:30pm Dinner with Janice Deakin

Braise Food & Wine – 125 Dundas St. London, ON. 519-433-1414

Thursday August 25, 2011

8:30 – 9:15am Janice Deakin – StvH 2107H

9:15 – 10:00am Jim Weese – StvH 2166

10:15 – 11:00am SRS Management with Therese Quigley – StvH 2166

11:00 – 11:30am John Doerksen – StvH 2166

11:30am – 12:45pm Lunch with John Doerksen and Directors – StvH 2166

1:00 – 1:45pm Ruban Chelladurai – StvH 2166

1:45 – 2:45pm SRS Program Coordinators – StvH 2166

3:00 – 3:45pm Earl Noble – StvH 2166

3:45 – 4:30pm FT Coaches – StvH 2166

4:30 – 5:15pm Susan Grindrod – StvH 2166

5:30 – 7:00pm Reviewers only – StvH 2166

7:30pm Dinner with Janice Deakin

Waldo's on King – 130 King St. London, ON. 519-433-6161

Friday August 26, 2011

6:30 – 8:00am Working breakfast – Delta London Armouries

8:30 – 9:30am Cheryl Finn (Sport Tourism) and Scott Stafford (London Recreation) – StvH 2166

9:30 – 10:15am Frank Erle and Frank Miller – StvH 2166

10:15 – 10:45am USC President and VP Student Affairs and SOGS VP Student Services – StvH 2166

10:45 – 11:15am Therese Quigley – StvH 2166

11:30am – 1:00pm Lunch with Janice Deakin & Ruban Chelladurai – Windermere Manor