

*University Health & Wellness Committee Peer Institutions Survey*  
*Fall 2008*  
*New Mexico State University, Las Cruces Campus*  
*Judy Bosland, Research, Evaluation & Assessment*

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Thirteen of NMSU's peer institutions responded to an on-line survey regarding wellness and recreational sports programs in October, 2009. Of those responding, seven provided information regarding their wellness programs, and ten provided information on their recreational sports programs. Six of these responded on both.
- The wellness philosophy and vision statements varied considerably in context and depth that related to whether the wellness program was connected entirely with the recreational sports or if it was a collaboration between recreational sports, the student health center and possibly the counseling center. The more collaborative the relationship, the more encompassing the statement.
- Most of the philosophy/vision statements focused on students; only the statement for the University of Arizona specifically mentioned "a supportive wellness culture within the University of Arizona community." Of interest, the wellness program was not fully inclusive of the "community" as retirees, affiliates and community members were not permitted in the wellness program.
- The "recreational" wellness programs were centrally housed within recreational activities, while the collaborative programs were located in various locations on campus. Oregon State University and Colorado State University had specific areas set up for "wellness" while the University of Tennessee had separated units.
- Colorado State University, the University of Arizona and the University of Tennessee offered the widest range of activities and programs under their umbrella of "wellness." Although Oregon State University also had a collaborative program, the survey respondent list only wellness advertising and wellness programs (such as health fairs) and did not specify other programs such as exercise, nutrition and physical health.
- Costs of the wellness programs were mostly covered by student fees, although some institutions (particularly the University of Arizona) funded the programs through grants and other special funding. The institutions with wellness programs tightly connected with recreational activities also received funding through employee membership fees. Operating costs of the programs ranged from under \$5,000 at Oregon State University (with only wellness and not recreational activities) to \$270,000 at the University of Arkansas (reflecting the budget for recreational activities).
- It is doubtful from the responses that many of the institutions have measured the effectiveness of their wellness programs on either students or employees. At least the general perception of these programs is they have a positive effect on student health and retention, and on employee health and morale.
- All of the institutions which responded to the recreational sports portion of the survey provide the program to at least full-time students and to employees. Whether spouses, dependents, retirees, etc., were allowed varied, but most institutions allowed at least some of those categories to participate.
- All institutions funded student participation through mandatory student fees that, for many of the institutions, a portion of which were specifically mandated for the recreational sports program. All of the institutions also provided membership to employees through an annual fee of at least \$120 (University of Arkansas), which could be paid annually, monthly, by semester, etc. Most institutions offered payroll deduction. Additionally, at least some of the activities had an additional fee (such as for personal trainers).
- All of the recreational sports programs received the majority of their funding through student fees. However, employee and other membership fees, additional program fees and rental fees made up the remainder of the budgets. The University of Wyoming was the only institution to report receiving university budget support.
- All of the institutions had larger staffs in their recreational sports programs than has NMSU. The University of Wyoming's staff was the smallest with eight full-time staff, while Texas A&M University's program had 64 to

serve its 1,000,000 students who come through its doors. However, there was no visible relationship between staff size, budget size, membership cost, usage counts, and student/staff fall semester headcounts.

- All of the institutions offered a wide array of activities and programs, but none offered childcare. Most of the activities and programs were offered to students without an additional fee, but it varied widely by institution. Furthermore, responses were muddled as to what constituted a fee—was this in addition to the membership fee or not.
- **In summary**, NMSU can look to Colorado State University, Oregon State University and the University of Arizona for examples of collaborative, holistic wellness programs. None of these programs received extensive university budgetary support, but were supported more by special funding or by funding within the units which collaborated. Few fees were charged for these programs, as well. To have a truly, overarching wellness program thus far envisioned by the NMSU Wellness Committee would be unique among our (responding) peers.
- All of the institutions permit employees full access to the recreational sports program, and charge an annual fee of at least \$120. Additionally, there were fees for at least some programs on top of the membership fees. By having this additional income, larger staffs could be hired. Despite permitting employees, dependents, etc. to also use the recreational facilities, the largest users (and source of income) were students. Based on our peers, NMSU should be able to easily justify creating a membership cost program for its employees to use the recreational facilities.

*University Health & Wellness Committee Peer Institutions Survey  
Fall 2008  
New Mexico State University, Las Cruces Campus  
Judy Bosland, Research, Evaluation & Assessment*

The University Health and Wellness Committee was established in Fall 2008 to develop a strategic plan for creation of a "comprehensive health and wellness initiative" that will "influence the health and wellness of the NMSU institution and community." As part of the Committee's information-gathering efforts, an on-line survey was developed to assess the structure of the health and wellness programs at NMSU's sixteen peer institutions plus the University of New Mexico and the University of Texas at El Paso. The directors of each institution's recreational sports programs, as identified by Paul Laporte, director of NMSU's Activity Center, were sent an email message on October 8, 2008 requesting their assistance with NMSU's planning efforts by completing the on-line survey. The survey closed on October 20; thirteen institutions responded to some degree (Table 1).

The survey consisted of two sections accessed via introductory questions on whether or not the responding institution had a wellness program and/or a recreational sports program. Because of the varied nature of the responses and the limited number of responding institutions, this analysis presents the responses by institution.

### Results

Although nine of the responding institutions indicated they had a wellness program at their institution, two did not complete any questions beyond the initial question (Table 1). Eleven institutions responded affirmatively to having a recreational sports program; one institution provided no information on its program. In several instances, inconsistencies were found among the responses for an institution. Where possible, the institution's website was reviewed for clarification.

**Table 1. Institution Responses**

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Wellness Program</b>	<b>Recreational Sports Program</b>
Clemson University	No	Yes
Colorado State University	Yes	Yes
Iowa State University	nr*	nr
Kansas State University	No	Yes
Louisiana State University	nr	nr
Oklahoma State University	Yes	Yes
Oregon State University	Yes	Yes
Texas A & M University	No	Yes
University of Arizona	Yes	Yes
University of Arkansas	Yes	Yes
University of Missouri	Yes	Yes (incomplete)
University of New Mexico	Yes (incomplete)	nr
University of Tennessee	Yes	Yes
University of Texas, El Paso	nr	nr
University of Wyoming	No	Yes
Utah State University	nr	nr
Virginia Tech	nr	nr
Washington State University	Yes (incomplete)	nr
<b>Count of those with program:</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>11</b>

\*nr = no response

## *Wellness Programs*

### *Wellness Program Philosophy/Vision Statements:*

The seven responding institutions with wellness programs provided either a mission/vision statement or a brief description of what is involved in their wellness program. Although all of the programs focus on health, some were more explicit on the extent on wellness. Colorado State University specifically addresses wellness in terms of mind, body, spirit and culture, while Oregon State University cites using the "Wellness Wheel" as their model. Other universities mention collaboration of health, recreation, and counseling centers. Other than the University of Arizona, few specify a mission or vision that also includes staff or the community beyond students.

#### Colorado State University –

The Mission of the Wellness Programs of CSU is to help students explore and enhance their well being. Through the use of these programs students will: Understand the complexity of developing the Mind through intellectual curiosity, responsible decision making, seeking emotional stability, and appreciating challenges as opportunities for growth. Be committed to a lifelong development of health, strength and positive behaviors that encourage a healthy Body image. Acknowledge the encompassing concept of Spirit including inner strength, discovery, and commitment to one's values. Appreciate the richness of culture that CSU affords through the celebration of difference, dedication to environment, and development of character that supports a civil and growing Community .

#### Oklahoma State University –

"Healthiest Campus in the Country"

#### Oregon State University –

Our University approaches Wellness in many ways. Our student affairs division has a wellness alignment which consists of student health, counseling, and recreational sports. Our student health department provides health coaching, health promotion and doctors visits. Counseling provides group sessions or one on one meetings. Recreational sports provides sport clubs, intramurals, independent recreation, outdoor activities, climbing, fitness services and safety classes. Recreational sports also is developing its own wellness program and I will answer questions based on this program. We currently use the wellness wheel as our model.

#### University of Arizona –

The UA Well University (Well U) Partnership is committed to creating, supporting and sustaining individual health and well-being, developing responsive and productive work environments, and fostering a supportive wellness culture within the University of Arizona community.

#### University of Arkansas –

To integrate multiple aspects of recreation services into an overall implementation and awareness of holistic wellness. To positively affect physical, social, affective, and cognitive health and development.

#### University of Missouri –

Maximum Participation. To be the best part of your Mizzou day, and your first choice for fun.

#### University of Tennessee –

Wellness is not a stand alone area as we utilize our GA's from Fitness, our Fitness Director and an educational component is provided through our Marketing and Special Events Director and staff. The Student Health Services Area has a Wellness/Health Educator along with peer counselors and the Counseling Center works with the RecSports Department on wellness and mental health issues with our students.

*Location of Wellness Program:*

Three of the seven institutions have their wellness programs centralized within Recreational Activities; one of these also has a separate program in the health center. Four have cross-departmental collaborations, but management is varied. The program at Oregon State University appears to more of a marketing/information program about wellness rather than a collaboration of departments which provide related activities.

Colorado State University (CSU) — Individual units, collaboration among Directors of each unit.

Oklahoma State University (OkSU) — Centralized, in with Recreational Activities

Oregon State University (OSU) — Our wellness area is located in public area on campus, so all are welcome to join who are able to make it to our area or use the soon to be here website. We serve as a connection point for small programs put on by the wellness alignment.

University of Arizona (UAz) — Part of a University Partnership entitled Well University which includes Campus Rec, Campus Health, Life and Works Connections, Nutritional Science, Residence Life, SHAC - part of Student Government, Nursing.

University of Arkansas (UAK) — Centralized, in with Recreational Activities. There is a program at the University Health Center as well as within the campus recreation department. They are separate programs.

University of Missouri (Mizzou) — Centralized, in with Recreational Activities.

University of Tennessee (UTn)— Housed in Fitness and educational/special event programs in RecSports, housed in Health Education in Student Health Services, Counseling Center in relation to workout addiction and individual health situations (i.e., anorexia, bulimia, work out addiction, etc.)

*Activities and Programs in the Wellness Program:*

All of the institutions include wellness advertising and programming (which may include Health Fairs, etc.) in their wellness activities (this is all that the program at OSU includes). Other than OSU, the institutions also include physical exercise and recreational activities. CSU, UAz and UTn provide all the listed activities, including mental and physical health, and nutrition programs. OkSU, UAK, and Mizzou provide nutrition programs but not mental and physical health programs. Both UAK and Mizzou have separate departments that address those issues.

**Table 2. Activities/Programs Included in the Wellness Program**

<b>Institution</b>	<b>Physical Exercise</b>	<b>Mental Health</b>	<b>Physical Health</b>	<b>Nutrition Programs</b>	<b>Recreational Activities</b>	<b>Wellness Advertising</b>	<b>Wellness Programs</b>
Colorado State University	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Oklahoma State University	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓
Oregon State University						✓	✓
University of Arizona	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
University of Arkansas	✓				✓	✓	✓
University of Missouri	✓			✓	✓	✓	✓
University of Tennessee	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

*Participants in the Wellness Program:*

Oregon State University's Wellness program is open to anyone who is interested, and with no fee (Table 3). However, while it offers "wellness programming," this does not reflect all the components of a wellness program. On the other hand, the University of Missouri is also open to anyone, it offers more wellness activities, but it charges a fee to everyone, including to students. The University of Arkansas integrates its wellness program with its recreational sports program. Open to everyone who pays the HPER membership fee, all members have access to the wellness activities, although some activities may charge an additional fee. The University of Arizona offers their wellness program to students, employees, families and alumni with no additional fee, but it is not open to retirees and the community. Oklahoma State University is the more restrictive; students may participate free of charge, while employees, alumni and retirees only may participate for a fee, and families and community members may not. At the University of Tennessee, students participate with no additional fee, while employees, families of students, and alumni can participate once they pay the "RecSports" membership fee. The wellness program at CSU is a collaboration between the Counseling Center, the Health Center, and the Campus Recreation Center entitled "The Wellness Zone." Although the Campus Recreation Center is open to a wide variety of members, "The Wellness Zone" is limited to students and employees.

Thus, two types of participant models (with variations) occur with these seven institutions. The "recreational sports" model has participation in the wellness program that is directly reflective of participation in recreational sports (UAK, UTn, Mizzou; OksU is open to a smaller variety of participants). In this model, students usually pay no fee, while other participants pay a membership fee. The second model is a collaborative model in which the wellness program is not directly connected to recreational sports. At OSU, this is free and open to anyone, while at CSU it is restricted to students and employees. The University of Arizona is somewhat a mix of both.

**Table 3. Participants in the Wellness Program**

Who may participate in your Wellness Program?	Yes - no fee	Yes - with a fee	Yes - with restrictions	No
Students	●●■	■	●■	
Employees (Faculty/Staff)	●■	●■	●■	
Family - of students	●■	■	■	●●
Family - of employees	●■	■	■	●●
Alumni	●■	●■	■	●■
Retirees	●	●■	■	●
Affiliates	●	■	■	●●■
Community members	●	■	■	●●■

*Comments on Participation:*

- Colorado State Some activities/events/programs/services are free and some are offered with a fee. Program NOT offered to employees located off campus.
- Oklahoma State Spouses of students, faculty/staff are eligible for program. Program IS offered to employees located off campus.
- Oregon State Our wellness area is located in public area on campus, so all are welcome to join who are able to make it to our area or use the soon to be here website. Program IS offered to employees located off campus.
- University of Arizona Program IS offered to employees located off campus.
- University of Arkansas All HPER members can utilize the student recreation center and its fitness facilities at no charge other than membership. Personal Training, group exercise, fitness assessments, and massage carry additional fees. No employees are located off campus.
- University of Missouri Program IS offered to employees located off campus.
- University of Tennessee The groups with restrictions must be RecSports members and have paid their fees to be eligible to participate in these programs. Program IS offered to employees located off campus.

*Costs associated with the Wellness Program:*

Which entity covers the cost of the wellness program and the range of fees charged varied by the type of program that constitutes the institutions' wellness programs, and what frame the responder was referring to when answering the survey questions. Although the limited Wellness Program at OSU is open to everyone, it has a small budget that comes entirely from student fees. "The Wellness Zone" at CSU offers services and information free to students and employees but charges a fee for chair massage. The other components of CSU's wellness program, such as the Campus Recreation Center, charge participation fees for some of its activities (as well as membership fees for its employees). While no program had its costs entirely covered by the institution's budget, the University of Arkansas had a portion of its costs for all participants included in the budget. The University of Missouri's budget covered some of the costs for students. General student fees covered the students' costs at six institutions (not including the University of Arizona). The University of Arizona depends on grants and special program funding to cover the costs of its wellness programs. Thus, funding comes from multiple sources for most of these institutions. Not one institution depends solely on the institution's budget, although (mandatory) student fees always pay a large portion of the cost. Participation fees are an integral part, and grants or special funding is also another major source.

Although several institutions did not provide direct information on the way fees are charged, generally there was the full range of possibilities. OSU charges no fees at all to anyone, while CSU charges only for chair massage. Charge methods are reflected in how closely the described wellness program is integrated with recreational sports.

**Table 4. Costs of the Wellness Program are Covered by...**

	For Students	For Employees	For Other Participants
Costs of the Wellness Program are covered by...			
The University Budget	■	■	■
General student fees	● ● ● ● ● ●	■	■
Participation fees	● ● ● ● ● ●	● ● ● ● ● ●	■
Grants, special programs, etc.	● ● ● ● ● ●	● ● ● ● ● ●	■
Fees are charged according to the following...			
One fee for entire program per time period	● ● ● ● ● ●	● ● ● ● ● ●	■
One fee per activity/class	● ● ● ● ● ●	● ● ● ● ● ●	■
One fee per attendance	● ● ● ● ● ●	● ● ● ● ● ●	■

*Comments on Costs and Fees:*

- Colorado State Operating Cost: Split between 3 unit budgets
- Oklahoma State Operating Cost: Approximately \$80,000; Fees are determined independently for each class/
- Oregon State Operating Cost: Under \$5,000 spent largely on marketing and programs.
- University of Arizona Operating Cost: \$5,000
- University of Arkansas Operating Cost: \$270,000; Admittance to the facility is paid by student and membership fees. University funds are used for maintenance. Participants pay program fees for personal training, fitness assessments, massage, and group exercise.
- University of Missouri Operating Cost: \$60,000
- University of Tennessee Operating Cost: Not determinable due to how the program is split between different program areas; Employees must pay for a RecSports membership and then are eligible for participation in the programs available.

*Measuring the effects of the Wellness Program:*

Several of the institutions have not measured the effects of their wellness programs on students nor on employees. The University of Arkansas (UAK) believes they have seen a positive effect on student health, recruitment, retention and participation rates in campus activities. The University of Missouri (Mizzou) said their wellness program was beneficial for student health, recruitment and retention but did not look at participation nor class attendance. The University of Tennessee (UTn) found no effect of their wellness program on student recruitment and class attendance, but said it did improve student health and retention.

Two institutions, Oregon State University (OSU) and Mizzou, strongly agreed that their wellness programs benefitted their employees in all categories. Given the limited budget and scope of the OSU program and that nothing was measured for students, this may be more a perception rather than actually measured. Oklahoma State University (OkSU) was the only institution to disagree that their wellness program decreased health insurance costs. Yet they believe the program decreased health CARE costs, reduced sick leave, and improved workplace moral.

While it is not known whether actual measurements of effectiveness of the wellness programs have been conducted, the general perception among at least half of these institutions is that the wellness programs have a positive effect on student health and retention, and on employee health and morale.

**Table 5. Effects of the Wellness Program**

What has been the effect of your Well-ness Program on...	Positive Effect	No Effect	Negative Effect	Not Measured
Student health	●●■			●●■
Student recruitment	■	■		●●●■
Student retention	●●■			●●■
Student participation (campus activities)	●■			●●■
Student attendance (in classes)		■		●●●■

  

Does the Wellness Program for employees benefit your university in these areas?	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Have no idea
Decreased health care costs	●■	●■		■
Decreased health insurance costs	●■	■	●	■
Improved work-place morale	●■	●■		■
Increased loyalty to the university	●■	■		●●■
Increased productivity	●■	■		●■
Increased responsibility	●■	■		●●■
Reduced absenteeism	●■	■		●■
Reduced overall costs	●■	■		●■
Reduced sick leave	●■	●■		■

  

●	Colorado State
●	Oklahoma State
●	Oregon State
■	University of Arizona
■	University of Arkansas
■	University of Missouri
■	University of Tennessee

## *Recreational Sports Programs*

### *Fee Structures for the Recreational Sports Program:*

Ten of the responding institutions provided information on their recreational sports program; six of these also had a wellness program. The University of Missouri, which reported on its wellness program, and said it had a recreational sports program, did not complete the recreational sports portion of the survey. Clemson University (Clemson), Texas A&M University (TAMU), Kansas State University (KSU) and the University of Wyoming (UWy) reported on recreational sports but said they do not offer a wellness program.

At all of these institutions, full-time students are eligible for "free" membership as a result of paying student fees. At most of these institutions, a specific portion of the mandatory student fees were tagged for recreational activities. These ranged from as little as \$3.00 at the University of Arizona to \$98 at TAMU. Additional fees for specific activities/classes may also be charged to the students (described later).

All of the ten institutions permit employees (and generally families and retirees as well) to participate in their recreational sports program, and all of them charge a "membership" fee (Table 6). The annual fee ranges from \$120 at the University of Arkansas (UAK) to \$355 at TAMU for employees with an average for the ten institutions of approximately \$210. This fee may be paid in various ways at all the institutions, including payroll deduction at several. Most charge an extra fee (though small) for the convenience of payroll deduction. For those institutions that allow other memberships, such as spouses, dependents, retirees and alumni, the fee structure may vary, but is always there. In all cases, this fee permits access to the recreational sports facility and use of much of the equipment. For some, pool facilities are included while it is an extra cost for others. There is usually an additional fee for participating in specific activities/classes (described later). From the questions on the survey and reviewing the institutions' websites, there is little observable evidence for understanding the large range in memberships costs among these institutions.

**Table 6. Employee Recreation Program Fees**

<b>Responding Institution</b>	<b>Annual Employee Fee</b>	<b>Comment</b>
Clemson University	\$150.00	Options include pay-roll deduction, annual or six month.
Colorado State University	\$250.00	Options include pay-roll deduction, and day, month or annual purchase.
Kansas State University	\$172.80	Options include pay-roll deduction, and day, month or annual purchase.
Oklahoma State University	\$240.00	Tax is additional; can purchase annual or semester pass
Oregon State University	\$262.00	Community members can pay per use, per term, for 9 months or for 12 months. Automatic monthly withdrawals are available.
Texas A & M University	\$355.00	Options include pay-roll deduction, and one semester, two semesters, or annual purchase.
University of Arizona	\$250.00	Options include pay-roll deduction, and semester or annual purchase.
University of Arkansas	\$120.00	Options include semester or annual purchase.
University of Tennessee	\$144.00	Options include month or annual purchase.
University of Wyoming	\$192.00	Options include pay-roll deduction, and semester or annual purchase.

### *Cost, usage and staffing for the Recreational Sports Program:*

As was discussed with the wellness programs, most of the recreational sports programs at these institutions are not funded by university funds except for mandatory student fees. Several institutions who receive student fees did not consider those fees to be a "university contribution." The University of Wyoming (UWy) stated they received a fixed amount from the university budget each year, but provided no further information. On the other hand, Clemson University provided a very detailed comment on their funding which includes about \$300,000

from the institution qualified as "state funds." Clemson also described the separate fee for the recreational program in the mandatory fees students pay, although most of the institutions also charged such a fee (Table 8). In general, funding for the recreational sports programs come from a combination of student fees collected with "tuition and fees," membership fees from employees and others, activity/class fees and rental fees (lockers, equipment, etc.). The greatest proportion of the cost for most institutions comes from the student fees. Likewise, the heaviest use of the sports programs are by students.

The mandatory student fees reported in Table 8 reflect the proportion of fees related to the recreational sports program, except for Oklahoma State University and the University of Arizona (Uaz). TAMU charges the highest fees, while Clemson and UAk student fees are the lowest.

The number of staff supporting the recreational sports programs ranged from eight at the University of Wyoming to 64 at Texas A&M University (TAMU). There appears to be a slight correlation between the number of staff and the employee membership fee, but not an obvious relationship between the usage headcounts and the number of staff. Nor is there a relationship between student and staff headcount and usage headcount. TAMU has by far the largest and most expensive program, but also serves the largest number of students. Of note, all of these institutions have a larger full-time staff than NMSU.

**Table 7. Costs and Usage of Recreation Programs**

Responding Institution	University Contribution		Proportion by Source		Usage Headcount		Staff (non-student)	
	Method	Annual Amount	Students	Staff	Students	Staff	Full-time	Part-time
Clemson University	Varies with student fees	\$1,700,000*	62%	12%	432,869	31,623	12	1
Colorado State University	No contribution		97%		500,000		26	1
Kansas State University	No contribution		55%	45%	550,000		12	0
Oklahoma State University	No contribution		96%	4%	800,000		19	0
Oregon State University	No contribution		75%	**	481,658	53,888	25	0
Texas A & M University	No contribution		85%	3%	1,000,000	100,000	64	0
University of Arizona	No contribution				22,430	2,000	14	1
University of Arkansas	Varies with student fees		75%	25%	400,000	216,000	14	0
University of Tennessee	No contribution	\$500,000	92%	8%	579,000	45,000	14	0
University of Wyoming	Fixed amount						8	0

\*Clemson University: The Campus Recreation Fee is \$35.00 per semester per student, which generates \$1,050,000 annually. Other fees generate approximately \$400,000, and approximately \$300,000 is received from the Institute (state money) for a total budget of about \$1,700,000. Student enrollment is about 15,000 who pay the fee, and all programs are free for these students.

\*\*Oregon State University: Student fees cover 75% of our costs. The rest is covered by faculty staff fees, rentals and program fees.

**Table 8. Fall 2008 Enrollments and Student Fees**

Responding Institution	Headcount			Full-time Student Fees	Satellite Campus?
	Student	Faculty	Staff		
Clemson University	17,000	2,500	1,500	\$35	Yes
Kansas State University	23,000	4,000	4,000	\$60	No
Oklahoma State University	23,000	5,000		\$110/cr hr	Yes
Oregon State University	19,753	3,134	1,268	\$61	Yes
Texas A & M University	48,000	1,800	8,000	\$98	No
University of Arizona	38,057	5,851	8,725	\$50	Yes
University of Arkansas	18,000	2,000	5,000	\$3.29/cr hr	No
University of Tennessee	27,000	2,000	4,000		No
University of Wyoming	13,000				

University Health & Wellness Committee Peer Institutions Survey, Fall 2008

*Programs in the Recreational Sports Program:*

With the exception of childcare which no institution offered in its recreational sports program, all of the institutions offered a variety of activities and programs under their umbrella of recreational sports. Colorado State University did not complete this part of the survey, but a review of their website indicates an extensive list of activities, some of which they charged an additional fee to all participants. All of the other institutions offered cardio activities to students without an additional charge, and all charged a fee to both students and employees for personal training (not available for employees at the University of Wyoming). There, the similarities ended (Table 9).

Some of the respondents may have interpreted the survey question to include the recreational facility membership fee, while others responded with regards to an additional fee. Clemson University offers a wide variety of activities to students, employees and other participants at no additional cost, except for massage therapy and personal training for which all groups pay a fee. As reported earlier, Clemson charges \$150 per year for its employee membership fee. Kansas State University also provides a wide array of activities to employees and especially to other members at no additional cost over the approximately \$175 annual membership fee. On the other hand, Texas A&M University charges \$355 to its employees and chose the "with fee" response for almost all activities for all groups (including students). The University of Tennessee provides a very wide array of activities free to its students and employees (all except for personal training and outdoor adventure) but does not offer any activities to other categories of people. Oklahoma State University offers most activities free to students, but charges a fee for these to employees. It may be presumed that the fee is the membership fee (\$240 annually). There is not a strong correlation between the employee membership fee and the number of activities offered, for free or otherwise. Of note, because all the institutions charge a membership fee it is not known whether any of the recreational sports programs allow employees who do not get a membership to participate in any of the programs by paying a fee just for that activity.

**Table 9. Programs Included in Recreation Programs**

Do you offer any of these programs? (Select all that apply)	Students no cost	Students with fee	Employees no cost	Employees with fee	Others no cost	Others with fee
Aerobics -	●●●●●	●●●●●	●●●●	●●●●●●●●	●●	●●●●
Aquacise -	●●●●	●●●	●●	●●●●●●	●	●●
Cardio -	●●●●●●●●		●●●●●	●●●●	●●●●	●●
Childcare -						
Dance -	●●	●●●●	●	●●●●●●		●●
Health Education -	●●●	●	●●●	●	●	●
High Ropes Course -		●●●●		●●●●		●●●
Indoor Cycling -	●●●	●●	●●	●●●●	●	●
Intramurals -	●●●●●	●●●●	●●●	●●●●●●	●	●●●
Kickboxing -	●●●●●	●●●	●●●	●●●●●●	●●	●●●
Massage Therapy -	●	●●●●●	●	●●●●●		●●●
Mind/Body -	●●●	●	●●	●●	●	●●
Nutrition -	●	●	●	●		
Open Recreation	●●●●●●	●●	●●●	●●●●	●●	●●●
Outdoor Adventure -	●●	●●●●●●	●	●●●●●	●	●●●
Personal Training -		●●●●●●●●		●●●●●●●●		●●●●●
Pilates -	●●●●●	●●●●	●●●	●●●●●●	●●	●●●
Pool Facilities -	●●●●●●	●●	●●●	●●●●●	●●	●●●
Sports Clubs -	●●●●●	●●●	●●●●	●●●	●●	●●
Tennis -	●●●●●	●●	●●●	●●●●	●●	●●
Walking Fitness -	●●●●●	●	●●●●	●●	●●●●	
Weight Room -	●●●●●●	●	●●●	●●●●	●●●	●●
Yoga -	●●●●	●●●●	●●●	●●●●●●	●●	●●●

- Clemson
- Kansas State
- Oklahoma State
- Oregon State
- Texas A&M
- University of Arizona
- University of Arkansas
- University of Tennessee
- University of Wyoming

*Colorado State did not respond*