

# COSAF Report | Recommendations & Comments

Review: FACE/LEAP Fee

Facilities and Campus Enhancements Fee & Legal Education Enhancement and Access Program

November 3, 2023

**Action Item #2024-026**

## Quorum Met

Per the Council on Student Affairs and Fees Bylaws: Recommendations associated with CPI adjustments must have a quorum, defined as **half the voting membership**, rounded up to the nearest number.

Total Voting Members: **19**  
In Attendance: **17**  
Quorum was met at **89%** attendance

## FACE CPI Recommendation

Per the Council on Student Affairs and Fees Bylaws: Recommendations associated with CPI adjustments on Campus Based Fees must pass by **66%**, rounded to the nearest number.

	Intercollegiate Athletics	Campus Recreation	Student Recruitment & Retention Ctr.
YES	15	13	14 *
NO	2	4	2
	Yes <b>88%</b>	Yes <b>76.4%</b>	Yes <b>87.5%</b>

RESULTS: COSAF recommends a CPI adjustment to the FACE fee in 2024-25 for Intercollegiate Athletics, Campus Recreation and Student Recruitment & Retention Center.

## LEEAP CPI Recommendation

Per the Council on Student Affairs and Fees Bylaws: Only the LSA (Law Students Association) Representative will vote on CPI adjustments to the remaining portion of the LEEAP fee: Law School Recruitment and Retention.

	Law School Recruitment & Retention
YES	1 *
NO	0
	Yes <b>100%</b>

RESULTS: COSAF recommends a CPI adjustment to the LEEAP fee in 2024-25 which supports Law School Recruitment & Retention

\* Per COSAF Bylaws, Law school member does not vote on the Student Recruitment & Retention Center portion of FACE. Law school member does vote on Law School Recruitment & Retention, as part of LEEAP.

The following pages include recommendations and comments provided by council members regarding the FACE/LEEAP department presentations.

Please provide your comments regarding the **Intercollegiate Athletics: Schaal Aquatics Center and UC Davis Health Stadium** presentation and use of FACE fees.

## YES VOTES

The UCD Health stadium is a central structure to the campus of UCD as a whole and should be supported. I believe that ICA is doing a great job at making its facilities available to the entire student body. Additionally, I found their presentation to be very informative and specific to the FACE fee and how it is used.

These presentations were very thorough. It was clear to understand the purpose behind reparations to this facilities.

Re-plastering the pool was a major feat and BIG expense. While the facilities and programming are mostly geared toward Athletes, the program has campus wide appeal.

The presentation itself was very informative as to how the department utilizes the funding and how it benefits the students on campus.

We have seen the detrimental effects the Intercollegiate Athletics: Schaal Aquatics Center and UC Davis Health Stadium can have if the CPI is not adjusted for. Although this program only benefits a minority of the student body, this is essential for creating a sense of community, belonging and aggie pride.

ICA has seen the effects of not applying CPI in prior years, and it arguably stretched them out too thin. I felt more comfortable this year to recommend an adjustment as their presentation was great and offered more information to make an educated decision.

After looking at the information provided by BIA and ICA, I believe that ICA is striving to take cost saving measures in all the things that they do. With cuts taking place in the CEI fee without COSAF's input further makes me want to recommend a CPI adjustment. I also appreciated that they have a plan to use down their carryforward.

The facilities Intercollegiate Athletics uses and shares with the Davis community are vital to maintain. Notably, alumni often reconnect to the UC Davis community through athletics, and it is meaningful that University facilities stay up-to-date. Recently, the Schaal Aquatics Center underwent major deck maintenance, which dramatically decreased Intercollegiate Athletics carry-forward. Increasing the cost of future maintenance to the UC Davis Health Stadium warrants a CPI adjustment to the FACE fee supporting Intercollegiate Athletics facilities.

ICA has continuously demonstrated their frugality to COSAF in regards to travel expenses, and staff salaries. While UCD is not notoriously known to be a school for athletics we still are division 1 and after COSAF did not recommend to apply the CPI adjustment last year, after seeing their projected sources and uses for the subsequent fiscal year, I would vote for them to keep their same purchasing power by applying a CPI adjustment. These facilities definitely need a CPI adjustment to keep up with upkeep and maintenance. They are an important resource and I really appreciate how the ICA tries to use these facilities for more than just athletics.

While it may be easy for some to discount ICA's need to receive a CPI adjustment, there can be serious programming and safety repercussions by doing this. In addition, ICA certainly changes the lives of student-athletes and provides an outlet of community, pride, and fun for the rest of the student body. ICA athletes and its facilities represent UCD at large within national athletics.

While it may be easy for some to discount ICA's need to receive a CPI adjustment, there can be serious programming and safety repercussions by doing this. In addition, ICA certainly changes the lives of student-athletes and provides an outlet of community, pride, and fun for the rest of the student body. ICA athletes and its facilities represent UCD at large within national athletics.

## NO VOTES

I feel that ICA has a well-developed strategy to covering the costs of maintaining their facilities. I appreciate their dedication towards doing so. A small portion of this fee goes towards the maintenance of these stadiums.

## Intercollegiate Athletics | NO VOTES *continued*

There are 650+ student athletes and over 37,200 students. Rounding up to a generous 700, that is less than 2% of the student population. Yet 100% of students pay this fee, including the law students. I understand that there are expenses that need to be paid each year, from salaries to operating expenses, etc. However, there is a carry forward balance every year and I am not convinced that every upcoming project is entirely necessary at this moment. For example, ICA noted the sound system needing to be replaced, and during the tour, noted the stadium chairs needing new paint and better material that is more comfortable for guests. I think ICA can maintain their current expenses with the carry forward balance and be more practical about which projects need to happen now or in the next few years, especially prioritizing those increasing safety for students (i.e., the replastering of the pool and deck – great use of funds) rather than aesthetic/material projects when something is not broken. Further, last year the ICA fundraised 3x the amount projected for the upcoming year. They already receive so much funding from students that I would like to see increases in other forms of funding (i.e. institutional support, fundraising, ICA generated) before increasing student fees. Further, this is the Legal Education Enhancement and Access Program Fee. I do not see how legal education is enhanced or made more accessible by paying into the ICA. I believe these funds should go towards truly improving student academic and professional goals, from connecting us to more practitioners/firms in California to improving day to day basic needs at King Hall. There are students that struggle with putting food on the table each day, but yet have to pay for the Aquatics Center and Stadium that most of us do not use during our time here at King Hall.

## ALTERNATE MEMBER COMMENTS

I appreciate ICA's transparency with the program and how fees are used. I find it much improved over previous years. I am concerned about the lack of preventative maintenance at the Aquatic center and the machinery. I feel that this has led to exorbitant expenses for large-scale maintenance. I feel fees would be better spent on preventative maintenance instead of upgrades at the health stadium.

I believe we should be supporting ICA in their improvements, seeing as they are already attempting to be frugal, and the upgrades seem to be for legitimate and safety reasons.

I believe based on the presentation and financial information/templates provided by ICA, they seem to be mindful and resourceful with their spending and are trying their best to maximize improvements while working with their budget.

It appears that a Consumer Price Index (CPI) adjustment is necessary (and reasonable) to ensure the continued availability of these services to UCD students, faculty, and staff. The presentations were well done, and the stadium and aquatic complex tour was a valuable addition. In the context of future "Intercollegiate Athletics: Schaal Aquatics Center and UC Davis Health Stadium" presentations, it would be beneficial to include more detailed explanations of the expenses. For instance, it would be helpful to clarify the components of "maintenance expenses" and "fixed expenses."

While, the Health Stadium and Schaal Aquatics Center are very important to the culture and face of UC Davis, I don't think increasing the fees paid by students would cast a wide-enough positive effect across campus. Both the stadium and Aquatics Center are used only by student-athletes, and I think the CPI adjustment could be more wisely placed with organizations who serve a wider student body.

Please provide your comments regarding the **Campus Recreation** presentation and use of FACE fees.

## YES VOTES

---

Campus Recreation provides a lot of services to the general student body. This adjustment will allow them to continue to keep the ARC open for the current timeslots.

I think the addition of lights to Russell field and renovations to the lockers rooms will be very useful. Students will make good use of it.

I believe a CPI adjustment is justified considering the number of students that benefit from campus recreation programs and facilities. The presentation had shown their carry-forward balance was put to good use and outlined their projects for the future.

Again, the presentation was very informative. The use of these fees are utilized by many diverse walks of life and is an essential resource to maintain every student's livelihood.

I personally benefit greatly from the ARC. Their long hours make it accessible for many students to visit the arc.

Despite Campus Recreation having a significant carry-forward budget, Campus Recreation has multiple planned uses, such as the partial turfing of Hutchinson Field and increases in maintenance spending. Additionally, Campus Recreation emphasized increases in pay for student workers, which otherwise (without a CPI adjustment) would lead to shorter open facility hours. A key feature of Campus Recreation facilities, such as the ARC, is the prolonged opening hours. Reducing the opening time of such facilities will have significant implications for the student environment.

Campus recreation is arguably the most impactful and wide reaching department of all departments supported by the FACE fee. Given the results they provided to COSAF from the student satisfaction survey, it would evidently be a loss to our campus if the campus rec had to reduce their hours since so many students rely on their services. I would therefore strongly encourage the face fee for campus rec to receive a CPI adjustment to maintain their purchasing power.

Campus Rec is an important aspect of the student community at Davis. I hope they can be more mindful of maintenance since a lot of people discussed some equipment being broken for a while. I believe that the ARC would need to work at current levels to match the demand for their services.

Campus recreation provides an outlet for stress relief, fun, new skills, and more for all students to access. I believe their facilities and ability to keep providing these outlets to students will suffer if they do not receive a CPI adjustment.

According to the swipe dashboard presented by the Campus Rec team, 400+ law students use their services, which is around 2/3 of the total law school student population. Personally, I know many law students that use the ARC. Although this does not directly "enhance legal education and access," I do believe there is an impact in helping law students balance academics with their personal life since physical exercise can be crucial to many students' mental health. Although I am frustrated that the Campus Rec team said a denial of CPI adjustment would lead to a decrease in student salaries, yet an approval would go towards student salaries AND equipment, I do not want to take away from student salaries at the end of the day. But, I want to note the discrepancy there. Further, although Campus Rec can decide how to allocate their budget, I'd like to note most law students only use the ARC, Rec Pool, and Craft Center. Very few of us use the Equestrian Center, Rec Sports, Club Sports, etc., and if we were voting on usage for each subsection of Campus Rec, I would have voted only to adjust for the ARC, Rec Pool, and Craft Center.

## Campus Recreation

### NO VOTES

I believe that Campus Rec is an integral part of our campus. However, based on the fact that they have a current carryforward of 200% of their yearly expenses, and do not have specific, concrete ideas about how they plan to use this money in the near future, I do not believe they need a CPI adjustment. If Campus Rec had made it more clear what their carryforward funds are set aside for, I would be more inclined to give them a CPI adjustment. However, as of now, it seems as if worst comes to worst and they needed more funds, they could easily dip into their carryforward. In the future, I would appreciate it if their presentation focused more on the fee and how it is specifically used, and what plans they have for their carryforward vs what campus rec does in general.

ARC is a wonderful facility. They offer a wide range of programs and have also been thoughtful enough to create fee waivers to ensure programs are accessible. Recommend not applying a CPI adjustment and keeping this student fee flat, as there is a significant carryforward balance.

Campus Rec has a large carry forward that I believe should be used before applying the CPI adjustment. Additionally, during our meetings, the answer for what the adjustment would be used for continued to change and was not aligning with their template answers. I would be more likely to consider the adjustment if Campus Rec gave the council more information and a better presentation.

When Campus Recreation was presenting to the Council, I was unconvinced that they needed a CPI adjustment. Campus Rec also has extremely high carryforward with no plans presented to COSAF to get it brought down to the BIA recommendation of 25% of expenses. If Campus Rec did not receive a CPI adjustment, then it is projected that they will still be adding over a million dollars to their carryforward each year. I did not appreciate that Campus Rec only told COSAF that the CPI increase would only support wages for students when that clearly was not true. It felt like they were trying to say whatever made the students on COSAF happy. In the future, I would appreciate if they focus more on the financials instead of focusing the majority of their presentation on the departments within Campus Rec the fee supports. I understand the importance of what Campus Rec does for students, but I do not see the data supporting the need for a CPI adjustment.

### ALTERNATE MEMBER COMMENTS

Campus Rec provides resources for many many students. I struggle to understand how students pay such high amounts of fees and yes equipment and space is scarce and taking classes or participating in sports is prohibitively expensive. I think rec needs to refocus on doing the basics well and worry less about fancy things that cost a lot of money and serve few students. Why are gym memberships (1) cheaper, (2) have more space and equipment, and able to still make a profit? But the rec center, with a captive audience (where many people must pay but don't use the facilities), always at capacity and every expensive to run?

Campus Recreation seems to put FACE fees to good use, however, there are clearly still items and activities affecting students that they would like fixed (i.e. broken ARC equipment).

Campus recreation is a huge part of UC Davis, and they require the FACE fee support to ensure that the facility can be run in an efficient way

I believe the ARC plays an important role for the students at this school and is very valuable to many students. It seems that it is important for them to have the financial funding to keep their hours of operation as long as possible and also make necessary renovations/improvements to the facility when needed. I do think that is important to be mindful about the large carryforward that they have and will continue to have when making decisions about funds.

## Campus Recreation | ALTERNATE MEMBER COMMENTS *continued*

The adjustment of the CPI is essential to address the challenges resulting from the growing number of Campus Recreation service users. While some users may have reservations about increased fees, they will also appreciate the continued access to high-quality recreation activities and services offered by UCD. Given the significance of these programs for the community's physical and mental well-being, the CPI adjustment is indeed necessary.

Campus recreation is crucial for wellness of all students.

I wholeheartedly support Campus Recreation in its use of FACE fees. A large part of the student body uses facilities such as the ARC, REC sports, club sports, as well as other services. These services provide increase physical and mental health support to the entirety of the student body. Furthermore, ensuring proper student worker pay and consistent open facility hours should be priority for COSAF, which the CPI adjustment would ensure.

Please provide your comments regarding the **Student Recruitment & Retention Center** presentation and use of FACE fees.

### YES VOTES

---

I believe that the SRRC is an amazing resource for our student body and believe that a CPI adjustment will help them expand and renovate their space, allowing them to better aid students.

The testimonials shared during the presentation shows how the SRRC impacts students life. Hope the funding support helps them positively impact more students.

The SRRC provides an important service to students in creating space for prospective and current students. What is not clear is how the SRRC works with campus units and partners to achieving outcomes. Actually, the SRRC did not address what their outcomes were. It is a student run center -- but how does that reflect the needs of students campus wide and prospective students.

Its important to maintain an equitable education for all students of different backgrounds. This department utilizes the face fees to achieve this.

The Student Recruitment & Retention Center create an inclusive environment to many students. Their services have a great impact on the student body.

The SRRC is a crucial aspect of campus that is helping students everyday. They currently have a high carryforward, but they stating to the Council that they have a plan to spend that carryforward down. I believe they would benefit from a CPI adjustment.

The Student Recruitment & Retention Center (SRRC) provides influential programs and facilities to disadvantaged and minority communities at UC Davis. The SRRC has many student-run initiatives, which include paid student positions. The SRRC maintains a considerable carry-forward budget, which does have planned uses. I recommend that the SRRC shares the intended uses of the carry-forward budget in the future.

It is an important resource to many different students and integral to Davis.

In order for the SRRC to continue their student-run and student-initiated programming for students, they should receive a CPI adjustment. Otherwise, their significant programming and outreach may suffer and the students who rely on those programs for community and empowerment will lose vital resources.

## Student Recruitment & Retention Center NO VOTES

The SRRC does a lot of great work for student communities!

The student recruitment and retention center has a very large carryforward from prior years, perhaps a result of still coming out of covid, and I believe they would be able to sustain their expenses for the next fiscal year without a CPI adjustment

### ALTERNATE MEMBER COMMENTS

I really appreciate their presentation. I think it is clear that they work every hard to serve their communities and make Davis a welcoming place for all. This is important! I don't think student fees should pay for recruitment! These should be covered by admissions or central UC. Student fees should go to directly serve existing students. I am concerned about how large the carryover has become. I really am glad they are responsible with the money, but this carry forward makes it clear they have enough money to meet their mission and then some. I will not recommend an adjustment because of this.

FACE fees are vital to the Student Recruitment & Retention Center, which has been proven to benefit UC Davis students.

I believe the SRRC is helpful for a unique subgroup of students on campus and need to improve their outreach to larger more general populations in the coming years. Many people on campus are unaware of the impact they can have for student life.

This center seems like a very important and impactful place for students to have a safe space to feel included and foster academic and personal growth. Based on the presentations, I think that they are investing the funds into their center in impactful ways to continue to foster an inclusive environment for students.

The presentation had some notable drawbacks, particularly regarding organization and time management. They allocated a significant amount of time for self-introductions, with approximately 10 presenters. I believe this time could have been better spent providing the audience with a clear understanding of the goals and accomplishments of the various SRRCC programs, as well as the reasons behind the need for a CPI adjustment.

While they mentioned conducting around 50 programs per quarter, they didn't offer any insights into the outcomes of these programs or how the budgets are allocated among them.

Furthermore, the presentation lacked information about how SRRCC supports graduate students and international students, who constitute a significant part of the UCD community. Programs related to recruitment and retention for these student groups should have been emphasized.

Based on the content of the presentation, I find it difficult to determine the necessity of this adjustment.

Student employees should be paid fairly.

SRRC should be a priority for FACE fees because of the fact that it serves as both recruitment and support for minority and under-served groups.

Firstly, its costs are cheaper, on the order of hundred thousands, while other departments served by FACE are on the order of millions.

Second, the SRRC is student-run providing work experience and leadership skill opportunities to the student body.

Please provide your comments regarding the **Law School Recruitment & Retention Center** presentation and use of LEEAP fees.

## YES VOTES

---

Although COSAF does not oversee Law School specific uses of the LEEAP fee, I am in favor of adjusting for CPI given that more than half of the money is given back to students in the form of financial aid. What I would hope for the rest of the uses of the LEEAP fee that COSAF oversees is that we reconsider LEEAP's place in the ICA budget, given that in 22-23 law students paid \$73,000 into the ICA when the ICA had half a million dollars not used.