

Council on Student Affairs and Fees (COSAF) Meeting
January 8, 2016
Memorial Union, MU II
11:30 am – 1:00 pm

- I. Call to Order (Chairs)
- II. Fall Quarter Review (Chairs)
- Chairs requested feedback, questions, critiques, suggestions
 - Previous suggestions:
 - Send agendas earlier
 - Provide links to information
 - Question (MW) Why did a CRU staff member do the presentation for SCC rather than an SCC staff member?
 - (NM) CRU manages the facility and the budget
 - (JB) CEI goes to the facility, not the program
 - Q – Isn't there a facility manager?
 - Yes, but she does not manage the funding
 - The point is well-taken, though
 - Vidur: Is there anything we can do to help the committee understand the information better?
 - Naftali: We hope to have more meetings in the MU, which is easier for conversation.
 - Question (GO) Last year the vote was on the fee as a whole; this year the committee is voting on individual fees. Why is that?
 - It provides better information for the Vice Chancellor to know how the committee feels about each of the units
 - Question: How can we adjust fees if it's not how the original ballot works?
 - (JB) We are advisory. Fred Wood (prior VC) preferred a bundled model; Adela is in favor of a more individualized model. In the bundled model, each unit was considered individually for funding anyway.
 - There were requests from students on the committee every year about why it had to be a bucket vote. The change represents a climate change that comes with a change in leadership.
 - Question: Did CRU previously say they didn't need an increase so we didn't need to vote?
 - (JC) They did do it once a couple of years ago. It was the first year of the CEI for SCC. CRU wasn't the only one. During a time of heavy budget cuts, units were supporting the freezing of fees.
 - Different facilities got bonded at different times. They are all bonded now.
 - Naftali: Thanks to Greg for bringing up the question on voting – it was a significant change.
 - (JC) Adela would appreciate knowing at the end of the year whether or not we think it was better.
- III. Review of CPI vote for CEI (Chairs)
- Committee members should check the recommendation from last year (on the website) if they haven't already
 - Be sure to stay informed. If it takes too much time to read attachments and information sent in emails with agendas, we'll coordinate time for that
 - Vidur: Note that CPI is considered an adjustment, not an increase, so it essentially de-funds programs when we vote "no"
 - It's important for Adela to know and understand our reasons for our votes.
 - Question (PC) can you draw from meeting notes to add comments to the recommendation?

- Naftali – we can if needed, but we want to add notes today
- IV. COSAF Recommendations to Vice Chancellor De La Torre (Chairs)
- Comments regarding ICA CPI
 - No votes
 - ICA doesn't affect that many students; there's not a huge interest in attending
 - Their sports record is not that impressive, so it's not exciting to attend games that are going to be lost to small schools, even though we are D-1
 - Yes votes
 - (non-voting visitor) We need funds in order to have a winning culture. There is potential to pull in revenue – no funding means no good athletes, no one comes, no money generated
 - We do have winning teams in some less highlighted sports
 - This isn't just about sports, but about campus culture. In the US, this culture often revolves around sports. It brings students together rallying around a common cause – even if it's a sport. Includes the marching band.
 - Comments regarding CRU CPI
 - No votes
 - There was only 1 no vote, with no comments. One could say it doesn't serve everyone
 - Yes votes
 - It adds a huge variety of things for students to participate in. Also, outsiders take advantage (community)
 - (non-voting visitor) Non-academic activities lead to healthier lifestyles which lead to better student retention
 - Sport Clubs are by and for students, which means student involvement
 - Question: What is considered “unreasonable” club dues? It seems subjective and dependent on the sport
 - (LH) Ultimately clubs set their own fees, but we are very mindful of fees with clubs as they work on determining them
 - Comments regarding SCC CPI (didn't pass)
 - Question (MG) – CPI funding is for the building, not the units in it, correct?
 - Yes
 - (MG) We do want to keep the building, because it serves many underrepresented students
 - Naftali – There were questions about reserves related to SCC. The reserves seem big, but considering the actual cost, they are not.
 - (JC) Facilities that are auxiliary are built through student referenda, e.g. Schaal, Stadium, MU, ARC, part of the Pavilion, SCC, SHC – all were funded 100% by referendum dollars. These buildings own their own burden of operational and maintenance costs. The campus won't come to their aid. So they have to have appropriate reserves for operations, replacement, repair, etc. Future generations will pay the fee and should expect the services related to it that these buildings offer. So buildings have to stay in good shape with functional equipment. This is the trick and the burden – and also the value – of reserves. Academic buildings do not have the built-in funding for ongoing needs. We have an obligation to be responsible for these facilities. Facilities are living, breathing things – as campus needs change, the use of funding reserves can change. We shouldn't confuse reserves with annual operational costs.

Reserves are not permanent funds. They can help with operational costs on occasion, but if the reserves are eaten up with annual operational costs there won't be money for replacing floors, bathrooms, etc.

- Naftali – It is important to recognize the high cost of construction
- We need a justification for our NO vote on SCC CPI
 - (MG) With additional info like today's, can individuals change their votes?
 - Naftali – Perhaps, either adding a vote, or changing bylaws. We can investigate.
 - (JB) Conversation like this would have been helpful BEFORE the vote. We can do that before the FACE vote
 - (JB) We can also maybe revisit the votes at the end of the year
 - Naftali – the plan this year was to get the most complicated fee out of the way first. Next year we will perhaps do a less dense initiative first! Not opposed to revisiting the vote.
 - (MW) If we do, can we have a more comprehensive SCC presentation?
 - Naftali – Would people want to revisit the vote?
 - Show of hands indicated yes.
 - (PC) My vote will be no for any of them – it increases cost for students
 - 43% of students don't pay the increase (e.g. those with Pell grants or other qualifiers), so it's tricky when you talk about raising fees
 - (Non-voting visitor) But Paul's point is true
 - Naftali – true, and thanks to Paul for the comment. It is the kind of thing we need to discuss
- Comments regarding CoHo CPI
 - No votes
 - Have a concern regarding the use of reserves. It seems the extension should be funded by a new referendum.
 - That would be an ASUCD fee, and would include Unitrans & CoHo
 - Regarding future presentations – Will there be a measure of impact? Student satisfaction? Cutting costs/efficiencies? Right now we are seeing only the numbers.
 - Every presenter got the same request for the presentation, but each interpreted it differently. CRU did it well.
 - (JB) That's a good point. The Division is spending a lot on creating good metrics. Asking for more specifics would be very helpful.
 - Naftali – let us know what was most helpful in any of the presentations.
 - (JB) If the group decides particular things would be helpful, they could be standardized
 - (MG) The ICA presentation was very vague regarding the reach of the ICA program, and how many students are impacted – not just the student athletes
 - Back to the CoHo! Yes votes
 - It is a central part of campus and it's important to give them resources to expand with the student body increase
 - Need to expand, shorten lines and the amount of time spent in them,
 - Food is cheap
 - It is innovative

- The student employment part of it is fantastic
 - Anything else to add for CoHo?
 - Naftali – If you are unable to attend a meeting it is okay to send an alternate, but please also look at the notes and the resources provided for the meeting. They are usually up on the website within a week or so of the meeting. The problem with abstention from a vote is that it reduces the student perspectives. So look at the information online, and if you have questions, ask the chairs.
 - Question – should we include an abstention category? (discussion)
 - No, our job is to be the voice of students and abstention doesn't do that
 - (alternate sent for Patrick Dolan) Patrick instructed her to vote only on things that affect grad students
 - Noted only committee members have a vote, not those sent on behalf of members who can't attend
 - Naftali – With the exception of LEAAP the committee wants to have a voice from all constituencies/perspectives
 - (MW) Issue of representation without taxation for CoHo/ASUCD shouldn't be lost in a vote. Fees subsidize to keep CoHo cost low for everyone.
 - Naftali – as advisory we can vote but also explain the opposing view
 - (PC) We are here to best serve the students and advise/provide insight for the rest of the group
 - (Patrick's substitute) We should review the statistical impact before eliminating the "abstain" option
 - (PC) If we only have Yes or No, is an abstention then just a lost vote?
 - Naftali – We have to find out
 - Asked Greg O
 - This committee votes more than any other AAC
 - Each committee does it differently
 - New Initiatives [Added info by John Campbell before he had to leave the meeting]
 - 2 of the proposed initiatives are going through the signature phase now – TGIF and Aggie. If signatures are obtained they will be back at our meeting on February 5 as a key piece of the process. This committee will make a recommendation to Adela.
 - Because these came in late they are squeezed on time to get signatures – about 7 academic days for ~3,000 signatures (8% of undergrads – number came from Registrar)
- V. Orientation to FACE Initiative (Facilities and Campus Enhancement)
- There is no time for the FACE Orientation today
- VI. Completing the discussion regarding the vote
- If we revisit the ballot we'll revisit the question of abstentions
 - (MG) Comments on the ballot shouldn't be optional, even if someone abstains
 - (JB) If we had this conversation before the vote it would make commenting easier
 - Do we need to change the bylaws?
 - (NM) No, not necessary
 - (NM) We can change the ballot to require a comment for every vote
 - (PC) That's assuming the conversation happens before the vote
 - (NM) Show of hands to do that? (Majority agreed)
 - Moving forward, Naftali and Vidur will discuss the vote
 - MW commented that if she's the only one with concern about the representation without taxation issue we don't need to revisit that particular issue.
- VII. Some final notes

- (JB) Reminder to complete the Cyber Security training. Record an hour on your timesheet for completion of it unless you've already made arrangements with another department for that.
- Naftali - Remember to take time to review materials related to the meetings.
- (JB) If you see information you don't understand, call Jan and she'd be happy to meet. It is difficult stuff to understand.
- (Laura – Patrick's representative) The Grad Student funding initiative passed again, so it is in the petitioning phase.
- (Naftali) We are looking for an alternate to attend HFOC and SHIP meetings if Nathan Sy can't. He has been our COSAF representative on those. If you are interested and able, email Vidur and Naftali.

VIII. Meeting adjourned 1:00 pm