

Council on Student Affairs and Fees (COSAF) Meeting
February 19, 2016
Memorial Union, MU II
11:30 am – 1:00 pm

- I. Call to Order (Naftali) 11:38 am
- II. FACE Presentation, Campus Recreation & Unions (Laura Hall)
 - PPT presentation is posted on COSAF site in “Meeting Resources”
 - Slides are included on IM and Sport clubs, but Laura spoke less about them since they were covered in the previous CEI presentation. Questions were welcome if the committee had them though.
 - With only a few exceptions, Sport Clubs don’t use the ARC because CRU wants to keep the space available for general use
 - The ARC is only closed for 44 hours/week.
 - Recently started opening at 5 am.
 - The 5 am users are predominantly students – about ¾
 - They are aware that the weight/fitness room is not adequate
 - Note that the first financial slide in the presentation does not include the facility – just the program
 - Member sales income augments both equipment and programs
 - JC noted that the final renovation design will come before COSAF once the bidding process is done
 - Equestrian center
 - 23 acres
 - 25,600 visits/yr (not unique users)
 - Impact of the Muriel Gill program was underestimated – there are many good stories of students who have benefited, and many are international students
 - Sport Clubs and Intramurals
 - Didn’t spend much time discussing – repetitive after previous presentation
 - JC clarified that the reason IM and Sport Clubs are part of CRU FACE funding is that they were part of ICA at the time of the FACE initiative, and when they moved under CRU the funding came with them
 - It was noted that the original ballot included a fee per student of \$68 to the ARC, \$4 to the Equestrian Ctr, \$1 to IM and Sport Clubs. Most of the money goes to the ARC.
 - Cost of wages includes the recent increases to the minimum wage (\$2/hr)
 - The reason the cost of living increase is important is to support student services
 - Equestrian center note – Pasture space has a wait list, stalls are full, but have no wait list.
 - Rekha Sylvain provided a handout with more financial information.
 - Handout was reviewed and is posted on COSAF meeting resources page
 - FACE – paid by undergrad & grad students
 - LEAAP – paid by Law students only
 - Salary and benefits
 - Includes ~700 student employees at any given time
 - Also need to take into account 2 career positions not yet filled
 - Only 63% of the fee is subject to CPI
 - Contribution to reserves is good this year – 39%, which is good because we need to feed our reserves
 - Areas include:

- Admin & Communications: phones, general supplies and website maintenance (for use by students and patrons)
- Building Services: cleaning and custodial services
- Recreational Units: uniforms, scheduling system, general supplies
- Important to note that increase in the student body will increase usage of the facility and create more wear and tear.
- JC noted some key things to recognize
 - The current level of reserves reflects the fact that a large portion of the reserves was already moved to the “plant account” and has been bonded to be available for the renovation costs. \$16M, 50% of the renovation project is to be paid by reserves.
 - There hasn’t been a significant change to facilities but the custodial service was previously outsourced and will now be performed by UC employees. This means an additional \$1.5M, mostly in expense to the ARC.
 - It is a \$50M facility, so we are deeply concerned about reserves and need to be sure to move money back into reserves for its upkeep.
- Question: What is the loan payment at the bottom of the handout?
 - JC – it is for the Equestrian Center. Money was borrowed from Student Services Fees and is being paid back from FACE. This is the final year of those payments
 - FACE is unique in that FACE dollars can be redirected, as it was here for the Equestrian center

III. FACE Presentation, Recruitment & Retention Center (Mayra Llamas, along with a number of SRRC student employees)

- PPT presentation is posted on the COSAF meeting resources page
- Student staff introduced themselves
- Is SRRC 15 year anniversary
- In response to Prop 209
- Modeled on a program at UCLA
- Total staff of 42 (3 career?)
- For marginalized and 1st generation students
- Creates cross-community collaborations
- Grad student involvement
 - Supports grad students
 - Also creates a pipeline from undergrad to grad programs
- Mayra highlighted some of their programs
 - Yield event
 - Invite admitted students to campus for a weekend (~150)
 - Have done it since 2010
 - Has a high % yield of students deciding to attend: 70-90%
 - Queer housing
 - Preparing students to move off campus
- Students design activities to fit the holistic support of objectives
- Community empowerment, e.g. grants and collaborations
- # of students using their facility has remained about the same, probably due to capacity, but they came more often last year than the previous year
 - May extend hours, add furniture, to increase availability

- Challenges
 - Enrollment increase is projected to include more underrepresented students, so there will be a need to increase services
 - Assessment has been a challenge due to lack of staff and the technical support for it. They hope to improve this!
- Budget
 - A career staff person was added
 - If there is no CPI, would like to discuss possible removal of SCC building maintenance fee
 - Question (VD): How do you plan to sustain growth beyond next year?
 - Possibly share office coordinator with AB540
 - Must reduce costs, which would mean reduced programming
 - They do get some funding for student-initiated recruitment activity (~\$54,000)
 - They are working with the development office for endowments, etc. Current endowment provides \$4,000/year
 - Work with Financial Aid to facilitate the Work Study process – saves significantly on student wages. Over 50% of the student staff are on Work Study.
 - Attended a meeting at UCOP advocating for increased funding, which was cut by ~50% about 6-7 years ago due to the budget situation.
 - They partner with other campus departments, e.g. co-sponsorships
 - Cuts would likely include food at events, which is actually very important to some of the students the center serves – they plan their day around events to be able to eat
 - Question (IW): What is the LEAAP portion of the funding?
 - Didn't have that number

IV. Health Fee Oversight Committee Report (Director Michelle Famula)

- Handout with information voted on by the HFOC as a recommendation to the Chancellor
- First part shows the actual recommendation voted on
- 2nd part shows the effect if the CPI were applied
- They also voted to adopt CPI
- The initiative allows the increase to go up to 7% annually; they voted for 6.6% to make it a \$12 fee
- The RTA amount in red does not come to the program
- Operating reserves are to cover unexpected salary increases per union contracts and unexpected costs
- There has been no CPI for a long time because there has been a robust reserve, but they no longer have that.
- Michelle explained that JC advised voting for regular CPI increases going forward rather than needing an abrupt fee increase at times
- Question: Why enter into contracts with employees if you can't meet the costs?
 - Clarified that "contracts" noted above referred to union agreements – things they have no control over, negotiated between campus and the unions.
 - They do occasionally hire contract positions, but those are budgeted
- Michelle thanked COSAF for having a representative at the HFOC meetings

V. Chairs Update

- Patrick gave GSA update – referendum for GSA fee increase is beginning next Monday and going through the following week. He will keep the committee informed of the result.
 - Naftali noted that in the future, COSAF may be voting on whether or not to apply CPI to GSA

- Recruitment process for 2016-17 COSAF
 - Vidur asked that everyone PLEASE apply for committee membership for next year by March 7
 - Also, anyone interested in Co-Chairing should let the chairs know by the end of the quarter. Both positions will be open.
- CEI CPI Vote Results
 - ICA & Health Ctr didn't pass
- Discussion regarding abstaining; voting in absentia
 - Abstaining is not giving the opinion you are being paid to give!
 - Naftali – It's possible to change the bylaws so only Yes/No votes are possible
 - Asked for show of hands of those interested
 - Simple majority is needed for this
 - Maybe will vote on it next week
 - May also discuss next week the potential of an absentee vote
 - It was agreed more discussion was needed

VI. Meeting adjourned 1:00 pm