

**Council on Student Affairs and Fees (COSAF) Meeting**  
**March 4, 2016**  
**Memorial Union, DeCarli Room**  
**11:30 am – 1:00 pm**

- I. Call to Order 11:42 am
- John Campbell discussed an upcoming administrative shift
    - Jan Barnett agreed to return temporarily after retirement to help with the establishment of the new COSAF committee
    - Introduced Jason Lorgan, UC Davis Stores Director, who will be assuming responsibility as COSAF advisor
    - John remains administrative advisor to the committee
    - Jan will be advising Jason as we transition to Jan's exit
    - Jason will be the continuity expert for us
- II. Discussion Regarding Abstaining; Voting in Absentia (Chairs)
- Topic of voting in absentia introduced by Vidur
    - NM – any decision can be voted on by a show-of-hands vote. It takes a simple majority to change the bylaws
    - VD – feels that if a member has been engaged and attending meetings, then should be able to vote even if unable to attend a voting meeting
    - PD – We don't operate in a vacuum. We share info with those we represent, so feels should be able to send a proxy to vote
    - NM – maybe make a shift so that positions like the GSA rep has the possibility of sending a designee, like the ASUCD president can. Otherwise we are all individually appointed and responsible.
    - VD – the designee would have to be knowledgeable enough to vote in the GSA or LSA rep's stead
    - NM – personally in favor of absentee voting if not able to be present
    - NM – could we add the possibility of joining the meeting virtually?
      - JC – wouldn't want a whole committee phoning in
      - NM – maybe at the discretion of the chairs
      - PD – could still require a physical quorum, then extras could participate that way
      - IW – imposing restrictions overcomplicates things
      - PD – agrees
    - NM – would have to have enough physical presence
    - PD moved to change bylaws to enable proxy
      - NM seconded
      - Show of hands: Yes
    - IW moved to have the option for GSA and LSA reps to send a designee
      - GS seconded
      - Show of hands: Yes
  - Next topic – the question of abstaining or not
    - PD – spoke to GSA and they didn't like removing the option. Abstention is there for a reason. COSAF is advisory on something previously decided by referendum. Right now, abstention means to PD that he's not sufficiently informed to cast a vote. Can't force a vote. Problem is that abstentions now count essentially as a "NO" vote. Maybe switch that?

- NM – Currently abstentions are counted toward meeting the quorum, but are not included in calculating the % of Yes or No votes for the outcome
- GS – We're paid to be here, hired to do this. We should vote.
- MG – Agrees
- IW – Agrees with PD. Abstentions are a tool for those who don't feel they should vote. For example, LSA doesn't pay all the fees we vote on, so feels LSA shouldn't vote on those.
  - GS – Staff and faculty don't pay fees either, but they vote to help add the big picture view
  - JC – clarification: Grad students do pay some fees and not others, but we view the campus as a community. As a community, everyone is in it. We are advisory. There are things students do and don't pay – it's quirky. For example, LSA initially voted no to CEI for Unitrans, and the question now is how to get them involved in Unitrans
  - NM – these are advisory votes. On other AAC's NM has often voted on things he has no stake in, but it serves the campus community to be involved. The Vice Chancellor wanted graduate students, staff and faculty representatives on this committee, so she wants to hear their input.
  - JC – yes, that's the point he was trying to make.
  - NM – noted that comments will be communicated to the Vice Chancellor with the overall recommendations. It can include, for example, what LSA feels that may be different from the overall vote/recommendation.
- Are people comfortable on voting at this point on whether or not to retain the abstention vote?
  - PD – no
- More people abstained than just PD and IW. Why?
- What if there were 8 abstentions and one Yes vote? Would that be a Yes?
- NM – We want to provide something valuable. The result of a vote is helpful, and comments inform the voting results.
- JC – this is a good question. Maybe it is worth checking with Adela, asking her at the next meeting she attends
  - NM – good suggestion
  - VD – We will table this discussion until the next time Adela attends
  - JC – it would be good for her to hear this discussion.
- NM – Now we are counting abstentions only for quorum, so we will do the same today.

### III. FACE Discussion (Chairs)

- FACE/LEAAP handouts were given (also posted on COSAF site)
- Ballots were distributed to voting members
- Luci Schmidl summarized/reviewed the handouts
  - FACE – deals with operating expenses, doesn't apply to debt service
  - RTA is based on Pell Grant-eligible students
  - Income amount is based on current fee amount and enrollment
  - Question – LH – Can we change the title to Recreation Programming (not ARC)?
  - LEAAP – on operating expenses
  - That's what we're voting on
  - ICA includes both Aquatic Ctr and Stadium
  - Clarified what was included on each section of the ballot - ICA and CRU
- Question: How many students, outside of student athletes, use the Stadium and Schaal?

- JC – clarified that this is for operating expenses. It doesn't include capital expenses, bonds, etc. It is where raising the percentage can make a significant difference for being able to maintain these facilities
- NM – Do people want clarification on what operating expenses are?
  - JC – Not bonds/capital expenses, but things like
    - Utilities
    - Custodial costs
    - Replacement of equipment
    - Student payroll
    - Maintenance
    - Programming
    - The things it takes to operate a facility
- Question – regarding FACE reallocation option
  - JC – FACE is the only one that allows this body to recommend reallocation when a cost is terminating but the fee is continued. For example, what was allocated for the Equestrian Center bond – where should it go when the payoff is complete? Could expand on that by directing use of reserves. It is separate from CPI. Next year will be the first to see the reallocation of funding.
- Question re: SRRC – Why is it 100% just operations? You can't just let a facility go.
  - JC – this was a case where fees were bundled. They voted to fund the program ONLY. They are tenants in a building, which is different from having facility needs. For example, replacing the stadium turf is an operating cost, very different from the SRRC operations
- Question – PG – any thoughts on the last meeting? Opinions?
  - PD – good idea to discuss opinions
  - MG – SRRC is reaching a lot of students. Seem to be maximizing their use of funding. CPI would be beneficial. Personally in favor.
  - NM – funding a career position through reserves is a challenge
  - VD – has a concern for the reserves
  - JC – they were allowed to build reserves for a period of time, and they shouldn't have been. Programming is fee in/fee out. They were charged to use up their reserves and decided to do so via a temporary position. They understood that the Division should not have allowed reserves. Past leadership decided how to use.
- Question – IW re: ICA. Certain things need to be paid for to meet requirements. Is it true that an MRI machine is necessary?
  - MB – Wouldn't come from FACE funds. Purpose is to determine on site if someone is able to continue playing in a game
  - LH – It is part of partnering with other entities
  - GO – Other Division 1 football teams have an MRI machine on site. This would be usable by opposing teams as well
- MG – Keep in mind it is PE students, sport clubs, and the community using the spaces, not just the 100 student athletes
- MB – Schaal opened up the impacted space at Hickey Pool
- VOTE TAKEN, reported later via email from the chairs as follows:
  - Below are the results for today's votes:

	Yes	No	Abstain
ICA	8	2	0
CRU	10	0	0
SRRC	8	1	1

- As it stands, all of them passed to recommend a CPI adjustment.

#### IV. Update on Recent Fee Referenda (JC)

- Results will be posted on COSAF site
- Both the Green Initiative (TGIF) and the Aggie Initiative passed. They had the required voter turnout (at least 20% of 26,873 as designated by the Registrar's office)
- TGIF
  - 3,995 Yes
  - 1060 No
  - 1170 Abstained
- Aggie
  - 3584 Yes
  - 1509 No
  - 732 Abstained
- GSA initiative did not pass. PD update:
  - Insufficient voter turnout
  - 892 or 893 were required
  - Got 803
  - Of those, 71% were Yes, 29% were No
  - Question – MG – So what happens?
    - PD – It's hard to count grad students, and hard to reach out to them. The vote was likely affected by the fact that nursing students do not have ucdavis accounts and so were unable to vote.
    - So it failed. They will try again next year. It takes too long to go through both the GSA process/rules and the UC Davis process to redo it this year.
- From here the results go to Adela. She reviews them and advises the Chancellor, then the Chancellor advises UCOP. New fees are not official until UCOP says so.
- PD (re: GSA fee) They are trying to figure out how to apply CPI to a fee that didn't initially include it.
  - JC – congratulations to PD for his uphill battle working on this referendum. Will continue to work with campus on this
  - JC – congratulations to all who worked on the referenda and made them happen.

#### V. Student Service Fees Overview (Laurie Carney, BIA)

- SSF overview is already on the COSAF website
- Will send links so people can review info before the next meeting on recent expenditure reports on SSFs and Health Fee
- SSF is set by UC, but each campus has some discretion on the use of fees/funds
- Questions regarding use of fees can be directed to the Vice Chancellor
- Chairs:
  - Looking at SSFs it can be pretty exciting to see programs you may not know about
  - Okay to put time on your timesheet between now and the next meeting to examine info

#### VI. Chairs Update

- Remember to apply for COSAF for 2016-17
  - New deadline is March 28
- PLEASE email chairs if you are interested in chairing next year
- We want time for training

VII. Meeting adjourned 12:58 pm