

COSAF Report

Referenda Ballot Language feedback for CEI Revote

November 15th 2021

1. Is the ballot language clear what will happen if a student votes 'YES' on the CEI Revote referenda? What could be added or removed to make this more clear?

Yes it is clear

I do not think the ballot language is clear on what a 'yes' vote on CEI would mean. It is not clear on what is going to happen to ICA without the funding of CEI. All the person voting knows is that they wont have to pay \$226 annually/quarterly? As a voter I would want to know what that would mean for the program. This leaves room for voters to speculate on what is going to happen.

No. Again, what will happen without that funding? It's not clear what will happen to the student athletes. The ballot only focuses on saving each individual student money, and doesn't explain what we lose if we don't fund it.

No, the ballot language is not clear. The word "nullification" leads to confusion. A better way to phrase the question is: "YES, the portion of the CEI student fee that goes toward ICA athletic scholarships should be maintained."

Yes, the language is clear

The ballot language is pretty clear to me if a student votes yes on the CEI Re-vote referenda it could help numerous programs on campus, including a return- to-aid component, which supports financial aid for those undergraduate students with financial needs.

It is clear to me as a COSAF member but I'm concerned if students who don't pay attention to the formation of their fees can understand quickly and clearly. I recommend you include more contents and fuller perspectives into the top section so that even if a student does not have time/patience to read the entire article, they can make a decision by reading just the top portion. You will get a better chance to get more students to vote and participate. I recommend the top portion includes: 1) why re-vote; 2) what will happen to SASI fees effective xxxx; 3) how it may impact intercollegiate athletic programs and/or institution. Summarize in top portion and refer students to following sections for details.

Yes, it is clear nothing should be added or removed.

No - what happens if ICA funding is eliminated? No more sports? Would we cut sports teams? How would we decide which teams to cut? Where would the funding come from (I'm sure ICA has exhausted all other avenues of funding)?

No, it is not clear. It does not include any of the impacts that would occur listed by Budget and Institutional Analysis. This should absolutely be included in the CEI Re-vote referenda.

I believe the ballot language is clear on what will happen if a student votes YES on the referenda. There are no changes that need to be made.

While the ballot language is very concise, and to the point, I think it avoids a lot of the repercussions of what a "YES" vote would mean for students, student athletes, staff, and the athletic facilities. I believe it is necessary to add a sentence or so about the effects of them not getting that funding.

Yes, the ballot language is clear on what will happen if a student votes 'YES' on this referenda. Nothing more or less can be added or removed to make this more clear.

Should reference Table - "as projected in Table 2" nullification isn't the best word. If it is not required for some legal / technical reason, consider eliminate or the like.

I would suggest changing "nullification" to "removal".

2. Is the ballot language clear what will happen if a student votes 'NO'? What could be added or removed to make this more clear?

Yes it is clear

I do think the ballot language is clear on what a 'no' vote on CEI would mean.

What happens if we do fund this? What are the benefits?

No, the ballot language is not clear. The double negative leads to confusion. The NO question should be phrased: "NO, the portion of the CEI student fee that goes toward ICA athletic scholarships should be terminated."

Yes, the language is clear

Yeah, the ballot language is pretty clear to me and if we vote no it can affect the return aid component which includes a return to aid component to undergraduate students and their financial needs.

Yes, it is clear what will happen is a student votes no.

Yes

Yes.

I believe the ballot language is clear on what will happen if a student votes NO on the referenda. There are no changes that need to be made.

Yes, the ballot language if a student votes "NO" is clear and concise. I appreciate the second sentence that provides further clarification.

Yes, the ballot language is clear on what will happen if a student votes 'No' on this referenda. The two sentences could perhaps be condensed into one if needed.

Should reference Table - "as projected in Table 1"

I would suggest changing "nullification" to "removal".

3. Are there any parts of the ballot language that you find ambiguous? What is ambiguous about that part and how can it be made more clear?

No. It is clear.

One discrepancy I found confusing on the ballot was the date for when the referenda would take effect if passed. On the first page, it states that this would be 'Effective Fall 2022'. Yet, the last page of the referenda states that this would be 'Effective Fall 2023'. Secondly, on the chart of data with a breakdown for what 'each undergraduate pays' it is not clear if this is \$226.83/year i.e. \$75.61/quarter. This makes it unclear for voters to see how much they actually pay into for athletics.

What is the purpose of this funding? It's hard to understand why we pay these fees.

Both the YES and NO ballot language choices are ambiguous and could be seen as misleading.

NO, It's very clear to me and I understood everything very well.

Why re-vote is ambiguous. As a COSAF member, I know why, but how would an ordinary student know? Should it be transparent to students?

No parts of the ballot language are unclear to me.

It is unclear what would happen if ICA funding was eliminated. There is no plan for gradually acclimating ICA to new funding sources which seems unrealistic and dangerous for UCD's finance department that is already working hard to preserve our reserves.

Please separate Parts A and B. They were not conducted under the same vote and you do not make that clear. ICA was covered only in Part A.

I don't believe there is any ambiguity in any parts of the ballot language.

I think the whole layout of the referenda is a little scattered. I suggest moving the background writing to the start of the document so that voters have a better knowledge on CEI before reading the tables of projected CEI allocation's.

No, there are no parts of the ballot language that I find ambiguous.

If this affects student benefits it should be listed - i.e. "If nullified, students may have to purchase tickets to attend games" Should say - "This would result in a significant loss of financial-aid funding for Student-Athletes" I think the chart doesn't accurately represent the resolution itself. I think this type of figure is best for opinions appended to the resolution, it appears one sided as there is no place of ICA to explain their award process (Is it need based? Program based? Are they targeting awards to specific under-represented groups at specific rates? Are they supposed to match the campus demographics?). I think it is wrong to insinuate that their award system is unfair without letting them explain the award system. All acronyms need to be written out (NCAA, COSAF, etc).

4. Is the ballot language neutral? Why or why not?

Yes. It is Neutral.

I do not believe the ballot language is neutral as the ballot does not seem to explain CEI under ICA extensively besides just comparing the amount students pay to other departments on campus.

No. It focuses (again) on saving each individual student money, and does not address the positives benefits we get by paying these fees.

The word "nullification" is a strong word-choice, and does not seem neutral.

I think it is neutral because they are helping undergraduate students and are helping the campus and aren't getting any more benefit than it so I think they are neutral.

I think it tried to be neutral by not specifying why a revote is proposed. I think students should know before voting, both why the fee is in exist, what it does to benefit students and institution, also why a revote to remove portion of the fee is proposed.

The ballot language is neutral because it has no persuading or argumentative language.

No - I am uncomfortable with the statistic of "20.4%" approval. This is not how voting is typically reported and any student would probably see that number and assume that the CEI fee was not enacted by a majority of voters.

Why do you not give the initial figure of the vote like you did in the SASI referendum? Is it because it is not as big of a difference as the SASI referendum and helps your case? Please include those numbers.

The ballot language does appear to be neutral given that it only provides factual numbers, however, it does appear to emphasize how much money is being spent by undergraduates on athletic scholarships which does imply a more negative tone on how the money is being distributed.

Yes, the ballot language is neutral. It clearly, concisely, and objectively states the facts and history of CEI.

The ballot language is neutral because it gives the quantitative data of the CEI with little to none qualitative analysis.

See above, I think the chart isn't a fair reflection of ICA. Otherwise there is reasonably neutral language.

I think so.

5. Do you have any specific recommendations to pass along regarding the ballot language of the CEI Revote referenda?

No recommendations.

The overview should be more than just comparing the amount students pay for CEI in the athletics program to our other campus departments. You should touch on how there would be less financial aid for students due to the fact that ICA would no longer be contributing 25% of what they receive from students as 'Return to Aid'. Again though, referenda lacks general explanation of CEI under the ICA program which is necessary as students aren't going to be familiar with everything a university is going to have to offer. I definitely think there needs to be more explanation on the consequences of a 'yes' and 'no' vote. I think how TGIF presented it in their referenda would be an improvement.

Explain why we pay the fee, what will be lost if we don't pay it, and if outside funds can be used instead

I don't have any recommendations because they explain everything I wanted to know

I have no specific recommendations, the referenda language is fine as is.

It isn't clear what would happen to ICA if their funding from CEI was removed. I think this referendum should consider how we might gradually decrease ICA funding instead of eliminating it altogether. This referendum assumes the school, the athletics department, and college athletes have the capacity (and the time) to magically make this funding appear. The effective date mentioned in paragraph 1 does not match the timeline described in the last paragraph. How would this impact financial aid awards for the broader campus?

I do not have any specific recommendations to pass along at this time.

I believe expanding on what explicitly the Athletics-Scholarships box on the table fees go directly to would help. Maybe adding the number of athletes receiving full-scholarships thanks to those undergraduate fees, or some further background on what the \$226.83 is being spent on would be best for transparency.

There could be an explanation of why CEI fees are necessary when UCD moved into Division I NCAA.

Tables 1 and 2 should reference "Intercollegiate Athletics (ICA) athletic scholarships" Reference tables by the number wherever they are used.