

COSAF Report

Referenda Ballot Language feedback for TGIF

November 15th 2021

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

Yes

I believe the ballot language is very clear on what a 'YES' on the TGIF referenda results in.

Yes, looks good! Very clear and detailed.

I feel that the ballot language for the TGIF referenda is clear.

Yes, it is clear.

the ballot language is pretty clear about what will happen if a students vote yes on TGIF referenda it's would be for the better because this would help the campus program that offers students the opportunity to develop and launch innovative sustainability projects within the UC Davis campus community, and also will help by promoting sustainability.

Yes, it is clear.

Yes

Yes.

I believe the ballot language is clear about the consequences of voting YES and I don't believe any adjustments are needed.

Yes, the ballot language is very clear for the "YES" vote on the referenda.

No. What should be included in this line is the mention of an increasing of funds by \$0.50/quarter annually. As it is, a 'YES' vote seems to only reinstate the \$3.00/quarter fee.

I think it is clear.

Yes

Yes, very clear.

It should be added that the fee would expire at the end of AY 2032-2033 (it could be quickly miss read as increasing only until 2033, but still collected after). Yes, it would begin collecting a student fee in 2023 of 3.50. This fee would fund student oriented projects through 2032-33. (but it is unclear if the program expires in 2033 or if the fee expires in 2033)

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

I do think the ballot language is clear on what a 'no' vote would mean as they clearly state that the TGIF program will have to end if the referendum is not passed. This leaves no room for speculation on what the consequences are.

Yes, looks good! Very clear and detailed.

Yes, the ballot language is clear.

Yes, it is clear

The ballot language is pretty clear about what will happen if a student votes no and it's pretty clear that they are doing a great job of keeping up the referendum.

Yes, it is clear what will happen.

Yes

Yes.

I believe the ballot language is clear about the consequences of voting NO and I don't believe any adjustments are needed.

Yes, the ballot language is very clear for the "NO" vote on the referenda.

Yes, the ballot language is clear on what will happen if a student votes 'NO'. The 'loss of funds' phrase seems to be appealing to emotion because of the following listed 'losses'.

I think it is clear.

Yes

Yes, very clear.

The use of "loss of funds" seems misleading. If no funds are collected, no funds can be lost. It is sufficient enough to say that "... results in closure of the TGIF program and cease funding...."

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

I didn't find any parts of the ballot language to be ambiguous.

No, looks good.

The "(25 percent of which is used for Return to Aid)" could be explained in more detail, with a description of what return to aid means.

There should be a more detailed focus on how TGIF provides sustainable development since that is there main focus.

NO, I found everything pretty clear and simple.

No, there are no parts that I found were ambiguous.

No

I believe the ballot language is very thorough as it explains exactly where the funding is being distributed to.

No, I believe the proposed ballot language is very clear, and perfectly elaborates when necessary.

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

I do not find any part ambiguous.

No

As said above, I think it needs to clearly state in the yes language, issue, and overview that the fee would expire after the 2032-2033 school year. It is kind of buried at the very bottom.

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

Yes

I do think the ballot language is neutral as the overview has a lot of background information that isn't presented in a manner that may look as if it is trying to persuade you a certain direction. The results of a 'yes' and a 'no' vote are clearly stated and thought out by the author of the referenda.

Yes, looks good! Very clear and detailed pros and cons of the fee

The wording for the NO vote could possibly be changed to make it even more neutral to: "A 'no' vote rejects the TGIF fee renewal and results in closure of the TGIF program and an end to funding for student-centered environmental sustainability projects, student internships, and sustainability programming and initiatives at UC Davis."

yeah, the ballot is neutral because the students will get much more from it and it will help a lot of students during their undergraduate years.

Yes, because there is no persuading language.

Yes - it is clear what this referendum would accomplish with either vote. I think a gradual increase is pretty straightforward.

Yes, I do find that it is neutral because it is simply stating facts. There is not really an overall negative towards a single side.

The ballot language appears to provide only unbiased factual information and does seem to be neutral.

Yes the ballot language is very neutral and objective. It does a great job at giving a thorough overview of what TGIF is, and what it offers Davis students, staff, and faculty. It also provides a necessary amount of data, statistics, and information required to make a decision regarding this referenda.

The listed things that are lost when a loss of funds occur during a 'No' vote seems to be appealing to emotion. The listed things are things most students will almost always support, and by saying that they could lose them, it could influence students to change their vote.

It is neutral to an extent. The language could be made more neutral if the "Yes" and "No" options simply stated "Yes" meant the TGIF fee would be reinstated and a "No" vote would be a rejection of the renewal.

Yes

Neutral

I think it is reasonably neutral in wording, with the above comments it will be more clear.

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

No

none

no i don't have any recommendations everything was explained

I do not have any specific recommendations to pass along.

No, I loved the presentation as well.

I would recommend to make mention of the fee increase in portion of the explanation of the 'YES' vote.

I do not think the average student will read the short essay written in under the "overview" section. Consider cutting it down.

No

As said above: (1) I think it needs to clearly state in the yes language, issue, and overview that the fee would expire after the 2032-2033 school year. (2) The use of "loss of funds" seems misleading. If no funds are collected, no funds can be lost. ---- It is sufficient enough to say that "... results in closure of the TGIF program and cease funding...."