

VOTE RESULTS AND SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

COSAF Meeting, April 22, 2022

New Referenda-Final Review: CEI Revote, SASI Re-vote, TGIF

CEI REVOTE | Voting Member Survey Results *

Survey Question: Do you endorse this initiative moving forward?	YES, I believe it is in the best interest of the student body and the campus as a whole to move forward and place the item on the ballot in Fall of 2022.	NO, I believe reducing the Athletics portion of this fee is not in the best interest of the student body and the campus to move forward due to the adverse impact on student services and programs associated with this reduction.
	7	10

RESULTS:

- By majority consensus, COSAF does not endorse the **CEI Revote** referendum being placed on the Fall 2022 ballot.

Action Item #2022-035

SASI REVOTE | Voting Member Survey Results *

Survey Question: Do you endorse this initiative moving forward?	YES, I believe it is in the best interest of the student body and the campus as a whole to move forward and place the item on the ballot in Fall of 2022.	NO, I believe reducing the Athletics portion of this fee is not in the best interest of the student body and the campus to move forward due to the adverse impact on student services and programs associated with this reduction.
	6	11

RESULTS:

- By majority consensus, COSAF does not endorse the **SASI Revote** referendum being placed on the Fall 2022 ballot.

Action Item #2022-036

TGIF | Voting Member Survey Results

Survey Question: Do you endorse this initiative moving forward?	YES, I believe it is in the best interests of the campus as a whole to move this initiative forward.	NO, I do not believe it is in the best interests of the campus as a whole to move this initiative forward.
	17	1

RESULTS:

- By majority consensus, COSAF endorses the **TGIF** referendum being placed on the Fall 2022 ballot.

Action Item #2022-037

*Referendum sponsor vote not included.

SUMMARY OF COUNCIL COMMENTS

CEI Revote - YES

The students should be able to vote on whether to continue this fee.

Students deserve a chance to decide if fees are still relevant for use. I personally think some form of the fee needs to remain to support athletics but a vote for this is important as it gives the student populace a chance to voice a collective opinion.

I believe that since it has been so long since students voted on CEI that they should have another opportunity to decide on whether or not they want to pay hundreds of dollars towards something they might not use or benefit from.

Students should have the opportunity to vote on what their tuition is going toward especially if their tuition is going toward other students' tuitions (scholarships, etc)

I believe that students should have a choice. Personally, I think if the referenda were to pass, the costs would outweigh the benefits and I would vote against its passing. However, I firmly believe that the student body should have the right to make that decision.

CEI Revote - NO

I cannot endorse this referenda as written because:

- 1) The sponsor did not modify the referenda based on COSAF feedback and was unable to demonstrate how COSAF feedback and student feedback improved the ballot language.
- 2) I find it unconvincing that administrative 'interference' (whether real, perceived, or imagined) is a valid
- 3) This referenda provided no safety net or provision to protect student-athletes who would lose funding.

I think the biggest issue I have with this initiative is that it takes an extreme approach to a seemingly smaller problem. In fact, the extremity of the referenda seems to suggest that the initiative is the result of something more personal and appears to be a vindictive attempt to "get even" with the administration. COSAF is here to be both conscious of student fees being spent while simultaneously finding ways to capture the interests of all students. This initiative fails to demonstrate the way in which students would benefit from such a referendum. Further, it seems to be an impulse reaction, piggybacked on by ASUCD, to add spice to their regularly scheduled meetings. The misinformation caused by this referendum and its ASUCD affiliates has only worsened campus trust in the administration, which seemed to be the underlying goal of the presentation. Still, despite the constant accusations, I have found the administration to be wildly supportive throughout the process.

At this point, it's clear that this referendum (and ASUCD) have no intention of developing a proposal that actually reflects the wants and needs of the UCD campus since this initiative remains both wildly impractical, radical, and irresponsible. The threats of action made by Calvin and ASUCD toward COSAF members only demonstrate a disconnect from the "every day" UCD students that they allege they represent. Thus, I do not think ASUCD nor this referendum represent the interests of students on campus.

There has been a large effort put forth by Calvin Wong and his team to fight for this referendum. I see and somewhat admire the passion that they have put into this, but I am unable to support moving forward with this referendum. I understand the points that Calvin has brought forth calling into question the purpose and amount of the CEI fee that goes to Intercollegiate Athletics but an immediate full reduction of, as Vice Chancellor Kelly Ratliff said, \$11.4 million dollars is both irresponsible and infeasible. It could lead to the dismantling of different programs both within and outside of ICA. It does not seem to benefit the majority of students. It seems to do the opposite. After Calvin's presentation on April 22, 2022, I felt as if this referendum was put forth as revenge toward ICA and the UC Davis administration because of the dismantling of the credit-bearing PE program, a program seemingly promised by SASI (not CEI). I believe there were both better and more feasible solutions that Calvin could have taken to address his complaints, but he admittedly decided to proceed with a plan that was the most drastic and unlikely of them all. During this presentation, he said that this drastic plan was put forth as a way to get the administration's attention

and not be ignored as he believes he was before. Calvin's demeanor and attitude towards most members of COSAF were extremely rude and ineffective at getting his major points across. He also has not spoken with people and athletes that directly benefit from this fee while also not understanding the indirect benefits of it as well. I do urge Calvin or any other student to create referenda looking at a potential and gradual reduction of CEI fees if they believe it to be both beneficial and necessary. I believe this fee should be looked at by the student body once again not because of a need for retribution but because of a genuine desire to get the student body's opinion.

The sponsor, Calvin Wong, did not provide a viable alternative financial plan for students who would be directly affected by the ICA portion of the CEI fee if it was eliminated.

In order to complete Wong's objective of funding athletic classes, he should look into expanding the ICA portion of the CEI fee and not reducing it.

I do not believe tuition should increase, programs should be cut, and positions for employees should be reduced which are all possibilities if the Athletics portion of the fee was removed. While most students are not athletes they still benefit from the Athletics portion of the fee by going to games, getting visibility to UC Davis, and so much more. I do not want to be a part of hampering the futures of the athletes on campus just so that I do not have to pay for Athletics fees.

CEI contributes to attracting students to our school. The most prestigious academic universities (ivy leagues) maintain athletic teams. I think it is also unclear about the RTA. Less RTA hurts everyone including nonathletic because the school has less funds to give. RTA is the reason I am a UCD student today. Also 13% of the team receiving scholarships are Black, I am a black student and will try and serve as a voice for them. Despite them paying for their own scholarships, it gives people access to higher education.

I support a continued conversation between Student Affairs/administration, ASUCD, ICA, and COSAF to discuss a potential long term plan re: these specific student fees and appropriate institutional funding models.

I think that this is a tough push towards something that should only be taken in increments at a time. Fully pushing the cut at once would result in the collapse of other departments. So I think that there's a better way to approach this problem. Not only that, there's almost no regard for the UC Davis athletics team while they are a part of the students.

CEI Revote - Alternate Member Comments

Since nearly half (i.e., 37.6%) of the CEI fee allocates toward ICA, and not many students can directly benefit from the athletic scholarship. I'd recommend re-examining and adjusting the CEI funding allocation.

I believe it is in the best interest of the student body to vote yes, and be able to spark these difficult conversations with the administration; while ensuring that both sides of this argument are heard.

SASI Revote – YES

Students should be able to vote on whether they want to continue this fee.

SASI was originally made by a vote and should continue to be adjusted by a vote.

A lot of the things included in the ICA section of SASI the common UC Davis student does not benefit nor have access to. Not everyone has access to ICA medical trainers, travel busses, or to be a coach. For these reasons, I feel like the average Davis student has the right to decide if they want to no longer pay into this fee.

Again, I believe the student body as a whole should decide how to move forward. I am personally against the referenda, but believe the students as a whole should decide.

I think reducing the athletics portion of this is a good way of not charging everyone who isn't even doing anything but on the other hand, I believe that our campus is known for it's athletic stardom and should be allowed but i will stick to my answer and will support yes

SASI Revote – NO

I cannot endorse this referendum based on concerns with the presentation today and text of the referenda, namely:

- 1) It is potentially unethical, or at least I find it ethically dubious, for students to use campus referenda to reduce services to other students (potentially with the intent to 'punish' affected students) because of a disagreement with the Provost's decision canceling another program.
- 2) The presentation today included information that may be incorrect regarding referenda policies. For example -- in reading UC Policy and Procedures Manual Chapter 280, Section 15 it appears to -- (i) included language regarding changing/eliminating fees in 1996 and the 2021 reissue include includes language regarding changing/eliminating fees; (ii) 280-15 does not include a preclude student affairs or COSAF from inviting affected students to speak about potential referenda.
- 3) Based on presentations, it is evident that, in addition to student-athletes, other student groups would experience reduced services from this. I believe this is not reflective of the majority of students wishes.
- 4) The sponsor appeared to verbally withdraw this referendum from consideration

I think the biggest issue I have with this initiative is that it takes an extreme approach to a seemingly smaller problem. In fact, the extremity of the referenda seems to suggest that the initiative is the result of something more personal and appears to be a vindictive attempt to "get even" with the administration. COSAF is here to be both conscious of student fees being spent while simultaneously finding ways to capture the interests of all students. This initiative fails to demonstrate the way in which students would benefit from such a referendum. Further, it seems to be an impulse reaction, piggybacked on by ASUCD, to add spice to their regularly scheduled meetings. The misinformation caused by this referendum and its ASUCD affiliates has only worsened campus trust in the administration, which seemed to be the underlying goal of the presentation. Still, despite the constant accusations, I have found the administration to be wildly supportive throughout the process.

At this point, it's clear that this referendum (and ASUCD) have no intention of developing a proposal that actually reflects the wants and needs of the UCD campus since this initiative remains both wildly impractical, radical, and irresponsible. The threats of action made by Calvin and ASUCD toward COSAF members only demonstrate a disconnect from the "every day" UCD students that they allege they represent. Thus, I do not think ASUCD nor this referendum represent the interests of students on campus.

There has been a large effort put forth by Calvin Wong and his team to fight for this referendum. I see and somewhat admire the passion that they have put into this, but I am unable to support moving forward with this referendum. I understand the points that Calvin has brought forth calling into question the purpose and amount of the SASI fee that goes to Intercollegiate Athletics but an immediate full reduction of, as Vice Chancellor Kelly Ratliff said, \$7.5 million dollars is both irresponsible and infeasible. It could lead to the dismantling of different programs both within and outside of ICA. It does not seem to benefit the majority of students. It seems to do the opposite. After Calvin's presentation on April 22, 2022, I felt as if this referendum was put forth as revenge toward ICA and the UC Davis administration because of the

dismantling of the credit-bearing PE program, a program seemingly promised by SASI. I believe there were both better and more feasible solutions that Calvin could have taken to address his complaints, but he admittedly decided to proceed with a plan that was the most drastic and unlikely of them all. During this presentation, he said that this drastic plan was put forth as a way to get the administration's attention and not be ignored as he believes he was before. Calvin's demeanor and attitude towards most members of the COSAF were extremely rude and ineffective at getting his major points across. He also has not spoken with people and athletes that directly benefit from this fee while also not understanding the indirect benefits of it as well. I do urge Calvin or any other student to create referenda looking at a potential and gradual reduction of SASI fees if they believe it to be both beneficial and necessary. I believe this fee should be looked at by the student body once again not because of a need for retribution but because of a genuine desire to get the student body's opinion.

Calvin Wong has not accounted for the many students who would be directly affected by these funds if they are eliminated. For many people, the athletic scholarships have been a significant factor that has helped them to continue to be able to attend the University of California, Davis. If the funding were to be cut off, and without any viable alternative, a measure eliminating the fee would negatively affect a large portion of the student body (sports games, band, jobs, athletes, facilities, etc.). Even one individual who might drop out of college directly because of Wong's proposed changes is one too many.

I believe that it is important to continue supporting UC Davis athletics.

Student services would be inevitably affected if the Athletics portion of the fee was removed. It sounds like if this fee was removed, the Undergraduate experience would not be the same, as money from other departments on campus would be needed for funding. As a result, less faculty positions would be present, longer waits for services, and overall the experience would not be as pleasant as it is currently. For that reason, I think the Athletics portion of the fee should remain in place.

SASI allows for facility maintenance. Other organizations like ASUCD and Campus Rec rely on these facilities as well for their programs and services. I think enacting this within 6 months from now is also too drastic.

I support a continued conversation between Student Affairs/administration, ASUCD, ICA, and COSAF to discuss a potential long term plan re: these specific student fees and appropriate institutional funding models.

I believe that working towards a slow reduction would be a much effective and efficient use of our time.

SASI Revote – Alternate Member Comments

The value of the SASI fee is only directly benefitting a small minority of students and this should be reevaluated.

ICA receives the most funding from SASI, however, not many students can directly benefit from the athletic scholarship. Re-examine and adjusting the funding allocated to ICA is in the best interest of the largest student body at UC Davis.

Based on the comments and inquiries I have made to random UC Davis students, from my perspective, it seems the students want a reduction in student fees, not abolition. I answer for the people.

TGIF – YES

I endorse this initiative because I think sustainability and climate change are growing concerns for all of us. For students interested in sustainability, TGIF offers an avenue for students to experiment with ideas that can directly improve their campus. As a land grant university, this is especially important.

The Green Initiative Fund provides funds to UC Davis students, faculty, and staff to develop and lead projects to enhance sustainability measures. The mission that TGIF funds is one of great need in the face of climate change and global warming. The reinstatement of TGIF fees seems to be a benefit to the campus as a whole. I hope that the TGIF fund, if reinstated, is able to support many projects in the future. I find the ballot language neutral and ready to be in a future UC Davis vote.

I do not see why the student body should not be given the opportunity to vote on whether it wants to continue funding TGIF or not.

The program is very involved on campus and does a good job trying to push a green agenda. It would be a loss not to continue this fee

TGIF has provided many grants to thoughtful projects in the past and I believe we should continue this fee.

TGIF is making great efforts towards campus life, and I believe it is best to move this initiative forward for the student population.

TGIF has a great mission for the school, city, and for the world. Students seeing this on the ballot would be great for them to know that the fee is going toward a wonderful mission.

TGIF continues to make UCD a leader in environmentally conscious campuses. Great way for students to get funding for projects.

I love TGIF and all that they do. I think having them is very important for UC Davis to move toward a more climate-friendly campus and changes the student's attitude toward global warming. The different projects are enjoyable, inclusive, and provide the student's additional opportunities to be included.

yeah even though our school is already green I believe we can make it more green and I give my full support to it cause we need to make more green

TGIF – NO

I cannot support the green initiative fund referenda because:

- (1) The long-term sustainability benefits are not tracked and demonstrated in a comparative way. Thus the language and branding of the fund is misleading to voters
- (2) This fund has largely funded campus and research projects. Students should not be funding professor's side projects. Students should not be funding improvements to the campus landscaping, etc. These should be funded via appropriate grants or campus central funds
- (3) In a time when costs are increasing, I cannot support adding additional fees to undergraduate's cost of attendance.

TGIF – Alternate Member Comments

It is a great program and should be reinstated.

TGIF asks for a little funding but can make a huge impact on our future environment.

TGIF only benefits the university by providing funds to common students, faculty, and staff with inspirational goals that achieve sustainability goals set by the United Nations