

# RECOMMENDATION RESULTS AND SUMMARY OF COMMENTS

COSAF Meeting, October 29, 2021  
Facilities and Campus Enhancements Fee (FACE)  
Legal Education Enhancement and Access Program (LEEAP)

## Quorum Met

Per the Council on Student Affairs and Fees Bylaws: *Recommendations associated with CPI adjustments must have a quorum, defined as **half the voting membership**, rounded up to the nearest number.*

Total Voting Members: **19**  
In Attendance: **17**  
Quorum was met at **89%** attendance

## FACE CPI Recommendation

Per the Council on Student Affairs and Fees Bylaws: *Recommendations associated with CPI adjustments on Campus Based Fees must pass by **66%**, rounded to the nearest number.*

FACE: **19** ballots completed (17 in attendance + 2 via absentee)  
**13** yes votes required to pass

	<u>Intercollegiate Athletics</u>	<u>Campus Recreation</u>	<u>Student Recruitment &amp; Retention Ctr.</u>
YES	12	17	16*
NO	7	2	1

### RESULTS:

- COSAF recommends a CPI adjustment to the FACE fee in 2022-23 for Campus Recreation and Student Recruitment & Retention Center
- COSAF does not recommend a CPI adjustment to the FACE fee in 2022-23 for Intercollegiate Athletics

Action Item #2022-003

## LEEAP CPI Recommendation

Per the Council on Student Affairs and Fees Bylaws: *Only the LSA (Law Students Association) Representative will vote on CPI adjustments to the remaining portion of the LEEAP fee: Law School Recruitment, Retention & Outreach.*

LEEAP: **2** voting member present. **2** yes votes required to pass.

	<u>Law School Recruitment &amp; Retention</u>
YES	2*
NO	0

RESULTS: COSAF recommends a CPI adjustment to the LEEAP fee in 2022-23 which supports Law School Recruitment, Retention & Outreach

Action Item #2022-004

\* Per COSAF Bylaws, Law school members do not vote on the Student Recruitment & Retention Center portion of FACE. Law school members do vote on Law School Recruitment & Retention, as part of LEEAP.

## SUMMARY OF COUNCIL COMMENTS

Action Item #2022-005

Please provide your comments regarding the **Campus Recreation** presentation and use of **FACE/ LEEAP** fees.

I believe that CRU provides good value and useful services to grad students. I appreciate the detail look at how grads use these services. It is clear that UCD experience benefits from CRU and that CRU provide exceptional value for the money

I do believe campus recreation is an important outlet for students to take a break from school work.

The Campus Recreation is a luxury to have and maintain for the students.

Campus Recreation has adapted to COVID-19 so effectively, while still benefitting the student body, and offering a multitude of different services. The Campus Recreation presentation did a great job at conveying this, and I believe making an adjustment to the FACE/LEEAP fee would be very beneficial to most undergraduate students.

I think having the option to use Campus Recreation's facilities is great. They offer many programs and serves aimed at reducing student's stress. Campus Recreation has also stepped up during COVID-19.

If I could have voted I would have voted yes.

I use the Rec Center often and believe an adjustment is necessary. A broad campus group also uses this program.

The ARC helps to promote Aggie wellness. Using this facility is a great way to relive stress and maintain balance in the daily lives of students. The CPI adjustment is necessary in order to continue to provide this important resource.

Excellent facility, utilized by many students.

I believe Campus Rec is an important factor when it comes to satisfaction with campus facilities.

82% of students find belonging with Campus Rec. The Rec employs lot of student employees.

We should not be paying for 8 4 wall courts when only 4 of them are being used for their intended purposes. This pattern of wasteful spending and exploiters of the student body should not be rewarded.

All students can use the Campus Rec Center if they want to, so this is a good investment. Many students can benefit from Campus Rec services.

I use the ARC sometimes but my friends and all the members of the community benefits from it I got here sometimes and enjoy my time also I do my Covid testing for free which is a very big thing and I will vote for it and I would like them to get the funding

I thought the presentation was good. Campus Rec seems to be growing and I know the ARC recently was exposed with having a leak problem so improving and repairing these facilities are important.

Please provide your comments regarding the **Intercollegiate Athletics: Schaal Aquatics Center and UC Davis Health Stadium** presentation and use of **FACE/ LEEAP** fees.

Graduate students receive very little if any benefit from these facilities vs. the cost of maintenance and the maintenance priorities set. I recommend greater outreach to students in general and grad specifically. Possibly oversight should be done by cru with ACI having shared use or priority access

I at first thought that we should vote for it but then when I heard that all the students are charged for the FACE/LEAP it kind of threw me off which made me think that we shouldn't charge all the students for only 2% of athletes and we can experience everything with the same budget they have this year and it's perfectly fine raising it and giving funds would be unfair to the people who pay and doesn't use it but we should give priority to the athletes because of them we are known around the country

I don't believe students should be burdened with having to help preserve facilities they will not be able to use such as the Schaal Aquatics Center. Furthermore, the argument that increasing funding for these facilities will bring the university prestige is not strong enough. It was mentioned in the meeting that our prestige should come from academics rather than athletics, and that is a fair point to make. A final point is that a majority of the student body has not appeared to show interest in funding these facilities.

I think that the Intercollegiate Athletics is an extremely important aspect to the student lives and I can see Schaal Aquatics Center need a lot of remodeling sooner or later.

I believe there should be a CPI adjustment to the portion of the FACE/LEEAP fee supporting Intercollegiate Athletics. ICA not only benefits the student body, but actually the entire Davis community. Athletes deserve the safest, most effective facilities, and Schaal Aquatics Center definitely needs some renovating. If this fee adjustment can help get that in the works I believe it would benefit not only the ICA, and club sports teams but also the entire student body, and visitors. ICA is a huge part of college life for most students (athletes or not), and by not making an adjustment would be unfair to them.

The Aquatics Center and Health Stadium do not give anything tangible to students in return. As the Athletics Director said during his presentation 14% was their record attendance for a home game. It should fundamentally be the university's burden to main facilities that the majority of students on this campus do not have any opportunity to utilize. We are coming out of a pandemic. This CPI increase should be in students pockets. Students need to use however they want. Athletics had \$1 million surplus from 2019-20. They do not need this CPI increase.

I think that Athletics in an integral part of the campus dynamic and its importance mirrors Campus Recreation. Although on paper it seems to benefit a small number of students, the reach ICA has is far and wide across the country. It builds UC Davis's reputation as not only a good athletic school, but academic as well. ICA has made it clear how much they stress UC Davis's academic achievements when on Live TV. Without athletics I think the campus environment would change drastically. I know a lot of minority students participate in athletics. This is a group that already has a hard time finding a home on campus. As a minority myself, it's hard enough as it is.

If I could have voted today, I would have voted no. These increases do not represent the student body and undergraduate students' best interests; especially because they are the ones made to pay for ICA's use of the funds. Please reconsider and do not approve these increases.

I'm a graduate student voting alternate. I don't vote but here are my comments on behalf of graduate students: Personally, I love athletic students and sports they plan. However, from my personal experiences, I do not hear any graduate students take the benefits of the athletic stadium, athletic Schaal aquatic center. We do often use the rec pool, the gym, and the Arc pavilion, but we rarely watch ongoing football matches, basketball competitions etc. Most of us are mostly interested in research funding, housing, and food security. We do hope UC Davis can allocate findings wisely to the interest of the majority of students not to the only 2% of the athletic students.

College athletics can make or break a campus. I have several friends at athletic colleges and have compared their sporting events to an expensive NFL game. I also have friends at colleges with few college sports. Those friends have indicated their biggest regret is attending a non-athletic university.

When deciding, I thought what would happen if they don't get the money? ICA provides services to student athletes but also the benefits of a sports program to all students. Without the money, repairs might not happen, which would affect club and ICA sports and prevent sporting events in Davis, which are the biggest benefit for students.

I do believe funding could be found elsewhere to support these portions of FACE. Many students I have spoken with do not want a higher fee to support ICA.

Students should not be burdened with paying for the maintenance of a pool that they cannot even use. Athletics already received a tone of funding from SASI and CEI, so it does not make sense to continue overcharging students.

I believe that these funds are necessary and important in maintaining the reputation of the school and promoting the wellbeing of the students. The aquatic center and football stadium both help to promote student athletic success which in turn affects the image of the school which then effects the entire student body.

We need to maintain these excellent facilities.

**Please provide your comments regarding the [Student Recruitment & Retention Center](#) presentation and use of FACE/ LEEAP fees.**

This is important to the values and principles of our community. While largely UG focused (I'd like to see more grad work) it still provides opportunity for community to the UC Davis students in general. I loved seeing how many people who participated in the programs are now part of facilitating them.

I think that this fee would have to increase due to nature inflation and able to support more student services would be a great way to have provide for the students.

I believe the Student Recruitment and Retention Center, adjustment should be made as it will benefit many different groups of students.

The SRRC helps serve our most underrepresented students on campus and gives them a space to gather. They definitely were always packed when we were in person pre-COVID. I think that goes to show students on campus love what they have to offer.

If I could have voted I would have said yes, this is a great use of the funds.

The CPI adjustment would help to continue to support these important opportunities that the SRRC provides for students.

They are doing an excellent job!

I do not think that this is an important aspect of campus. Yes, all students can use it, but I believe students should not need to fund this. It does not add a great deal to overall student experience.

Student Recruitment & Retention Services are important for the success of many students. They provide such important support for so many students, with a 51 cent increase to continue providing these students with support, it's an obvious yes.

Every student can benefit from the services provided by the SRRC. That is sufficient condition to having every undergraduate pay into this fee.

Again, all students can use this resource if they choose to, so this is a good use of student fees; unlike athletics, which only benefits 700 students out of 40,000+.

They provided a good amount of information. I think they are doing a lot of good outreach virtually and I hope with us being back in person they continue to reach out and do programs in underserved communities to encourage them to attend.

**Please provide your comments regarding [Law School Recruitment, Retention & Outreach](#) and use of LEEAP fees.**

I believe the adjustment goes towards financial aid which is extremely important to a number of law students who are in debt.

Law School Recruitment & Retention Outreach is an essential program on campus. I would like to see more marketing and advertisement of what the program does so that students are aware of what they are funding.