

# Voting Results and Summary of Comments

COSAF Meeting, December 1, 2017

Facilities and Campus Enhancements Fee (FACE)

Legal Education Enhancement and Access Program (LEEAP)

---

## Quorum Met

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

Total Voting Members: **17**

In Attendance: **16**

Quorum was met at **94%** attendance

## FACE CPI Vote

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

FACE: **16** voting members present. **11** yes votes required to pass.

	<u>Intercollegiate Athletics</u>	<u>Campus Recreation</u>	<u>Student Recruitment &amp; Retention Ctr.</u>
YES	13	14	13*
NO	3	2	1

## LEEAP CPI Vote

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

LEEAP: **1** voting member present. **1** yes vote required to pass.

	<u>Law School Intramurals</u>	<u>Law School Recruitment &amp; Retention</u>
YES	0	0
NO	1	1

\* Per COSAF Bylaws, the LSA representative does not vote on this portion of FACE

## FACE Summary of Comments

### Intercollegiate Athletics

- I believe that both facilities are barely being maintained to standards with the quality and quantity of use they see (ICA/IM/PE). Along with wage increases, I think a CPI adjustment is necessary to maintain facility quality.
- Not convinced as to the necessity of the new scoreboard and high costs of updates to Schaal. How will the Schaal updates be impacting the student body overall? I do not find the proposed changes require an adjustment.
- I am looking at the data that was provided it was mentioned that due to the Facility Director being vacant for 6 months there was a lower Staff Salary. In looking into the numbers I saw that this is half of what they are asking/stating that the Schaal pool will cost (\$600,000). In looking at this and hearing what they presented, I do not feel the CPI adjustment is necessary.
- Because I think it is important that we should maintain these facilities so that students have the opportunity to use them. Also it allows students to be able to enjoy going to any sport even happening that is readily available on campus
- Please continue to make efforts to provide a broad scope of student's use of the facilities. I am most confident voting yes because you stated that you are partnering with student affairs to use the scoreboard for movies. That is an awesome idea.
- Programs are a foundational part of the college experience of many students and it appears all funds are being properly used and accounted for.
- Aggie stadium and Schaal aquatic center are both important facilities to athletes and the student body as a whole. Failing to approve the requested CPI adjustment would damage the department's ability to maintain the facilities without incurring additional costs to students from other avenues.
- However I believe that it is very important to continue opening the door and hosting events to students that are not athletes. By this I mean that I want the facility to be used for more than athletic purposes. More late night events and outreaching to other organization so that Schaal and the stadium feel like a student space and not just athletic space.
- ICA has been a faithful steward of their funds and the Schaal aquatic center is in a desperate state, putting both student athletes and students in general in suboptimal positions regarding use of the facility I
- Necessary for pool maintenance, new offices and scoreboard. Big outreach community with lots of outside funding makes me confident in this decision.
- Sounds appropriate.
- We saw a need for additional funds for these facilities. The athletes should not be placed in subpar environments.
- I agree that Aggie stadium and Schaal center would benefit from the CPI adjustment to start to put more towards their renovation effort. During our visit to those facilities they did seem to need some urgent renovation to maintain and expand their capacity.
- I would like to see greater inclusion of students (undergraduates) who may not be aware of the services offered. Also would like to see leadership find other ways to support the UC Davis athletes.
- Aggie stadium and Schaal aquatic center are large capital assets that need to be properly maintained. If they are not they run a risk of potential safety/ health issues and increased cost to repair in the future

## Campus Recreation

- Especially with the ARC remodel, there has already been faith put into the ARC's ability to reach/benefit students. Newer facilities cost more to maintain, so it seems silly not to adjust the fee accordingly.
- While I have voted to approve CPI adjustment this is predominantly due to the student wages that will need to be curved. However, perhaps earlier close times and later opening times should be explored.
- In looking at the arc swipe data and cutting the hours from 12am to 10pm for close time of the ARC I saw that only 2.9% of the ARC total yearly use was during the hours of 10pm to 12am. It does not make sense to keep those hours if only 2.9% of the use is during this time. Therefore, I do not support the CPI adjustment.
  - o 10:00-10:59 = 17936 swipes yearly
  - o 11:00-12:00 = 6522 swipes yearly
  - o 10:00-12:00 = 24458 swipes yearly
  - o  $24458/841477 = 2.9^*$  of yearly swipes occur from 10pm to 12am
- Because students should be able to participate in sport clubs, equestrian center, activities and recreation center, as a way to destress from school work or to be able to continue their hobbies and interests.
- I am not completely satisfied by the swipe data that was provided. Even taking into account that the ARC is not open until midnight every night of the week, there are still much less students using it late at night. However, I will still vote yes as I don't have enough information about ARC usage to suggest changing the hours. I would just like to suggest we remain open to the idea and consider taking more observations of ARC usage. Changing the hours might be a good way to lessen fee burdens on students in the future.
- Vital services to help maintain happy and healthy student body. No apparent concerns of misuse of any funds.
- The ARC along with these other facilities are incredibly important to the student body. Failing to maintain them is an injustice to the many students that use them. Similarly, this avoids likelihood of students being charged additional fees for using the facilities that have been intended for them.
- The services Campus Recreation provide are beneficial to the college experience. From my personal experience Campus Recreation is a unit on campus that has student's best interest in mind.
- ARC participation has been dwindling and this adjustment will help bolster student usage rates; this has been a major undergraduate concern.
- As an employee at the ARC I realize that cutting hours short to manage unrewarded funds is doable, but not practical. The ARC is already overcrowded due to construction. Also those who drive to the ARC typically do so at 10pm when parking is free.
- Very useful facility.
- The ARC has been doing a great job meeting student needs.
- I vote to approve for similar reasons as above.
- Students use the facilities and are served well by the programs.
- The ARC is a large capital asset and enjoyed by a large section of the campus and community population. It is important to maintain the asset as well as ensuring it meets the needs of its users.

## **Student Recruitment and Retention Center**

- I think the work they do is important for UC Davis Students and should be supported accordingly.
- The SRCC provided strong evidence as to how they directly increase recruitment and retention of students. It would be nice to have data on how many senior night students completed their degrees at UC Davis vs another UC.
- It was mentioned during the presentation that they had more money than originally thought and that was going to go towards programs (end of the meeting by the presenter's director). Also in looking at what was presented and the cost/increase of CPI, I do not feel that an increase in CPI is necessary so I do not support a CPI adjustment.
- Because it is important to continue helping students to succeed academically.
- I am satisfied that all the adjustments are justified. I don't have any other comments.
- Important for many underrepresented student groups, though oversight to ensure duplicate services aren't being funded through multiple departments across campus may be provident in the future.
- This center serves a great purpose in helping to build and maintain a campus community for students who would otherwise go without. These services should be supported and maintained while requiring as little as possible from those that need them.
- The SRCC has a variety of programs that are aimed to assist student with their college experience. However, I would like to see larger programs and events from this center. These events should target the students here at the university and have less of an emphasis on incoming students.
- This is one of the most heavily involved communities on campus and students are extremely worried about it's continued service if cuts continue; adjustment is not only advisable but necessary.
- Detailed presentation with validated retention and participation of their program. Students really seem to enjoy this program and find a home base here.
- Sounds fine.
- They are doing a great job and even going above their required duties. Hope they continue to fund the outreach/minority programs and keep up the great work.
- I vote to approve a CPI adjustment to account for the wages/expense increase over the years.
- The center is a good steward of their budget, reserves and constitues. I see that they are responsible managers of their programs and are committed to the development of the students they pursue.
- The services provided to this department are essential to ensuring that all students have their opportunity to succeed at this university.

## **LEEAP Summary of Comments**

### **Campus Recreation**

- This vote [no] is based on concern for students at the Law School who are currently paying extremely high rates of tuition. When LEEAP was approved, tuition was about \$5,000. It is currently at \$47,000.

### **Intercollegiate Athletics**

- See above

### **Law School Recruitment, Retention & Outreach**

- See above