

Voting Results and Summary of Comments

COSAF Meeting, November 2, 2018

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: **19**

In Attendance: **17**

Quorum was met at **89%** 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: **17** voting members present. **11** yes votes required to pass.

(Count below includes 2 absentee ballots for a total of 19 votes)

	<u>Intercollegiate Athletics</u>	<u>Campus Recreation</u>	<u>Student Recruitment & Retention Ctr.</u>
YES	18	17	16*
NO	1	2	2

RESULTS: COSAF recommends a CPI adjustment to the FACE fee for 2019-20 to all recipients

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 & Retention</u>
YES	0	0
NO	1	1

RESULTS: COSAF does not recommend a CPI adjustment to the LEEAP fee for 2019-20

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

Intercollegiate Athletics

“YES” Comments:

- I think the stadium and aquatic center provide good opportunities for students in terms of recreational activities (games, tailgates, movie nights etc). I think however, they would benefit from publicizing such events more
- While I believe the aggie stadium and the Schaal aquatic center can stand to benefit a larger pool of students, they do serve a decent amount. These facilities do require repairs and upkeeps to run. The CPI adjustment is necessary for them to continue their current level of work, and will not prevent them from expanding the future to serve more students.
- I do think that the maintenance and needs to be met. If the CPI isn't given then other things must be neglected in order to pay the employees the new minimum wage.
- Both facilities are at risk of falling behind of their maintenance schedule. I believe a CPI increase will help each facility stay relevant and useful.
- CPI adjustment makes sure UC Davis maintains continued high-quality services to all students without any compromised level. Affirmative “yes”.
- This is necessary.
- The aggie stadium and Schaal aquatic center serve very specific groups of people and not a large enough audience.
- I believe that a CPI adjustment to the portion of the FACE fee supporting the Aggie Stadium and Schaal aquatic center with intercollegiate athletics because of how much they are both used by students on Davis's campus.
- Because I'm in aggie stadium quite often, I understand how much it would benefit from the CPI adjustment. It is used by many campus groups, and employs several students who would also be affected if we did not pass the adjustment.
- It I important to support our athletes.
- Want to allow ICA to provide the current services and access that they do at these facilities. Provide value to a large number of students through direct and indirect access.
- I vote yes because both the Aggie Stadium and the Schaal Aquatic center affect the student body by giving entertainment, recreation and jobs, among other benefits. This fee will help keep the mentioned facilities running with workers and safe conditions.
- I think centers such as these are important for student retention as well as fundraising for the university.
- I believe a CPI adjustment is required due to the minimum wage increase. However, the idea that Schaal and the stadium appear to be catered to very specific student groups. Having a fee on the student body overall that steadily increases feels as though we are not prioritizing the needs that would benefit all students.
- Aggie stadium serves a wide population of the student body. The Schaal aquatic center serves less people but provides services and spirit to the campus.

“NO” Comments:

No comments provided

Campus Recreation

“YES” Comments:

- Campus rec really needs continual support. They are currently improving and growing rapidly to meet the needs of each and every student and to continue this, they require financial support.
- Campus Rec serves a vast amount of students and the CPI adjustment is necessary to ensure the same amount of resources are available for them to serve UC Davis students.
- The ARC employs many students, a CPI increase will help the ARC keep each service open and give students the opportunity to work on campus in a safe environment.
- CPI increases are necessary.
- Campus rec is utilized and very important to many people. Physical health is extremely important to a successful student and needs to continue. I rarely use the ARC but friends and many fellow students live here and is a place that helps them to relax and get healthier.
- I vote to recommend a CPI adjustment to a portion of the FACE fee supporting Campus Recreation once again because of how big of an impact it has on our campus. I would love to see them continuing what it is they're doing.
- I'm a member of the Band-Uh!, which means that I participate in many Campus Rec activities and therefore understand their impact quite well.
- Amazing programs.
- Used by a large number of students and large employer.
- I support the fee because recreation is a necessity for all students to experience and learn for their mental and physical health. The ARC helps us be better students and has student works that will be paid increased minimum wages.
- Important for student retention and recruitment.
- Craft center and campus rec provide valuable services to students, stress relief and health and wellness services.

“NO” Comments:

- This is a large increase of funds to request and in addition for charging each student \$16.15, an additional fee for all students who are playing IMs. The new IM fee is very high and most students can only play 1 per quarter so I do not think the increase will be beneficial.
- Annual fee is already large enough as it is. This institution can be run more efficiently.

Student Recruitment & Retention Center

“YES” Comments

- Perhaps in future presentations, you could emphasize how the CPI adjustment directly impacts your budget and ability to host programs. Additionally, thank you for responding to questions afterward!
- I believe the student and recruitment center needs to be properly supported to ensure the university maintains a certain level of input to the general public.
- Although the SRRC does not constantly affect all students, it helps bring students to attend UC Davis, bring student culture to campus. Additionally, an increased budget will allow the SRRC to expand its operation and reach.
- Continue to provide a much needed suite of services to a number of communities.
- Important for the mission of our school to support students.
- I support a CPI adjustment for the SRRC because, while many students do not utilize its services, it does create a lasting impact on many underrepresented student populations. In order to

promote inclusivity and diversity on campus, the SRRC must have the proper resources, which we can support by voting to recommend the CPI adjustment.

- I would recommend a CPI adjustment to the portion of the FACE fee supporting the Student Recruitment and Retention Center because of how big of an impact they have on some of the students on campus. I have a friend that went to the SRRC a lot last year and now works there. She's told me about how much of a family the people there are to her and I want more people to be able to feel like how she does.
- SRRC needs to focus more on retention and making this center known to more people. Recruitment is very important but once these students arrive, they need this center even more than before.
- This is necessary for CPI increase.
- Minimal wages and benefits increased. This justified the CPI adjustment. If no CPI adjustment, it will negatively impact students involved and decrease the quality of services in the following years.
- The SRRC serves a small student body with strong financial efficiency. With this increase, I readily expect their programs to increase in attendance size and frequency.
- This community program needs to expand and limiting the budget will only minimize its impact on campus.
- I believe the student recruitment and retention center does important work despite them not serving the majority of students. The CPI adjustment is necessary for them to continue their work and avoid cutting back on resources.
- While the SRRC is not quite the most utilized resource, they continue to perform good, valuable work. Many campuses don't have resources like this and this sort of multicultural support and recognition is valuable.

"NO" Comments:

- Does not affect as many people as it should be. Only 112 students decided to commit after their Aggie Senior Trip and Transfer weekend which is only 0.3% of enrollment.
- The center serves to narrow a population, and doesn't provide value.

"Comments for all three":

- Very hesitant to vote yes on CPI increase. Since UCOP has spent almost 2 years refusing to agree to a CPI increase on union employee wages (i.e. UPTA, AFSCME). However, I realize these fees are unrelated, greatly benefit the student community, and work to advance the goals laid out in the campus strategic plan (To Boldly Go). Therefore, I voted yes on all 3 to continue operating at all level of prestige. I would highly encourage the powers that be to provide similar increases to the unionized staff that execute our shared missions and goals.

LEEAP Summary of Comments

"NO" Comments:

- **Law School Recruitment, Retention and Outreach.** 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 over \$47,000.
- **Law School Intramural Sports.** Same as above. Also, I did some informal polling and it seems as if law school students have extremely low rates of participation in intramural sports.