The Regents of the University of California

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON STUDENT LIFE
AND ALUMNI AFFAIRS
January 21, 2010

The Special Committee on Student Life and Alumni Affairs met on the above date at UCSF–Mission Bay Community Center, San Francisco.

Members present: Regents Bernal, Nunn Gorman, Ruiz, Schilling, and Stovitz; Advisory members Cheng, DeFreece, and Powell

In attendance: Staff Advisor Martinez, Secretary and Chief of Staff Griffiths, Principal Counsel Quenneville, Interim Provost Pitts, Senior Vice President Dooley, Vice President Sakaki, and Recording Secretary Harms

The meeting convened at 12:00 p.m. with Special Committee Chair Bernal presiding.

1. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of June 10, 2009 were approved.

2. **STUDENT AND ALUMNI ADVOCACY EFFORTS**

[Background material was mailed to the Committee in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Senior Vice President Dooley explained that restructuring in the Division of External Relations has resulted in the consolidation of all advocacy activities in Sacramento. This hub will coordinate carefully with the Communications office and the Alumni Affairs office, both of which are now organized under External Relations.

Mr. Dooley remarked that the University is increasing its use of social media and electronic advocacy. It is also developing networks with individuals who have access to the Governor and the Speaker of the Assembly. The President will be meeting with these individuals to cultivate relationships that will support the University and that can reach out to engage others in the overall effort.

Mr. Dooley stated that the University is also working to develop advocacy efforts that are more locally based. He noted that representatives in Sacramento must hear from their own constituents about the value of UC. He stressed that this effort must include cultivation of likely future candidates to ensure long-term and persistent success.

A critical component of the University's strategy, said Mr. Dooley, is engagement of alumni and students in advocacy efforts. He stated that his office has spent considerable

Pending Approval

time in recent weeks establishing working relationships with students and alumni. He remarked that the responses from the alumni groups have been very heartening, and that there is a real enthusiasm from the alumni associations to become engaged in advocacy.

Mr. Dooley informed the Special Committee that President Yudof has met with the student editors of the campus newspapers and has been meeting with campus student leadership; recently he met with the University of California Student Association (UCSA) to discuss collaborative activities for the education advocacy march in Sacramento. He noted that the President is committed to arranging joint meetings between himself, the student leadership, the Chairman of the Board, and the Speaker of the Assembly and the President Pro Tempore while in Sacramento. Mr. Dooley's office will send information to the alumni associations about the planned activities and invite their members to participate.

Mr. Dooley stated that his office has been considering the creation of a campaign – such as might be used for running for an elected office – in support of higher education. He explained that the office has been speculating about how to advance a public discussion about the relative priorities of higher education using a traditional political campaign approach. The office is placing priority on establishing processes that will persist from year to year and will keep the importance of the University in the public eye.

Interim Provost Pitts observed that alumni advocacy maintains continuity through the already-established organization of alumni groups. However, perpetuating student advocacy is more difficult due to the relatively transient nature of the student body on the campuses. He asked the student Regent and student government participants to create a means for building in advocacy as an ongoing fixture of student government. He noted that the students have a very powerful voice in the public forum, and that they should develop a means to perpetuate support for the University from year to year.

Regent Stovitz remarked that he believed the most effective message that would resonate with students and alumni alike is employment. Mr. Dooley agreed that employment and the State's economic engine are core components of the University's messaging.

Regent-designate DeFreece asked how the Communications office is able to determine which messages and means of communication are working most effectively. Mr. Dooley explained that the electronic distribution systems being used by the University allow it to track interest and activity. For instance on Facebook, UC can track how many people click on a particular advertisement and how many individuals then sign up to be advocates. This information lets the University know which of the approaches makes best use of available resources. He remarked that his office likewise has been tracking news clips, and that there has been a decided improvement in the tone of many of the stories about the University. Mr. Dooley expressed his view that most of the improvement in print coverage is the result of the work of the new communications staff, many of whom worked previously in journalism.

Pending Approval

Regent-designate Cheng echoed Dr. Pitts' comments and stated that it is important to develop a culture of student advocacy on the campuses and within student government. He also noted that UCSA had played a role in contacting the media and building stories for the University. He asked how the Communications office is shaping UC's message to activate more students and alumni. Mr. Dooley responded that all of the University's core messages must be consistent, though they may be framed differently for separate audiences. He explained that one new member of the Communications staff was directed to review all of the Office of the President materials, printed and electronic, and found them to be unappealing. The office began developing templates that would cast the University's message in a warmer, friendlier way. Currently, the office is systematically improving all of UC's communications vehicles, adapting to what is effective and discarding what is outmoded or ineffective. He expressed concern that the combined efforts to respond to immediate media needs while at the same time reforming the vehicles of UC communication might overstress the staff in the Communications office.

Faculty Representative Powell remarked that the Academic Senate would be pleased to meet with UCSA if it would be helpful to their efforts and their communications with the Office of the President. He also noted that he had recently approached gubernatorial candidate and Attorney General Jerry Brown and asked him what he would do for higher education if he were elected. Mr. Brown indicated that he would be happy to accept any informational materials the University wanted to provide him. Dr. Powell extended that invitation to the Special Committee and informed the members that he could serve as a liaison between the University and Mr. Brown's staff in this regard.

Mr. Dooley explained that his office has been arranging luncheons and dinners with all of the gubernatorial candidates, both to develop relationships with them and also to ask for specific commitments from them in support of the University.

3. **IMPACT OF BUDGET REDUCTIONS ON STUDENT SERVICES**

[Background material was mailed to the Committee in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Janina Montero, Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs at UCLA, explained that she would discuss the funding streams for student affairs, review the reductions in the program, and outline strategies and challenges her department now faces.

Ms. Montero explained that the Registration Fee, set by the Regents, is the same across all the campuses and is used for a range of student services. The Education Fee, similar to classic tuition, funds core student programs, financial aid, and outreach. Campus-based fees are essentially self-imposed student taxes that are used to address certain specific objectives. Ms. Montero noted that recently there had been an infusion of funds to all areas through allocation of the mental health initiative that took place approximately three years ago. While it did not mitigate the impact of cuts in other areas, it did give the University means to address some vital concerns.

Pending Approval

Ms. Montero explained that systemwide strategy for student services focuses on the need to maintain the quality of service. Concerns about reduced staff and lessened support for students during this time of economic turmoil are present on every campus. Mental health continues to be an issue, particularly for vulnerable populations such as underrepresented minority students, lesbian/gay/bisexual/transgender students, and undocumented students. Another challenge, said Ms. Montero, is the issue of consistent communication with students, parents, and the community.

Fred Wood, Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs at the Davis campus, observed that emphasis has understandably been placed on the academic mission of the campuses during the budget cuts. However, he noted, reductions in student services do affect the academic mission. To prepare for the cuts, the student affairs division at Davis initiated a consultative process with staff, faculty, deans, and students to determine the areas of highest priority. Mr. Wood noted that the $6 million sustained in cuts at Davis resulted in a loss of approximately 60 staff in the division.

Regent-designate DeFreece asked what percentage of the staff that loss represented, and Mr. Wood answered that it comprised between 10 and 15 percent of the staff.

Regent-designate DeFreece asked how much money Mr. Wood felt would need to be in the bank – in reserves – for the division to feel protected. Mr. Wood stated that the department was now operating below that threshold, but that the current economic circumstances have made that necessary. Mr. Dooley added that systemwide reserves have dropped at a precipitous rate, and Interim Provost Pitts echoed his comment.

Mr. Wood observed that next year would see an additional centralization of operations in student affairs. The division is carefully examining ways to reprioritize and restructure while maintaining excellence. Dr. Pitts offered that the student affairs staff systemwide are working very hard to maintain their budgets and support their students.

Regent Ruiz suggested that the division solicit student input regarding the prioritization of programmatic cuts. He also asked if a comparison to division structure and overhead from five years ago would yield areas that perhaps had overgrown organizationally and could be streamlined. Mr. Wood replied that his division had met extensively with students when determining its course of action, and that the meetings had been very helpful.

4. **LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL, AND TRANSGENDER STUDENTS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

[Background material was mailed to the Committee in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Vice President Sakaki explained that her presentation would provide information about the University's lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) students and the

Pending Approval

challenges they are facing. This information would be culled largely from the UC Undergraduate Experience Survey **(**UCUES**)** results.

Ms. Sakaki noted that nearly five percent of the University's undergraduate population self-identifies as LGBT. This data is consistent with national surveys, which show that five to ten percent of the general population identifies as LGBT. The data also revealed that 33 percent of LGBT students state that they have serious depression issues that interfere with their academic performance, compared with 22 percent of straight (heterosexual) students. Previous surveys also related that LGBT, underrepresented, and international students experience higher levels of alienation, stress, and suicide rates. Feelings of stigmatization often affect their graduation and retention rates.

Ms. Sakaki observed that the majority of all student respondents felt that their sexual orientation was respected on campus, however 30 percent of LGBT students did not, compared to ten percent of straight students. Forty percent of LGBT students feel that the campus faculty and staff do not value them, compared to 20 percent of straight students. Ms. Sakaki observed that additional surveys are needed to obtain more specific information about LGBT student experiences and needs.

Ms. Sakaki said that UC campuses have established a variety of policies in an effort to improve campus climate, including non-discrimination statements that include sexual orientation and gender identity, student family housing that is inclusive of domestic partners, tuition and financial aid equity for domestic partners, and student insurance policies that are transgender-inclusive. The only campus that does not currently have an LGBT resource center is Merced, but students at that campus who have self-identified as LGBT do receive support through a designated representative.

Regent Bernal noted that Merced is unique in having the largest percentage of LGBT-identifying students in the UC system.

Regent-designate DeFreece asked if participation in the UCUES survey is compulsory, and Janina Montero, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs at UCLA, said it was not, and that it had a response rate of approximately 42 percent systemwide. She added that the survey has only been offered four times, and longitudinal data will become more relevant with each year the survey is completed. Regent-designate DeFreece stated his view that the survey should be compulsory.

Ms. Sakaki remarked that the campus LGBT resource centers are important places that support students and help them feel comfortable and safe. Services at the centers include library and computer space, support, community events, and LGBT orientation events. Alumni organizations also play a significant role in the success of LGBT students. Alumni groups at Berkeley, Los Angeles, and San Diego raise funds and award specific scholarships to LGBT students. The Riverside campus also provides emergency funds for students who are cut off financially by their families when they "come out" as gay. LGBT alumni groups provide current students with opportunities for networking,

Pending Approval

mentoring, and social activities. In recognition of their efforts, UCOP held its first systemwide reception for LGBT alumni in 2008, which was quite successful.

Ms. Sakaki introduced Richie Nguyen, Berkeley undergraduate and two-time recipient of the Cal Alumni Pride Scholarship.

Mr. Nguyen explained that he had been invited to the meeting of the Special Committee to share his experiences as a gay undergraduate. He explained that he initially decided to go to Berkeley because it had a reputation of being progressive, diverse, and inclusive. Nevertheless, he felt very out of place as a student, and had trouble making friends. He was especially nervous because he had three straight roommates, and he was afraid that they would not accept him. While he tried to counteract those feeling by joining student organizations on campus, he still did not feel part of the community.

Eventually, Mr. Nguyen joined UC Berkeley's gay fraternity, and began to realize the importance of LGBT spaces on campus. In addition to being surrounded by people with whom he could identify and feel safe, the fraternity offered him the tools and confidence to be a campus leader in other arenas.

Mr. Nguyen expressed deep appreciation and gratitude for the support of some openly gay faculty, counselors, and staff at Berkeley, and noted that the presence of LGBT employees on the Berkeley campus was critical to his success. The LGBT resource center helped him organize effective spaces for LGBT students on campus.

Although he has had a positive experience at Berkeley, Mr. Nguyen stated that most LGBT students do not feel physically or emotionally safe on or around campus and must deal with homophobia and heterosexism on a daily basis. Many suffer loss of financial support from families and fear that being openly LGBT will affect their chances of academic and personal success. He said that it is increasingly important to have identity-affirming spaces on campus, resources specific to the needs of LGBT students, and a strong cohort of LGBT faculty and staff.

Regent-designate DeFreece said it was heartening to see that progress has been made for LGBT students at UC. When he was a student, he never felt that he had a safe space at Berkeley and witnessed homophobic actions on campus in the dormitories.

Special Committee Chair Bernal observed that the University had completed extensive work regarding diversity and campus climate, but that within nine reports generated, there was no mention of LGBT students, faculty, or staff. He asked if the data collected at the campus level could be collected to build a systemwide body of knowledge that would address some of the needs and concerns of LGBT students. Interim Provost Pitts stated that the University will be collecting campus data as a baseline, but it is unclear at this time how many resources can be dedicated to expanding that data collection. However, he noted, the Office of Student Affairs is holding more discussions on the issue and will ensure it gets more attention.

Pending Approval

5. **OVERVIEW OF CAMPUS RESPONSES TO THE H1N1 FLU**

[Background material was mailed to the Committee in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Felicia McGinty, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs at UC Santa Cruz, said she would explain how UC has coordinated efforts to combat the H1N1 influenza (flu) pandemic and would also give some specific examples of what has taken place at UC Santa Cruz in response to the flu.

Beginning last spring, said Ms. McGinty, UC campuses began seeing influenza-like cases in its student body. Between April and December 11, 2009, there were 7,319 cases reported. The incidents peaked in early fall, and were currently decreasing. The trend of cases at the campuses mirrored the number of cases reported on campuses nationwide, and none of the campuses had suffered any deaths from the flu.

Ms. McGinty said that the University approached H1N1 in a coordinated way, and expressed gratitude to her colleagues at the Office of the President who provided critical supplies to each of the campuses and collected data across the system for weekly reports. The University now has a pandemic advisory group, and every campus has a pandemic flu management plan.

Ms. McGinty observed that the focus at Santa Cruz has been placed on education, outreach, and prevention. The campus convened its emergency operations committee, and the health center director led the campus in identifying ways to educate students and prevent the spread of the illness. UCSC engaged in constant communication with the students. Prior to coming to the campus, students received messages about the risk of flu, and when they moved into the residence halls, they were provided with handouts about campus resources available and how to stay healthy. The campus provided flu kits for each of the residential students consisting of a disposable thermometer, Tylenol, hand sanitizer, and other supplies. The campus and faculty informed students about how to handle absences from class, and parents also were kept informed. Santa Cruz established a health hotline that enabled students to get advice from a nurse over the phone, and hand sanitizers were installed throughout the residence halls, dining halls, and classroom spaces.

Overall, said Ms. McGinty, preparation for H1N1 provided an excellent test for the campuses' emergency preparedness process. While not all campuses received vaccine, the University does have pandemic plans in place that are effective and responsive.

Regent Schilling asked if the rates of infection on the campuses have been above those of a seasonal flu season. Ms. McGinty said they were higher than for seasonal flu, but that they were within the national average for H1N1.

Regent Ruiz complimented Chief Risk Officer Grace Crickette for her involvement in the process. Ms. McGinty stated that Ms. Crickette's services allowed the campuses to work

Pending Approval

more broadly from a medical perspective and were instrumental in providing supplies to the campuses.

Dr. Pitts asked if the University had identified any reasons behind the three-to-one difference in the infection rate between various campuses. He asked if any best practices had been put in place at one campus and not at another. Ms. McGinty responded that her team had not yet finished its analysis, and that the data needed to be normalized to reflect differences between campuses on the quarter system and those on the semester system.

Secretary and Chief of Staff Griffiths asked why not all of the campuses received vaccine, and Ms. McGinty explained that it came from county health departments; not all of the counties received vaccine. Dr. Pitts confirmed that it was allocated in a very unorthodox manner, county by county. Regent Ruiz added that this type of difficulty had been encountered nationwide.

The meeting adjourned at 2:20 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff

Pending Approval