

The Regents of the University of California

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON BASIC NEEDS

March 12, 2019

The Special Committee on Basic Needs met on the above date at the Luskin Conference Center, Los Angeles Campus.

Members Present: Regents Anguiano, Butler, Cohen, Graves, Morimoto, and Pérez; Ex officio members Kieffer and Napolitano; Advisory members Bhavnani, Simmons, and Weddle

In attendance: Regents Leib, Makarechian, and Zettel, Secretary and Chief of Staff Shaw, Chief of Staff and Special Counsel Drumm, Vice President Brown, Interim Vice President Gullatt, and Recording Secretary Li

The meeting convened at 12:30 p.m. with Committee Chair Graves presiding.

In his opening remarks, Committee Chair Graves reported that he and Regent-designate Weddle visited all ten UC campuses and met with students, faculty, staff, and administrators. The most prevalent topic raised by students during these visits was basic needs. Students were appreciative of the University for its basic needs efforts and grateful to the State for the proposed budget allocation of \$15 million.

1. PUBLIC COMMENT

Secretary and Chief of Staff Shaw explained that the public comment period permitted members of the public an opportunity to address University-related matters. The following persons addressed the Board concerning the items noted.

- A. Patricia Macias, UCLA student, spoke in support of the \$15 million proposed in Governor Newsom's budget for student basic needs. She acknowledged the work of campus student basic needs coordinators and how UCLA's Community Programs Office (CPO) Food Closet has addressed food insecurity.
- B. Jose Ocampo, UCLA student and former food security coordinator, spoke in support of the allocation for student basic needs and recounted how weekly food bundles from the CPO Food Closet have helped student parents in need.
- C. Roberto Vasquez, UCLA student and Campus Retention Committee member, advocated for focusing the Governor's proposed \$15 million to basic needs programs and services. He explained that these programs and services were important for retention of low-income students and employ students as basic needs coordinators. Student basic needs services have provided an alternate form of aid to those who do not qualify for CalFresh, as well as students with dependents.

- D. Richard White, UCLA student and former chair of the UCLA Student Fee Advisory Committee, reported facing racist attacks from the UCLA Undergraduate Students Association for supporting student basic needs issues. He called for the University to support basic needs programs and services for low-income, minority students.
- E. Oscar Macias, UCLA student, spoke in support of funding for student basic needs and called for the Regents to do the same. He had been a recipient from the CPO Food Closet and had assisted in food box giveaways for students who stayed on campus during breaks. He noted that these food bundles also helped students with dependents and previously incarcerated students.
- F. Aidan Arasasingham, UCLA student, spoke in support of prioritizing the Governor's proposed budget allocation to fund existing basic needs programs on campuses.
- G. A UCLA student who was also president of Good Clothes Good People, an on-campus organization that takes donations of clothes and supplies and redistributes them back to students in need, sought funding for first-time costs incurred by the organization.
- H. Jamie Kennerk, External Vice President of the UCLA Undergraduate Students Association and University Affairs Vice Chair of the UC Student Association, called on the University to ensure that the Governor's proposed \$15 million would be dedicated to existing programs, many of which were run by students or with student input. These programs were already providing basic needs services and able to target the students most in need.

2. **APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of January 15, 2019 were approved.

3. **UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA UNDERGRADUATE EXPERIENCE SURVEY (UCUES) DATA AND DASHBOARD INFORMATION ABOUT BASIC NEEDS**

[Background material was provided to Regents in advance of the meeting, and a copy is on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Regent-designate Weddle introduced the presentation, calling for ongoing funding for a comprehensive service model and data in order to better understand food and housing insecurity systemwide.

Vice President Brown began by thanking campus basic needs committee members and colleagues at the Office of the President (UCOP) for their efforts in initiating, refining, and institutionalizing this data collection effort. She presented examples of food insecurity and homelessness data collected by California State University (CSU) and the California

Community Colleges in order to provide insight on challenges other institutions were facing and to show how the data collection changed over time. The University has used two methods to collect data on food insecurity. One of them, a six-item module developed by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), determined the participant's level of food insecurity based on the number of affirmative responses to the survey questions. One affirmative response or no affirmative responses denoted high to marginal food security; two to four affirmative responses indicated low food security; and five to six affirmative responses denoted very low food security. The six-item module was used in data collection efforts in 2015 and 2018.

The second method was a two-item module that was folded into the UC Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES) and the Graduate Well-Being Survey in 2016. Food insecurity was also determined by the number of affirmative responses, where zero affirmative responses indicated food security and one to two affirmative responses indicated food insecurity. Ms. Brown acknowledged that the six-item module provided a greater level of detail that could help campuses consider the approaches they would take in addressing these issues.

Unlike food insecurity, there was no national standard for collecting data on homelessness at the time of the presentation. When surveying students about homelessness in 2016 and 2018, the University defined it as "not having stable or reliable housing" and provided examples such as living in vehicles, living on camp grounds, and couch surfing. The one-item module also asked when the student experienced homelessness, such as during the academic year or during breaks. Any affirmative response to this question was considered homelessness. The Systemwide Basic Needs Committee members were exploring questions that would determine housing insecurity, such as inability to pay rent, difficulty paying utilities, and frequent moving. UC would continue to use the homelessness question until more appropriate questions are developed.

Ms. Brown summarized the University's four major data collection efforts. In 2015, the University surveyed a sample of undergraduate and graduate students for the Student Food Access and Security Survey (SFASS) using the six-item module for food insecurity. In 2016, the SFASS was incorporated into the UCUES and the Graduate Student Well-Being Survey, which helped institutionalize the data collection and provided a greater response rate and larger number of respondents. The two-item module was used for food insecurity and one-item module for homelessness. UC returned to the six-item module for food insecurity in the 2018 UCUES and will continue to use it in future surveys.

In these surveys, 44 to 48 percent of undergraduates reported experiencing food insecurity, with former foster care youth, low-income students, first-generation students, underrepresented students, LGBTQ students, and transfer students reporting higher rates of food insecurity. Approximately 25 percent of graduate students reported experiencing food insecurity, with underrepresented students, LGBTQ students, and those majoring in humanities reporting higher rates of food insecurity. Around five percent of undergraduate and graduate students reported experiencing homelessness at some point in time. Foster care, low-income, LGBTQ, African American, international, and older students or those in

their fifth or sixth year of study were among the groups of undergraduate students who reported higher rates of homelessness. American Indian, African American, and LGBTQ students, as well as those pursuing Humanities and Social Sciences were among the graduate students who reported higher rates of homelessness.

Data have shown that food insecurity and homelessness have affected students' academic success. In UCUES, five percent of undergraduate students reported that food insecurity was an obstacle to academic success, and three percent of undergraduate students reported that homelessness was an obstacle to academic success. These percentages were higher among undergraduate students who also reported experiencing food insecurity and homelessness. Among graduate students, 78 percent reported that they were on track to finish their degrees; these percentages were much lower for those who were food and/or housing insecure.

This year, the results of these data collection efforts have been integrated into the UC Information Center online in order to empower campuses to access the data themselves. Data tables on this website display results by survey question and can be filtered by such categories as campus, gender, race/ethnicity, Pell Grant status, academic discipline, first language, and more. Ms. Brown explained that the data have been organized in such a way that would facilitate discussions on the different campuses about the services and support needed.

Faculty Representative Bhavnani asked for clarification about how the family responsibilities obstacle response came about. Ms. Brown replied that this was one of the questions in the survey and that several campuses were convening focus groups and leading discussions to parse the meaning of the data. Ms. Brown hoped that the data would be shared and parsed in order to determine what services campuses need.

Ms. Bhavnani added that looking at these data would be a great undergraduate student project.

Regent Anguiano asked what changes UCOP would be incorporating into future surveys in order to collect better data. Ms. Brown responded that UCOP is continuing to learn how best to collect these data. Developing the right questions would lead to consistency that reveals trends over time. For instance, UCOP is confident with the six-item module for food insecurity but will be improving the homelessness questions for future surveys. Ms. Brown added that research could change, so seeing the relationships between questions in UCUES will be helpful.

Regent Pérez noted the difference between assessing the problem and addressing it and asked for progress in this regard. He also asked about progress in that regard as well as progress in helping students obtain non-campus assistance such as CalFresh, in conjunction for campus programs. Ms. Brown responded that she anticipated answers to these questions from the presenters of the next item and that she would look into whether food insecurity would decrease if more students were able to sign up for CalFresh.

Regent Morimoto asked why food security questions cover a 12-month period and whether there was a discrepancy between the regular school year breaks. Ms. Brown responded that UCOP asked questions related to time for homelessness but relied on the USDA rubric for food security. She raised the issue of question consistency that would allow data comparison with other institutions and mused that more detailed questions could be asked in focus groups.

Regent-designate Simmons asked whether UCOP was collecting data on food insecurity and homelessness from campus services and student-run organizations for more qualitative information. Ms. Brown responded that data collection was a partnership between UCOP and the campuses, and some campuses have combined different data collection efforts. Ms. Brown agreed that collecting this type of data is important. Regent-designate Simmons then echoed Regent Pérez's concerns and cautions against "analysis paralysis" based on how much time is spent assessing issues over addressing issues.

4. **BASIC NEEDS PROGRAMS AND SERVICES FUNDING PRIORITIES**

[Background material was provided to Regents in advance of the meeting, and a copy is on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Interim Vice President Yvette Gullatt introduced the presentation and speakers, Systemwide Basic Needs Committee Co-Chairs Ruben Canedo and Tim Galarneau, and she thanked them for their commitment, advocacy, and leadership at UC, the State of California, and nationwide.

Mr. Galarneau stated that over 100,000 undergraduate and graduate students at UC experience low or very low food security, and a subset also experience homelessness. One-time funding allocations have enabled the Basic Needs Initiative to develop structures for the scale of need but further investment in the systemwide model will result in aid to far more students. The Systemwide Basic Needs Committee also looks forward to align basic needs services with UC's degree completion goals.

Mr. Galarneau introduced three of the eight basic needs funding priorities, which align with the Prevention and Research areas of the Basic Needs Model. The first area, Pre-College Outreach and Preparation, focuses on messaging and resources for elementary and middle school students, as well as partnerships with California State University and California Community Colleges. The second area focuses matching CalFresh dollars to aid ineligible populations, such as undocumented and formerly incarcerated students. The third area, Emergency Relief/Crisis Resolution, encompasses problem-solving at both the campus and individual levels, with services such as food distributions, short-term crisis aid support, eviction prevention, and homeless response strategies. Campuses are also teaching and learning from each other to improve the systemwide basic needs effort.

Mr. Canedo stated that the systemwide effort, now entering its fifth year, is focusing on deepening the understanding of campus operational budgets, scaling efforts to serve more students in need, making efforts sustainable. Since Governor Newsom's announcement of

his proposed budget, the Systemwide Basic Needs Committee has met with campus and student leadership, Office of the President (UCOP) leadership, and fellow members of the California Higher Education Basic Needs Alliance, and it has provided a template for each campus to determine how to allocate its share of the \$7.5 million proposed systemwide basic needs budget, which will be distributed evenly across the ten campuses. Systemwide investment would fund training, coordination, evaluation, research, and reporting. Each campus would receive additional funding over the allocated \$750,000 that is proportionate to the population of students in need, which will hopefully include Dream Act aid recipients, work-study students without Pell Grants, and low-income graduate students. Currently, limited funding has prevented campuses from serving all students in need or accounting for how many students are being served. The students with the highest rates of food and housing insecurity also tend to have limited access to financial aid.

Mr. Canedo provided an example of how basic needs funding would be used. In order to provide whole meal plans for 250 students, which be two meals per day at \$10.41 per meal for nine months of a school year, it would cost \$5,246.64 per student and a total of \$1.3 million annually. Another example Mr. Canedo provided was CalFresh, where improving processes, enrollment, and availability of electronic benefit transfer (EBT) machines on campus could help generate more revenue for basic needs funding. For instance, enrolling 2,500 students in CalFresh would generate \$4.3 million in revenue to support basic needs, financial aid, and campus budgets. Mr. Canedo concluded his remarks by stating that the underlying goal is to eradicate poverty and intersectional oppression. Ongoing funding would help with such things as scaling, reporting, and training.

Regent Cohen asked how the proposed \$7.5 million was derived. Mr. Canedo explained that the Systemwide Basic Needs Committee could not make demands on the campuses. Instead, it engaged faculty, staff, students, and county service providers to develop a strategic model. The Systemwide Basic Needs Committee determined that each campus would need \$750,000 to build the infrastructure for this strategic model. Regent Cohen asked whether there was a breakdown of how the \$750,000 would be spent on each campus, and Mr. Galarneau responded in the affirmative. Regent Cohen asked how the Systemwide Basic Needs Committee would address the differences in the availability of existing funding, whether through fundraising or student fees, on different campuses.

Mr. Canedo responded that the systemwide effort does not have nearly the amount it needs. Firstly, campuses with better fundraising are not necessarily allocating those dollars toward basic needs because of other priorities. Secondly, infrastructure costs of operating basic needs centers and food pantries are comparable at each campus. Fundraising for basic infrastructure on campus has been challenging, because infrastructure is not as attractive as direct services. Mr. Galarneau added that the Systemwide Basic Needs Committee has been advising campuses on campus-level investment such as supplemental funds from the State and setting up ongoing funding for basic needs services.

Regent Cohen asked for an update on how many campuses were approaching optimal access to CalFresh benefits versus how many campuses needed more assistance.

Mr. Canedo responded that the Systemwide Basic Needs Committee must first identify the population that qualifies for CalFresh. California State Senate Bill (SB) 173, which

would create a standardized form to verify that a student is approved for State or federal work-study, would help graduate students qualify for CalFresh. Code for America's online CalFresh application is available at the majority of UC campuses, and campus eligibility workers are being trained in the use of this online tool. Mr. Canedo added that five campuses were performing better with regard to CalFresh and that the remaining campuses would reach similar performance levels over time.

Regent Pérez also requested to see the detailed budget for basic needs infrastructure and expressed his belief that the baseline funding of \$750,000 per campus for infrastructure was too high. He cited as an example UCSF, which has a small student population and no undergraduate students, and stated that it was not comparable to other campuses. In addition, there should be a show of effort by each campus tied to the funding. Regent Pérez's third point was that not all infrastructure investments were equal, because some, like an investment in CalFresh, could help offset costs and have more value. Finally, Regent Pérez asked whether progress had been made in introducing a bill that would make qualifying for CalFresh easier. He distinguished such a bill from SB 173, calling the latter a bill that would identify qualified students but could not enroll them.

Mr. Canedo responded that Systemwide Basic Needs Committee is determining how to use the existing federal infrastructure, such as Pell Grant eligibility, to create direct eligibility for CalFresh. The Trump administration has proposed a budget that would cut both SNAP and federal financial aid, which would make qualifying and enrolling more students more difficult. Mr. Galarneau added that he and Mr. Canedo would submit budget details for the Committee's review.

Regent-designate Weddle asked about campus basic needs committee structure and how campuses spend basic needs funds. Mr. Galarneau responded that campus basic needs committees are comprised of academic and administrative co-chairs, elected members of student government, undergraduate and graduate student researchers, staff, and community partners. At the committee meetings, the following year's budget is reviewed, and budget requests are assessed for whether they achieve parts of the Basic Needs Model. Through the UCOP Global Food Initiative, these basic needs committees have worked through multiple phases of scaling up efforts and engaged with the student community, gradually working up the inverted pyramid model. Mr. Canedo added that efforts had already been in place at some campuses prior to the current basic needs conversation; these efforts might not need more funding, but rather updating or adjusting. The largest portion of the inverse pyramid model is Pre-UC work, which better prepares students entering the University. This work is not necessarily UC-funded, and campuses can work with their partners. Basic needs leaders have been thinking critically about what areas require funding, what areas require a shift in messaging, and what areas require policy work, both at a systemwide level and campus level.

Staff Advisor Klimow asked how campuses were leveraging external services, such as food banks, to help pre-college students and save campus dollars for use elsewhere.

Mr. Galarneau responded that basic needs leadership developed relationships with food banks early, and food bank directors joined campus basic needs committees early as well. The systemwide basic needs leaders are training basic needs coordinators to ensure the

right messaging to community members and external stakeholders. UC is also collaborating with its partners at California State University and the California Community Colleges to ensure a unified message to students. Mr. Canedo added that external partnerships would prevent financial aid departments from cutting staff and budgets to provide more funding to basic needs efforts. He also explained how funding would help a student in a crisis or emergency situation.

Student Advisor Huang asked how basic needs services are communicated to applicants and accepted students. Mr. Canedo replied that systemwide basic needs leaders have participated in College Access Network conferences to better train elementary, secondary, and post-secondary school staff to talk to students about basic needs, and they are brainstorming a possible basic needs question in the UC admissions application that would allow applicants to consent to basic needs outreach.

5. **GOVERNOR'S 2019-20 BUDGET PROPOSAL: STUDENT HUNGER AND HOUSING INITIATIVES**

[Background material was provided to Regents in advance of the meeting, and a copy is on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Associate Vice President David Alcocer presented a proposal of how the University would use the \$15 million that Governor Newsom has allocated in his initial budget. The Governor's allocation did not specify strategies and has given the University flexibility in what programs and services to support. The question that arises is what factors should be considered in deciding how to allocate these funds across the system. Mr. Alcocer presented examples of how the University has approached other allocations for funds.

UC's permanent State General Fund appropriation of \$3.5 billion is split into small, fixed amounts for each campus and is allocated mainly based on student enrollment. The undergraduate University Student Aid Program, UC's primary need-based financial aid program, takes into account total cost of attendance, family resources, and projected grants. Deferred maintenance funds, an example of one-time funding, is allocated based on square footage, age of space, estimated replacement value, and number of structures. Excess reserves from the Mortgage Origination Program comprise one-time funding that addresses student, staff, and faculty housing. Half of this money is divided equally among the campuses, and the other half is allocated according to the number of Pell Grant recipients at each campus. Some funds are also allocated based on the enrollment of students from Local Control Funding Formula Plus (LCFF+) schools, which are under-resourced schools that enroll students who need extra academic support, low-income students, or underrepresented minority students. Previous money for basic needs was one-time funding that was divided equally among ten campuses. The University also received \$2 million in one-time funding for increasing faculty diversity systemwide. Rather than divide this small amount of money, campuses were invited to propose pilot programs for recruiting faculty from underrepresented backgrounds, and several programs have been approved for funding. The guiding principles of these approaches have been transparency in showing the basis of these allocations, flexibility for campuses to devise strategies suited to their

populations, accountability through reporting, and timeliness to spend or encumber State funds within the year given.

The meeting adjourned at 2:05 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff

Pending Approval