

The Regents of the University of California

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON BASIC NEEDS

September 17, 2019

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

Members Present: Regents Cohen, Leib, Park, Simmons, Um, and Weddle; Ex officio member Pérez; Chancellor May; Advisory members Bhavnani, Muwwakkil, and Stegura

In attendance: Regent Reilly, Regent-designate Mart, Staff Advisors Jeffrey and Klimow, Secretary and Chief of Staff Shaw, Chief of Staff and Special Counsel Drumm, Interim Vice President Gullatt, and Recording Secretary Li

The meeting convened at 5:20 p.m. with Committee Chair Weddle presiding.

Committee Chair Weddle provided a synopsis of the Public Engagement and Development Committee meeting at Mann UCLA Community School. At that meeting, Regents Leib and Simmons led discussions about the University's outreach and access efforts, and State Senator Holly Mitchell spoke about critical issues such as food and housing insecurity and systemic inequalities. Senator Mitchell highlighted the responsibility of the Board to be innovative and collaborative in its efforts to promote equity and best serve students. Committee Chair Weddle urged the Committee to consider this collective responsibility during the meeting.

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

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of July 16, 2019 were approved.

2. **CALFRESH ELIGIBILITY, ACCESS, ENROLLMENT AND PARTNERSHIP ACROSS THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

[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 Gullatt introduced the presentation by stating that UC campuses had enrolled two to 20 percent of the CalFresh-eligible student population, which was approximately 18,000 students systemwide. This presentation would cover legislative advances, partnerships with County agencies and the California Department of Social Services (CDSS), and campus efforts at UCLA and UCSB.

Systemwide Basic Needs Committee (Systemwide Committee) Co-Chair Tim Galarneau stated that enrolling students for Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits through CalFresh was a clear priority. Federally funded CalFresh would add a

monthly benefit of up to \$192 without affecting financial aid packages. Students could use their CalFresh awards to purchase produce, whole grains, lean protein, and seeds and plants that produce food. Eligible students include those who work 20 hours per week, are eligible for work-study, have children, receive Cal Grants A or B, participate in an educational opportunity program, or are members of a campus program for students with disabilities.

Mr. Galarneau shared legislation that supported student eligibility in CalFresh. State Assembly Bill (AB) 214 and AB 1747 confirmed eligibility through exemptions such as Cal Grant A or B, Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS), and disability programs. AB 1930 established the Cal Grant verification form, affirmed graduate student eligibility, and began an implementation work group with CDSS, the Western Center on Law and Poverty, and representatives from UC, California State University (CSU), and California Community Colleges (CCC). State Senate Bill (SB) 173 established a work-study verification form that would further streamline CalFresh enrollment. CDSS sent an All County Letter to County agencies to clarify and provide updates on student eligibility. The Systemwide Committee was working with CDSS and its CSU and CCC partners to further develop graduate student CalFresh eligibility, a key priority this year. Code for America developed an online enrollment tool, Get CalFresh, which is a streamlined mobile app and web portal available in all UC campus counties, and it was also working with CDSS to add SAR & Eligibility Status Report form capability. Even with CDSS, All County Letter, and legislative support, as well as improved online services, counties had different approval processes for student applications, which required campuses to have close relationships with County eligibility workers and third-party outreach officers. All campuses had established innovative peer enrollment, advising, and programming, as well as food assistance programs for those not eligible for CalFresh, such as formerly incarcerated and undocumented students. Resources for these students include meal vouchers, retail gift cards, and direct food awards.

Systemwide Committee Co-Chair Ruben Canedo reported that all campuses had submitted their preliminary CalFresh plans through fiscal year 2022. These plans would focus on increasing student and staff capacity to grow application, enrollment, and renewal numbers, as well as improve approval rates for graduate, undergraduate, and professional students. Another area of focus would be bettering the relationships between financial aid and basic needs teams to improve campus CalFresh strategies, impact, and reporting. Financial aid teams would communicate information about CalFresh to a wider audience, and basic needs teams would provide subject matter expertise and application assistance. Campuses also planned to build and strengthen relationships with County agencies to increase awareness, training, outreach, application support, and case management. Application rates might rise but enrollment rates would stay low without partnership with the County, which could discourage more students from applying. Another area of focus would be evolving efforts based on feedback. The Systemwide Committee was already working with Assistant Professor Suzanna Martinez at UCSF, who has been revising reporting based on student feedback. Some students had reported challenges working with County eligibility workers, so this feedback would inform both student experiences with campus staff and County staff. With over 120,000 UC students potentially eligible for CalFresh, the Systemwide Committee was committed to increasing enrollment and taking

part in the statewide work group to create a work-study verification form, which would be especially helpful to graduate students. U.S. Representative Jimmy Gomez was sponsoring House Resolution 4297, the Enhance Access to SNAP (EATS) Act, which would remove exemption requirements for college students. The Systemwide Committee would continue work with CSU and CCC to build the California Higher Education Basic Needs Alliance to reach out to and strategize with the California Department of Education with regard to educating students and preparing them for applying for public assistance in college.

UCLA Basic Needs Manager Chidera Izuchukwu stated that two percent of eligible UCLA students were currently enrolled in CalFresh. The CalFresh Initiative (Initiative) at UCLA, brought about by the Global Food Initiative and campus basic needs efforts, aimed to increase awareness and enrollment, as well as streamline the application process. The Los Angeles Department of Public Social Services (DPSS) worker that was originally stationed at UCLA Medical Center was now in the middle of campus and had biweekly office hours. Student assessors would be available twice a week during the academic year and the summer. The Initiative has hosted quarterly “enrollment days,” brought DPSS workers to campus to boost enrollment, and made the process accessible for students. These efforts led to 400 students enrolling last year and improved interest and visibility, resulting in more of a DPSS staff presence on campus. The Initiative has aimed to destigmatize CalFresh, eliminate food insecurity, and increase enrollment and renewals. Ms. Izuchukwu shared some of the Initiative’s successes. Sixty to 100 students have attended each of the quarterly basic needs resource fairs and CalFresh enrollment days. DPSS and student assessors have been available weekly, and UCLA had its own Get CalFresh online portal. The Initiative has worked with the campus entities such as the Basic Needs Committee, Health Campus Initiative, Swipe Out Hunger, Financial Aid, Residential Life, and the UCLA Undergraduate Students Association Council. The Initiative has also improved its feedback collection and reporting to the State, and it was part of the CalFresh Outreach Program at CSU, Chico. This partnership funded about 50 percent of UCLA efforts and enabled the Initiative to expand its team from three to six members. One challenge that UCLA faced was CalFresh eligibility for graduate and medical school students, who did not receive the Cal Grant or work-study, and the CalFresh Initiative was working to put medical school students on an eligibility exemption list. The Initiative was also working with UCLA’s Dining Services director to meet the food security needs of students with meal plans. UCLA was also working with DPSS to train campus staff to make up for DPSS staff limitations on campus. Many students were not aware of CalFresh or their eligibility, so more campus staff would provide CalFresh information to students. DPSS outreach days and office hours were lengthened to accommodate student class schedules, and UCLA planned to move the phone interviews with caseworkers to an online platform.

UC Santa Barbara Basic Needs Co-Chair Katie Maynard stated that, by the end of the 2018–19 academic year, UCSB students received \$652,800 per month, or \$7.83 million per year, in CalFresh awards. UCSB has also subcontracted with CSU, Chico’s CalFresh program. CalFresh-eligible students have been able to use their benefits at almost any local grocery store, which provides these students the full choice of items, fresh produce, and the dignity to shop with their friends. Campus advocates were trained not only to help students apply for CalFresh, but also become aware of other basic needs resources, which

would be particularly valuable for students who were not CalFresh-eligible or in need of immediate assistance before their CalFresh award was available. UCSB helped 3,400 students apply for CalFresh in 2018–19; students who applied with an advocate’s help were 20 percent more likely to get accepted, bumping the acceptance rate at UCSB to 80 percent. In 2018, UCSB’s largest convenience store became a pilot store for accepting CalFresh on campus, and CalFresh accounted for 13 percent of sales, or nearly \$500,000 from 67,838 clients. In 2019–20, UCSB was working to expand CalFresh to a campus grocery store and other stores. UCSB significantly reduced the stigma of CalFresh participation through highly visible and available advocates and consistent messaging year-round. Advocates were stationed at nine outreach sites, were available nearly full-time at a central office, and attended events from student communities less likely to seek services. UCSB made 121,907 non-unique contacts last year, including online contacts.

The CalFresh application process remained a challenge: there were multiple meetings, phone calls, and a large amount of documentation to submit, but there was no streamlining with other applications such as the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) or Cal Grant application. Another challenge was applying for electronic benefit transfer (EBT). One UCSB campus store applied for EBT access three times before it was accepted, which was very challenging and time-consuming for busy store managers. UCSB and other UC campuses were in counties that did not have the CalFresh Restaurant Meals Program (RMP), which allowed hot meals to be purchased with CalFresh dollars and would be helpful for housing insecure students, nontraditional students, students with disabilities, and others. UCSB was considering building on CSU’s model of bringing RMP to its campuses. Ms. Maynard noted that UCSB’s CalFresh efforts have dovetailed well with UC’s rapid rehousing work. She acknowledged the student interns, CalFresh coordinator Melissa Fontaine, and the departments who have assisted CalFresh advocates and raised awareness of the campus’ basic needs services.

Chair Pérez expressed frustration at the time-intensive nature of the application process for both students and staff. He suggested that Committee Chair Weddle, Regent Leib, who was Committee Chair of the Public Engagement and Development Committee, and Associate Vice President Kieran Flaherty of State Governmental Relations determine County-specific barriers to CalFresh eligibility, develop County engagement approaches, and consider advocating changes to State law in areas where Counties are unable to make changes. He highlighted the difference in the CalFresh acceptance rate of students who applied with the help of an advocate and that of students who applied without an advocate, adding that it was in the State’s interest to resolve. California had one of the lowest participation rates for a program of this kind. Structural changes were needed so that this level of engagement for every student was not necessary. Regent Leib expressed his eagerness to help and recalled a visit he and Regent Cohen had made to UC Riverside where he observed barriers to basic needs services. Committee Chair Weddle also accepted Regent Pérez’s suggestion. Mr. Canedo raised the question of how campuses could request that a County staff member be stationed full-time at every UC campus. UC Davis had a County worker, but UC Berkeley, the largest provider of CalFresh in Alameda County, had had its requests for a County worker denied because it had outperformed other institutions.

Chair Pérez stated that both the unique and overlapping needs of each campus should be determined because engagement for each would be different.

Regent Park stated that \$192 per month was a significant amount of money, that there should be no stigma attached to this benefit, and that CalFresh should be packaged as part of financial aid. She did not believe there was stigma tied to Cal Grant or Blue and Gold scholarships. UC should offer CalFresh applications to low-income students. Regent Park acknowledged the challenges at many different levels, from encouraging students to apply to helping them through the application process. She contrasted UCSB's CalFresh enrollment numbers with the eligible population and raised the K-12 system's approach, in which programming is recommended based on family income, as an example for UC. Mr. Galarneau thanked Regent Park for her encouragement and Systemwide Committee leadership shared her sentiments at a meeting with financial aid directors in July. Proactivity, early outreach, destigmatizing messaging, and incorporating CalFresh into financial aid were parts of the basic needs intervention model. Mr. Canedo suggested that normalizing CalFresh as part of the UC experience would require educating students in pre-college programs, communicating expectations to financial aid staff and basic needs centers, and strengthening relationships between campuses and County supervisors. Counties must understand that students need CalFresh to meet their basic needs, but this was not currently the culture in California, which was ranked 48th in the country for participation in this type of program. Many counties struggled to prioritize CalFresh in their budgets. Mr. Canedo believed that California had the potential to be among the top ten states for participation.

As a student at UC Santa Barbara, Regent-designate Muwwakkil observed the decrease in stigma for CalFresh enrollment. He noted that students speak to each other about CalFresh openly and encourage each other to enroll. He asked how basic needs coordinators would engage with students who did frequent campus, such as commuter students or students with families. Ms. Maynard referred back to Regent Park's comments about integration into central campus messaging. This year, UCSB sent information about CalFresh to all Cal Grant recipients and those in the work-study program. Also this year, the campus partnered with Santa Barbara County's Free and Reduced-Price Meal Program, which brought free meals to the children of student families and reduced-price meals for adults in those families. CalFresh advocates have hosted enrollment events at family student housing, graduate student housing, and student organization meeting spaces. UCSB was dedicated to reaching out directly to the most food-insecure students. Ms. Izuchukwu added that UCLA had committees that target commuter students, transfer students, and nontraditional students and reach out to staff and student leadership to raise awareness of all basic needs services provided. UCLA has sent CalFresh information to qualifying students through the financial aid office for the past three years. This summer, UCLA began basic needs training for staff who work with students and provided a reference guide for use in offices.

Regent Cohen emphasized that only one campus had a full-time County worker helping students with CalFresh applications. Given that this federally funded program was administered at the State level, he suggested using some of the new basic needs funding to contract with Counties and pay for County staff to be stationed at the campuses. Regent

Cohen also asked whether CalFresh enrollment was recorded on a systemwide basis in order to observe trends. Mr. Canedo responded that there was now federal language allowing financial aid offices to share information about qualifying for public assistance and that the Systemwide Committee was working with the Office of the President and campus financial aid directors on implementation. Basic needs staff have recorded event attendance but were unable to track the progress of CalFresh applications. Mr. Canedo believed that building relationships with County services leadership must be prioritized this year in order to solve this problem. Basic needs staff have struggled to reach County supervisors and decision makers. Mr. Galarneau added that outreach to County workers could be improved. Basic needs leadership was collaborating with CDSS on another All County Letter. With the new State funding, the Systemwide Committee planned to collect data and report it to the State and UC. Ms. Izuchukwu noted that the County has struggled with staff retention due to promotions. Regent Cohen asked how many campuses had County workers regardless of whether they worked full-time on campus. Mr. Canedo distinguished the counties that provided a worker on campus from counties that provided services to campuses. Regent Cohen wished to know which campuses had a County eligibility worker stationed on campus for any period time. Mr. Galarneau added that County eligibility workers might not need to be on campus full-time as long as they communicate with outreach workers. Mr. Canedo stated that three campuses had eligibility workers.

Staff Advisor Klimow suggested working through food banks such as Feeding America or the California Association of Food Banks to access County supervisors. Ms. Izuchukwu shared that UCLA's food bank connected basic needs leadership to a CalFresh task force comprised of DPSS supervisors and food banks but that UCLA's student population was small compared with other populations in need. Ms. Maynard stated that, in a previous staffing model, UCSB's CalFresh advisor used to work at the Santa Barbara County Food Bank. Later, the manager of the CalFresh program was on campus and a UCSB employee. UCSB had previously subcontracted with the Santa Barbara County Food Bank and now subcontracted with CSU, Chico, for U.S. Department of Agriculture reimbursements.

Chair Pérez asked the presenters to identify campus-specific issues in working with their respective Counties and State eligibility issues. This would help determine the appropriate efficiencies that could help Counties enroll more UC students and others.

4. **RAPID REHOUSING EFFORTS**

[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 Gullatt stated that the presentation would cover the University's overall housing approach and its response to housing insecurity in light of \$3.5 million in rapid rehousing funding from the State. In 2016, President Napolitano announced the Student Housing Initiative with the objective of adding 14,000 affordable student housing beds by fall 2020. UC was on schedule and planned to add 15,000 additional beds between 2020 and 2025. In 2017, the Board approved a one-time allocation of \$27 million for

student, staff, and faculty housing that went toward capital improvements, existing or new housing programs, and studies for housing projects. In May 2018, the Board approved an additional \$30 million for the same purposes.

Chief of Staff to the Chief Financial Officer Brad Werdick confirmed that UC was on track to provide 14,000 new, affordable beds across the system by fall 2020, with 3,000 beds already available this summer. Between May 2016 and May 2017, the campuses provided the Regents with overviews of their housing plans in terms of the number of students housed, housing goals, rental rates, comparisons to the real estate market, vacancy rates, and funding strategies. In November 2018, the Office of the President (UCOP) provided the Finance and Capital Strategies Committee with an overview of the number of students housed in fall 2018 and the number of beds that would be constructed from 2016 to 2020 and from 2020 through fall 2025. At that meeting, Regent Park had asked how new construction related to enrollment growth. In response, UCOP created a chart showing the trajectory of student housing growth. By fall 2025, UC would house 45 to 50 percent of students.

Systemwide Basic Needs Committee (Systemwide Committee) Co-Chair Ruben Canedo stated that five percent of graduate students and four percent of undergraduate students have experienced homelessness systemwide. He underscored that homelessness was underreported due to the language used in surveying. Funded by the Global Food Initiative, UCSF Professor Susanna Martinez has used research and focus groups to improve survey language. Ms. Martinez found that the shortage of affordable and on-campus housing has led to overcrowding, “couch surfing,” and sleeping in laboratories or libraries. The stress of housing insecurity affected academic performance. UCOP housing allocations and other sources have funded campus-level studies. For instance, focus groups at the Blum Center at UCSC found that the Santa Cruz housing market was unaffordable and that students lived in poor conditions. Substandard housing has negatively impacted students’ financial security, academic performance, and health and well-being. This research, which was being submitted for peer review, also revealed that students would experience homelessness for one week to one month. The majority of undergraduate students reported couch surfing, sleeping in vehicles, and short-term rentals as housing options. The majority of graduate students reported couch surfing, short-term rentals, and staying in motels.

Systemwide Committee Co-Chair Tim Galarneau explained that the inconsistencies in housing interventions were driven by campus capacity, resources, and priorities. Currently, campuses would typically provide one- to three-day support in the form of campus housing, hotel stay, or a voucher. Support for up to two weeks would take the form of campus housing, short-term locations, or vouchers. Longer periods of homelessness would be addressed on a case-by-case basis. After two years of research and discussion with students, staff, faculty, administrators, and community service providers, the Systemwide Committee decided that its housing efforts must match its food and economic efforts. Some campuses needed safe parking spaces. Campus basic needs staff and crisis teams have also identified the need for short-term housing and transition assistance for students who had become housing-insecure not due to their lifestyle choices. Rapid rehousing, a holistic intervention which could include case management, transitional housing, financial

assistance, and move-in packages, was a major focus this year. John Burton Advocates for Youth led a movement to secure ongoing rapid rehousing funding for all three public higher education segments in California, and it has also participated in basic needs meetings and training events. Campuses have submitted their proposals on how they would use the rapid rehousing funding from the State. UC must create a rapid rehousing model that would support students with higher rates of homelessness, such as those in their second-to-last year of study and especially certain demographics within that group. At the end of 2019, the Systemwide Committee anticipated a better understanding of at-risk groups, as well as better support, prevention, and crisis intervention that are centered in dignity, equity, and justice. The Systemwide Committee also looked forward to addressing its priority areas in 2019–20: evaluating different solutions; establishing holistic housing support protocols; assessing current housing availability; establishing and maintaining relationships with local and State providers; participating in campus design sessions; sharing data systemwide; and creating the first validated UC student housing survey.

Committee Chair Weddle noted that no UC campus operates a safe parking program and asked the presenters to expound on their plans to explore this option. Mr. Canedo emphasized the importance of distinguishing students who live in their vehicles out of necessity and students who choose it as a lifestyle. The University did not have language explaining legal or policy requirements regarding safe parking. Students have begun to advocate for safe parking programs as they determine housing arrangements. Parking is a limited resource, and campuses have not accommodated requests for overnight parking. Committee Chair Weddle requested a follow-up conversation on this issue.

Faculty Representative Bhavnani expressed her concern about encouraging and institutionalizing students living in their cars because it would remove pressure on the State, the University, or other providers to improve housing. She underscored that it was not adequate for people to live in their cars and that it should not be an intervention. Committee Chair Weddle asked what the University would do to meet housing needs if it does not support students living in their cars under duress. UC must hold itself accountable. Ms. Bhavnani stated that she was concerned that a short-term intervention would become the long-term solution.

Regent Park asked whether the chart in the presentation materials represented the vast majority of students who reported one week to one month of homelessness. Mr. Canedo responded that the data was from UC Berkeley and was not a systemwide data set. Regent Park asked whether he would caution against extrapolating from this data. Mr. Canedo replied in the affirmative. Regent Park asked when this homelessness would occur at UC Berkeley. Mr. Canedo replied that it varied but that the majority of homelessness has occurred the start of the semester and also between semesters, which were transitional moments. He added that, regardless of whether the University supports it, students would be living in their cars, and UC's response was not consistent. Regent Park stated that there should be action in response to this data. Mr. Galarneau stated that the new, validated survey instrument would reveal more information that would inform how this Committee and the University would proceed. More data could reveal campus needs based on their

unique student populations. For example, commuter students at UCLA might wish to sleep in their cars before a morning class.

5. **REVIEW OF THE 2017 TOTAL COST OF ATTENDANCE WORKING GROUP REPORT**

[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.]

Committee Chair Weddle explained that this presentation was the result of a request from Chair Pérez to consider the intersection of basic needs and the total cost of attendance. This presentation would review the Total Cost of Attendance Working Group (Working Group) report and identify key areas to focus efforts.

Interim Vice President Gullatt introduced the speakers: UC Merced Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs Charles Nies and Interim Director of Student Financial Support Shawn Brick. Mr. Nies served in the Working Group, represents UC in the California Student Aid Commission, and chairs the Education Financing Model (EFM) steering committee.

Mr. Brick provided background on the Working Group, which convened in 2017 and met six times, four times in person. Not only did the Working Group measure the total cost of attendance, but it also considered UC financial aid policies and whether they adequately covered the total cost of attendance. The Working Group focused on several parts of the EFM, such as where the Total Cost of Attendance was set, what the loan and work expectation was, and how UC was serving middle-class students. Though not part of the Working Group's discussions, Mr. Brick highlighted the importance of the Cal Grant in UC's financial aid program, especially in light of discussion of Cal Grant reform. The Cal Grant covers tuition and fees, which has enabled UC to use approximately two-thirds of the UC Grant to cover non-tuition costs.

Mr. Nies recalled that he, others from UC Merced, the Office of the President (UCOP), Chair Pérez, Regent Ortiz Oakley, and then Student Regent Paul Monge participated in the Working Group. The report stated that UC's financial aid strategy has generally been working well; UC enrolls and graduates a large number of low-income students with lower-than-average debt. UC Merced ranked number one in *U.S. News & World Report* for students receiving need-based financial aid and exceeding predicted graduation rates. Mr. Nies reviewed the Working Group's recommendations that were tied to basic needs. First was promoting summer enrollment and advocating for summer Cal Grants. This summer, the State's recent \$4 million special appropriation to UC signaled the State's interest in supporting students in the summer. He recognized UC students for their advocacy. The second recommendation was to expand multi-year financial aid plans like the Promise Scholar Program at UCSB, 95 percent of whose participants graduated on time. UC Merced has adopted a similar program that awards four-year financial aid packages for students with zero family contribution and provides a residential learning community with a network of resources as well as social and emotional support. UCM has observed higher retention rates for this population. The third recommendation was improving the

measurement of the total cost of attendance. UC has administered its Cost of Attendance Survey (COAS) every three years since the late 1990s and had an over 30 percent response rate this May. Based on the report recommendations, UC now planned to conduct the COAS every two years, reduce reliance on student survey responses, and, using third-party researchers, conduct qualitative research on students' experience with covering the total cost of attendance. The fourth recommendation related to basic needs was improving financial education. UCM has adopted a two-year on-campus living requirement. Basic needs coordinators could refer students to financial aid offices for financial literacy training, and all campuses have expanded their financial management offerings.

Regent Cohen asked which campuses were considering multi-year financial aid plans and how UCOP would ensure their adoption. Mr. Brick replied that he could return with more information at a future Committee meeting. Mr. Nies added that some campuses were wary of changes in conditions for students. The cohort-based tuition model could provide stability and address some of the campuses' concerns.

Regent-designate Stegura noted that campus' financial aid award letters differed. Grants, loans, fees, and total cost of attendance might be hard to discern. A better understanding of the award would help students better allocate resources. Mr. Nies stated that ways to streamline and create more consistent letters could be determined. The California Student Aid Commission and the Century Foundation compiled sample award letters to use as models. Regent-designate Stegura noted that UCLA's letter was laid out very intelligibly.

Regent Park asked how long \$30,000 had been the parent contribution starting point and how UC could change it. Mr. Brick replied that the parent contribution relied on the Free Application for Federal Student Aid assessment. UC has discussed making its own assessment. The July Academic and Student Affairs Committee meeting covered outcomes by race and ethnicity that prompted the need to review the assessment of a family's ability to pay. Asking more questions to improve the assessment, however, means a more complicated form that is harder for students to complete. Regent Park noted that no one is prohibiting UC from changing the parent contribution. Mr. Nies confirmed this. Mr. Brick cautioned that funding such a change would be a challenge. Chair Pérez stated that Regent Park's question would inform other discussions. Different tuition models must have different financial aid models. For example, California State University had more accurate tools to measure housing costs, but UC could better cover those costs. The Committee looked forward to more information in future meetings. Committee Chair Weddle underscored the Regents' influence and encouraged innovative, bold questions.

The meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff