

The Regents of the University of California

PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

July 17, 2019

The Public Engagement and Development Committee met on the above date at UCSF–Mission Bay Conference Center, San Francisco.

Members present: Regents Blum, Guber, Kieffer, Lansing, Leib, Ortiz Oakley, Sherman, Simmons, and Zettel; Chancellors Block, May, and Wilcox; Staff Advisor Jeffrey

In attendance: Regent Thurmond, Regents-designate Mart, Muwwakkil, and Stegura, Secretary and Chief of Staff Shaw, Managing Counsel Shanle, Acting Provost Carlson, Senior Vice President Holmes, Interim Vice Presidents Gullatt and Leasure, and Recording Secretary Li

The meeting convened at 9:40.m. with Committee Chair Leib presiding.

Committee Chair Leib remarked that he had been discussing with Committee Vice Chair Simmons ways to make this Committee more relevant. He noted that the Committee had not been engaging with constituent groups per the Committee charter and that he had met with Regent Kieffer, Secretary and Chief of Staff Shaw, Senior Vice President Holmes, Associate Vice President Kieran Flaherty, and others to discuss ways to make the Committee more relevant. He stated that there would be an opportunity to solicit ideas during this meeting. Three off-site meetings were planned: one at UCLA Mann Community School in Los Angeles, one at a community college in Riverside, and one at UC Merced.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meetings of January 15, 2019 and April 22, 2019 were approved.

2. STATE GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS UPDATE

[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.]

Senior Vice President Holmes began remarks by welcoming Regents Leib and Simmons as Committee Chair and Vice Chair. She stated that State Governmental Relations (SGR) at the Office of the President (UCOP) focused on budget, legislative affairs, and advocacy and that she sought perspective and advice from Committee members on these efforts. Currently SGR's number one priority was qualifying a general obligation (GO) bond for the University, which would provide significant investment in UC's capital program.

SGR Associate Vice President Kieran Flaherty stated that the State budget outcome demonstrated that the new administration and new Legislature were dedicated to collaborating with the University, as well as ensuring increased access and enhanced investment. One piece of legislation that passed was State Senate Bill (SB) 77, the Higher Education Trailer Bill, which would provide financial assistance to undocumented students. He explained that some undocumented resident students were exempt from nonresident tuition under State Assembly Bill (AB) 540, but other students situated similarly technically did not qualify. SB 77 would allow UC to establish scholarships using non-State funds to help these students. While the University did not receive all the ongoing funding requested, SGR was grateful for Governor Newsom's and the Legislature's support. SGR knew that it must continue working with State leadership on ongoing funding for UC's ongoing costs such as enrollment growth and hiring faculty.

Mr. Flaherty highlighted UC's priority legislation. SB 14, which was mentioned earlier by Ms. Holmes, would qualify an \$8 billion GO bond split between UC and California State University (CSU), who were co-sponsoring the bill. It was awaiting hearing at the time of this meeting, and SGR expected that it would be taken up when the Legislature reconvened from Summer Recess. SB 461, the summer Cal Grant bill co-sponsored by UC and UC Student Association (UCSA), became a two-year bill. In the meantime, the Budget Act of 2019 has provided UC \$4 million for financial aid for summer enrollment. Assembly Constitutional Amendment 14 would prohibit the University from using contract workers in a wide range of work and would require UC to obtain statutory authority in advance of some types of contracting out. It passed through the Assembly and was awaiting hearing in the Senate at the time of the meeting. The bill would need a two-thirds vote in the Assembly and Senate to be placed on the ballot and did not require the Governor's signature. The University opposed the bill, and Mr. Flaherty thanked the Regents for their efforts.

Mr. Flaherty reviewed recent advocacy efforts from UC students. In addition to co-sponsoring legislation with SGR, UCSA also employed phone banks and social media, as well as meetings, hearings, and testimony at the State Capitol. Students were essential in securing basic needs, mental health, and rapid rehousing funding, most of which is ongoing. The UC Advocacy Network (UCAN) increased its membership by more than 4,000 in about six months. UCAN Student Ambassadors were responsible for a quarter of that membership increase. Forty UCAN Student Ambassadors met with legislators and State leadership and coordinated the first UCAN petition related to the State budget and garnered over 1,300 signatures within a few days. UC Davis UCAN Student Ambassadors delivered the petition to members of the Legislature. UCAN would like to increase active membership by 50 percent, from 16,000 to 24,000 members, by the end of 2019. Mr. Flaherty concluded his remarks by sharing a brief video of UCLA gymnast Katelyn Ohashi promoting UCAN.

Regent Zettel asked when SB 461 funds would be available for students if it passes. Mr. Flaherty responded that SB 461 became a two-year bill that would be taken up early in the following year's legislative session. State Senator Richard Roth and UCSA were interested in continuing to pursue the bill. The \$4 million provided for summer enrollment

would become available upon the signing of the budget in late June. He believed that those funds might be available for summer 2019.

Regent Zettel asked what comprised the non-State funds for financial aid to non-AB 540 undocumented students in SB 77. Mr. Flaherty replied that the source had not been determined and would be at the discretion of campuses. Systemwide financial aid leadership planned to work with the campuses to establish systemwide guidelines. UC did not track students' undocumented status, so students would have to self-identify to receive this financial aid. UC had been working on a process such that undocumented students would be comfortable seeking financial aid. Mr. Flaherty projected that the guidance would be in place by the end of July and that awards would be made by fall 2019.

Regent Sherman asked whether there was still discussion regarding the UCOP allocation. Mr. Flaherty stated that UCOP still received a line item in the State budget separate from the \$3.5 billion UC general instructional allocation. Three hundred forty million dollars had been allocated for UCOP, UCPath, and Agriculture and Natural Resources (ANR). The 2016 State audit recommended that the Legislature create a separate line item for UCOP for a minimum of three years. UCOP believed that audit implementation was going well and wished to discuss next steps with the Legislature and State leadership. Regent Sherman asked when the three years would be completed. Mr. Flaherty stated that it would be in the following year.

Committee Chair Leib asked about the chances of SB 14 passing. Mr. Flaherty replied that UC had received a great deal of support from the Legislature and that the Governor's administration had signaled an understanding of the need and time frame that UC was trying to pursue. There had been a pent-up demand for GO bond funding. AB 48, a K-12 bond measure, was awaiting hearing in the State Senate, and SB 14 was awaiting hearing in the State Assembly. SGR anticipated consensus on one large bond measure or approval of both bonds individually, but nothing was certain. Mr. Flaherty believed SB 14 had momentum. It has been common for governors and the Legislature to work together to limit the number of GO bonds on the ballot, so it would not be surprising if these bonds were combined. SGR felt positive about UC receiving significant funding, if not full funding, either through a separate or combined bond measure. Ms. Holmes added that UC was working hard to maintain UC's \$4 billion GO bond even if it was combined with another bond and that Senator Steve Glazer was committed to that as well. The Regents' preliminary endorsement during the last Regents meeting was helpful, and Regent Kounalakis has been extremely enthusiastic and helpful.

Committee Chair Leib applauded students for their efforts, thanking UCSA president Caroline Siegel-Singh, UCSA, and all students, and he recognized SGR for organizing student advocacy. He viewed his role as Committee Chair as one of ensuring that the Regents use their expertise to engage with the Legislature on bills. He planned to reach out to Committee members individually regarding legislative advocacy.

3. **FEDERAL UPDATE**

[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.]

Federal Governmental Relations (FGR) Associate Vice President Chris Harrington provided an overview of the federal budget, appropriations, and other key federal issues. He underscored that it would be very difficult to pass the 12 appropriations bills that fund the federal government by October 1, 2020, the beginning of the fiscal year in the federal government. This was due to a lack of progress on an agreement to lift budget caps imposed by the Budget Control Act of 2011 and the lack of an agreement to raise the nation's debt ceiling. Congressional leaders and the President's administration have renewed negotiations; if there was no agreement to lift the budget caps, a period of sequestration would result, which meant cuts would be made to defense and non-defense programs at the start of FY 2020. Both political parties, Congress, and the White House have struggled to come to an agreement, and Congressional leaders did not think sequestration would be good for the economy or the country. Short-term spending bills in the fall might be needed to keep the federal government funded until an agreement is reached. Even in the absence of a plan to lift the budget caps and raise the debt limit, the vast majority of UC priorities were funded in spending bills written in the House of Representatives. The Senate has deferred on writing its own bills until a budget caps agreement is reached. UC would continue to advocate that caps be lifted and for its priorities to be fully funded.

Mr. Harrison reported that the American Dream and Promise Act, which would allow undocumented students known as "DREAMers" to apply for permanent residency, qualify for federal student aid, and eventually earn a path to citizenship, passed the House of Representatives on June 4. UC shared a letter from President Napolitano and all ten chancellors to the California delegation prior to the vote; most of the California delegation voted for the bill. UC's aggressive lobbying and advocacy campaign included Hill meetings, social media engagement, and a UC Advocacy Network (UCAN) advocacy campaign that generated over 3,000 communications to the Hill. However, Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell was not interested in bringing the bill for debate, and Senator Lindsay Graham would only move the bill for debate if provisions addressing his concerns about refugee programs were included. UC would continue to advocate for this legislation.

In the beginning of the year, Senator Lamar Alexander anticipated that the Higher Education Act (HEA) would be signed into law by December 2019. Over the past few months, however, little bipartisan progress has been made in the Senate and a bipartisan bill seems unlikely. Senator Alexander would likely introduce a narrow bill that would consolidate student aid and loan repayment programs and define participation in federal student aid programs. Congressman Bobby Scott had been updating and preparing the Aim Higher Act for reintroduction later this summer and hoped to pass this legislation before the end of 2019. The Aim Higher Act was introduced in 2018 and was a rewritten version of the HEA and contained several UC-support provisions, such as simplifying and improving the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) and permanently

indexing the Pell Grant to inflation so that Pell eligibility can last 14 semesters and be used for graduate studies. FGR would continue to advocate for an HEA reauthorization that reflects UC's priorities.

Congress and the Trump administration had been seeking ways to prevent adverse foreign influence and the theft of academic research, and it had garnered bipartisan interest. Members of Congress had attached proposals restricting research to the National Defense Authorization bill, which was guaranteed to reach the President of the United States every year. FGR was working with its partners to provide an analysis and information on how these proposals would affect the University and academic research. FGR was aware of the need to address national security concerns while protecting principles of academic freedom. Mr. Harrington quoted President Napolitano's statements in a February 2019 letter to the chancellors that UC should protect intellectual capital while enabling the pursuit of research regardless of nationality, free discussion, and publication of research results regardless of citizenship.

Regent Zettel asked whether UC could inadvertently compromise national security through its open access policies. Mr. Harrington responded that the University had extensive experience since it managed three National Laboratories, two of which had national security responsibilities. FGR had underscored to members of Capitol Hill the importance of international collaboration and research sharing in order to address challenging scientific and technological issues together. Both parties acknowledged that foreign adversaries were trying to access US intellectual property. Infiltrations had occurred at other universities. UC was reviewing its policies and protocols to ensure that it had the best protections in place while maintaining academic freedom. Regent Zettel recalled news of a UCLA student who was apprehended for having sensitive information while on a plane bound for China. Ms. Holmes responded that UC must address both issues and be the model for other institutions.

4. **STUDENT MENTAL HEALTH FUNDING**

[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.]

Senior Vice President Holmes introduced the item and speakers Chief Medical Officer of Student Health and Counseling Brad Buchman and Legislative Director Angela Gilliard.

Dr. Buchman began his remarks by stating that student health and counseling oversight at UCOP was provided in collaboration by Student Affairs, UC Health, and Risk Services. He introduced Mental Health Program Manager Taisha Caldwell-Harvey from Student Affairs. He stated that UC students were experiencing a phenomenal increase in self-reported levels of anxiety, depression, relationship struggles, and distress. National demonstrated that this was not unique to UC. Students were undergoing developmental adjustment while experiencing uncertainty in the national and international environment. Dr. Buchman shared national data regarding students' depression, feelings of hopelessness and anxiety, and suicidal thoughts. Over the past decade, UC has had about a 2.7 percent

increase in enrollment growth but nearly an eight percent increase in unique clients in counseling centers per year. Something beyond enrollment growth was leading UC students to counseling, and demand continued to increase. National data from the Center for Collegiate Mental Health mimicked UC data almost exactly.

In 2005, then UC President Dynes had appointed a committee to look into mental health at the University; UC knew there was a need but had difficulty adequately funding student mental health services. The committee spent about a year to observe national and UC trends in order to estimate the University's need for resources and reported its findings to Regents, recommending an investment of \$43 million in 2006 that used a three-tier model that prioritized investment of those monies. Tier 3, the base of the model, represented funding toward prevention and creating healthy learning environments. Not all students experiencing distress went to a counseling center, and many services could be provided through faculty, staff, academic and student life support units, or other groups. Tier 2 was focused on targeted interventions for vulnerable student populations, such as undocumented, first-generation, and international students, as well as students showing signs of distress. Tier 1 represented investment in direct service providers. Students had been very vocal about access and wait times for appointments, and UC Health put a lot of effort into recruiting high-quality clinicians and meeting nationally recognized student-to-provider ratios. Dr. Buchman reported that UC was doing well in this regard and has hired a diverse counseling staff. Still, UC was struggling to maintain competitive salaries. In the past five years, UC Health has focused much of its efforts on Tier 1 services, but it cannot meet rising demands without directing funds to Tier 2 and Tier 3. In 2007, the Regents decided to increase the student registration fee by \$4.6 million for Tier 1 services, and \$8 million was earmarked in 2008 for Tier 1 and Tier 2 services. Many of those funding increases were severely affected by budget cuts during the economic downturn in 2009. For example, UC Berkeley underwent a 25 percent budget cut for student health and counseling that year. UC received 28 percent of the estimated need of \$43 million. The following year, Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) Directors responded in a survey that demand was continuing to escalate and that they could barely meet those demands despite augmentations to services.

In 2011, UC received \$6.9 million in Proposition 63 money, and, in 2012, UC received \$877,000, approximately one-tenth of the previous amount. In 2014, UC received about \$250,000 to support a systemwide best practice conference on suicide awareness, cultural competency, and other topics. Ms. Caldwell-Harvey and her colleagues most recently held a successful conference in Anaheim; UC had partnered with California State University's (CSU) providers at past conferences. In 2015, the California Mental Health Services Authority (CalMHSA) funding for UC ended, but UC enacted a long-term stability plan for tuition and financial aid around the same time. The plan called for a five percent increase over five years of the Student Services Fee, 50 percent of which was earmarked to Tier 1 service providers. The five percent increase was about \$16 per student per year. In 2016–17, Governor Brown vetoed proposed legislation for more Proposition 63 money, so the University was relying heavily on the Student Services Fee increase to sustain mental health services and capacity. In FY 2017–18, the five-year plan was interrupted when UC accepted a \$4.8 million increase in one-time funding from State General Funds in lieu of

the Student Services Fee increase. This funding increase allowed UC Health to sustain and keep the providers it had hired, but it also interrupted taxing students for the final two years of the plan. UC Health was able to keep the 70 FTE counselors and ten FTE psychiatrists it hired. Given the threat of significant provider layoffs if the University did not find new funding and given that there would be no increase to the Student Services Fee, UC Health pursued advocacy to receive additional funds from the State.

Ms. Gilliard reported on 2019 advocacy efforts. UC advocated for State Assembly Bill (AB) 1689, which would provide \$40 million in Proposition 63 funding to UC, CSU, and the California Community Colleges (CCC). The bill had been held in the Assembly Committee on Appropriations and would not be moving forward. A one-time funding request for \$4.8 million in the State budget was made to continue the prior year's funding, but this was not allocated in the budget. However, Governor Newsom's January budget had \$5.3 million in ongoing funds, which was included in the final State budget. Two million dollars in ongoing Proposition 63 funds and \$3 million in one-time Proposition 63 funds were not retained in the final State budget. Ultimately, UC did receive \$5.3 million, and AB 1689 was held in suspension. One next step is engaging with the Mental Health Services Oversight and Accountability Commission (MHSOAC), which oversaw the implementation of Proposition 63, advises the Governor on mental health, and provides training and technical assistance to counties for mental health planning. UC has begun to demonstrate to MHSOAC the escalating demand for services and would like to establish key areas of need systemwide. UC has been identifying high-value pathways to submit systemwide proposals to MHSOAC focused on better programming, case management and care, and data analytics. UC Health would like to collaborate with campus medical centers to submit requests to address mental health needs and create a network of services for students and surrounding communities. In 2020, UC would like to continue its advocacy work with the Legislature and State leadership. The 2019 legislative and State budget activity increased awareness of mental health needs, laying a great foundation for 2020 advocacy. UC would continue to explore potential partnerships with nonprofit organizations and leaders in the field to improve mental health services.

Dr. Buchman stated that UC Health was beginning to work with MHSOAC and needed new funds to engage with campuses and integrate mental health efforts to academic and campus life environments. Many campuses had student-led mental health coalitions with much student input that had successfully mobilized students and informed them of resources. UC Health must identify what technological investments were needed, identify predictors of student success and distress through analytics and data, surveil these predictors, and intervene at the first signs of academic or social distress. UC Health has had early positive interactions with MHSOAC. Dr. Buchman noted that much of the success at UC medical centers has not involved student health and counseling units on campus, so UC Health would need to engage UC medical centers to partner with counties and MHSOAC to bring some funding to the campuses.

Regent Lansing noted that this was one of the highest priorities for the Health Services Committee and for the Regents; she asked how much more money UC would need. Dr. Buchman speculated that \$5.3 million would allow UC Health to retain staff hired but

that demand has continued to escalate. The University would need enough money to meet the needs of existing students and more money to supplement prevention and targeted intervention. A fair amount of money would be needed to do that. Regent Lansing asked Dr. Buchman to return to the Regents with an approximation, because the Regents could not address an advocacy plan without such an approximation.

Regent Lansing asked Regent Leib whether all his ideas were included in this presentation. Regent Leib responded that he and Dr. Buchman spoke to MHSOAC about asking for mental health funding from the many counties that were not spending it. Counties had budgets of \$2 billion per year for mental health services. Regent Leib wished to learn the next steps for working with these counties. Regent Lansing asked the presenters whether they were prepared to share those next steps at the present meeting. Ms. Gilliard replied that they had a promising conversation with MHSOAC, which would act as a facilitator between UC and the counties. The next step should be UC convening a small group to determine what advocacy would be needed for the counties and the Governor's office. Regent Lansing suggested moving forward with next steps with urgency and also suggested reports at a future meeting of the Health Services Committee, as well as this Committee.

Regent Lansing underscored the effectiveness of student advocacy and the importance of including students. She expressed deep concern about the national percentage of students who have considered suicide. Regent Lansing suggested having students share their experiences so that legislators learn about the pervasiveness of mental health issues on campuses and about the services available. She also suggested creating a mental health mobile phone application that could connect students with UC counselors and avert an urgent crisis, and she suggested giving the application a discreet name to address stigma. Dr. Buchman responded that UC had on-call services and crisis text lines, but UC Health was also implementing a systemwide mobile application called Therapy Assistance Online through which students could communicate directly with UC counseling staff. The application was being funded partially by UC Student Health Insurance Plan (SHIP) reserves and would be launching in the fall.

Regent Zettel asked whether there was any interest in reactivating the increase in the Student Services Fee such that it would be directed toward mental health services. Dr. Buchman replied that students had made a five-year commitment to collect the increase in the Student Services Fee in 2015 but it ended after three years. Recent feedback indicated that students were not interested in reactivating it. Most of mental health services had been funded by Student Services Fees as far back as the 1940s and 1950s. The University had been under a fair amount of pressure not to increase tuition or Student Services Fees. Demand for mental health services was growing faster than enrollment, and the cost of living has been escalating. Dr. Buchman noted that, in 2005, a committee spent one year to determine a dollar amount needed.

Regent Zettel asked whether UC Health was exploring why the need for mental health services was on the rise. She brought attention to the possible role of recreational drugs such as marijuana in student mental health and asked whether students could be surveyed on recreational drug use. She pointed out a study showing a relationship between marijuana

use and depression. Dr. Buchman responded that these questions were being asked but predictive analytics had not been used. Researchers at UC Berkeley and UCLA had been conducting large studies with student data. He stated that there was a significant relationship between marijuana use and anxiety. Regent Zettel asked that Dr. Buchman share that information with the Regents.

Regent Simmons noted the direct correlation of basic needs with mental health and encouraged UC Health to work with basic needs coordinators in order to prevent duplicate programming and “double dipping” of funding. Dr. Buchman expressed his agreement and stated that UC Health was in discussion with basic needs coordinators.

Regent Sherman asked whether UC had data on primary reasons people visit mental health centers in order to tackle the causes. He requested to see such data on a periodic basis. Regent Sherman, while acknowledging the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) and that most students were of legal age, asked whether the University could involve parents of students experiencing distress. Dr. Buchman confirmed that confidentiality and student age were factors and added that Tier 2 activity would focus on students known to be at higher risk or parents trying to find services. The University could not approach the parents of a student unless the student consented to it, but it could send general outreach reviewing topics that parents could cover with students. Regent Sherman suggested informing parents that students could designate parents to receive medical information in the same way that students could delegate parents to pay tuition. He underscored that parents would want to be informed if their student was in crisis. Dr. Buchman acknowledged Regent Sherman’s concerns but reiterated State privacy laws. He stated that such a discussion would have to happen at home but noted that students might be deterred from seeking services if their parents found out about it. Regent Sherman asked whether SHIP charges indicate the type of service provided. Dr. Buchman replied that it would only indicate the dollar amount. Regent Lansing added that almost no student would give doctors permission to talk to their parents and that parents could not access grades without student permission. Regent Sherman stated that there should be an option during registration to delegate parents as recipients of students’ medical information.

Regent Thurmond asked whether campuses had healthy eating and healthy living campaigns and positive interaction with peers. He noted the rise in suicide and depression rates among K-12 students and the introduction of social and emotional learning. He also suggested that students who did not have access to a counselor have a peer who could connect them to resources. Dr. Buchman replied that all campuses had robust programs on lifestyle and nutrition, student relaxation spaces, and peer health advocates. Campuses could definitely enhance and grow those programs with more funding and by involving faculty and staff to create a student safety net.

Regent Thurmond asked whether UC has engaged with county boards of supervisors in advocating for Proposition 63 funding and to do so if it had not. Recently, Los Angeles County allocated a significant amount of Proposition 63 reserves to the Los Angeles Unified School District (LAUSD). Regent Leib stated that he and Regent Lansing had discussed working with the counties for the last several months and that the Regents have

considered pilot projects at several campuses such as UC Merced. Ms. Gilliard added that MHSOAC suggested a multi-campus pilot rather than a one-off program. MHSOAC wished to see success at multiple counties that could be replicated statewide. Regent Thurmond agreed with the multi-campus focus and suggested that UC start its funding advocacy with Los Angeles County by leveraging the UCLA centennial. Collaboration between UC and counties could generate savings for counties. Regent Thurmond asked whether UC Health was able to draw from underutilized federal funding such as Medi-Cal and Medi-Cal Administrative Activities (MAA), perhaps collaborating with K-12 school districts. Ms. Gilliard replied that this was discussed with MHSOAC and was under consideration. Regent Thurmond offered the California Department of Education's support and collaboration in pursuing funding.

Chancellor Block stated that the growth of mental health issues on campus might stem from the reduction of stigma and more students seeking help. He shared UCLA's Depression Grand Challenge, a research project to understand the causes of depression and anxiety. Part of the Grand Challenge was creating innovative treatments, and UCLA offered free screenings to students as a result. At the time of the meeting, 6,000 students had participated, allowing the campus to triage and treat students on a larger scale. Many could be treated with online therapy and peer counselors, which would prevent more serious conditions. Students tracked sleep and social activity using mobile phone applications. UCLA was still collecting data but hoped to extend the program in one year, possibly to community colleges. He noted that many campuses were innovating new approaches to student mental health. Committee Chair Leib suggested a future discussion of best practices across all campuses.

Regent-designate Muwwakkil asked about extending mental services to dependents and spouses of students in order to create healthier learning and living environments and what the barriers to expansion were that were not cost-related. Dr. Buchman replied that UC SHIP offered coverage for dependents. With regard to non-financial hurdles, more pediatricians would be needed, and student funds, which fund student health services, would be diluted to serve dependents. Most campuses did not have enough child-age dependents to justify hiring one or more pediatricians on campus. While SHIP does offer dependent coverage, students and parents could choose another insurance plan. Regent-designate Muwwakkil noted that SHIP's dependent coverage was not highly discounted, so it would be a financial burden for students to include their dependents in the plan. He asked how UC could better cover students and their dependents given that it was such a small population. Dr. Buchman responded that insurance premiums for dependents and women of childbearing age were usually higher. Some campuses had established the same premiums for everyone, subsidizing dependent premiums by splitting those costs among all students.

Regent Kieffer agreed with Regent Thurmond that UC should be more aggressive in pursuing Proposition 63 funding from Los Angeles County and set an example for a pilot project statewide. He did not wish to see the University stymied by attempts at coordinating a larger effort. Regent Kieffer requested that UC staff collect articles about cultural trends' effects on mental health from the best thinkers and present them to the Regents

periodically. He also wished to learn what research was being done on such causes of mental health issues. Committee Chair Leib agreed that the Regents should help the University advocate for Proposition 63 funding from Los Angeles County straightaway and report back at the next Committee meeting. Regent Lansing expressed her discomfort with reporting back after a long periods of time and suggested phone calls in the interim.

Regent-designate Stegura suggested outreach to parents that would help them identify potential risks and help them communicate with students. Dr. Buchman stated that he has spoken to parent groups during new student orientations on identifying signs of mental health warning signs. He stated that UC Health could survey campus student health centers to ensure that they were talking about mental health warning signs and sending information with acceptance letters.

Chancellor Wilcox stated that this was a challenge that all campuses struggled to keep up with. He wished to expand the conversation to faculty and viewed academia as a microcosm for society as a whole. He mentioned the experiences of LGBTQ students and students of color. He agreed that the University should try not to solve all problems at once but underscored a more holistic approach that considered social inequality.

Committee Chair Leib suggested putting together a working group with himself, Regents Lansing, Kieffer, and Thurmond, as well as Chancellor Block.

5. **DISCUSSION OF FUTURE GOALS FOR THE UPCOMING YEAR**

[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 Leib highlighted the uniqueness of this Committee in that it did not take specific actions on specific matters. Legislation was addressed through updates and advocacy. He expressed his excitement that Regent Simmons was chosen Committee Vice Chair because of her experience. He and Regent Simmons spoke to past Committee leadership about ways to make this Committee more engaging and effective, and he wished to move the Committee to the direction of off-site meetings.

Regent Simmons explained that the Committee would enter into communities to showcase its work, engage with and gain feedback from constituents, and interact with the legislators who serve these communities. These visits would make people aware what UC did in their communities and enable UC to hear from alumni, parents, and community groups. Mann UCLA Community School in South Los Angeles would be the location of the first off-site meeting, and legislators representing that area would also be invited. She hoped to invite the admissions director at UCLA, who has worked to increase the admission of students of color following the restrictions of Proposition 209. It was also her hope that these off-site meetings would impart to underrepresented students that they were desired and that a UC education was possible. These meetings would also inform the media and general public of less obvious ways that UC was involved in communities and that services would disappear if funding disappeared. In turn, community members would advocate for UC to

their legislators Committee Chair Leib added that they planned to invite legislators, city councilmembers, and their staff. Since it was a goal listen to these constituents, State budget requests or ideas on how UC could better interact with underrepresented communities might result. Upon consulting with former Committee Chair Ortiz Oakley, Committee Chair Leib shared that another meeting would be at a community college, with Riverside as a potential location. Regent Simmons added that this would be a great opportunity for the Regents to learn about the demographics and transfer system of the Inland Empire. Each of the off-site meetings would focus on different aspects of the UC identity, different services UC provided, and different constituents UC wished to serve. Committee Chair Leib stated that a third off-site meeting would be at UC Merced, which had a student population that was 56 percent Latino(a), 70 percent first-generation, about 80 percent Pell Grant recipients, and 40 percent from Los Angeles County. He observed a student body that was eager to learn and that valued its campus. He planned to invite legislators to that meeting. Given the high percentage of UC Merced undergraduate students who pursued graduate school, Committee Chair Leib observed that UC could build a more diverse faculty through UC Merced. He then asked the Committee to contribute ideas for the future. Regent Simmons added that the agricultural community and the Central Valley were being considered for outreach.

Regent Kieffer commended the proposed off-site meetings and suggested coordinating with the UC campus and public officials where an off-site meeting was to be held. He also suggested reaching out to Board members not in this Committee and working with Chair Pérez to create an expectation to attend some of the off-site meetings. He suggested working with Associate Vice President Kieran Flaherty to determine which Regents should communicate with State legislators after an off-site meeting.

Regent Sherman suggested conducting a survey of what different constituents, such as legislators, the general public, or high school students, think of the University. Senior Vice President Holmes stated that surveys on the perception of UC have been conducted with California voters, most recently in summer 2018, and she would be able to provide survey results at a later date. Regent Simmons stated that it would helpful for the Committee to see this feedback in order to inspire additional ideas.

Regent Ortiz Oakley voiced his support for the direction that the Committee was going. He suggested working with State Governmental Relations (SGR) to strategize the most effective approach for interacting with legislators. As Chancellor of the California Community Colleges, he was committed to making the off-site meeting at the community college an effective one. Regent Ortiz Oakley suggested working with the UC Student Association and other student organizations to solicit feedback from transfer students. He also suggested inviting organizations such as The Education Trust West and Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) to participate in the off-site meetings. He suggested clarifying the Regents' legislative and advocacy goals. He cited the example of attempts at removing direct appropriation to the Office of the President from the Legislature and added that clarifying the Regents' goals would help reinforce the work of SGR. Committee Chair Leib opined that organizations like PPIC would be eager to participate and share their knowledge. He and Regent Simmons had consulted at length with Chair Pérez, who wished

to help invite legislators to these meetings. Committee Chair Leib was eager to encourage more Regents to attend these off-site meetings. It had not been determined how many off-site meetings would be held, whether they would be held in lieu of regular Committee meetings, and what topics would be discussed at the meetings.

Regent-designate Stegura suggested sending campus foundation trustees to interact with State legislators in their districts and added that foundation trustees had influence in their communities. Committee Chair Leib asked Mr. Flaherty whether the Board had enlisted the help of campus foundation trustees often, and Mr. Flaherty replied that campuses had determined whether to include foundation trustees in their advocacy efforts. He included UC Merced and UC Berkeley as examples of campuses that had included foundation trustees during campus legislative advocacy days in Sacramento. Regent Kieffer stated that he visited several campus foundations and that, while the Regents did not need to employ foundation trustees in their lobbying efforts, they still deserved the Regents' attention as de facto trustees of their campuses. He suggested that Regents be assigned to visit foundations for campuses in or near their area annually. Regent-designate Stegura added that Regent Kieffer was very warmly received at the UC Davis foundation meeting and echoed his suggestion to have more Regents visiting foundation trustees.

Chancellor Wilcox emphasized the value of a Regent's visit to a campus and recalled the impact of the time a Committee met with members of the Riverside community. He suggested that the Committee connect with the University's public and private research partners. Chancellor Wilcox also reiterated Regent Kieffer's suggestion that campuses regularly update the Committee on how collaborations had evolved following a visit.

Regent-designate Muwwakkil voiced his support for giving those experiencing the issues discussed by this Committee an opportunity to share their experiences in future meetings. He suggested creating a point of contact for students from community colleges inspired by a Committee visit to transfer to a UC campus. Regent-designate Muwwakkil also suggested examining successful engagement models from community partners and campuses, such as UCLA's Center for Community College Partnerships, which had a robust engagement with local community colleges. Committee Chair Leib agreed and was eager to hear from members of the community.

Regent Lansing stated that this Committee was formed so that UC would have a better relationship with the public, the State Legislature, and the federal government in order to receive support, particularly financial support. She suggested that the Committee did not need to hear reports that could have been read and that the Committee could be more interactive, whether by hosting events, visiting Sacramento, or engaging in online campaigns. She suggested revisiting ideas from previous Committee meetings, explaining that many great ideas had been presented but had not been executed. She underscored the importance of the presence of State legislators at off-site visits, such as the one planned at Mann UCLA Community School. Regent Lansing suggested holding regular meetings and viewed off-site meetings as an addition. She felt that campuses sometimes viewed Regents' offers of advocacy as interfering, and she reiterated her belief that the Committee could and should do more. Committee Chair Leib stated his mission that the Committee learn

from communities and try to make changes. He hoped that the off-site meeting at Mann UCLA Community School would result in a budget request for funding underrepresented constituents. Chancellor Wilcox replied that campuses did not regard Regents as interfering; rather, each campus might be reluctant to ask Regents to attend many events out of respect for the other campuses and their events. A conversation about better collaboration was needed.

Regent Thurmond acknowledged that convening legislators was difficult and suggested holding joint meetings with State legislative committees whose interests align with this Committee, such as the State Assembly Committee on Higher Education and the Senate or Assembly budget committee. He highlighted having directed conversations with the chairs or members of these legislative committees. Regent Thurmond acknowledged that, while legislators were eager to do all that they could to help, they might not be able to allocate more funding in, for instance, an economic downturn. He envisioned some off-site visits with groups and legislators resulting in those legislators making proposals for systemic revenue increases to the State, meaning more money for higher education, K-12 education, and other systems. He also suggested inviting chairs and key members of legislative committees to provide advice on budget requests at Committee meetings.

Regent Simmons stated that, given her one-year term as Regent, she was very motivated to make an impact quickly. She and Committee Chair Leib had discussed what kind of impact the Committee could make in a year in collaboration with campus and community stakeholders.

Regent Zettel suggested inviting legislative staff to off-site meetings. She also suggested holding the January Committee meeting in Sacramento to coincide with the slower legislative period, meaning legislators might be more available to attend the Committee meeting and present their ideas. Committee Chair Leib replied that legislators were invited to the September Committee meeting, when they would not be in session and hopefully would be more available.

Regent Kieffer explained that, when this Committee was first formed, it aimed to achieve its goals with one big campaign. Over time, the Committee broadened its approach. He suggested engaging all the stakeholder groups within the University, such as campus divisions of the Academic Senate, student newspapers, staff organizations, and connecting with them. These groups were not in touch with the Regents because of the University's size, and the Legislators would hear about this engagement.

Committee Chair Leib would be reaching out to Committee members separately; he encouraged members to reach out to him or Regent Simmons with further ideas.

The meeting adjourned at 12:05 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff