

THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

November 17, 2022

The Regents of the University of California met on the above date at the UCSF-Mission Bay Conference Center, San Francisco campus and by teleconference meeting conducted in accordance with California Government Code §§ 11133.

Members present: Regents Anguiano, Batchlor, Cohen, Drake, Elliott, Hernandez, Leib, Makarechian, Matosantos, Pouchot, Reilly, Robinson, Sherman, and Timmons

In attendance: Regents-designate Ellis, Raznick, and Tesfai, Faculty Representatives Cochran and Steintrager, Staff Advisors Lakireddy and Mackness, Interim Secretary and Chief of Staff Lyall, General Counsel Robinson, Provost Brown, Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer Brostrom, Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer Nava, Senior Vice President Colburn, Vice President Brown, Chancellors Block, Christ, Gillman, Hawgood, Khosla, Larive, May, Muñoz, Wilcox, and Yang, and Recording Secretary Li

The meeting convened at 8:40 a.m. with Chair Leib presiding.

1. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Leib 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. Agam Patel, UC Riverside staff member and Council of UC Staff Assemblies (CUCSA) delegate, thanked the Regents for considering CUCSA's request for a ten percent pay increase for all policy-covered staff in good standing. While CUCSA was disappointed in the University's final decision, it wished to discuss this and other solutions with the Regents in the future.
- B. Kylie Jones, UC Irvine student and UC Student Association (UCSA) Campus Climate Officer, shared the following requests from students regarding the UC Community Safety Plan: to clarify the Plan's implementation process; distinguish the role of the Office of the President (UCOP) and of each campus; discuss the role of policing within the Plan and explore alternatives; explain how the Plan would be funded; and identify additional opportunities for student input and representation during implementation.
- C. Kathryn Lybarger, President of American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) 3299, expressed AFSCME 3299's solidarity with UC Student-Workers Union United Auto Workers (UAW) 2865 in their ongoing strike and urged the Regents to reach an agreement that respected these

workers. She stated that University employees could not afford to live on what they were paid and called on the Regents to address increasing campus poverty. She noted that unions helped secure billions of dollars in federal rescue funding for UC during the COVID-19 pandemic, UC medical centers made millions of dollars in profit, and that the State Legislature passed a historic increase to UC's budget last year. The union coalition also demanded that the University match the full amount of healthcare retention payments for both UC Health and campus workers.

- D. Melody Torres, UC Santa Barbara student, called on the University to end its discrimination against undocumented students by providing equal access to opportunities for students regardless of their immigration status. Undocumented students who were not participants in the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program did not have employment opportunities and might not be able to afford basic needs. She urged the Regents to join the Opportunity for All campaign.
- E. Emma Sebastian, UCSF CUCSA Chair, thanked the Regents for considering CUCSA's request for a ten percent pay increase for all policy-covered staff in good standing. She reiterated comments made by Mr. Patel.
- F. Paulina Rojas, UC Davis graduate student, called for affordable housing for student families and adequate relocation assistance. Ms. Rojas chose to attend UC Davis because of the housing that she was offered, but the apartment was scheduled for demolition in 2023, and she was uncertain whether she could finish her program given available housing options. She stated that affordable housing for student families would create greater equality and opportunities, particularly for women.
- G. Darryl Lucien, representative of Charles R. Drew University of Medicine and Science, shared that the institution sought to establish its own medical program and looked to deepen its partnership with the University.
- H. Diego De Nault, UC Berkeley student and representative of Universities Allied for Essential Medicines (UAEM), called on more UC campuses to adopt the Affordable Access Plan, which required biopharmaceutical companies that enter into licensing agreements with UC campuses to submit plans for providing access to the UC innovations in low- and middle-income nations. UCLA was the first to incorporate such language, reported no objection to its use, and has suggested that other campuses do the same.
- I. Fiona Weigant, UC Santa Cruz staff member and former CUCSA delegate, thanked the Regents for considering CUCSA's request for a ten percent pay increase for all policy-covered staff in good standing. She reiterated comments made by Mr. Patel.
- J. Sky Yang, UC San Diego Student Body President, asked the Regents to set a date to establish a four-year housing guarantee for students. He underscored the importance of setting a goal and having a plan to achieve it. In 2020, 16 percent of UC students were living in hotels, transitional housing, or outdoors. Despite UC

adding about 20,000 beds in 2015–16, more than 7,500 students were waitlisted for campus housing in fall 2021.

- K. Peter Hein, UCLA alumnus, spoke in opposition to UCLA joining the Big Ten Conference and expressed concern about the effect of such a move on smaller athletics programs and the fostering of future Olympians. He stated that UCLA benefited from the 1932 Summer Olympics hosted in Los Angeles, and that afterschool activities benefited from a strong pact between campuses, like UC Berkeley and UCLA, which comprised what was currently the Pac-12 conference.
- L. Emma Craig, organizer for Pro-Life San Francisco, called on UC to employ ethical research practices and to stop coordinating with abortion providers. She contrasted the celebrated birth of quadruplets at UCSF Benioff Children's Hospital in December 2018 with abortions of fetuses at up to 24 weeks' gestation.
- M. Isabella Stelter, UC Berkeley student and representative of UAEM, called for the systemwide adoption of the Affordable Access Plan as universal licensing language to promote access to and the affordability of future therapies. She shared that advocacy by UAEM students in the wake of the Xtandi patent case in India led UCLA to adopt the Affordable Access Plan in July 2020.
- N. Kristin Turner, Executive Director of Pro-Life San Francisco, spoke in opposition to research practices at UCSF and alleged that criminal activity was occurring there. She stated that UCSF was administering abortions in the second trimester without the use of feticidal agents, which could result in fetuses being born alive in over 50 percent of cases, and that UCSF lacked written policies to provide life-saving care to these fetuses. UCSF has stated that it has not encountered fetuses born alive during abortion procedures, which Ms. Turner regarded as a statistical anomaly. She asked to meet with Chancellor Hawgood.
- O. Jennifer DiSanto, UCSF student, asked the University to bargain with UAW 2865 in good faith so that UC student workers could have a living wage and resume work that fulfills UC's public service mission. She shared that many postdoctoral researchers and graduate students at UCSF could not afford rent or groceries and were receiving free produce from the student market.
- P. Allisun Wiltshire, UC Berkeley student and representative of UAEM, called for the systemwide adoption of the Affordable Access Plan as universal licensing language. The Plan has not been met with resistance by industry licensees and has yielded promising conversations with Chancellor Christ and other UCB administrators. The Affordable Access Plan had the support of UCB faculty and its undergraduate student association, and support was also growing systemwide.
- Q. Robert Byrd, representative of Pro-Life San Francisco, asked Chancellor Hawgood to meet with members of Pro-Life San Francisco. He stated that documents the organization received from UCSF following public record requests indicated that

tissues had been removed from aborted fetuses. He added that digoxin was not being used in these procedures and that fetuses were being disarticulated in utero.

- R. Sara Gibson, UCLA student, addressed item B4, *Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment Prevention, Response, and Complaint Resolution Programs*, and asked the Regents to include language regarding rape test kit availability. Such kits provided physical evidence that helped identify and prosecute rapists. Victims of sexual assault on campus must travel an average of 10.4 miles to access these kits, and up to 48 miles in rural areas. Other barriers to access included police involvement and availability of campus resources.
- S. Sofia De La Cruz, UCSD student and member of the Green New Deal at UC San Diego, stressed the importance of setting goals, funding, and infrastructure changes by this decade to reduce campus carbon emissions by 50 percent by 2030 and 95 percent by 2035. Ms. De La Cruz asked President Drake and the Regents to replace fossil fuel with renewable electricity in the capital financial plan.
- T. Nan Renner, UCSD staff member, urged President Drake and the Regents to make concrete plans and provide financing to reduce UC fossil fuel combustion by 50 percent by 2030 and 95 percent by 2035 in line with targets set by the memorial approved by the Academic Senate.
- U. Megan Curtin, UC Berkeley student and representative of UAEM, called for the systemwide adoption of the Affordable Access Plan, which had been implemented at UCLA and was supported by UC Berkeley faculty and its undergraduate student association, not exclusive to UCB, with support growing systemwide. Ms. Curtin stated that language from the Affordable Access Plan and a letter from students could be provided to the Regents.

2. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meetings of August 17 and September 21 and 22, 2022 were approved, Regents Anguiano, Batchlor, Cohen, Drake, Elliott, Hernandez, Leib, Makarechian, Matosantos, Pouchot, Reilly, Robinson, Sherman, and Timmons voting “aye.”¹

3. **REMARKS FROM STUDENT ASSOCIATIONS**

President Drake announced Associate Vice President Kieran Flaherty’s retirement and that this was Mr. Flaherty’s last Board meeting. He thanked Mr. Flaherty for his service to the University.

President Drake introduced UC Student Association (UCSA) President Alexander Niles.

¹ Roll call vote required by the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act [Government Code §11123(b)(1)(D)] for all meetings held by teleconference.

Mr. Niles shared progress made on this year's UCSA budget priorities. As part of its menstrual equity efforts, UCSA joined a coalition advocating free menstrual products in all K–16 schools. Mr. Niles stated that the locations where menstrual products were offered on UC campuses were not well publicized or easily accessible. Another budget priority was \$18.9 million in funding for disabled student services staff and programming. Existing staff were stretched thin, and the number of students who would request accommodations was likely to increase given enrollment growth and the COVID-19 pandemic. More staff were also needed to help identify or prevent accessibility issues on campus. Mr. Niles noted that the Community Safety Plan would leave UC police departments intact despite students informing both the Board and the Office of the President that police have caused them harm, made them feel unsafe, and were unresponsive to their needs. Students sought a thorough restructuring of resource allocation for community safety. Survivors of sexual violence have stated that police retraumatize them or create more harm. UCSA called for restorative justice programs that are not linked to law enforcement, as incentives such as reduced penalties would undermine the goal of achieving personal accountability for wrongs. Students should have independent places to heal and grow after harmful events.

Mr. Niles concluded his remarks by addressing the strike by UC academic workers. He recalled how the teaching assistant (TA) in his freshman history class helped him build skills and confidence. TAs were instructors, mentors, counselors, confidantes, and care providers. In Mr. Niles' view, academic workers played an outsized role in student success at UC and were doing so without being paid a living wage, which was diminishing their ability to work as instructors and mentors. Undergraduate students felt as if their tuition was not being invested in those who contributed to their UC experience, and students were rethinking whether to apply to UC graduate programs. Mr. Niles stated that UCSA stood in solidarity with the demands of the Fair UC Now Coalition.

President Drake introduced UC Graduate and Professional Council (UCGPC) President Hayden Schill.

Ms. Schill began her remarks by acknowledging the strike by UC graduate student researchers, postdoctoral scholars, and others as UC Student-Workers Union United Auto Workers (UAW) 2865, UAW 5810, and Student Researchers United–UAW were negotiating their labor contracts with the University. She provided an example in which over 75 percent of a graduate student researcher's salary went toward on-campus housing, adding that some graduate students were living far from campus or in their vehicles due to cost. In her view, research and educational excellence were negatively affected by graduate students' inability to meet their basic needs. Contributions from graduate students and postdoctoral researchers included helping generate billions of dollars in grants and fellowships; mentoring undergraduate students, helping them seek funding, and writing their letters of recommendation; and teaching courses and holding office hours. More time spent commuting, as well as mental health struggles due to rent burden and workplace harassment, meant less time conducting research and mentoring students. Ms. Schill noted that the University's reputation was affected by this strike, the largest educational strike in U.S. history. She added that UC graduate programs were prohibitive for students who were parents, from a low-income background, or those from marginalized backgrounds due to

the lack of a living wage. Talented students were deciding not to enroll at UC or were transferring to other institutions that offered higher pay. UC must provide the structure and resources for all graduate students to thrive in order to diversify the professoriate. Ms. Schill called on the Regents to exercise their leadership and end unlawful bargaining practices and urged chancellors to encourage UC to accept union demands.

The Board recessed at 9:30 a.m.

.....
The Board reconvened at 11:20 a.m. with Chair Leib presiding.

Members present: Regents Anguiano, Batchlor, Blas Pedral, Chu, Cohen, Drake, Elliott, Hernandez, Kounalakis, Leib, Makarechian, Matosantos, Park, Pérez, Pouchot, Reilly, Robinson, Sherman, and Timmons

In attendance: Regents-designate Ellis, Raznick, and Tesfai, Faculty Representatives Cochran and Steintrager, Staff Advisors Lakireddy and Mackness, Interim Secretary and Chief of Staff Lyall, General Counsel Robinson, Provost Brown, Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer Brostrom, Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer Nava, Senior Vice President Colburn, Vice President Brown, Chancellors Block, Christ, Gillman, Hawgood, Khosla, Larive, May, Muñoz, Wilcox, and Yang, and Recording Secretary Li

4. **UCLA BIG TEN MEMBERSHIP**

[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.]

Chair Leib announced that the Regents would meet in December to finalize recommendation language related to UCLA's decision to join the Big Ten Conference.

President Drake began his remarks by thanking the Regents for their guidance and Governor Newsom for sharing his concerns, and for maintaining focus on the potential impact of these changes on students. The University has engaged in a closer analysis of the collegiate athletics landscape and sought additional perspectives from student-athletes. These conversations played a critical role in UCLA and UC Berkeley's plans to support students and commit to devoting more resources to the student-athlete experience. UCLA aimed to mitigate travel impact and minimize time spent traveling. The Regents would further consider the additional information received at their meeting in December.

Vice President Pamela Brown stated that the Office of the President (UCOP) partnered with UCLA to survey over 600 student-athletes and received responses from 111 individuals, a response rate of nearly 20 percent. Ms. Brown noted that female student-athletes made up 72 percent of respondents but only 54 percent of the student-athlete population. Responses were organized based on the impact that joining the Big Ten Conference would have on the respondent. When asked why respondents chose to become

student athletes, the top two responses across all categories were to compete at the highest level nationally and to receive an undergraduate education at UCLA. Thirty-five percent of respondents believed that joining the Big Ten would be a good idea and 38 percent needed more information. Those who needed more information wished to know whether resources would go to sports other than football and basketball and how the impacts of travel and missed class time would be mitigated. Twenty percent did not have an opinion and seven percent felt the move was a bad idea. When asked about the benefit of moving, the top three responses were increased national exposure, resources, and television opportunities. Female respondents and those who would be affected more by the move cited better name, image, and likeness opportunities. Those who would be affected less by the move cited enhanced services to student-athletes. Respondents were most concerned about increased travel time and missed classes, and over 50 percent were concerned about the impact on physical health and well-being in colder locations. When asked how UCLA should prioritize increased resources, the top three responses were nutritional support when traveling and on campus, faculty support for missed classes, and examination accommodations. Those who would be affected more by the move also called for charter flights and academic support and online materials while traveling.

Chancellor Block stated that, annually, UCLA would need at least \$1 million in additional academic support, an additional \$500,000 in mental health support, and an additional \$2.5 million to \$3 million in nutritional support, and an additional \$4.5 million to \$5.8 million for travel support, for a total of about \$10 million more per year.

Chair Leib asked why the survey had such a low response rate. Ms. Brown replied that UCLA typically had a lower survey response rate. This survey was administered over two to three weeks so that results could be provided at this meeting. In comparison, other surveys have typically been administered over multiple months.

Chair Leib asked if any actions could be taken between the present time and December to collect more survey responses. Ms. Brown replied that UCLA administered the survey, and efforts could be made to collect responses from those who did not participate in the survey.

Chancellor Block asked Martin Jarmond, Director of Athletics at UCLA, to expound on other ways the campus has learned about student-athlete attitudes toward a move to the Big Ten. Mr. Jarmond replied that he and other staff met with over 250 student-athletes via teleconference or in person and discussed what they wished to see with more resources. He noted the challenge of collecting responses to an email survey, especially for events that would occur two years from now.

Chair Leib asked if responses from these meetings were separate from the survey results. Chancellor Block stated that these responses were provided in the written materials of a prior Regents meeting.

Regent Sherman asked about the availability of student-athlete grade point average (GPA) and graduation rates and how they compared with other Association of American Universities members. Ms. Brown responded that graduation rates by sport were provided

following the meeting on August 17. Most men's sports had a graduation rate of 90 percent or higher. For football it was 70 percent, and for basketball it was 55 percent. Most women's sports had a graduation rate of over 90 percent, and for softball it was 85 percent. This was comparable to overall graduation rates at UCLA generally.

Regent Cohen stated his understanding that there was no formal policy prohibiting the transfer of funding from academic to athletics programs, and vice versa. Chancellor Block responded in the affirmative. Regent Cohen asked if the athletics program has traditionally been expected to pay for itself, without subsidy from academic programs. Chancellor Block replied that this was correct.

Regent Cohen asked if academic program funding would be transferred to support the athletics program if the latter was in a budget deficit and no corrective action was taken. Chancellor Block stated that the athletics program was self-funded except for a small amount in student fees. Without additional resources, UCLA would have to tighten its athletic budget, which likely meant reducing the number of sports teams, and provide additional support from campus resources. Providing institutional support to athletics programs was not uncommon among many institutions.

Regent Cohen asked whether revenue generated by the athletics program would remain if it was making a net profit. Chancellor Block expressed his hope that sufficient athletic revenue could provide general benefits to the campus, such as psychological support. Regent Cohen asked that this be clarified in the December meeting and stressed the importance of fair access to high-quality student services. He did not wish to see student-athletes receiving better services than other students. Chancellor Block agreed with Regent Cohen, and he expressed pride in the student services provided at UCLA.

President Drake recalled his own experience overseeing an athletics program whose profits were shared with the campus, and programs that promoted student-athletes' academic success were expanded campus-wide. Regent Cohen reiterated his concern that expanding services in the athletic program could potentially result in less funding for student services generally.

Regent Park asked Chancellors Block and Christ how their thinking about the effect of conference membership on student athletics and the broader UC community had evolved. Chancellor Block replied that he was concerned about how the move to the Big Ten would affect the future of athletics at UCLA. The campus wished to maintain its tradition of providing opportunities for students. The college athletics landscape was volatile, and UCLA believed that it needed additional resources to better succeed. Student-athletes sought better national exposure and competitive excellence.

Chancellor Christ stated that she decried the changes she observed in college athletics, such as "pay for play" and the increasing professionalization of revenue-generating sports. After much consideration over the last five months, she had come to believe that more conferences that are stronger would have a retarding effect on those changes. Chancellor Christ noted that UC Berkeley had 30 sports and some 900 student-athletes, and she

underscored the importance of thinking about the experience of all of those students. It was her belief that the consolidation of conferences to a few very powerful ones while weaker ones cease to exist was not to the benefit of all student-athletes, particularly women's and Olympic sports.

Regent-designate Ellis took issue with the ambiguity of the President's Standing Order, and he opined that what has transpired should be codified for the future. He suggested that UC be explicit about the delegation of such decisions to the chancellors and that an implementation plan should be created. Chancellors should present possible systemwide impacts to the President before a decision is made. Regent-designate Ellis also suggested targeted communication to the Chair, Vice Chair, or select Committees.

Regent Blas Pedral noted that there were only four respondents who played football for a survey related to a decision regarding football. She asked that future data be more reflective of the student-athletes who would be affected. Regent Blas Pedral encouraged these student-athletes to provide public comment.

President Drake stated that information from the campuses would be evaluated, answers to any new questions that arise would be provided, and this would be reported to the Regents at the upcoming Special Meeting.

5. UPDATE ON IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS OF UC COMMUNITY SAFETY PLAN

[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.]

President Drake introduced the item. Last August, the University released its first ever Community Safety Plan after over 18 months of discussions at the campus and systemwide levels, and with community members, stakeholders, and subject matter experts. All campuses were implementing inclusive, tiered response models that ensure that the most appropriate responders are deployed. UC has launched six public, interactive data dashboards, with new standards for data collection and reporting, on the safety and security environment at each campus. In July, UC hired Jody Stiger as the new Systemwide Director for Community Safety, and was working to expand community feedback mechanisms, enhance independent oversight of safety personnel, and updating policies and procedures.

Mr. Stiger provided an overview of the Community Safety Plan. In summer 2020, each chancellor created task forces to re-envision campus safety, and the University hosted two symposia in 2021 for further dialogue. The Community Safety Plan was drafted from these efforts and was provided to UC stakeholders for input. The Office of the President (UCOP) posted a near-final draft online for public feedback. The Plan, which called for changes to UC policy, procedures, and culture, had four guiding principles. First was community- and service-driven safety. Campus safety policies and practices must reflect the needs and values of and be in service to diverse communities. Second was a holistic, inclusive, and tiered response model for safety services. Safety would be defined broadly and include

mental health, wellness, basic needs, and a bias and hate response. Multidisciplinary teams would triage behavioral health crises, conduct wellness checks, and connect individuals to care. The third principle was transparency and continuous improvement through data. Campuses would collect and share uniform safety data on a systemwide dashboard to empower the community and inform change. The fourth was accountability, and independent oversight. Independent police accountability boards comprised of a broad cross section of the UC community would investigate complaints.

Since the Plan's release, strong progress has been made on 31 action items that implement these guidelines, but there was still much to accomplish. Campuses were submitting twice-yearly progress reports that were available online. UCOP established two work groups of students, staff, and faculty, and both have reported on their work. One work group developed recommendations pertaining to vehicle, uniform, and equipment standards so that public safety personnel are differentiated. The second work group developed a process for collecting public safety data, including identifying and standardizing data sets, and published six interactive dashboards publicly available online. Systemwide efforts included reviewing the Universitywide Police Policies and Administrative Procedures, building on data reporting requirements, and working with student mental health providers. Mr. Stiger's office was developing standard policies and training for emerging threats such as active shooter events.

Chancellor Wilcox stated that a bias incident involving the UC Riverside Police Department (UCRPD) in 2015 led to the formation of a Black Student Task Force that year and a Black Student Experience Working Group in 2019. A UC-mandated campus safety task force, formed in 2020, built on the work of these groups. UCR examined what safety meant to different identities and communities and adjusted accordingly. The campus created UC's first division of Health, Well-Being and Safety, and UCRPD has been integrated into student services.

Denise Woods, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Well-Being and Safety at UCR, explained that the reorganization aimed to streamline access to resources and to ensure that the campus is more appropriately responsive to student needs. She compared this with Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs. UCR sought to destigmatize seeking help, reduce barriers to resources, and integrate a tiered response model. UCR was moving away from safety from the perspective of enforcement toward one of guardianship, and police would no longer be the primary professional for all instances. If there is no immediate threat to safety, UCR would turn to campus partners for on-campus matters, City or County partners for unaffiliated matters, and the Student Well-Being Intervention and Follow-up Team (SWIFT) before involving police. SWIFT was supervised and led outside of the police department. UCR was also convening a team of Community Safety Responders who were trained in de-escalation crisis response, as well as State-certified student emergency medical technicians. The Health, Well-Being and Safety leadership team met regularly, attended training events together, and addressed issues collectively. In July, the division hosted a training event for all officers and most of the police department support staff. The training covered topics such as the history of policing, implicit bias, and engaging with marginalized communities. A campus safety data dashboard was now online, and UCR has

generated quick response (QR) codes that link to online resources. Two police officers were now community engagement officers who built bridges with the campus community. They wore different uniforms and participated in presentations to both students and campus leadership.

Chancellor May stated that, in 2020, UC Davis created a task force to reform campus safety, and over 30 members of the campus community were charged with providing recommendations. In 2014, the campus established a Police Accountability Board (PAB), the only one in the system and one of a few such boards in the country. Campus policy prohibited UC Davis from receiving equipment from the U.S. Department of Defense or the Law Enforcement Support Office. UC Davis had “military-style equipment” as defined by State law and would only use it under extraordinary circumstances. Chancellor May introduced UC Davis Police Chief Joseph Farrow, adding that Mr. Farrow began a three-year term as president of the board of directors of the California branch of the National Alliance on Mental Illness (NAMI) and has been instrumental in advancing campus safety measures, especially UC Davis’ mental health crisis response.

Mr. Farrow provided an overview of UC Davis’ tiered campus safety response. CORE officers were nonuniformed police officers who respond to calls for service that do not require armed police. Community Safety Ambassadors would respond to calls for service, write reports, and conduct investigations but would not be full police officers. Protective Service Specialists, or security guards, were moving from the medical centers to the Davis campus. Aggie Hosts were student security staff who drove Safe Ride vehicles. UCOP recommended that all ten campus police departments must apply for International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators (IACLEA) accreditation, which included a 36-month assessment of policies and procedures. UC created the University Police Accreditation Committee (UPAC) so that the campuses could work together to attain the accreditation. Another UCOP recommendation was implementing a PAB, which UC Davis established in 2014, and other UC campuses were doing the same. Prior to the establishment of this board, many community members felt that citizen complaints and concerns were going unanswered. The UCD Office of Compliance now investigated complaints and presented them to the PAB to make a finding. The police chief would implement the board’s finding. Given the low number of complaints across the system, the campuses signed a memorandum of understanding (MOU) that allowed the UCD Office of Compliance to conduct investigations for all complaints. Campuses might create their own compliance teams as needed in the future.

Regent Anguiano asked how common UC Riverside’s response model was. Chancellor Wilcox stated his belief that merging the police department with student affairs was unique to UCR. Regent Anguiano asked if this model would be expanded nationally. Chancellor Wilcox replied that, while it was still early in UC Riverside’s implementation of this model, it was the campus’ intention to help other institutions around the country. Mr. Stiger added that UC did plan to focus first on the campuses and eventually create a nationwide blueprint. President Drake stated that campuses would share best practices amongst each other before those best practices are exported.

Regent-designate Raznick asked if the response model included preemptive action related to potentially troubled students. Mr. Farrow responded in the affirmative. All campuses had systems in place that connect students and staff in crisis to services and monitor to ensure campus safety. These systems were collaborative in nature, involving academic programs, health services, police departments, student affairs, and paramedics. Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer Nava stated that every campus had a threat assessment team.

Regent Kounalakis expressed gratitude and recognized the University for its progressive approach. This innovative thinking could serve as a model for campuses around the country.

Staff Advisor Mackness shared that, at UC Berkeley, it was challenging to staff UCPD, student affairs, and mental health services. Given that these efforts were more centralized and campuses were more connected, she asked if there was an opportunity to quickly increase the number of staff and share training resources so that campuses could achieve this response model more quickly. Mr. Stiger stated that Associate Vice Provost Elizabeth Halimah was leading a group that focused on campus behavioral health services, such as resource and knowledge sharing among campuses. For instance, campuses were discussing different ways they could increase the number of licensed mental health practitioners. UCOP was looking to build similar systemwide committees for other tiered response models. Mr. Farrow shared that recruiting and retaining police officers was very challenging due to the decline in applications for law enforcement jobs, but applicant quality was high. Although staffing was low at times, UC did not want to hire people who should not be working as police officers on a university campus. Ms. Woods shared that UC Davis recently hired a well-being liaison who would answer telephone calls from students who felt they were in crisis and wished to speak to someone who could also connect them to services. Because behavioral health practitioners were difficult to recruit, UC Davis was trying to leverage other resources to provide tiered expertise levels.

Regent Matosantos asked about gaps in hiring as campuses implement this new response model, turnover among sworn personnel, and training and support for existing staff. Ms. Woods acknowledged that recruitment was challenging. The UCR police department had a stable corps of officers—some have been serving for ten to 15 years while a few were close to retirement, and there were several officers in the academy.

Regent Matosantos asked if UC Riverside was bringing its new response model to the broader community and what community resources and opportunities were available. Ms. Woods replied that the Riverside County Department of Mental Health has authorized UCR to perform psychiatric holds pursuant to California Welfare and Institutions Code Section 5150 (5150 hold), and the campus was identifying counselors and therapists to do that. Riverside County and UCR jointly applied for a grant so that County professionals could assist the campus with unaffiliated police interactions. UC Riverside was also finalizing an MOU for a campus restorative justice and diversion program as an alternative to the criminal justice system. Mr. Farrow stated that all members of UC Davis' tiered response received similar training. He thanked President Drake for the University's support

of Senate Bill 960, which would allow undocumented individuals to become police officers. UCDPD's first undocumented officers would be hired after January 2023. Mr. Stiger observed that many UC police were alumni who understood student life and the communities they served.

Regent-designate Tesfai, referring to dashboard data, remarked that Black students were stopped a disproportionate number of times by UCPD this calendar year and noted the historical aspect of police stops. He stated that Black students were stopped at a rate of 17 percent and only 25 percent of those stops were the result of a call for services. He asked what circumstances led to the other 75 percent of stops and how UC would respond to inquiries by student and community groups. Mr. Farrow responded that police departments had been wrestling with decisions to make stops on college campuses for several years. The data would indicate that the number of stops made daily has decreased as police have tried to move away from making stops for minor violations. Through their training, policies, and procedures, UC police were prohibited from using race as a reason for any stops. Mr. Farrow stated that the data for stops made at the Davis and Sacramento locations could appear distorted if combined because of their different demographics. All ten campuses monitored and dissected their data to ensure that stops are reasonable, necessary, and that they follow proper procedure and policy. Sergeants and lieutenants were responsible for speaking regularly with their officers about the stops they made. Ms. Woods stated that data should be collected for quality improvement. UC Riverside was working to eliminate pretextual stops, and the number of stops made has decreased. This was being communicated to both officers and the community, and policies and procedures were being put in place to prevent the community from becoming more unstable. Chancellor Wilcox added that, if people do not feel safe even with no crime on campus, then UCR has not achieved its safety goal. Mr. Stiger shared that, in one instance, UCRPD retrained all of its officers after analyzing data gathered from stopping Black males and was now more successful in minimizing those stops. It was Mr. Stiger's job to ensure that data are used for the betterment of the campus community.

Regent Reilly asked if UCOP was receiving timely and accurate data from the campuses. Mr. Stiger responded in the affirmative. UCOP was currently asking campuses to send data on a quarterly basis but was considering systemwide software that could provide information in real time. Ms. Nava thanked Vice President Brown and Institutional Research and Academic Planning for compiling these data. Regent Reilly offered the Regents' help in these data collection efforts.

Regent Reilly asked what UC Davis has learned from establishing a PAB. Mr. Farrow responded that UCD students, staff, and faculty served on UC Davis' PAB, established in 2014, on a rotating basis. He reported that the PAB worked very well and that it was supported by the Federated University Police Officers Association. Recently, Chancellor May approved policy that made the PAB permanent. UC Davis has been assisting the other nine campuses with establishing PABs and with IACLEA accreditation. Mr. Stiger shared that UCOP recently met with officers from each campus regarding PABs. UCSF was set to launch its PAB this month, while other campuses planned to launch PABs in January. Campuses originally aimed to form PABs in June but decided to wait until students

returned to campus. Ms. Woods shared that UCR would launch its PAB before the end of the calendar year.

Regent Reilly asked what changes in morale have been observed among officers as the new response model was being implemented. Chancellor May replied that the campus community was proud of the progress being made, and he commended Mr. Farrow's efforts. Ms. Woods expressed pride in UC Riverside officers. The proposed changes were initially met with skepticism, but morale had improved after much communication and discussion about why these changes were being made.

Staff Advisor Lakireddy shared that UC Merced recently launched its PAB and that it was difficult to engage students and staff given how labor-intensive it was to serve on a PAB. She suggested that those who serve on these boards be compensated.

6. **SEXUAL ASSAULT AND SEXUAL HARASSMENT PREVENTION, RESPONSE, AND COMPLAINT RESOLUTION PROGRAMS**

[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.]

This item was deferred.

7. **COMMITTEE REPORTS INCLUDING APPROVAL OF RECOMMENDATIONS FROM COMMITTEES**

Chair Leib stated that Chairs of Committees and Special Committees that met the prior day and off-cycle would deliver reports on recommended actions and items discussed, providing an opportunity for Regents who did not attend a particular meeting to ask questions.

Report of the Academic and Student Affairs Committee

The Committee presented the following from its meeting of November 16, 2022:

A. ***Amendment of Regents Policy 3105 – Regents Policy on Residency and Payment or Waiver of Tuition, Non-Resident Supplemental Tuition and Mandatory Systemwide Fees***

The Committee recommended that the Regents amend Regents Policy 3105: Regents Policy on Residency and Payment or Waiver of Tuition, Non-Resident Supplemental Tuition and Mandatory Systemwide Fees as shown in Attachment 1.

Regent Park explained that this amendment would make the policy more aligned with federal and State law.

B. ***Achieving the Academic Mission: Academic Senate Survey of UC Faculty and Instructors and the Continuing Impact of the Pandemic in the 2021–22 Academic Year***

Regent Park reported that respondents to the Academic Senate’s survey on the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on faculty and instructors reported feeling burnt out, that they had less time for research, and that they considered leaving academia. The survey results correlated with national trends. The Committee discussed possible opportunities despite these challenges.

C. ***Statements Describing Faculty Contributions to Inclusive Excellence***

Regent Park reported that the Committee learned how the use of faculty diversity statements has evolved.

D. ***Accountability Sub-Report on Diversity***

Regent Park reported that Shirley Malcom, Director of the American Association for the Advancement of Science’s STEMM Equity Achievement (SEA) Change program, spoke to the Committee. All ten campuses were members of this national program. The Committee also discussed how ongoing funding for the Student Academic Preparation and Educational Partnerships program would be used. Part of those funds would go toward UC’s Growing Our Own initiative.

E. ***How UC Research Informs Academic Planning***

Regent Park reported that the Committee heard a presentation by UC Berkeley Associate Provost and Dean of the School of Information Jennifer Chayes on the development of data science at the Berkeley campus, as well as how the generation, use, and analysis of data affected academic development. The School was taking a “pull-in” approach that was also intersegmental and interdisciplinary in nature.

Upon motion of Regent Park, duly seconded, the recommendation of the Academic and Student Affairs Committee was approved, Regents Anguiano, Batchlor, Blas Pedral, Chu, Cohen, Drake, Elliott, Hernandez, Kounalakis, Leib, Makarechian, Matosantos, Park, Pouchot, Reilly, and Sherman voting “aye.”

Report of the Compliance and Audit Committee

The Committee presented the following from its meeting of November 16, 2022:

A. ***Ethics, Compliance and Audit Services Annual Report 2021–22***

Regent Elliott reported that, as part of this presentation, the Committee discussed the compliance rates for mandatory trainings by campus, training frequency, and variations in compliance rates. Committee Chair Sures requested an update on

training compliance rates at a future meeting and expressed a strong desire to see higher rates.

B. ***Annual Report of External Auditors for the Year Ended June 30, 2022***

This item was not summarized.

C. ***Fostering a Fair and Accountable Culture to Promote High Reliability in Health Care***

Regent Elliott reported that the Committee heard a presentation on developing a culture of shared accountability by encouraging open communication, learning from mistakes, and promoting best practices. One Committee member expressed concern that the presentation normalized deviance and minimized the significance of the five percent of preventable patient harm events.

Report of the Finance and Capital Strategies Committee

The Committee presented the following from its meeting of November 16, 2022:

A. ***Budget, Scope, External Financing, and Design Following Action Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act for Site and Make-Ready Portion of the Project, UC Merced Medical Education Building, Merced Campus***

The Committee recommended that:

- (1) The 2022–23 Budget for Capital Improvements and the Capital Improvement Program be amended as follows:

From: Merced: Health and Behavioral Sciences Building – preliminary plans for the entire project – \$12 million to be funded from external financing supported by State General Fund appropriations (\$7.8 million) and general campus funds (\$4.2 million).

To: Merced: UC Merced Medical Education Building – preliminary plans for the entire project and working drawings and construction for the Site and Make-Ready portion of the project – \$21.5 million to be funded from external financing supported by State General Fund appropriations (\$17.3 million) and general campus funds (\$4.2 million).

- (2) The scope of the Site and Make-Ready work portion of the UC Merced Medical Education Building project shall relocate the campus stormwater retention basin to clear the site for the Medical Education Building and create a permanent, more sustainable solution for the campus. The project

will also augment the electrical capacity of the campus to enable the full electrification of the Medical Education Building and future facilities.

- (3) The President of the University be authorized to obtain external financing for the UC Merced Medical Education Building project in an amount not to exceed \$9.5 million plus related interest expense and additional related financing costs. The President shall require that:
 - a. Interest only, based on the amount drawn, shall be paid on the outstanding balance during the construction period.
 - b. The source of repayment for the \$9.5 million shall be from State General Fund appropriations, pursuant to the Education Code Section 92493 et seq. Should State General Fund appropriation funds not be available, the President shall have the authority to use any legally available funds to make debt service payments.
 - c. The general credit of the Regents shall not be pledged.
- (4) Following review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the UC Merced Medical Education Building project as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), including any written information addressing this item received by the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff to the Regents no less than 48 hours in advance of the beginning of this Regents meeting, testimony or written materials presented to the Regents during the scheduled public comment period, and the item presentation, the Regents:
 - a. Certify the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the UC Merced Medical Education Building project.
 - b. Adopt the CEQA Findings for the UC Merced Medical Education Building project, having considered both the UC Merced 2020 Long Range Development Plan Environmental Impact Report (2020 LRDP EIR) and EIR for the UC Merced Medical Education Building project.
 - c. Approve the changes to the previously adopted Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program adopted in connection with the 2020 LRDP EIR.
 - d. Approve the design for the Site and Make-Ready portion of the UC Merced Medical Education Building project, Merced campus.

B. *Budget, Scope, External Financing, and Design Following Action Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, Viterbi Family Vision Research Center, San Diego Campus*

The Committee recommended that:

- (1) The 2022–23 Budget for Capital Improvements and the Capital Improvement Program be amended as follows:

From: San Diego: Viterbi Family Vision Research Center – preliminary plans – \$6 million, to be funded from campus funds.

To: San Diego: Viterbi Family Vision Research Center – preliminary plans, working drawings, construction, and equipment – \$152 million to be funded with external financing.

- (2) The scope of the Viterbi Family Vision Research Center project be approved. The project shall provide approximately 100,000 gross square feet, including dry laboratory space to conduct computational analytics and clinical trial research; wet laboratory space (open laboratory space design with dedicated laboratory support) to conduct basic science and clinical trial research; a core laboratory (vivarium); meeting and support space; and retail. The project would also provide service access to the building, parking reconfiguration, and public realm improvements.
- (3) The President of the University be authorized to obtain external financing in an amount not to exceed \$152 million plus additional related financing costs to finance the Viterbi Family Vision Research Center. The President shall require that:
 - a. Interest only, based on the amount drawn, shall be paid on the outstanding balance during the construction period.
 - b. As long as the debt is outstanding, general revenues from the San Diego campus shall be maintained in amounts sufficient to pay the debt service and to meet the related requirements of the authorized financing.
 - c. The general credit of the Regents shall not be pledged.
- (4) Following review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed Viterbi Family Vision Research Center project, as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), including any written information addressing this item received by the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff no less than 48 hours in advance of the beginning of the Regents meeting, testimony or written materials presented to the Regents during the scheduled public comment period, and the item presentation, the Regents:

- a. Adopt the CEQA Findings for the Viterbi Family Vision Research Center, having considered the 2018 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the La Jolla Campus and Addendum No. 10 to the 2018 LRDP EIR for the Viterbi Family Vision Research Center.
 - b. Make a condition of approval the implementation of applicable mitigation measures within the responsibility and jurisdiction of UC San Diego, as identified in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program adopted in connection with the 2018 LRDP EIR.
 - c. Approve the design of the Viterbi Family Vision Research Center project, San Diego campus.
- C. ***Budget, Scope, External Financing, and Design Following Action Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, Neuropsychiatric Replacement Hospital, UCLA Health, Los Angeles Campus***

The Committee recommended that:

- (1) The 2022–23 Budget for Capital Improvements and the Capital Improvement Program be amended as follows:

From: Los Angeles: Neuropsychiatric Replacement Hospital – preliminary plans – \$22.5 million funded from hospital reserve funds.

To: Los Angeles: Neuropsychiatric Replacement Hospital – preliminary plans, design, construction, and equipment – \$352 million funded from external financing.
- (2) The scope of the Neuropsychiatric Replacement Hospital project be approved. The project shall renovate the former Olympia Medical Center Hospital into a state-of-the-art acute Neuropsychiatric Hospital to provide 119 inpatient beds and related clinical and building support spaces. Site development shall include landscape and hardscape, utilities, and pathways to and around the building.
- (3) The President of the University be authorized to obtain external financing in an amount not to exceed \$352 million plus additional related financing costs to finance the Neuropsychiatric Replacement Hospital. The President shall require that:
 - a. Interest only, based on the amount drawn, shall be paid on the outstanding balance during the construction period.

- b. As long as the debt is outstanding, the general revenues of UCLA Health shall be maintained in amounts sufficient to pay the debt service and to meet the related requirements of the authorized financing.
 - c. The general credit of the Regents shall not be pledged.
- (4) Following review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the Neuropsychiatric Replacement Hospital project, as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), including any written information addressing this item received by the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff to the Regents no less than 48 hours in advance of the beginning of this Regents meeting, testimony or written materials presented to the Regents during the scheduled public comment period, and the item presentation, the Regents:
 - a. Determine that the project is categorically exempt from CEQA.
 - b. Approve the design of the Neuropsychiatric Replacement Hospital, Los Angeles campus.
- D. ***Amendment of the Budget, Scope, External Financing, and Design Following Action Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, Kresge College Non-Academic, Santa Cruz Campus***

The Committee recommended that the Regents' March 2019 action, *Approval of the Budget, Scope, External Financing, and Design Following Action Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, Kresge College Non-Academic, Santa Cruz Campus*, amended May 2022, be further amended as follows:

- (1) The 2022–23 Budget for Capital Improvements and the Capital Improvement Program be amended as follows:
 - From: Santa Cruz: Kresge College Non-Academic – preliminary plans, working drawings, construction, and equipment – \$234.15 million to be funded by Auxiliary – Student Housing/Dining reserves (\$8.5 million), Auxiliary – Student Fee Reserves (University Fee Reserves) (\$1.2 million), Auxiliary – Parking reserves (\$100,000), General Campus Funds (\$27,547,000), external financing supported by Student Housing/Dining (\$190 million), and external financing from Century Bonds (\$6,803,000).
 - To: Santa Cruz: Kresge College Non-Academic – preliminary plans, working drawings, construction, and equipment – \$429,594,000 to be funded by State funding from the Higher Education Student Housing Grant Program (\$89 million), Auxiliary – Student

Housing/Dining reserves (\$8.5 million), Auxiliary – Student Fee Reserves (University Fee Reserves) (\$1.2 million), Auxiliary – Parking reserves (\$100,000), General Campus Funds (\$28,666,000), external financing supported by Student Housing/Dining (\$295,325,000), and external financing from Century Bonds (\$6,803,000).

- (2) The scope of the Kresge College Non-Academic project, as amended, shall consist of approximately 146,400 assignable square feet (ASF), primarily residential space, supplying 400 new residential-hall-style beds (phase one) and approximately 590 apartment-style and residence hall beds (phase two). In addition, the scope includes approximately 3,600 ASF of student programs space, 2,800 ASF of college academic space, a 3,300 ASF new Town Hall for student activities, outdoor program areas, circulation, and parking lot accessibility improvements, and a newly accessible bridge.
- (3) The President of the University be authorized to obtain external financing in an amount not to exceed \$295,325,000 (a further increase of \$105,325,000) plus additional related financing costs to finance Kresge College Non-Academic. The President shall require that:
 - a. Interest only, based on the amount drawn, shall be paid on the outstanding balance during the construction period.
 - b. As long as the debt is outstanding, the general revenues of the Santa Cruz campus shall be maintained in amounts sufficient to pay the debt service and to meet the related requirements of the authorized financing.
 - c. The general credit of the Regents shall not be pledged.

...

- (5) Following review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the Kresge College Non-Academic project, as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), including any written information addressing this item received by the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff to the Regents no less than 48 hours in advance of the beginning of this Regents meeting, testimony or written materials presented to the Regents during the scheduled public comment period, and the item presentation, the Regents:
 - a. Adopt the CEQA Findings for the Kresge College Non-Academic project, having considered both the Kresge College Renewal and Expansion Project Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and the Addendum to the EIR for the Kresge College Non-Academic project.

- b. Adopt as a condition of approval the applicable mitigation measures within the responsibility and jurisdiction of UC Santa Cruz, as identified in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program adopted in connection with the Kresge College Renewal and Expansion Project EIR.
 - c. Approve the design modifications to the approved Kresge Non-Academic project.
- (6) The President or designee be authorized, in consultation with the Office of the General Counsel, to execute all documents necessary in the execution of the above.

E. ***University of California 2022–28 Capital Financial Plan***

The Committee recommended that the University of California 2022–28 Capital Financial Plan be approved.

F. ***University of California Financial Reports, 2022***

The Committee recommended that the Regents adopt the 2021–22 Annual Financial Reports for the University of California, the University of California Retirement System, and the five University of California Medical Centers.

G. ***Approval of the University of California’s 2023–24 Budget for Current Operations and State Request for Capital Projects***

The Committee recommended approval of the following items:

- (1) The proposed budget plan shown in Attachment 2, *University of California 2023–24 Budget Plan for Current Operations*.
- (2) A request for one-time State funding of \$1.2 billion in 2023–24 for capital projects to support facilities renewal, enrollment growth, and clean energy.

Regent Cohen expressed concern that the University’s expenses were exceeding its revenue despite the good condition of UC finances and suggested that the situation should be monitored. Given that news media have reported that preliminary estimates for the State budget’s shortfall next year would be \$25 billion, Regent Cohen expressed gratitude for the stability that Governor Newsom’s five-year funding compact would provide to UC.

H. ***Annual Actuarial Valuations for the University of California Retirement Plan and Its Segments and for the 1991 University of California-Public Employees’ Retirement System Voluntary Early Retirement Incentive Program***

This item was not summarized.

I. ***Annual Actuarial Valuation of the University of California Retiree Health Benefit Program***

This item was not summarized.

J. ***Report of Budget to Actual Expenditures for Fiscal Year 2021-22 for the Office of the President and First Quarter Fiscal Year 2022–23 Results***

This item was not summarized.

Upon motion of Regent Cohen, duly seconded, the recommendations of the Finance and Capital Strategies Committee were approved, Regents Anguiano, Batchlor, Blas Pedral, Chu, Cohen, Drake, Elliott, Hernandez, Kounalakis, Leib, Makarechian, Matosantos, Park, Pouchot, Reilly, Robinson, and Sherman voting “aye.”

Report of the Governance Committee

The Committee presented the following from its meeting of November 16, 2022:

A. ***Approval of Appointment of and Compensation for Tricia Lyall as Secretary and Chief of Staff to the Regents as Discussed in Closed Session***

The Committee recommended approval of the following items in connection with the appointment of and compensation for Tricia Lyall as Secretary and Chief of Staff to the Regents:

- (1) Per policy, appointment of Tricia Lyall as Secretary and Chief of Staff to the Regents, at 100 percent time.
- (2) Per policy, an annual base salary of \$260,000.
- (3) Per policy, eligibility to participate in the UC Employee Housing Assistance Program, subject to all applicable program requirements.
- (4) Per policy, standard pension and health and welfare benefits and standard senior management benefits including eligibility for Senior Manager Life Insurance and, after five consecutive years of Senior Management Group service, eligibility for Executive Salary Continuation for Disability.
- (5) Per policy, an administrative fund will be established for official entertainment and other purposes permitted by University policy. Adjustments may occur annually as allowed by policy.

- (6) Ms. Lyall will comply with the Senior Management Group Outside Professional Activities (OPA) policy and reporting requirements.
- (7) This action will be effective on Ms. Lyall's start date, which is estimated to be on or about December 1, 2022.

The compensation described above shall constitute the University's total commitment until modified by the Regents, as applicable under Regents policy, and shall supersede all previous oral and written commitments. Compensation recommendations and final actions will be released to the public as required in accordance with the standard procedures of the Board of Regents.

Chair Leib noted that Interim Secretary and Chief of Staff Lyall recused herself during this Committee Report.

B. *Approval of Exception for Moving and Relocation Expenses for Barbara Cevallos as Associate Vice President – Systemwide Controller, Office of the President as Discussed in Closed Session*

The Committee recommended that the Regents approve the following for Barbara Cevallos as Associate Vice President – Systemwide Controller, Office of the President:

As an exception to policy, extend the period of time to September 30, 2023 for Ms. Cevallos to (1) submit receipts and/or documentation supporting her moving and relocation expenses; (2) sell her former primary residence; and (3) complete her move. This permits the reimbursement of expenses authorized by Regents Policy 7710, Senior Management Group Moving Reimbursement, which are incurred by Ms. Cevallos through September 30, 2023.

Chair Leib reported that the Committee amended Ms. Cevallos' extension from 12 months to nine months.

C. *Amendment of Regents Policy 7102: Policy on Appointment of Chancellors*

The Committee recommended that the Regents amend Regents Policy 7102 – Policy on Appointment of Chancellors, as shown in Attachment 3.

D. *Approval of Appointment of and Compensation for Catherine Reinis Lucey, M.D., as Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, San Francisco Campus as Discussed in Closed Session*

The Committee recommended approval of the following items in connection with the appointment of and compensation for Catherine Reinis Lucey, M.D., as Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, San Francisco campus:

- (1) Per policy, appointment of Catherine Reinis Lucey, M.D., as Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, San Francisco Campus, at 100 percent time.
- (2) Per policy, an annual base salary of \$620,000.
- (3) Per policy, standard pension and health and welfare benefits and standard senior management benefits including eligibility for senior manager life insurance and, after five consecutive years of Senior Management Group service, eligibility for executive salary continuation for disability.
- (4) Per policy, eligibility to continue to accrue sabbatical credits as a member of the tenured faculty, consistent with academic personnel policy.
- (5) Per policy, eligibility to participate in the UC Employee Housing Assistance Program, subject to all applicable program requirements.
- (6) Dr. Lucey will comply with the Senior Management Group Outside Professional Activities (OPA) policy and reporting requirements.
- (7) This action will be effective on Dr. Lucey's start date, which is estimated to be on or about January 1, 2023.

The compensation described above shall constitute the University's total commitment until modified by the Regents or the President, as applicable under Regents policy, and shall supersede all previous oral and written commitments. Compensation recommendations and final actions will be released to the public as required in accordance with the standard procedures of the Board of Regents.

E. *Approval of Salary Increase for Julie Hooper as Vice Chancellor for University Development and Alumni Relations, Berkeley Campus as Discussed in Closed Session*

The Committee recommended approval of the following items in connection with a market-based salary adjustment for Julie Hooper as Vice Chancellor for University Development and Alumni Relations, Berkeley campus:

- (1) Per policy, a 19.7 percent (\$88,036) market-based salary adjustment increasing Ms. Hooper's base salary from \$446,964 to \$535,000 as Vice Chancellor for University Development and Alumni Relations, Berkeley campus, at 100 percent time.
- (2) Per policy, continuation of standard pension and health and welfare benefits and standard senior management benefits including eligibility for senior manager life insurance and, after five consecutive years of Senior Management Group service, continued eligibility for executive salary continuation for disability.

- (3) Per policy, continuation of eligibility to participate in the Senior Management Group Supplemental Benefit Program, subject to all applicable program requirements.
- (4) Per policy, continuation of eligibility to participate in the UC Employee Housing Assistance Program, subject to all applicable program requirements.
- (5) Ms. Hooper will continue to comply with the Senior Management Group Outside Professional Activities (OPA) policy and reporting requirements.
- (6) This action will be effective December 1, 2022.

The compensation described above shall constitute the University's total commitment until modified by the Regents or the President, as applicable under Regents policy, and shall supersede all previous oral and written commitments. Compensation recommendations and final actions will be released to the public as required in accordance with the standard procedures of the Board of Regents.

Upon motion of Chair Leib, duly seconded, the recommendations of the Governance Committee shown above were approved, Regents Anguiano, Batchlor, Blas Pedral, Chu, Cohen, Drake, Elliott, Hernandez, Kounalakis, Leib, Makarechian, Matosantos, Park, Pouchot, Reilly, Robinson, and Sherman voting "aye."

Report of the Health Services Committee

The Committee presented the following from its meeting of October 19, 2022:

A. ***Approval of Incentive Compensation Using Health System Operating Revenues for Carrie Byington, M.D. as Executive Vice President – UC Health, Office of the President as Discussed in Closed Session***

The Committee recommended approval of the Clinical Enterprise Management Recognition Plan (CEMRP) incentive award for Dr. Carrie Byington as Executive Vice President – UC Health, Office of the President, in the amount of \$308,635, which is comprised of a Short Term Incentive award of \$268,768 for the 2021–22 CEMRP plan year and a Long Term Incentive award of \$39,867 for the performance period of July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2022.

The incentive compensation described above shall constitute the University's total commitment regarding incentive compensation until modified by the Regents or the President, as applicable under Regents policy, and shall supersede all previous oral and written commitments. Compensation recommendations and final actions will be released to the public as required in accordance with the standard procedures of the Board of Regents.

B. ***Community Health Needs Assessments and Implementation Plans, UC Health***

The Committee recommended that the Regents approve the implementation strategy developed by each of the University of California hospitals to address the significant health needs identified in their respective Community Health Needs Assessments for the taxable year ending June 30, 2022.

C. ***Update from the Executive Vice President of UC Health***

This item was not summarized.

D. ***Employee Engagement, UC Health***

This item was not summarized.

E. ***Affiliations with Healthcare Organizations That Have Adopted Policy-Based Restrictions on Care: UC Faculty Physician Panel – Women’s Reproductive Health and Transgender Care at the Affiliated Hospitals, and UC Health Update on Implementation of Policies Governing Covered Affiliations***

This item was not summarized.

Upon motion of Regent Reilly, duly seconded, the recommendations of the Health Services Committee shown above were approved, Regents Anguiano, Batchlor, Blas Pedral, Chu, Drake, Elliott, Hernandez, Leib, Park, Pouchot, Reilly, Robinson, and Sherman voting “aye” and Regents Cohen, Kounalakis, Makarechian, and Matosantos abstaining.

Report of the Investments Committee

The Committee presented the following from its meeting of November 16, 2022:

Real Estate Investment Strategy Update

Regent Sherman reported that the Committee discussed government accounting standards and whether to classify investments as University assets or investment assets. The Committee concluded that investment merits would dictate how the Office of the Chief Investment Officer (CIO) acts, and that the Office of the CIO would coordinate with the Office of the Chief Financial Officer on the classification of these assets.

Report of the Public Engagement and Development Committee

The Committee presented the following from its meeting of November 16, 2022:

A. ***November 2022 Election: Outcomes and Insights for the Year Ahead***

Regent Reilly reported that political strategist and UC Berkeley instructor Dan Schnur spoke to the Committee about the State and federal elections results, ballot initiatives, and the potential impact of these elections on higher education.

B. *Safeguarding American Democracy: What To Do and How To Do It*

Regent Reilly reported that UCLA School of Law Professor Rick Hasen spoke about challenges to American democracy and the law school's new Safeguarding Democracy Project, whose goal was to ensure free and fair elections in the U.S.

C. *UC Systemwide 2022 Civic Engagement Efforts*

Regent Reilly reported that the Committee heard a presentation on efforts to increase systemwide voter registration and participation. In the 2020 election, 76 percent of UC students voted. The Committee also learned about the California Freedom Summer, which sent students to communities with low voter turnout to encourage civic participation among young voters.

Report of the Special Committee on Innovation Transfer and Entrepreneurship

The Special Committee presented the following from its meeting of October 28, 2022:

A. *Update on Patent Policy Revision*

This item was not summarized.

B. *Proposed Royalty Audit Identification Approach*

This item was not summarized.

C. *Status Update: Realignment of Legal and Policy Compliance for Equity and Licensing Contracts*

Regent Park reported that the Special Committee heard how campuses would use their increased flexibility to conduct legal review of equity and licensing deals.

D. *Speaker Series: UC Merced Professor Reza Ehsani – Agriculture Technology Innovation: Challenges and Opportunities*

Regent Park reported that, as part of the presentation on innovation in agricultural technology, the Special Committee learned that the Central Valley produced one quarter of the nation's food supply.

E. *How the University of California Can Help Create a Thriving Startup Ecosystem in the Central Valley*

Regent Park reported that recent alumni spoke to the Special Committee about creating a thriving startup ecosystem in the region.

8. **RESOLUTION IN APPRECIATION – MICHAEL BROWN**

Upon motion of Regent Park, the following resolution was adopted, Regents Anguiano, Batchlor, Blas Pedral, Chu, Cohen, Drake, Elliott, Hernandez, Kounalakis, Leib, Makarechian, Matosantos, Park, Reilly, Robinson, Sherman, and Timmons voting “aye.”

WHEREAS, the members of the Board of Regents wish to express their deep and abiding gratitude to Michael T. Brown as he prepares to step down from his role as Provost and Executive Vice President of Academic Affairs, and in recognition of his nearly three decades of dedicated and steadfast service to the University and to its many constituencies as a gifted professor of Counseling, Clinical and School Psychology in the Graduate School of Education at the Santa Barbara campus, as Dean of UC Santa Barbara Extension, as a dynamic leader of the systemwide Academic Senate, and as the University’s Provost and Executive Vice President since September 2017; and

WHEREAS, he served with distinction in many roles in the Senate, particularly as the Chair of the Academic Senate from 2007 to 2008 and Chair of its Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) from 2005 to 2006, when he led the development of significant reforms to admissions policy to create more equitable opportunity for all Californians; and

WHEREAS, as Provost and in collaboration with the Regents, the Academic Senate, and President Napolitano, he led an historic change to UC admissions policy, discontinuing the use of standardized tests for admissions, a policy that has had nationwide influence; and

WHEREAS, he has ardently championed diversity at UC, spearheading UC’s 2030 goals with a particular focus on closing equity gaps and growing and diversifying the professoriate and the graduate student body to advance inclusive excellence, reflecting his career-long commitment to understanding the cultural variables underlying the career and educational choices of racial and ethnic minorities and women; and

WHEREAS, hallmarks of his tenure have been effectively coordinating critical elements of the UC academic community’s response to the COVID-19 global pandemic, including the rapid transition to remote instruction, and his advocacy for the University’s Native American repatriation efforts, including shepherding UC’s new cultural affiliation and repatriation policy and systems of accountability;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Regents of the University of California express to Michael T. Brown their warmest appreciation for his service to the University and to the State;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Regents will greatly miss the joy and enthusiasm that he brought to every endeavor, fondly wish Michael the greatest happiness

as he begins a new chapter in his life, and direct that a suitably inscribed copy of this resolution be presented to him with their admiration and affectionate best wishes.

Regent Park paid tribute to Provost Brown's talents and contributions to the University with words beginning with each letter of the alphabet.

9. **REPORT OF MATERIALS MAILED BETWEEN MEETINGS**

Interim Secretary and Chief of Staff Lyall reported that, on the dates indicated, the following were sent to the Regents or to Committees:

To the Regents of the University of California:

- A. From the President of the University, a notice of University of California Retirement System Compliance Amendments. September 16, 2022.
- B. From the Chair of the Board, a statement regarding the recent adoption of amendments to bylaws by student groups at UC Berkeley School of Law that exclude Zionist speakers and supporters of Israel from speaking to said groups. October 12, 2022.
- C. From the Chair of the Board, the 2022-23 membership of the Special Committee on Innovation Transfer and Entrepreneurship. October 15, 2022.
- D. From the Executive Vice President of UC Health, information on respiratory viruses in children and current reports on the impact the rise of both influenza and RSV infections have had on UC children's hospitals. October 25, 2022.
- E. From the President of the University, the Annual Report on Regents Policy 3501: Policy on Student-Athletes. October 26, 2022
- F. From Associate Vice President, External Relations and Communications, Federal Update, 2022, Issue 9. October 27, 2022.

To the Members of the Health Services Committee:

- G. From the Executive Vice President of UC Health, the 2021-22 Annual Report of the UC Global Health Institute. October 13, 2022.

The meeting adjourned at 1:15 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff

Attachment 1: Proposed Amendments to Regents Policy 3105: Regents Policy on Residency and Payment or Waiver of Tuition, Non-Resident Supplemental Tuition and Mandatory Systemwide Fees

*Additions shown by underline; deletions shown by ~~striketrough~~.

Regents Policy 3105: Regents Policy on Residency and Payment or Waiver of Tuition, Non-Resident Supplemental Tuition and Mandatory Systemwide Fees

POLICY SUMMARY/BACKGROUND

As a state-supported institution, the University of California confers on California students the benefit of attending the University at lower cost than students who attend from outside the state. Students classified as California residents are not charged Nonresident Supplemental Tuition (NRST). For most students, determining whether they qualify as a California resident is very straightforward. For a minority of students, the determination requires close examination. State law and University policy authorize some students to be considered California residents based on social policy considerations consistent with the mission of the University even if they don't meet the standard criteria for determining residency. This policy identifies the criteria for being classified as a California Resident (either by meeting standard Residency Requirements or special circumstances residency requirements) or for being classified as otherwise eligible for waiver of NRST. Further details are provided in Residence Policy Guidelines (Guidelines), maintained by the Office of the President (with the assistance of the Office of General Counsel) to facilitate implementation of this policy. Terms that are capitalized in this policy are defined in the Guidelines. This policy is informed by both the California Education Code and financial aid standards issued by the U.S. Department of Education. In light of the combined effect of a Student's Residency Classification and financial aid eligibility on the cost to attend UC and resources available to support attendance, wherever possible, this policy seeks to maximize consistency between University financial aid determinations and Residency Classifications to improve transparency for Students. All references to the California Education Code are for informational purposes only.

POLICY TEXT

- A. **Principles Governing Residency Determinations:** A Student's Classification for purposes of the Student's responsibility for payment of Nonresident Supplemental Tuition ("NRST") as either Resident, Non-Resident or NRST Exempt ("Residency Classification") shall be made based on information provided by the Student before initial Enrollment, upon re-Enrollment, or as may otherwise be required. Each Residency

Classification shall be made by authorized University employees on the basis of this Policy and the implementing Guidelines adopted by the President pursuant to this Policy. Consistent with Regents Policy on Admissions Decisions, Residency Classifications shall not be motivated by development considerations or financial, political or other such benefit to the University. The Board recognizes that correspondence or inquiries received from individual Regents or from elected officials may be appropriate, but efforts to inappropriately influence the outcome of individual residency classifications are not.

- B. The burden is on each Student to demonstrate eligibility for classification as a resident or as NRST Exempt. A Student initially classified as a nonresident will retain that status unless and until the Student is deemed eligible for Resident Classification or an NRST Exempt Classification in a subsequent quarter or semester. A Student initially classified as a Resident who becomes a Non-Resident by virtue of acts of the Student or a Qualifying Individual is required to notify the Student's campus registrar immediately.
- C. The University may request that information submitted by a Student or a Qualifying Individual to support a Resident Classification or NRST Exempt Classification be sworn under penalty of perjury. The University may reconsider a Resident Classification or NRST Exempt Classification upon good cause. Where a Resident Classification or NRST Exempt Classification is found to have been based on inaccurate or incomplete information, the University may:
 - 1. bill the Student for NRST for periods of previous Enrollment in which NRST was not charged;
 - 2. hold a Student's registration until full payment of amounts due has been received;
 - ~~3. hold release of Student records until full payment of amounts due has been received;~~
 - 4. 3. notify appropriate regulatory agencies;
 - ~~5.~~ 4. initiate discipline under the Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline ("PACAOS100");
 - ~~6.~~ 5. impose an administrative penalty no greater than the amount of NRST for each affected quarter or semester where a Student, Parent, or Qualifying Individual intentionally misrepresented or withheld relevant information, and/or
 - ~~7.~~ 6. pursue any civil, criminal or other remedies that may be appropriate under the circumstances.

I. Residency Classifications and Tuition Policy

- A. Each Student shall be charged Nonresident Student Tuition except as provided in this policy. A Student shall not be subject to payment of NRST if the Student and ~~one~~ Parents (or other Qualifying Individual, as applicable):
1. satisfy the Residency Requirements identified in Section B below; or
 2. demonstrate(s) at least one of the special circumstances warranting a Resident Classification identified in Section D below; or
 3. otherwise demonstrate(s) eligibility for exemption from payment of NRST as identified in Section E below.
- B. Residency Requirements. A Resident Classification at the University of California shall be granted where the Student and ~~one~~ Parents, or other Qualifying Individual as applicable, demonstrate that they have established a primary and permanent home in California by providing evidence that they satisfy the following Residency Requirements:
1. Physical Presence: Except as otherwise provided in the Guidelines, ~~C~~ continuous physical presence in California for more than one year immediately before the Residence Determination Date, as further defined and explained in the Guidelines. Physical presence in California solely for educational purposes does not constitute the establishment of California residence, regardless of length of stay. The impact of absences from California on a Student's Residency Classification shall be addressed in the Guidelines.
 2. Intent: Except as otherwise provided in the Guidelines, intent for more than one year immediately before the Residence Determination Date to make a primary and permanent home in California, as demonstrated by indicia of intent identified in the Guidelines.
 3. Evidence to demonstrate satisfaction of Residency Requirements for Students (and, where relevant, Parents or other Qualifying Individuals) who are not U.S. citizens or permanent residents are addressed in the Guidelines.
- C. Who Must Satisfy Residency Requirements:
1. Student and Parents (or Qualifying Individual): Except as provided in Subsection 2, undergraduates who will not reach the age of 24 by December 31 of the academic year for which Resident Classification is sought must demonstrate that the Student and ~~a~~Parents (or other Qualifying Individual as applicable) satisfy the Residency Requirements.

2. Student Alone: The following Students may demonstrate satisfaction of the Residency Requirements on their own without regard to information about a Parent or other Qualifying Individual:
 - a. Graduate Students, regardless of their age;
 - b. Undergraduates who have reached the age of 24 by December 31 of the academic year for which Resident Classification is sought;
 - c. Undergraduates who are married as of the Residence Determination Date, regardless of their age;
 - d. Undergraduates who otherwise meet the independence standard for purposes of eligibility for federal financial aid; and
 - e. Undergraduates who demonstrate that they have been Self-Supporting for at least one year before the Residence Determination Date according to criteria set forth in the Guidelines.
- D. Special circumstances resident classification: A Resident Classification (or Contingent or Limited Duration Resident Classification, as specified below) at the University of California shall be granted where a Student demonstrates any of the following Special Circumstances:
1. Student Member of the U.S. Armed Forces: A Student who is a member of the U.S. Armed Forces stationed in California ~~on active duty~~, except if assigned for educational purposes, is eligible for a Contingent Resident Classification. Such a Student may retain a Contingent Resident Classification if the Student is transferred outside of California pursuant to military orders, so long as the Student remains continuously enrolled at a California public post-secondary institution. See section 68075.
 2. Student Dependent of Member of the U.S. Armed Forces: A Student who is a dependent of a member of the U.S. Armed Forces stationed in California ~~on active duty~~ is eligible for a Contingent Resident Classification. Such a Student may retain a Contingent Resident Classification if the member of the armed forces is transferred outside of California pursuant to military orders, or retires from the armed forces, so long as the Student remains continuously enrolled at a California public post-secondary institution. See section 68074.
 3. Ward of the Court: A Student who resides in California and who is currently a dependent or ward of the state through California's child welfare system, or was a dependent or ward of the state and is no longer being served either due to emancipation or aging out of the California child welfare system, is eligible for a Resident Classification. See section 68085.

4. **Non-Resident Dependent of a California Resident:** A Student who does not satisfy the Residency Requirements but who has a Parent who both satisfies the Residency Requirements and either claimed the Student as a tax dependent or continually contributed court-ordered child support for the Student during the one year immediately before the Residence Determination Date shall be eligible for a limited duration Resident Classification for one academic year. Such a Student may thereafter be eligible to receive a Resident Classification if the Parent continues to satisfy the Residency Requirements and the Student demonstrates timely satisfaction of the Residency Requirements. See section 68076.
5. **Student Under Care of An Adult Qualifying Individual Other than a Parent:** An undergraduate Student who was under the continuous direct care and control of an adult Qualifying Individual other than a Parent for at least two years before reaching the age of 19 is eligible for a Resident Classification when both the Student and Qualifying Individual(s) demonstrate that they met the Residency Requirements for more than one year immediately before the Residence Determination Date. See section 68073.
6. **California Public School Teacher:** A Student who is employed by a California school district in a full-time position requiring certification qualifications shall be eligible for a contingent Resident Classification while completing course work to meet credential requirements according to the additional conditions set forth in the Guidelines. See section 68078.
7. **Graduate of Bureau of Indian Affairs School:** A Student who is a graduate of a school located in California run by the United States Bureau of Indian Affairs is eligible for a Resident Classification. See section 68082.
8. **Amateur Student Athlete Training at a U.S. Olympic Training Center:** A Student who is an amateur student athlete training at a U.S. Olympic Training Center in California is eligible for a limited duration Resident Classification for one academic year. Such a Student may thereafter be eligible to receive a Resident Classification if the Student demonstrates timely satisfaction of the Residency Requirements. See section 68083.
9. **Refugees/Victims of Trafficking, Domestic Violence or Other Crimes:** A Student who has been classified as a refugee, as specified in the Guidelines, or who holds a visa provided for victims of trafficking, domestic violence or other serious crimes (any “T” or “U” visa) is eligible for a limited duration Resident Classification for one academic year. Such a Student may thereafter be eligible to receive a Resident Classification if the Student demonstrates timely satisfaction of the Residency Requirements.

10. University/Laboratory LLC Employees: An individual assigned to work outside the state of California who is a full-time employee of either the University ~~assigned to work outside the state of California~~ or ~~a full-time employee of an LLC~~ holding a contract to manage a university laboratory, as well as the dependent spouse, registered domestic partner or Child of such an individual, shall be eligible for a contingent Resident Classification. The Contingent Resident Classification shall expire at the end of any quarter or semester in which the Qualifying Individual no longer has an employment relationship that qualifies the Student for this contingent Resident Classification.
 11. Dependent of Member of Academic Senate: A Student who is the spouse or registered domestic partner or unmarried dependent Child of a member of the University faculty who is a member of the Academic Senate shall be eligible for a Resident Classification. See section 68078.
- E. Students Exempt from Payment of NRST (“NRST Exempt”): A Student who does not qualify for a Resident Classification under Section B or D above may nonetheless be eligible for exemption from payment of NRST under the following circumstances:
1. “AB 540”: A Student who qualifies under the provisions of section 68130.5 of the California Education Code (commonly known as AB 540) is eligible for an NRST Exempt Classification.
 2. Student Discharged from U.S. Armed Forces: Subject to limitations set forth in the Guidelines, a Student who was a member of the U.S. Armed Forces stationed in California ~~on active duty~~ for more than one year immediately prior to being discharged is eligible for NRST Exempt Classification for one academic year so long as the Student files an affidavit stating the Student’s intent to establish California residence at the time the Student seeks the NRST Exempt Classification. The one year NRST Exemption must be used within two years of being discharged. Such a Student may thereafter be eligible to receive a Resident Classification if the Student demonstrates timely satisfaction of the Residency Requirements. See Education Code section 68075.5.
 3. Federal Law Addressing Veteran or Foreign Service Higher Education Access: A Student who meets the definition of “covered individual” in section 702 of the U.S. Veterans Access, Choice and Accountability Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-146; 38 U.S.C. §3679(c)) or the eligibility requirements of the U.S. Higher Education Opportunity Act (20 U.S.C. §1015d) (or any other federal law addressed in the Guidelines regarding access to higher education for veterans of the U.S. Armed Forces) is eligible for an NRST Exempt Classification, including, effective July 1, 2023, a Student who is a member (or spouse or dependent Child of a member) of the Foreign Service who would otherwise not meet the eligibility

requirements of the U.S. Higher Education Opportunity Act (20 U.S.C. §1015d) until July 1, 2024.

II. Tuition / Mandatory Systemwide Fee Policy

Each Student shall be charged Tuition and other Mandatory Systemwide Fees except where they demonstrate any of the following circumstances, subject to further details in the Guidelines:

1. Recipient of Congressional Medal of Honor: A Student who has a Resident Classification and received or is the Child of someone who received the Congressional Medal of Honor and satisfies all requirements set forth in the Guidelines is eligible for exemption from payment of Tuition and Mandatory Systemwide Fees. See section 66025.3.
2. Student Dependent of Deceased or Disabled Veteran/CA National Guard: A Student who has a Resident Classification and who is the Child or dependent or surviving spouse or registered domestic partner (who has not subsequently married or registered as a domestic partner) of a deceased or disabled veteran or member of the California National Guard who was killed or permanently disabled while in active service of the United States Military or California National Guard, shall be exempt from payment of Tuition and Mandatory Systemwide Fees so long as the Student satisfies all requirements set forth in the Guidelines. See section 66025.3.
3. Student Survivor of Law Enforcement or Fire Suppression Personnel: An undergraduate Student who is the surviving spouse or registered domestic partner or Child of a California resident whose principal duties consisted of active law enforcement service or active fire suppression and prevention and who was killed on active duty shall be exempted from Tuition and Mandatory Systemwide Fees. See section 68120.
4. Student Survivor of Healthcare Workers or First Responders Deceased Due to COVID-19: Student who is a surviving spouse or surviving child of certain healthcare workers and first responders who died from COVID-19 shall be exempted from Tuition and Mandatory Systemwide Fees. See section 68120.3.

COMPLIANCE/DELEGATION

The President or designee, in consultation with the General Counsel, or designee, is authorized to adopt and amend implementing Guidelines consistent with this policy. The President or designee may delegate responsibility for applying and implementing this policy.

NO RIGHT OF ACTION

This policy is not intended to, and does not, create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or in equity by any party against the University of California or its Board of Regents, individual Regents, officers, employees, or agents.

University of California
2023-24 Budget Plan for Current Operations

(dollars in millions)

Attachment 2

2022-23 CORE FUNDS FOR CURRENT OPERATIONS

Total Core Funds (State General Funds, Student Tuition and Fees, and UC General Funds) **\$ 10,567.3**

PROPOSED CHANGES IN EXPENDITURES

Sustaining Core Operations

Faculty compensation: policy-covered	\$ 97.4
Faculty merit program	\$ 37.1
Staff compensation: policy-covered	\$ 69.0
Contractually committed compensation	\$ 37.0
Retirement contributions	\$ 72.7
Employee health benefits	\$ 24.3
Retiree health benefits	\$ 6.8
Non-salary price increases	\$ 55.4
Debt service for AB 94 capital projects	\$ 6.0
Subtotal	\$ 405.7

Enrollment Growth

Compact: 2,000 CA undergrad, 625 grad*	\$ 55.5
Subtotal	\$ 55.5

Student Financial Aid

New enrollment (2,000 undergrad, 625 grad)	\$ 16.1
Add'l 900 aid-eligible undergrads (NR swap)	\$ 4.0
Tuition/Fee/NRST Adjustments	\$ 58.2
Subtotal	\$ 78.3

Additional High-Priority Investments

DDS-ASPIRE	\$ 1.8
------------	--------

EXPENDITURES TOTAL \$ 541.3

PROPOSED CHANGES IN REVENUE / RESOURCES

Alternative Revenue Sources

Procurement savings	\$ 13.8
Asset management	\$ 30.0
Nonresident enrollment growth (560), net	\$ 10.8
Subtotal	\$ 54.7

State General Funds

5% Base Budget Adjustment	\$ 218.3
Convert 900 nonresident to resident slots	
Offset lost nonresident tuition revenue	\$ 27.9
Aid for add'l 900 eligible undergrads	\$ 4.0
DDS-ASPIRE	\$ 1.8
Subtotal	\$ 252.0

Tuition and Fees

For campus operations

Enrollment growth (net of aid)	\$ 32.0
Nonresident tuition reduction from swap	\$ (27.9)
Tuition/Fee Adjustment (net of aid)	\$ 61.4
Nonresident tuition adjustment (net of aid)	\$ 26.9

For student financial aid

From enrollment growth	\$ 16.1
From Tuition/Fee/NRST adjustments	\$ 58.2
Subtotal	\$ 166.7

REVENUE / RESOURCES TOTAL \$ 473.4

Add'l cost savings/revenues required \$ 67.9

ADDITIONAL REQUEST FOR ONE-TIME STATE FUNDS

Capital Support for Facilities Renewal, Enrollment Growth, and Clean Energy Projects \$ 1,200.0

Figures may not sum to totals due to rounding.

* Does not include additional CA undergraduate growth beyond the level in the Compact, which would be funded from the University's 2022-23 State appropriation together with students' tuition and fees.

Additions shown by underscoring; deletions shown by strikethrough

Regents Policy 7102 – Policy on Appointment of Chancellors

Approved May 15, 1981

Amended January 2008, June 26, 2018, and July 30, 2020*

POLICY SUMMARY/BACKGROUND

The Policy on Appointment of Chancellors facilitates the selection of candidates for Chancellorships by outlining the selection process for search advisory committee membership and the roles and responsibilities of the committee members.

POLICY TEXT

1. The President of the University will ensure that the University has a continuous robust process for identifying promising candidates. This process is included as an important complement to the systematic nationwide search which will be undertaken each time a vacancy occurs.
2. When a vacancy occurs or is imminent, the Board and the President each has a role in the appointment of a new chancellor. A search advisory committee will be formed to advise the appointment. The Committee will consist of:
 - The President of the University, who will serve ex-officio;
 - The Chair of the Board, who will serve ex-officio;
 - Five Regents appointed by the Chair of the Board;
 - Five faculty members appointed by the President of the University;
 - one shall be either the Chair or Vice Chair of the Academic Council;
 - one shall be a faculty member from a campus other than the one that is the subject of the search, chosen from a panel of no less than three nominees submitted by the Academic Senate's Universitywide Committee on Committees; and
 - three shall be campus faculty members chosen from a panel of no less than six nominees submitted by the campus Academic Senate Committee on Committees.

- A graduate and an undergraduate student appointed by the respective graduate and undergraduate student associations of the campus;
 - An alumni representative appointed by the alumni association of the campus;
 - A Foundation representative chosen by the President from a panel of no less than three names submitted by the Campus Foundation; and
 - A staff employee representative of the campus chosen by the President from a panel of no less than three names submitted by the Campus Staff Assembly.
3. The President of the University will meet with the Regent members of the Committee prior to the retention of the search firm and appointment of other members of the Committee to discuss the search process. The President will convene the Committee and ensure that the Committee has a strong balance of skills, background, and experience, and represents the diversity of the University community.
 4. The Committee shall solicit the opinions of a wide variety of groups in the search for candidates. The Committee shall invite faculty and other university stakeholders to submit any number of promising candidates to the Committee for consideration. The Committee will evaluate these nominations and may consider or suggest other names. It shall interview candidates.
 5. The Committee shall be mindful of the University's firm commitment to diversity in the employment of women and minorities in seeking out the most qualified candidates.
 6. After the Committee has completed its process, the President shall meet and discuss the Committee's recommended list of finalists for the position ~~candidates~~ with the Regent members of the Committee. Throughout the negotiation process with the finalists, the President shall regularly update the Chair and, with the help of the Chair, update the Regent members of the Committee. Once the President has selected a final candidate to bring to the Board for approval, the President shall meet with ~~and then propose a candidate for approval by the Regent members of the Committee~~ to inform them of the candidate, prior to making the recommendation to the Board of Regents for consideration and approval. The President shall notify all non-Regent members of the Committee of the recommendation at an appropriate time.

NO RIGHT OF ACTION

This policy is not intended to, and does not, create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or in equity by any party against the University of California or its Board of Regents, individual Regents, officers, employees, or agents.

**Technical Amendments made by the Secretary and Chief of Staff to the Regents per Policy 1000*