The Regents of the University of California

COMPLIANCE AND AUDIT COMMITTEE
January 22, 2025

The Compliance and Audit Committee 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, Beharry, Cohen, Elliott, Leib, and Park; Ex officio member Reilly; Advisory member Cheung; Chancellors Hawgood, Larive, and Yang; Staff Advisor Frías

In attendance: Regents Drake, Hernandez, Pack, Salazar, and Sarris, Regents-designate Brooks, Komoto, and Wang, Faculty Representative Palazoglu, Secretary and Chief of Staff Lyall, General Counsel Robinson, Chief Compliance and Audit Officer Bustamante, Provost Newman, Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer Brostrom, Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer Nava, Senior Vice President Turner, Vice President Kao, Chancellors Frenk and Wilcox, and Recording Secretary Johns

The meeting convened at 5:15 p.m. with Committee Vice Chair Elliott presiding.

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

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of November 13, 2024 were approved, Regents Anguiano, Batchlor, Beharry, Cohen, Elliott, Park, and Reilly voting "aye."[1]

2.   **UPDATE ON THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA 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.]

Systemwide Director of Community Safety Jody Stiger commented that since the inception of the Community Safety Plan in 2021, the UC community has wholeheartedly embraced the Plan, and there has been substantial progress. Six UC campuses have achieved accreditation from the International Association of Campus Law Enforcement Administrators. The accreditation process involved meeting 227 rigorous standards that reflect best practices in campus public safety, ensuring that UC police departments operate at the highest professional levels. Each campus was also supported by operational police accountability boards. These independent bodies, composed of students, faculty, and staff

---

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

play a critical role in reviewing complaints of alleged misconduct by sworn UC police officers, ensuring accountability and transparency.

The University was proud to support the 30×30 Initiative, a program dedicated to increasing the representation of women in law enforcement to at least 30 percent by the year 2030. Through this effort, agencies were working to ensure fair policies, open opportunities for hiring and career growth, and a workplace where everyone feels respected and supported. All campuses have pledged their support for this important goal.

This summer, the Office of Systemwide Community Safety, in partnership with Risk Services, conducted tabletop exercises for all ten campuses. These exercises addressed important issues related to leadership's response to expressive activities on campus and the expectations of the Regents and State legislators. In October 2024, the Office also provided training on the laws of arrest for the police accountability boards, with additional training planned for spring 2025. The Office commissioned an independent analysis of the vehicles, uniforms, and equipment recommendations of UC police departments. This analysis, conducted by Nolan Milani, a graduate student at the Goldman School of Public Policy, UC Berkeley, with guidance from the Strategy and Program Management Office at the Office of the President, confirmed that a one-size-fits-all approach did not effectively address the diverse needs of the campuses and medical centers. While the campuses generally prefer a reduced police presence, the medical centers have expressed the need for more visible uniformed presence. This insight would guide UC in tailoring its safety measures to meet the unique needs of each location. The Office was also making strides toward automating data collection to provide daily updates on key safety metrics, with completion expected by fall 2025. This would enable UC to monitor trends in real time and respond more effectively to safety concerns. Mr. Stiger recalled the work of 21st Century Policing Solutions (21CP), which was commissioned to investigate incidents of violence on the UCLA campus during the past spring. President Drake has asked the chancellors to implement 12 key recommendations from the 21CP report. Although most of the recommendations were specific to UCLA, Mr. Stiger and his colleagues believed that those selected for systemwide implementation would strengthen UC's community safety measures and were in harmony with existing systemwide guidance.

UCSF Senior Vice Chancellor Erin Gore described UCSF's integrated Community Safety Plan, which covered both the medical center and the academic campus. UCSF had ten hospital facilities across the Bay Area with about 2.7 million square feet and just over 100 health safety ambassadors. UCSF had a separate public safety ambassador classification for the campus, but these safety ambassadors can be moved to medical center or hospital facilities if needed. UCSF's new acquisitions of Saint Francis Hospital and St. Mary's Hospital were being integrated into this plan and had a smaller safety force. UCSF police covered all these facilities with just under 30 officers. From December 2023 to December 2024, UCSF police responded to about 47,500 incidents at medical and campus facilities. Health safety ambassadors, not including Saint Francis Hospital and St. Mary's Hospital, responded to 31,586 incidents during this period, almost as many as the police. UCSF facilities experience a wide variety of incidents. In the spirit of its Community Safety Plan,

UCSF always calls on its uniformed officers as a last resort and carries out de-escalation procedures whenever possible.

Director of Student Mental Health and Well-Being Genie Kim shared an update regarding progress toward developing and implementing mobile crisis response strategies on UC campuses. Mobile crisis response refers to campus-based approaches to providing immediate assistance to individuals experiencing behavioral health crises on campus. These approaches enabled trained and licensed mental health staff to respond to crises, conduct behavioral wellness checks, and offer on-site crisis intervention. Mental health staff also provided consultation, training, and outreach support to community safety staff. Developing mobile crisis response teams and programs was a new operational area for many of the campuses. Currently, seven campus locations provided practitioners to staff their mobile crisis response teams, and one campus contracted with a local nonprofit agency to provide these services. In addition, two campuses worked closely with their local community safety offices and county mobile crisis response teams to provide this support. Overall, the greatest challenges campuses faced in developing their mobile crisis response strategies were recruitment and retention of staff. One strategy that UC has developed to help campuses with this effort was the development of a new position description. In collaboration with UC Human Resources, Ms. Kim's office helped define the crisis intervention specialist position based on industry standards, including job scope, licenses, and skills necessary to perform these critical job functions on UC campuses. Developing and implementing this job description would enable campuses to hire more easily and provide consistency across the UC system. As campuses continued to develop and implement these programs, feedback indicated that these programs have been invaluable and have enabled campuses to respond and provide support to the campus community during times of crisis.

Regent Reilly asked about the work of the police accountability boards. According to background information provided, each campus had a police accountability board. During the public comment period earlier that day, a speaker stated that these boards were not active, at least on a few of the campuses. Regent Reilly asked how the boards were working, if they were effective, and if there was enough information available for the public to be able to access these boards and to lodge a complaint if necessary. Mr. Stiger responded that each campus had a website where anyone could lodge a complaint against a police officer. He noted that some of the police accountability boards only meet if they have an investigation to discuss. Currently, he had only been informed of eight formal complaints systemwide, fewer than one per campus. This might be a reason why some of the police accountability boards had not been meeting frequently. He had met with all the boards, and his office had provided and would continue to provide training for them.

Regent Reilly asked if Mr. Stiger felt that the boards were functioning well. Mr. Stiger responded in the affirmative. Because these boards were new, and in the absence of complaints, some boards were not sure what they should be doing. Mr. Stiger and his office informed them that they should engage with students and the community.

Regent Reilly asked how complaints are resolved when they are brought to one of these boards. Mr. Stiger responded that once a person makes a complaint against a police officer, it is forwarded directly to the police accountability board, which sends it to UC Davis, which performs an independent third-party investigation. The results of the investigation are communicated to the police accountability board, and the board makes recommendations to the Chief of Police, who makes the final disciplinary decision. If the police accountability board does not agree with the Chief of Police, it can take the matter to the Chancellor, who would have the final say.

Regent-designate Wang suggested that it might be helpful for the Regents to review these websites as well. The speaker who voiced concerns during the public comment period appeared to have reviewed this matter carefully. This was a very important element of building trust in the community; communication, clarity, and transparency were essential. It would be good for the Regents to know how individuals are chosen to serve on the police accountability boards and how this is communicated to the public. Regent-designate Wang stressed that alumni are part of the UC community and should be involved in these programs when possible. With regard to student mental health, she asked if there were initiatives across campuses to support and track behavioral health needs before crisis intervention becomes necessary, or forms of pre-crisis intervention. Ms. Kim responded that all the campuses have received State funding to provide prevention, early intervention, and treatment and recovery services for students. In the area of prevention, campuses have health education promotion offices that engage in proactive education outreach and suicide prevention resourcing, and many campuses provide mental health screening for students. Recently, the University partnered with the California Department of Health Care Services, which has invested in a behavioral health software program (app) called Soluna, which is free for individuals aged 13 to 25 and available to the campuses. The app provides early intervention and preventative coaching before the point of crisis. Students are able to work with a behavioral health coach who is trained to support students within the app environment.

Regent-designate Wang asked about the upper limit of age 25 for this service. Ms. Kim responded that this was a matter of State statute.

Regent-designate Brooks commented that it was difficult to find information about the police accountability boards, such as a website. There could be improved communication with the campuses. Undergraduate and graduate students were supposed to be involved in these boards. She advised that there should be information available about the membership of the boards, when they meet, whether meetings are open or closed and, if there is a recruitment effort for students to serve and an application process, this should be made known. Mr. Stiger responded that, per the Community Safety Plan, his office receives a progress report from the campuses every six months. Beginning this year, his office would assess situations on campus, and this would include auditing. Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer Nava added that, based on feedback at this meeting, UC would work with all responsible campus officers or administrators to make sure that there is communication with the community about the boards, their work, and the application process for board membership.

Regent-designate Brooks related that third-party agencies who came to UCLA for a campus climate initiative represented communities that have not been the kindest to marginalized populations. She asked if there was a vetting process or criteria for the choice of third-party advisors or agencies who work with the campuses on campus climate. Ms. Nava responded that the effort at UCLA was under the direction of the Office of the Provost. The University has standard processes to assess vendors and to evaluate the effectiveness and the appropriateness of their service in UC communities and was open to feedback.

Regent Beharry drew attention to the work of a UCLA student organization, Survivors + Allies, which included research on student concerns. This work had been cited by California State Assemblymember Mike Fong and had contributed to the implementation of Senate Bill 1491, the Equity in Higher Education Act. Survivors + Allies would be carrying out research again this year to update their findings, and it would be desirable for this organization to receive accurate data from the University. Police accountability boards and other UC advisory boards play an important role in mitigating difficult situations on campus. Regent Beharry stressed that the advisory boards must have a serious focus and in fact provide a forum for students to present information and their perspectives. Mr. Stiger responded that at one campus, the police accountability board and another committee were doing the same work. The campus had reviewed its bylaws and clarified the roles of each group.

3. **PLAN FOR EXTERNAL AUDIT REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL**

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

    Associate Vice President and Systemwide Controller Barbara Cevallos recalled that PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC) has been serving as the Regents' external auditor since 2015. The University conducts a competitive selection proposal or bid process every decade or so for its external auditor. The Office of the President (UCOP) would now proceed to bid with a Request for Proposal process, and she anticipated that UCOP would present a recommendation for an external audit firm to the Regents in September.

The meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff