

The Regents of the University of California

PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

November 13, 2019

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

Members present: Regents Blum, Guber, Lansing, Leib, Ortiz Oakley, Pérez, Reilly, Sherman, Simmons, and Zettel; Advisory members Gauvain, Mart, Muwwakkil, and Stegura; Chancellors Block, May, and Wilcox, Interim Chancellor Brostrom; Staff Advisor Jeffrey

In attendance: Assistant Secretary Lyall, Managing Counsel Shanle, Provost Brown, Executive Vice President Byington, Senior Vice President Holmes, Vice President Brown, Interim Vice President Gullatt, Chancellor Christ, and Recording Secretary Li

The meeting convened at 1:45 p.m. with Committee Chair Leib presiding.

Committee Chair Leib began the meeting by announcing upcoming Committee meetings at UC Merced and in the Inland Empire region. He called on those present to contact him or Regent Simmons with suggestions for future Committee meeting locations.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meetings of September 17, 2019 and September 18, 2019 were approved.

2. ENDORSEMENT OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND MEASURE ON THE MARCH 2020 BALLOT

The President of the University recommended that the Board endorse Assembly Bill 48, the Public Preschool, K-12, and College Health and Safety Bond Act of 2020.

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

Senior Vice President Holmes explained that Assembly Bill (AB) 48 was signed by Governor Newsom and would appear on the ballot as Proposition 13 in March 2020. If passed, it would allocate \$2 billion to UC, which would assist campuses with deferred maintenance, seismic retrofit, and enrollment growth. In addition, \$9 billion would be allocated to preschool and K-12 schools, \$2 billion to the California Community Colleges, and \$2 billion to the California State University. Though the Regents informally supported AB 48, the Committee must consider whether to formally endorse it per Regents Policy:

8301 Policy on Higher Education Bond Measure Information and Advocacy Implementation Plan.

Upon motion duly made and second, the Committee approved the President's recommendation and voted to present to the Board.

3. **FEDERAL GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS UPDATE**

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

Associate Vice President Chris Harrington provided an update regarding the public engagement and advocacy that UC has undertaken in support of *Regents of the University of California v. the United States Department of Homeland Security* (the DACA case). The University's communications aligned with the arguments of the case and educated the public about UC's services for its undocumented students, staff, and alumni. On the day the case was before the U.S. Supreme Court (SCOTUS), there was a vibrant gathering of UC students, staff, alumni, and allies outside the courthouse. UC community members were supplied with UC-branded signs, t-shirts, and pins. The butterfly logo on these materials was designed by an Office of the President (UCOP) employee who was also a Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) recipient and UC alumnus. Congress must enact legislation to protect DACA recipients regardless of what SCOTUS decides. In support of the DACA case, UC launched a new website, released a video that had been viewed over 55,000 times, and conducted congressional and student briefings. More than 13,000 in the UC Advocacy Network signed a pledge in support of DACA. A chalkboard campaign allowed advocates to show their support of undocumented students online. This campaign served as a reminder of how UC provides leadership to the state and country.

Mr. Harrington provided an update on the federal appropriations process. Last summer, Congress agreed to increase spending and end the sequester but could not agree on spending levels for appropriations bills, so a continuing resolution would fund the federal government until November 21, 2019. Congress was likely to pass another continuing resolution to fund the government until December 20, 2019 rather than pass new legislation. The Trump Administration would also need to support any potential legislation.

A rewrite of the Higher Education Act (HEA) would not be completed by the end of 2019 as predicted. Smaller Senate bills, such as one that would raise the minimum Pell Grant by \$20 and another that would simplify the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) have been introduced. The House Education and Labor Committee voted on a bill that would raise the Pell Grant by \$625, index it to inflation, and create a partnership that would provide federal higher education funding in states where community college tuition was free. The House Education and Labor Committee was open to working with UC on amendments to the bill, and UC remained engaged with House and Senate leaders.

Regent-designate Stegura asked whether the chalkboard campaign had ended. Mr. Harrington responded that the campaign was still ongoing.

Interim Chancellor Brostrom noted that the U.S. President's budget would severely cut federal work-study. UC Merced received one-tenth of what it needed in federal work-study funding and hoped to see an increase. Mr. Harrington responded that Federal Governmental Relations (FGR) was strongly advocating for federal work-study and a few other programs.

Regent Ortiz Oakley asked whether SCOTUS was expected to make a decision on the DACA case by June 2020. Mr. Harrington replied that SCOTUS tended to release decisions at the end of the term, which was in June, but could decide as early as when it goes into conference. Regent Ortiz Oakley asked, if SCOTUS ruled against UC, how much time there was before the decision would affect DACA students. Mr. Harrington stated that students who were considering their futures were already affected. He clarified that DACA students, faculty, and staff would be affected, and UC was reminding them to keep their DACA renewal up-to-date. Managing Counsel Shanle added that the President's Executive Office was working on strategies based on all conceivable outcomes. Regent Ortiz Oakley underscored the importance of those strategies in the event of an unfavorable decision. Mr. Harrington added that the President had a working group on this issue.

Regent Simmons asked how the new legislation on National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) athletes would affect UC. Ms. Holmes replied that Associate Vice President Kieran Flaherty would review this in the following presentation.

Regent Zettel how the differences between the HEA reauthorization bills in the House and Senate would be resolved. Mr. Harrington stated that this has been ongoing. Both bodies of Congress would have to pass a bill and go to conference. He was cautiously optimistic about next year; the bill could be a legacy item in Senator Lamar Alexander's last year.

4. **STATE GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS UPDATE**

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

Associate Vice President Kieran Flaherty stated that State Senate Bill (SB) 206, the Fair Pay to Play Act, which addresses compensation for student-athletes, would not go into effect until January 1, 2023. State Governmental Relations (SGR) had serious concerns that SB 206 would put student-athletes out of compliance with the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA). The NCAA Board of Governors has voted to permit student-athletes to benefit from their name, image, or likeness but have not approved bylaws or made binding policy changes. SGR was skeptical that this would mirror SB 206 or similar laws passed in other states and would work with the NCAA, State administration, and Legislature to ensure that students are not harmed.

Regent Simmons asked about the financial impact to UC. Mr. Flaherty replied that campus athletic directors were assessing the impact and that he would provide data at a later time.

Regent Sherman remarked that a student-athlete's endorsement would compete with a team endorsement. Mr. Flaherty stated that the law was interpreted as allowing that. The University would likely forbid competition, so it could be a breach of contract. There was no specific provision in the law for grandfathering.

Regent Lansing asked whether the student-athlete would have the right to do what he or she wanted regardless of existing contracts with the University. Mr. Flaherty responded in the affirmative, adding that this was the basis of UC's opposition. Chancellor Block noted that the language of the law had been corrected to protect against such a scenario.

Regent Guber noted that athletes could receive endorsements before they enter college and suggested a holistic approach that considered the changed relationships between student-athlete, sponsor, and UC. Students would become participants in the endorsement process.

Committee Chair Leib asked who was considering these issues. Mr. Flaherty replied that SGR, Student Affairs at the Office of the President (UCOP), and campus athletic departments. Ms. Holmes added that External Relations would be involved with trademark and licensing. Regent Simmons offered Regent Guber's and other Regents' expertise to advise the University. Mr. Flaherty would compile an analysis of the enacted legislation.

Committee Chair Leib invited Regent Pérez to share his experiences from attending the hearing for *Regents of the University of California v. the United States Department of Homeland Security*. Regent Pérez explained that each side had 40 minutes with questions from the Justices. The Trump Administration's rescinding of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) was based on then U.S. Attorney General Sessions' assessment that DACA was illegal and unconstitutional. Memos from the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) relied heavily on this assessment, and the Administration regarded deferrals and non-enforcement negatively. The State Solicitor General explained the implications on due process, Miranda rights, and rule and lawmaking if DACA ended, and he noted that DACA and non-DACA recipients would be affected. He shared the Supreme Court of the United States blog's summary of proceedings. UC students and branding outside the courthouse were most consistently visible and sent a strong message that UC was fully engaged. The decision would likely be issued during the summer, and students might not return in the fall if UC does not clearly communicate its commitment to students in the midst of uncertainty.

Interim Chancellor Brostrom remarked that congressional solution was popular among both political parties and asked whether such a solution was likely. Regent Pérez replied that he was not very optimistic about a bipartisan solution given the U.S. President's impeachment proceedings. President Trump had showed his disregard for facts about DACA. Regent Pérez was more optimistic about the court ruling in favor of DACA protection. Mr. Harrington added that Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell has stated that he would not bring up House Resolution 6, The Dream and Promise Act, to the Senate floor.

Regent-designate Muwwakkil asked whether questions from the Justices referenced the opposition to DACA on procedural grounds. He also asked how students were brought to UC Washington Center. Regent Pérez replied that there was a mix of UC students, students who had marched from New York, and community organizations present. The Justices did not engage much about DACA's constitutionality. Most of the discussion regarded technicalities of rulemaking and lawmaking. Five lower courts agreed with UC's positions.

Regent-designate Stegura commented that there were private philanthropy opportunities to help students renew DACA. Mr. Harrington added that DHS would announce a fee increase for DACA renewal. Regent Pérez stated that fee increases would apply to asylum applications and other evaluations as well. Committee Chair Leib asked Regent-designate Stegura to provide information about donation opportunities, and Ms. Holmes offered to assist her. Regent Pérez noted that 500,000 people have renewed DACA since the UC injunction, but UC now had more undocumented students who were not DACA recipients than undocumented students who were DACA recipients. There were 2,300 students who had no work-study eligibility or access to other resources.

Regent-designate Mart asked whether Justice Roberts would hold the deciding vote. Regent Pérez responded that he could not predict this and deferred to the attorneys present.

Mr. Flaherty stated that SGR met with the Systemwide Basic Needs Committee Co-Chairs regarding strategies for more access to CalFresh. Meetings with State officials and community organizations were planned, and options such as legislation were discussed. The Legislature would reconvene on January 6, 2020, and Governor Newson's State budget proposal was due January 10. The Legislature would recess in July and complete work for the biennium by August 31, 2020.

5. UC STUDENT ASSOCIATION ADVOCACY UPDATE

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

UC Student Association (UCSA) President Varsha Sarveshwar and UCSA Government Relations Chair Aidan Arasasingham provided an update on UCSA advocacy work. The mission of UCSA, the official voice of students at the University, was to advocate for the accessibility, affordability, and quality of the UC system. In 2018, UCSA helped secure over \$100 million in additional State funding. Students call key legislators, use social media, and every spring, hundreds of UC students go to the State Capitol for the UCSA Lobby Conference. Students' joint advocacy with the University has been very successful. State Assembly Bill 48, the facilities bond that would be on the ballot in March 2020, was UCSA's highest priority legislation. UCSA worked closely with State Governmental Relations (SGR), wrote an opinion editorial, and mobilized students to call key legislators using the UC Advocacy Network (UCAN) phone banking tool. UCSA has worked with Federal Governmental Relations (FGR), who has hosted UC Hill Day, providing training opportunities, and helped students with networking. UCSA sent students to a Deferred

Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) rally in Washington, D.C. UCSA was working with the Undocumented Student Coalition to raise awareness.

In spring 2020, UCSA aimed to collaborate with SGR to push for more State funding and Cal Grant expansion; advocate for State support for recruitment, outreach, and retention programs for underrepresented minorities, as well as mental health services; work with External Relations and Communications on voter registration and census outreach; and partner with Federal Governmental Relations (FGR) to advocate for reauthorizing the Higher Education Act, basic needs funding, and comprehensive immigration reform. UCSA invited the Regents to engage in joint advocacy with students.

Committee Chair Leib noted that Committee members were interested in joint advocacy. He asked Ms. Sarveshwar and Mr. Arasasingham to introduce themselves and share what they felt were urgent issues. Mr. Arasasingham was a Global Studies student at UCLA and was interested in social justice through urban planning and architecture, the distribution of bond funds to facilities that students used most, and recruitment and retention of students of color. Ms. Sarveshwar was a Political Science major at UC Berkeley and was interested in showing commitment to undocumented students, recruitment and retention funding, and financial aid reform based on the total cost of attendance.

Regent Ortiz Oakley asked what UCSA has done to educate students on the facilities bond and how Regents could help. Ms. Sarveshwar replied that UCSA releases endorsements and explanations in a voter guide for every election. UCSA was connecting students with advocacy opportunities where UCSA might be restricted due to its nonprofit status. Regent Ortiz Oakley asked whether engagement for the facilities bond would be discussed at an upcoming meeting, and Committee Chair Leib replied that it would be a good topic for the January meeting.

Regent Simmons emphasized the importance of outreach and retention in graduating more students. Admission without retention would be counterproductive.

Regent-designate Muwwakkil echoed Regent Simmons' comments and acknowledged the work of the presenters as full-time students. He asked about the logistics of coordinating student advocacy activities. Ms. Sarveshwar replied that, for the visit to Washington, D.C. for the DACA case, the UC Undocumented Student Coalition was consulted. The external vice presidents from each campus student government covered transportation costs for students from their campus who wished to attend. Mr. Arasasingham added that mobilizing students began by highlighting shared values between the University and students. Student buy-in has come easily when the University has student interests in mind. UCSA board meetings regularly welcome guests from the Regents and the Office of the President (UCOP), and UCSA has been in regular contact with campus leadership. Ms. Sarveshwar noted UCSA's very limited budget and called for more funding to student organizations.

6. **FIRST-GENERATION STUDENT EXPERIENCE: FORMER FOSTER YOUTH AND CARCERAL SYSTEM-IMPACTED STUDENTS**

[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.]

Chancellor Christ stated that foster youth comprised the smallest percentage of underrepresented minority (URM) students, and only 20 percent of foster youth who graduated high school attended college, as opposed to 60 percent of graduates overall. Foster youth frequently change schools and homes, are unprepared academically and socially isolated, and are often homeless when school is not in session. The UC Berkeley Hope Scholars Program, a primarily donor-funded initiative founded in 2005 that serves foster, probation, and orphaned youth, has provided academic and personal support, life skills workshops, health and wellness support, and food and housing assistance. Hope Scholars have received residence hall starter kits of bedding and furnishings, assistance with books and supplies, and care packages during final examinations. The Program has served more than 180 students, with 60 students in the current cohort.

UC Berkeley student Rebecca Borges introduced herself as a peer ambassador for the Hope Scholars program. “Foster youth” was an umbrella term for orphaned, guardianship, or probation youth, displaced undocumented students, and others. Ms. Borges had been in foster care since infancy and had experienced homelessness multiple times. Without parental support, housing insecurity has pushed many foster youth to seek off-campus housing that is inadequate and unsafe. State Assembly Bills 1228 and 1393 could help students secure housing.

Committee Chair Leib asked about the progress of these bills. Ms. Borges replied that both bills passed several years ago but had not been implemented. In AB 1393, California State University (CSU) and California Community Colleges (CCC) were required and UC was requested to provide foster youth with year-round housing. Regent Lansing expressed her dismay and asked whether the Hope Scholars Program covered tuition only. Ms. Borges clarified that Hope Scholars was not a scholarship program. Rather, the Program provided emergency funding for things that financial aid does not cover. UC Berkeley Student McArthur Hoang added that a student had no guarantee of housing when accepted at UC Berkeley.

Mr. Hoang stated that he came from a family of Vietnamese refugees and was introduced to violence at a young age. He was in the foster system until he was 18 years old. He was a member of Berkeley Underground Scholars and the Hope Scholars Program. Mr. Hoang studied sociology at UCB and researched employment outcomes for formerly incarcerated college graduates. He was initially denied access to the Hope Scholars Program. As someone who was formerly incarcerated and formerly in the foster system, Mr. Hoang had difficulty finding housing. He helped form research teams whose members were undocumented, women of color, and formerly incarcerated students. Students from a peer group he formed won \$140,000 in scholarships. He wondered what these programs could achieve if they were fully funded.

Mr. Hoang suggested that the University deem foster youth the highest priority for housing. He believed that, given how few foster youth attended UC, it was an achievable goal. Committee Chair Leib asked for clarification on the number of foster youth at UC Berkeley. Mr. Hoang replied that there were 60 Hope Scholars and 100 Underground Scholars, but it was underreported. He believed there was double that number who were too ashamed to seek help. Mr. Hoang suggested reevaluating the Regents Scholarship so that it was not only merit-based, which gave students whose parents attended college an advantage. There should be a multi-year investment in Underground Scholars. He also suggested removing age restrictions on foster student programs. Post-graduate fellowships should be offered to prevent homelessness after graduation. Mental health support was greatly needed. Mr. Hoang suggested that the University hire formerly incarcerated and foster youth and that the use of criminal background checks should be reformed. He stated that the Regents should provide compensation when asking vulnerable populations to advocate their issues. He and Ms. Borges were taking time from work to speak to them.

Interim Chancellor Brostrom asked about the status of the “ban the box” campaign, which sought to remove questions about felony convictions from job applications. Mr. Hoang replied that “ban the box” hurt black men because, without the question, employers were making race-based hiring decisions. Studies have shown that college graduates who were formerly incarcerated were less likely to commit a crime than the average person.

Regent Ortiz Oakley expressed his appreciation to the presenters and asked Mr. Hoang about his experience with the transfer process and support from CCC. Mr. Hoang stated that Berkeley Underground Scholars had volunteers who helped with transfer applications. There were other programs that helped transfer students, but more vulnerable populations needed more guidance. Ms. Borges added that most Hope Scholars were transfer students. She underscored outreach and retention and noted that transfer students who had support and basic needs resources at CSU no longer had them at UC. Regent Ortiz Oakley thanked Mr. Hoang for his recommendations and suggested following them in order to serve the growing population of nontraditional students in higher education. He stressed the importance of improving transfer between CCC and UC. Mr. Hoang’s experiences were shared by students at CCC, where there were more vulnerable populations. This was an opportunity to reflect on how to build a better system and provide opportunities to students with the least access to them. He called on the Regents to spend time addressing these issues.

Regent Simmons expressed her appreciation to the presenters and stated that they embodied the University’s mission to change trajectories. She thanked Mr. Hoang for his recommendations. She suggested creating a task force to further explore them. Committee Chair Leib added that UC should analyze campus programs for foster youth across the system so that campuses could learn from each other.

Regent-designate Muwwakkil acknowledged the presenters’ challenges and stated that he agreed with Regent Ortiz Oakley’s comments about challenges students face in the CCC system. He called for investing more in students like the presenters and asked about their

experience with research. Ms. Borges replied that she was trying to submit the Hope Scholars Program into a research program so that the group could leverage the data for more campus support. Mr. Hoang formed his own research group and added that the Institute for Research on Labor and Employment was also a resource. Over \$500,000 in funding had been raised for student researchers from vulnerable populations. Ms. Borges noted that the Hope Scholars Program was primarily student-led and needed more support.

Regent Lansing suggested that the task force should include representatives from CCC and CSU. Committee Chair Leib added that Regent Simmons agreed to chair the task force. Regent Sherman suggested that the task force should coordinate with the Special Committee on Basic Needs.

Faculty Representative Gauvain asked for recommendations on how to support students as they transition after graduation. Ms. Borges suggesting removing age limits for these programs and allowing graduate and reentry students over the age of 25 to participate. The programs should reach out to alumni, who could return as mentors. Mr. Hoang stated that post-graduate fellowships would help foster and formerly incarcerated students compete with privileged populations. UC should recruit students from vulnerable populations. Mr. Hoang invited Regents to attend a NavCal event and meet students from vulnerable populations. Ms. Borges asked whether students can be involved in the task force, and Regent Simmons responded in the affirmative.

7. **ANNUAL REPORT ON UNIVERSITY PRIVATE SUPPORT 2018–19**

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

Senior Vice President Holmes introduced John Cash, formerly of UC Berkeley and currently the Senior Consultant and Principal of Marts and Lundy. She reported that UC raised over \$2.7 billion from over 300,000 donors in 2018–19, surpassing its \$2 billion goal for the fifth consecutive year. Referring to the presentation materials, Ms. Holmes indicated an upward trend in private support to the University over the past 20 years. One percent of gifts were unrestricted, which was similar to other public institutions. Student support has increased, and campus giving days sought to expand the donor base.

Mr. Cash stated that he surveyed vice chancellors for development three years ago to determine how the Regents could be most helpful to campus development programs. He marveled at UC's success in private philanthropy. The modern era of public university fundraising began in the early 1980s at UCLA, the University of Michigan, and UC Berkeley. He noted UC's very successful campus campaigns and highlighted the differences between campuses. Large gifts were essential to success. Inflation caused by the size of gifts to UC skewed numbers for other universities in the U.S. There were 11 publicly announced campaigns at the \$3 billion level nationally. Capital improvements have become a growing concern as states have significantly cut funding. UC was trying to catch up to other major research universities that have rebuilt their science and engineering facilities. Student support at UC, which primarily went to financial aid, was higher than at

comparable public institutions. Alumni participation has been difficult to address; very few large public research universities had more than ten percent alumni participation. It was challenging and costly to convert alumni with set patterns of personal philanthropic giving. Campuses must work to create a pattern of giving among students and young alumni, with annual giving following graduation as a key indicator of success. The undergraduate experience was crucial to whether students give to the institution after they graduate. In the survey Mr. Cash conducted, vice chancellors suggested that Regents embrace the importance of philanthropy by acknowledging it publicly; endorse approaches to significant donors with whom a Regent has a relationship; support the work of affiliated campus foundations and recognize their volunteers; and consider adopting a campus to assist in its philanthropic efforts. Committee Chair Leib asked Mr. Cash to compile questions for Regents to consider in determining their role in private philanthropy. Mr. Cash asked what the Committee believed was the best use of the Regents in promoting private philanthropy. Second, he asked how the Regents could best support the chancellors in this work. Third, he asked how the Regents could support the affiliated campus foundations.

Committee Chair Leib asked whether there were innovative institutions that could steer giving towards addressing student needs and socioeconomic inequities. Mr. Cash replied that this was a complicated issue because of how institutions track data. Every successful development program has the following three pillars: a case for giving, donors identified, and the resources needed to take that case to donors. Based on his experience working with UC Berkeley, he knew that basic needs and student priorities would be a core element of the UCB campaign. He advised against thinking that people were not interested in giving to student support and cited the growth in giving to student support.

Committee Chair Leib expressed his wish to invite Mr. Cash to speak at a future meeting.

Regent Sherman asked why UC did not widely advertise planned giving. Mr. Cash replied that the most important example of planned giving was estates. Historically, UC has received many estate planning commitments. Public advertisements were not common among his clients. Regent Sherman suggested that gift annuities and estate giving could be combined. Ms. Holmes noted that there were estate planning functions at campuses. Chancellor May stated that all campuses had estate planning programs. Regent Sherman wished to see the University proceed more aggressively with estate planning.

Regent Simmons stated that UC must change its culture and better communicate an expectation of giving. As president of the UCLA Alumni Association, she spoke about giving at student orientation. She agreed with Regent Sherman that UC needed to be more creative with planned giving. She noted that studies have shown that underrepresented communities need to relate to causes before giving, so outreach must improve.

Interim Chancellor Brostrom highlighted the distinctions within restrictive gifts, some of which relieved core funding. For instance, endowed chairs might pay a portion of the professor's salary, which would come from State funding or tuition. Models should be used that reduce reliance on tuition or State support.

Regent Reilly asked how Mr. Cash advised his clients to engage with recent graduates or current students. Mr. Cash replied that philanthropy must be visible at the student level. For example, students should know the source of their scholarship funds, and there should be senior gift programs, senior challenges, and campus giving days, which have been very successful. He suggested allowing young alumni to give to things specific to their interests. Many of his clients have developed effective social media strategies. The traditional approach to alumni giving would not work for a younger generation.

Regent-designate Stegura stated that alumni associations should be responsible for keeping alumni engaged. The composition of the alumni base was changing, getting younger, and giving differently. She asked for UC alumni participation numbers. Ms. Holmes replied that it was 4.92 percent. She noted that campuses count alumni donors differently and stated her belief that alumni giving at UC has declined. Ms. Holmes explained that, while the percentage may have decreased, the number of alumni has increased.

Regent Blum stated that UC Merced likely needed most help and needed to work many years to build an alumni base. He suggested appealing to donors to give to campuses like UC Merced and UC Riverside that need the most help and not necessarily their alma mater. Committee Chair Leib emphasized that many at UC Merced were first-generation students.

Committee Chair Leib announced that he would be asking Committee members for suggested future topics on philanthropy.

The meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff