

The Regents of the University of California

PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

March 14, 2018

The Public Engagement and Development Committee met on the above date at the Luskin Conference Center, Los Angeles campus.

Members present: Regents Lansing, Mancina, Ortiz Oakley, and Park; Ex officio member Kieffer; Advisory members May, and Morimoto; Chancellors Block, Christ, Hawgood, Leland, May, and Wilcox; Staff Advisor Main; Student Advisor Sands

In attendance: Regent Guber, Assistant Secretary Lyall, Senior Vice President Gulbranson, Vice Presidents Brown, Budil, and Humiston, Chancellor Gillman, Senior Counsel Shanle, and Recording Secretary McCarthy

The meeting convened at 10:00 a.m. with Committee Vice Chair Lansing presiding.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of January 24, 2018 were approved.

2. FEDERAL ISSUES 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.]

Interim Associate Vice President Chris Harrington discussed the federal budget for fiscal year (FY) 2018. Congress passed a budget agreement on February 9 after a nine-hour government shutdown. The budget agreement contained the fifth Continuing Resolution of for the FY 2018 budget cycle, keeping the government operational through March 23. The main element of the budget agreement was a two-year deal to raise the spending caps for defense and non-defense discretionary programs, including a \$2 billion increase in National Institutes of Health (NIH) funding for biomedical research and an extension of funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program. While the increase in the spending caps do not reflect full parity as hoped, the University was relatively pleased with the final budget for non-defense discretionary funding, which would allow higher appropriations for programs through which the majority of UC's priorities are funded. Congressional appropriators were currently creating an omnibus spending package for the current fiscal year that would end October 1. UC continued to communicate with members of the California delegation in key committees regarding UC's FY 2018 budget priorities. With the increase in new non-defense discretionary funding, UC's Office of Federal Government Relations (FGR) had been working aggressively with UC campuses and its national association partners to make the case that some of this funding should be directed to

University priorities that had been underfunded or had not kept up with inflation. Among these priorities were funding for the National Science Foundation (NSF), which had been held relatively flat in recent years, and support for student financial aid, including Pell Grants.

Mr. Harrington characterized President Trump's FY 2019 Budget request, released in February, as draconian and unlikely to be adopted by Congress in its current form. An addendum to the budget released the same day expressed the Trump administration's opposition to the recent increases in non-defense discretionary funding and proposed funding these programs well below the newly enacted caps. While the Pell Grant maximum award would remain flat at \$5,920, the budget request proposed a steep cut to Federal Work-Study, and elimination of Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants and funding for Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need. Many of the proposals in the President's education budget mirror provisions of the Higher Education Act Reauthorization bill currently in the House. Both propose consolidating the federal government's Income-Driven Repayment Plans into one plan, eliminating all subsidized student loans, which would be a significant cut for UC's undergraduates as the interest on their loans would accrue while they are in school, and ending the Public Service Loan Forgiveness Program. As to research, the President's budget request would increase funding by \$700 million for the NIH, while again keeping NSF funding flat. UC is the single largest recipient of funding from the NIH and NSF, the two federal agencies primarily responsible for academic research. The budget also proposes cuts to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, the Environmental Protection Agency, the National Education Association, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and defense research. At the Department of Energy, the budget request would maintain the same level of funding for the Office of Science, eliminate the Advanced Research Projects Agency – Energy, and cut funding for energy efficiency and renewable energy programs.

UC recently shared its FY 2019 appropriation priorities with Congress. These funding requests would serve as UC's advocacy roadmap. Mr. Harrington said it was unlikely that Congress would complete action on a FY 2019 budget before October 1 and anticipated the government's operating on a Continuing Resolution until after the midterm elections.

In February, the Senate spent a week debating immigration reform, including amendments that would have protected Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) recipients. However, the Senate was unable to reach agreement. Discussions were underway about adding a short-term extension to the Omnibus Appropriations bill to protect DACA recipients, and provide funds for border wall construction, border security, and increased detention beds. UC continued to work actively toward a solution to protect its DACA recipients and believed that immediate bipartisan action was needed.

Efforts were underway to significantly change the Higher Education Act, the primary law governing post-secondary education including federal student aid programs. In anticipation of legislative action, UC developed a priorities document that would serve as its guide for advocacy efforts throughout the reauthorization process. UC's key priorities include:

strengthening existing federal student aid programs, supporting graduate students through student aid programs, and strengthening the investment in pipeline programs for underrepresented students. In early December, the House Committee on Education and the Workforce marked up and approved along party lines the Promoting Real Opportunity, Success, and Prosperity through Education Reform (PROSPER) Act, legislation to reauthorize the Higher Education Act. UC had significant concerns about this House proposal, including: its elimination of the in-school student loan subsidy; elimination of mandatory inflation adjustments for Pell Grants; significant changes to the Federal Work-Study; the elimination of federal campus-based aid programs; and the elimination of the Public Service Loan Forgiveness Program. Mr. Harrington anticipated that reauthorization of the Higher Education Act would remain on the House legislative docket for some time before receiving consideration. There had been widespread, vocal opposition from the higher education community, including UC. Senator Lamar Alexander, chair of the committee responsible for reauthorization, said he would like to have a bill drafted for consideration by early April. Mr. Harrington expressed his view that this goal was overly optimistic. UC FGR was actively involved on the reauthorization, including meetings with members and staff in both the House and Senate.

In late January, UC FGR, in coordination with the UC Office of the President, hosted the UC financial aid leadership institute in Washington, D.C. UC's financial aid leaders met with Legislators, senior committee staff, and participated in a round table discussion with Congressional California public higher education caucus members.

Committee Vice Chair Lansing expressed the Regents' concern about DACA. She suggested that FGR reach out to Regents with ways they could help ensure the safety of UC's DACA recipients, and keep Committee members updated if significant events occur between meetings.

3. **OVERVIEW OF UC ADVOCACY EFFORTS IN SACRAMENTO 2018**

[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 reported that UC had identified authors for its sponsored State legislation and would also continue to work on its legislative priorities that would be handled through the budget process. The Legislature had released three pieces of legislation related to the Board of Regents that would qualify constitutional amendments for the ballot. These measures would result in changes to the composition of the Board of Regents, lengths of terms of Regents, and other related changes. These proposals were in their earliest stages and similar past measures did not qualify for the ballot. UC's Office of State Government Relations (SGR) would closely monitor this legislation, which was of great concern to the University.

Mr. Flaherty reported that UC students and SGR had been working in partnership to advocate for increased State support that would obviate the need for a tuition increase. UC student leadership, the UC Office of the President (UCOP), including SGR, agreed to

advocate for State funding as equal partners in pursuit of a common budget request developed jointly. Students had been extremely effective advocates in articulating the need for resources other than tuition.

Mr. Flaherty reviewed the elements of this joint budget request. It was the common desire of UC, its students, and the Legislature to identify sufficient resources to negate a tuition increase. The request incorporated goals that are explicitly shared and expressed by the Legislature for continuing enrollment growth. UC leadership and student leadership share the goal of addressing the impact of recent enrollment growth on UC's current students' experience at UC.

This advocacy would try new approaches. SGR would support UC campuses' leadership and representatives who would take the lead in delivering UC's message in Sacramento. Students had also stepped to the forefront as equal partners. For example, student leaders and UC chancellors were attending spring meetings together with legislators. SGR chose witnesses who are subject-matter experts from UC campuses to testify at State Budget Subcommittee hearings, to demonstrate how budget decisions play out at UC campuses for its students. This spirit of collaboration would also extend to UC alumni and other stakeholders.

Associate Director Meredith Turner described a "speed meeting" SGR co-hosted with Assembly Speaker and Regent Rendon and Assembly Member Jose Medina, attended by all ten UC chancellors, President Napolitano, Provost Brown, several Regents, and 28 legislators. The event focused on opportunities for UC chancellors to meet with legislators other than the representative of their campus area. Legislators' interests were matched with programs and areas of expertise of individual UC campuses, allowing for substantial conversations and permitting chancellors to meet several new legislators.

UC's 150th anniversary reception in Sacramento, spearheaded by UCOP Office of Alumni and Constituent Affairs with support of SGR, featured outstanding UC undergraduate researchers. This event brought together alumni, students, and legislators for an evening that celebrated the cutting-edge research of UC students and its impact on California.

Ms. Turner stated that the UC Advocacy Network (UCAN) would be particularly important in the coming months of State budget advocacy. UCAN is the simplest way for SGR to engage those who want to advocate on behalf of UC, regardless of their location. UCAN allows SGR to tailor messages for certain constituencies such as alumni or students.

Regent Ortiz Oakley asked what commitment had been made to UC students in this joint advocacy, specifically if it had been promised that there would be no tuition increase if UC received the requested resources. Mr. Flaherty stated that the budget request, developed in conjunction with UC students, included a buyout of the proposed increase in tuition and student services fee, or \$70 million. Another \$25 million was intended to address the impact of enrollment growth on current UC students. He recalled that \$15 million from UCOP expenditures had been reallocated to support enrollment growth of 1,500 students. The budget request would include \$10 million to accommodate further enrollment growth,

including \$5 million to fund an additional 500 California undergraduates and \$5 million to add 500 graduate students. The total of this budget request was \$105 million, which would be in addition to UC's request that the Legislature approve the Governor's three percent base budget adjustment. UC had also requested one-time funds of \$35 million for deferred maintenance.

Regent Ortiz Oakley asked if UCOP had committed to not seek a tuition increase if UC received the \$70 million tuition buyout. Mr. Flaherty responded that the students advocating with the Legislature were aware that decisions about tuition rest with the Regents. SGR had communicated to students that obtaining that \$70 million from the State would negate the need for a tuition increase.

Regent Ortiz Oakley expressed concern about reports of the effect of enrollment growth on current UC students and asked how the amount of funding adequate for enrollment growth would be determined. Mr. Flaherty responded that UC would invest in teaching assistants, hiring faculty, and other areas that would have a direct effect on students' experience at UC. One measure used was the student-faculty ratio. The campuses had developed summaries including: how prior tuition increases were spent; how the proposed tuition increase or State buyout would be spent; and the effects of not receiving that funding. Advocacy would address frankly the impact on the educational experience of UC students. Student advocates were very effective at illustrating these effects. Also UC Davis' Vice Chancellor for Finance, Operations and Administration Kelly Ratliff had testified on specific effects of insufficient funding for deferred maintenance before a Budget Subcommittee in Sacramento. This level of detail can be more effective than reports of broader, systemwide budget needs.

Student Advisor Sands said he had requested a fact sheet from each campus detailing how requested State funding would be spent and asked that the Committee also be provided with those fact sheets. Having that information would enable students lobbying in Sacramento to speak with legislators about specific needs on their campuses that would be addressed. Committee Vice Chair Lansing agreed that having specific information about how funding would be used would be much more effective than vague, large funding requests. She expressed appreciation of students' efforts to lobby with specific information. She asked Mr. Flaherty to provide lobbying students and the Committee the fact sheets requested by Student Advisor Sands.

Committee Vice Chair Lansing recalled how crucial UC students' advocacy was for the passage of Proposition 30 in 2012 and that the University had guaranteed the students that tuition would not be increased if Proposition 30 passed. She suggested providing a similar guarantee this time as well that tuition would not be raised if the Legislature provided a tuition buyout.

Committee Vice Chair Lansing also suggested that the Regents seek a commitment from current gubernatorial candidates that they would agree to provide UC a tuition buyout. She noted that UC students, their parents, and alumni were important voters. She asked that the responses of the gubernatorial candidates be reported back to the Committee.

Regent Mancia said that he had witnessed the effectiveness of UC students lobbying legislators and at recent UC lobbying events.

Regent Park asked if the \$25 million request to address the effects of overenrollment on current UC students was a new request added since January. Mr. Flaherty explained that the \$25 million was not an individual line item. UC students had advocated vociferously and articulately their belief in the need for dedicated resources for currently enrolled students and the need to increase graduate student enrollment, based on their experience with increasing enrollment over the past several years. This request was viewed by SGR as reasonable and realistic. Mr. Flaherty said this would be within the requested budget for current operations. Regent Park asked if the \$25 million was calculated in relationship to the number of students enrolled above and beyond the minimum threshold at a rate of \$10,000 marginal cost. Mr. Flaherty answered in the affirmative, adding that the calculation was slightly above \$25 million. Regent Park asked if the requested buyout was \$50 million or \$70 million. Mr. Flaherty explained that, if a tuition increase had been approved by the Regents, the State General Fund would have contributed per statute through the Cal Grant program an additional \$20 million. The tuition buyout would be \$70 million.

Regent Park acknowledged that the Regents would decide whether there would be a tuition increase, but asked, should the Legislature approve a \$70 million increase, if the first \$70 million would be dedicated to the buyout. Mr. Flaherty said it had not yet been discussed in what order the funds would be applied, but he assumed that the Legislature would specify the purpose of funds. Mr. Flaherty said he had been encouraged by some legislators who had expressed their view that full UC funding would be \$105 million permanent and ongoing. Regent Park asked if the additional funds requested would be in addition to the three percent increase. Mr. Flaherty confirmed that understanding.

4. **COMMUNITY OUTREACH AND IMPACTS, IRVINE CAMPUS**

[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 Gillman affirmed that partnering with its community is fundamental to UC Irvine's mission and a centerpiece of its strategic plan. The campus has a dedicated website for this purpose, which includes tools for faculty to incorporate community engagement components into their activities and curricula. One of Chancellor Gillman's first initiatives was a partnership with the leading Orange County arts entities, allowing the campus to work with local symphonies and museums to enhance and amplify their activity, and to build a bridge between members of the UC Irvine community, especially its students, and the vibrant Orange County arts community. UC Irvine is engaged in a commercialization and technology transfer operation called Applied Innovation, an open-source enterprise and innovation hub for the region. UC Irvine also partners with local organizations and businesses on sustainability.

Ms. Jennifer Friend, president of the UC Irvine Alumni Association and the Chief Executive Officer of Project Hope Alliance, a nonprofit organization dedicated to helping homeless children, shared the impact of Project Hope Alliance's partnership with UC Irvine. She explained that her childhood family of six in Orange County had been intermittently homeless and she had lived in motels through her junior high and high school years. She attended junior college and then, with help from Pell Grants, graduated from UC Irvine and then law school, becoming a partner at a law firm before age 40. She knew firsthand the impact that UC Irvine partnerships could have on local non-profits. Project Hope Alliance partnered with the UC Irvine Claire Trevor School of the Arts to create a multi-media art installation demonstrating the lives of homeless children within Orange County. This art piece has toured throughout the community. Project Hope Alliance was also able to host nine School of Social Ecology advanced field study students, who had already served more than 360 hours helping with client assessments and interventions. Project Hope Alliance had also partnered with the UC Irvine Center for Psychology and Law for three years, placing a graduate student in residence to assist in highly specialized areas, enabling Project Hope Alliance to collect and analyze uniquely sophisticated data. UC Irvine had completed the Cost Study on Homelessness in Orange County, used by Project Hope Alliance and others to inform and drive a new initiative United to End Homelessness. In the last three years, Project Hope Alliance had brought about 150 homeless children and their parents to experience Shakespeare in the Park. Ms. Friend summarized that the UC system is uniquely positioned to bring its expertise and knowledge to community needs.

Chancellor Gillman introduced Pedro Alvarez, in his final year at UC Irvine School of Medicine and a member of the Program in Medical Education Latino Community (PRIME LC). These students pursue a medical degree and a master's degree in some relevant field to become physician leaders in the underserved Latino communities of California. Mr. Alvarez said he was a first generation college student whose immigrant parents had a taco truck serving migrant workers, which established a sense of community for Mr. Alvarez. When his father suffered a debilitating back injury and Mr. Alvarez served as a translator for his medical appointments, he decided to become a physician. He saw what the medical field could provide for the migrant community and what he could provide to the field of medicine. PRIME LC was an obvious choice for Mr. Alvarez' medical education, with its rigorous curriculum in Chicano/Latino studies and early exposure to these communities' healthcare needs. The heart of PRIME LC is community engagement, through participation in free clinics, health fairs, and mentoring. Mr. Alvarez and some colleagues created a Spanish-language radio show called Mind, Body, and Soul, dealing with health issues facing the Chicano/Latino community. About 87 percent of PRIME LC alumni remain in California to practice medicine, with 71 percent in low-income Chicano/Latino communities. Since the program's inception 15 years prior, PRIME LC had delivered on its promise to train physician leaders in the Chicano/Latino community. Mr. Alvarez expressed his appreciation to the Regents and the UC system for the opportunity to fulfil his dream to serve his community.

Chancellor Gillman introduced Stephanie Reyes-Tuccio, UC Irvine Assistant Vice Chancellor for Educational Partnerships. Ms. Reyes-Tuccio described her work building

bridges between UC Irvine and local underserved schools. As a land grant university, UC Irvine has had a long-term commitment to working with these communities, taking very seriously its mission to ensure that every student has access to its campus. UC Irvine was the first UC campus to develop a center dedicated to partnerships to improve the quality of public education and to work collaboratively with partners to close the achievement gap for first-generation, low-income students. This model has been emulated systemwide. UC Irvine's approach was distinctive in that its programs for underserved community students were not an end in themselves, but were a launching pad to build real relationships of trust and long-term commitment with schools, other institutions of higher education, corporate partners, and community partners to move the needle on major obstacles that students face in their journey to higher education. The work is more than isolated programs and becomes part of a larger strategy.

Ms. Reyes-Tuccio described UC Irvine's and California State University (CSU) Fullerton's joint partnership with the Santa Ana Unified School District, the state's third largest district, 93 percent Latino, with 84 percent of its students qualifying for free or reduced-price lunch, and more than 60 percent English-language learners. Through the work of this partnership, the number of high school graduates qualified to apply to a four-year institution of higher education had increased from 18 percent in 2010 to just less than 50 percent in 2016. This was achieved by aligning high school graduation requirements with the "a-g" requirements for UC and CSU; working with school leaders to evaluate and eliminate courses that took students off track; providing professional development to counselors; and placing trained undergraduates and professional staff in every school to work with students and families navigating this process.

Another educational partnership with local community colleges involved creating transfer pathways from two- to four-year institutions, including guided financial aid and academic counseling, and provisional and guaranteed admissions to participating students. By the prior year, UC Irvine had welcomed more than 500 transfer students from Santa Ana College. One such student, Skyler Phamie, a fourth-year UC Irvine student, described her background as an immigrant from Vietnam in 2014, her path to Santa Ana College, and transfer to UC Irvine through a program called the Santa Ana Promise. She worked with incoming transfer students, freshmen, and international students on financial aid applications, résumé writing, and graduate school applications. She expressed gratitude for the chance to pursue her dreams and help others in her community.

5. **UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA CLIO-METRIC HISTORY PROJECT**

[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 introduced Mr. Zach Bleemer, research analyst at the UC Office of the President (UCOP), project director and lead researcher for the ClioMetric History Project, which uses big data to develop a historical look at the impact of UC alumni and programs on California. Part of his project was underwritten by UCOP.

Mr. Bleemer explained that the ClioMetric History Project, a joint endeavor of UCOP and UC Berkeley's Center for Studies in Higher Education, was working to compile the history of the University to celebrate its 150th anniversary. The project would collect large amounts of data on the students, faculty, courses, budgets, and other detailed information about the University over the past 150 years. Sources of information include student registers, campus course catalogues, and student transcripts. New software had been developed to process this information into large databases. The Project had already compiled the largest and broadest-ranging database of university data in the nation.

Mr. Bleemer described narratives that could be told through computational analysis of this digital data. Regarding gender equity, Mr. Bleemer noted that UC had admitted women since 1870. Project data showed that many women from rural parts of California attended UC as early as the 1880s, coming from every part of the state to attend UC. In the early 1900s, 40 to 55 percent of UC's undergraduate students were women, and between 50 and 60 percent of its graduate students were women. Project data can be analyzed to show where UC students lived after graduation and could show, for instance, the first time a particular town had a female doctor. This study would be expanded to examine ethnic equity in California arising from the ethnic equity at UC in the early 20th century. Data show that in 1900 between ten and 20 percent of UC medical students were women. In the 1970s, the proportion of women increased dramatically, and since the late 1990s more than 50 percent were women.

Turning to socioeconomic mobility, Mr. Bleemer said linking the Project's database to U.S. census records could show students' parents' incomes and those students' later incomes. The data revealed that as soon as Stanford began to charge tuition in about 1916, the wage gap between Stanford and UC students grew. However, those same students' incomes 20 years after graduation show parity between Stanford and UC graduates. So, despite the fact that UC started to absorb a number of low-income students who would have otherwise attended Stanford, those students 25 years later had received the same benefits of higher education, at least in terms of wages and employment.

The Project was currently completing a report on UC's Eligibility in the Local Context Program as implemented in 2001, admitting the top four percent of students from each high school in the state, more than half of whom were black or Hispanic, mostly from small California towns, and many low- or middle-income students. Those students were more likely to graduate from college than if they had attended California State University or a California Community College, and if they graduated from college, they were more likely to earn an engineering degree, the highest wage major available at UC, creating a pipeline for economic mobility. Mr. Bleemer displayed an interactive map showing the large number of UC graduates who return to their home California communities after earning their degrees and provide tremendous local economic benefits.

Mr. Bleemer explained that the ClioMetric Project was ongoing and would travel to each campus to collect student records going back as long as possible. Record collection has been nearly completed at three campuses. As much data as possible would be made available for analysis, while excluding personal student records. Very detailed budget

records would also be available. A series of reports have been produced. A longitudinal study of the sources of UC funding was near completion and at the request of President Napolitano would be distributed to the Regents. A large scale UC socioeconomic mobility study should be complete by the end of the year. UC's 150th anniversary presented an opportunity to tell the longstanding contributions of UC to California's economic growth, its health, economic mobility, and gender and ethnic egalitarianism. Collecting as much information as possible and making that information as public as possible would maximize the value of these data for analysis.

Chancellor Block asked if the number of international and domestic nonresident students who remain in California could be tracked. Mr. Bleemer said that, while such a study had not yet been conducted, administrative student records had been linked to alumni records maintained by UC; these data would be a source of information for future research.

Chancellor Wilcox asked if the ClioMetric Project would be ongoing. Mr. Bleemer said the data collection effort had been underway long before this project. The innovation of this Project was to extend the data collection back in time. The data would be updated each year.

The meeting adjourned at 11:25 a.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff