

The Regents of the University of California

PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

July 18, 2018

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

Members present: Regents Anderson, Blum, Graves, Guber, Lansing, Ortiz Oakley, and Sherman; Ex officio members Kieffer and Napolitano; Advisory members May and Valdry; Chancellors Blumenthal, Christ, Hawgood, May, and Wilcox

In attendance: Regents-designate Simmons and Um, Student Advisor Huang, Assistant Secretary Lyall, Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer Brostrom, Interim Senior Vice President Holmes, Vice Presidents Ellis and Humiston, Deputy General Counsel Woodall, and Recording Secretary McCarthy

The meeting convened at 10:40 a.m. with Committee Chair Ortiz Oakley presiding.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of May 23, 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.]

Associate Vice President Chris Harrington reported that Congress was working to complete the budget for fiscal year (FY) 2019 prior to the start of the new year on October 1. Regarding the federal budget for FY 2019, UC advocated for more than 85 priorities across more than 25 federal agencies and subagencies, involving total federal funds of nearly \$10 billion for UC. Both House and Senate bills would provide significant increases for the National Institutes of Health (NIH). UC researchers generally receive five to six percent of NIH funding, nearly \$1.8 billion in FY 2017. Both House and Senate bills would also provide increases for the National Science Foundation. UC generally receives seven to eight percent of NSF funding, approximately \$510 million in FY 2017. Both chambers proposed small increases to Department of Energy funding, particularly for the Office of Science, critical to ongoing UC research on its campuses and at the three UC-affiliated National Laboratories. The House bill would hold the maximum Pell Grant flat, while the Senate bill would provide a \$100 increase for academic year 2019-20. UC enrolls more Pell Grant recipients than any comparable research university; 38 percent of its undergraduates received Pell Grants in fall 2017.

While UC advocacy was currently focused on FY 2019, the University was also concerned about the budget cycle for 2020, when budget caps were set to return. Without Congressional action to lift the caps, programs of importance to UC in research, education, and health care would be adversely affected. Mr. Harrington remained optimistic that Congress would continue to build on the investments it made in 2018. UC continued to urge Congress to increase funding in UC's priority areas.

Mr. Harrington reported on the status of Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA). In May, a House Republican-supported discharge petition that would have forced the House to take up a package of four immigration bills fell two votes short. Another Republican measure would have provided legal status for only one-third of the nation's DACA recipients and a limited pathway to citizenship for only a small number. UC expressed opposition to this bill, which the House failed to pass. While UC remained actively involved in efforts to find a solution that would protect its DACA recipients and believes that bipartisan action is needed immediately, there were presently limited vehicles available before the midterm elections. The UC Advocacy campaign led to more than 8,000 communications to the federal government in support of DACA.

Regarding reauthorization of the Higher Education Act (HEA), Mr. Harrington reported that in December the House Committee on Education and the Workforce quickly passed the Promoting Real Opportunity, Success, and Prosperity through Education Reform (PROSPER) Act reauthorization of the HEA. UC has significant concerns with the PROSPER Act in its current form, as it would make changes to several federal student aid programs including Pell Grants, Federal Work Study, and Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants that would make it harder for UC students to afford college. In June, this legislation did not have enough votes to move to the House floor. UC was working closely with its campuses, student organizations, partners at California State University (CSU) and the California Community Colleges (CCC), and national associations in its ongoing advocacy in opposition to the PROSPER Act. President Napolitano authored an opinion editorial published in a number of Southern California newspapers expressing her opposition to the PROSPER Act. The legislation was unlikely to be voted on by the House prior to the midterm elections, but Mr. Harrington anticipated that the Republicans would move to pass it during the lame duck session if they maintain control of the House in the midterm elections. Mr. Harrington said the Democratic ranking member of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce was expected to introduce an alternative proposal to the HEA and UC had communicated its priorities to him.

Regent Lansing asked for clarification about the reasons for UC's opposition to the PROSPER Act, to inform Regents' conversations with elected officials. Committee Chair Ortiz Oakley said he had requested that the Regents be provided with key points on all UC's legislative priorities.

Mr. Harrington continued, reporting that UC was also advocating for other important issues, including protecting agricultural research programs, reauthorization of the Farm

Bill, and the 340B Drug Pricing Program, which provides eligible hospitals discounts on outpatient drugs so they can use those savings to care for underserved populations.

Mr. Harrington noted that UC's campuses and Laboratories are critical partners in the University's ongoing advocacy. Most campus and Laboratory leaders have been to Washington, D.C. to advocate on important UC issues, and have been hosting members of Congress and agency officials in an effort to further federal partnerships and to highlight the work being done across the UC system.

Chancellor Blumenthal asked if Mr. Harrington was aware of problems UC campuses have had obtaining visas for foreign scholars and students. Mr. Harrington said his office was aware of issues related to visas and that the Trump administration had announced its plans to put in additional reviews for Chinese student visas. UC's Office of Federal Government Relations (FGR) had been engaged with UC's international directors across the system, export control officers, and others involved in the visa process. His office had identified a few instances of individuals' having difficulty getting through customs or the visa process, and had been able to work with members of the California delegation to resolve most of these issues.

Committee Chair Ortiz Oakley asked that Mr. Harrington's office provide all Regents materials on the key areas of UC advocacy, to inform Regents' interactions with members of their Congressional delegations. He asked if FGR had a strategy to engage new members of Congress regarding the needs of UC and California higher education following the upcoming midterm elections. He asked about efforts to engage Senator Lamar Alexander, Chair of the U.S. Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions, and his staff about UC's priorities and whether this advocacy was done in concert with other universities throughout the nation.

Mr. Harrington responded that his office had an ongoing working relationship with Senator Alexander's staff. President Napolitano met with Senator Alexander in Washington, D.C. a few weeks prior, to discuss UC's priorities regarding the HEA reauthorization, including a specific provision involving the Federal Perkins Loan Program and UC's appropriations priorities, as Senator Alexander is also a member of the U.S. Senate Committee on Appropriations. The legislation coming out of both committees included language for which President Napolitano had advocated, including on the Perkins Loan Program. SGR works closely with CSU and the CCC to advance common priorities, for instance through the California Public Higher Education Caucus, formed a few years prior through the initiative of UC students.

Committee Chair Ortiz Oakley expressed his view that UC should increase its federal advocacy, as federal legislation has a direct impact on California students through the availability of funding for financial aid, internships, and research. He requested more in-depth presentations on UC's federal advocacy, including ways to increase engagement of UC students.

3. STATE GOVERNMENT 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.]

Associate Vice President Kieran Flaherty thanked Chair Kieffer and Regent Lansing for their prior leadership of the Committee. Regents' engagement contributed to UC's improved results in state advocacy, both in budget results and in improved relationships with legislators.

Mr. Flaherty reported that on June 27, Governor Brown signed the State Budget Act of 2018, which provided a significant increase to UC of \$346 million in the 2017-18 budget, allowing UC to hold tuition and Student Services Fees flat for California students in 2018-19. UC also received one-time funds to support its record-high number of currently enrolled California undergraduates as well as funds for 2018-19 enrollment growth. Mr. Flaherty explained that UC had requested almost \$200 million in ongoing funding to build its base budget and continue to support students during this time of substantial enrollment growth. In total, UC received ongoing funding of half that amount, about \$100 million, plus \$250 million in one-time funding. Of the one-time funds, \$105 million would provide funding in lieu of the tuition increase to support current students and new enrollment; however, this funding was only for the current year, rather than the permanent investment needed to ensure student success and access. UC received significant funds to support research, deferred maintenance, and other support programs to address students' basic needs.

Regarding State legislation, Mr. Flaherty reported that a UC-sponsored bill that would make UCLA's Medical Graduate Training Program permanent awaited the Governor's signature. He anticipated that the UC-sponsored best value procurement bill would gain legislative approval. UC's Office of State Governmental Relations (SGR) would continue to work with UC students to advocate for the bill that would allow students to use Pell Grants during the summer term.

Mr. Flaherty discussed several proposed constitutional amendments of significant concern to the Regents, as they would alter the composition of the Board and the roles of Regents. SGR's work has staved off any hearings to date. The as yet unmade appointment of five new Regents could be considered by the Senate Rules Committee as early as August.

Mr. Flaherty turned to an assessment of UC advocacy. SGR would attempt to capitalize on current momentum by first assessing its 2017-18 partnerships and then developing a strategy and implementation plan. Students, chancellors, and alumni had been extremely effective advocates. Mr. Flaherty expressed particular appreciation for UC students' articulate and effective advocacy. SGR, President Napolitano, and other UC leaders were communicating currently with these groups to determine objectives for upcoming advocacy. SGR and student leadership had engaged in a candid assessment of their partnership. SGR conducted outreach to UC's internal stakeholders, campus government

relations colleagues, and faculty leadership. UC benefited greatly by taking the advice of legislators who are UC alumni.

SGR's 2018-19 major objectives would include pursuing a predictable and stable budget through permanent State investment. SGR would continue its multi-year effort to qualify a general obligation bond for needed capital outlay resources for classrooms and laboratories; SGR would also explore ways to partner with the Legislature to promote development of more student housing. In addition, the Regents had stated their preference for one general fund appropriation for UC in the State budget, rather than separate line items for the Office of the President, UCPath, and the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources. Objectives for legislation would be determined later in the fall. While State leaders and the public prioritize undergraduate access and affordability, SGR would also emphasize UC's obligation for graduate instruction and professional education. UC would continue progress in strengthening relationships with legislators.

SGR would attempt to achieve these objectives by being inclusive, focused around clear objectives with a unified message, and proactive through a broad-based, diverse advocacy group with clear roles to influence State leaders both in their communities and in Sacramento. SGR would define the roles of advocates and provide them with the guidance they have requested. SGR would identify Sacramento policymakers most responsible for decisions about UC and evaluate the best ways to engage them on issues, including in their districts. It would be valuable for Regents to meet with legislators when they visit UC campuses. A specific plan for Regents' involvement was being developed. Visits for legislators and their staff to UC campuses and medical centers would be planned. Advocacy would be focused on goals shared by UC constituents that benefit the entire University. It would be the responsibility of UC leadership to define and build consensus around its primary objectives. SGR would leverage UC's public service and research to partner with the next gubernatorial administration.

Regent Graves thanked UC students for their successful budget advocacy. He suggested promoting the University's work to the public and the Legislature. He asked how SGR coordinated its work with campus government relations staff. Mr. Flaherty cited examples of coordination. It was vital for legislators to visit the campuses to see their needs.

Chancellor Blumenthal asked if the potential capital bond could provide funding for the two major needs of deferred maintenance and classroom and laboratory facilities to support enrollment growth. The State budget provided \$35 million for deferred maintenance, but UC's accumulated deferred maintenance totaled \$6 billion. He asked if there were reasonable arguments in opposition to a bond measure. Mr. Flaherty said the main objection to a bond measure was that it would be an additional debt payment for the State. He reported that the Legislature was generally supportive of some type of capital outlay bond for the University and the California State University. General obligation bonds require the Governor's signature and the Governor weighs the priority of various bond measures.

Committee Chair Ortiz Oakley emphasized the importance of securing funding for capital investment and its direct impact on UC students. He asked SGR to work with UC student leadership to highlight this need. Failure to pass a bond measure would create pressure for increasing tuition. In addition, the issue of direct appropriation by the Legislature should be prioritized, as it had a direct effect on the University's ability to make decisions on behalf of its students and its campuses. The University and the Office of the President must be given full autonomy once again.

Committee Chair Ortiz Oakley asked if UC had the organizational infrastructure to deliver the agenda SGR and Federal Governmental Relations were proposing and how campus government relations infrastructure would be leveraged. Building on the successful advocacy of the past budget cycle would require a sustained effort over multiple years.

4. **STUDENT ADVOCACY EFFORTS**

[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 Judith Gutierrez reviewed UCSA's collaborative advocacy with the University for an increase in State funding to avoid a planned increase in tuition and Student Services Fees. UCSA and UC's Office of State Governmental Relations met in Sacramento to discuss hearings, joint talking points, and messaging around State investment in the current generation of UC students. Joint advocacy postcards were sent to all legislative members' offices and materials with detailed budget information delivered personally during student visits to members' offices. Despite this advocacy, the Regents increased nonresident tuition in March. UCSA looked forward to working with the Regents to find ways to expand financial aid to nonresident students. In May, the Regents agreed to postpone the vote on a tuition increase for California students. This joint advocacy was successful in securing funding beyond that needed to avoid the tuition increase. UCSA urged the Regents to continue to work with UC students to achieve a sustainable model that would increase student advocacy in the future.

UC students lobbied in Sacramento, met with legislators in their campus districts, organized phone banks, and held "Fund the UC" campus events to raise student awareness. Students also used social media, appeared in local news coverage, and wrote opinion editorials. More than 300 UC students participated in UCSA's annual student lobbying conference in Sacramento.

UC San Diego student Caroline Siegel Singh added that UC students' appearances at legislative budget hearings were very effective, with 20 to 30 students at each of the State Senate and Assembly budget hearings. Student phone banking was also effective in magnifying the student voice and increasing students' active engagement in the budget process.

Ms. Siegel Singh explained that UC students launched a social media campaign in January to gain attention of legislators and the media. UCSA found many Sacramento allies willing

to champion UC and its students. The active support of Senator Steve Glazer and Assemblymember Jose Medina were crucial to the success of students' budget advocacy. Students also established relationships with higher education reporters throughout the state, including from the *Los Angeles Times*, *Sacramento Bee*, and *CALmatters*.

Ms. Gutierrez expressed hope that the successful student advocacy of this budget cycle would be institutionalized so that it did not have to be reinvented each year. Student leadership on UC campuses should have the support of the chancellors. Joint lobbying visits of student leaders and their chancellors were valuable. The UC Advocacy Network (UCAN) and campus newspapers were effective in distributing students' message to various audiences. She encouraged increased support from campus government relations offices, and thanked the government relations offices at UC Berkeley, UC San Diego, and UC Santa Cruz for their direct support. UCSA and Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer Brostrom signed a Memorandum of Understanding the prior month agreeing to maintain open communication between UC students and the budget team, and encouraging chancellors to hold student consultation forums on their respective campuses so that students are aware of budget discussions.

Ms. Siegel Singh urged the Regents to continue to advocate for permanent support for UC and to allocate funding to support student travel for budget advocacy. She expressed UCSA's eagerness to work with the incoming Governor and new Regents. She hoped the Regents would continue to visit more campuses to engage directly with students.

Regent Lansing expressed her view that the advocacy of UC students was extraordinary and that its students are UC's most powerful voice. She expressed deep gratitude for students' efforts and organization over the past budget cycle.

Regent Graves thanked UCSA and its leaders for their work and sacrifices on behalf of the University and UC students. The open consultation between UCSA and Mr. Brostrom's office should be continued. He urged UC's chancellors to work with students as decisions were made about spending.

Chair Kieffer added his thanks for UC student advocacy, which had been forceful and sophisticated. He encouraged expanding these efforts to another level, as the Legislature is most responsive to students.

President Napolitano said these students' voices were persuasive and essential to obtaining good results for the University. She expressed her personal commitment to continue to build upon this collaboration to achieve UC's goals.

Committee Chair Ortiz Oakley thanked UC's students for their advocacy efforts. He suggested that UCSA compose a long-term strategic vision for its advocacy.

5. **UPDATE ON THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA MARKET RESEARCH STUDY**

[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 Senior Vice President Holmes recalled that a year prior the Committee had requested a market research study about how UC is seen by various audiences across the state, as a basis to develop more directed outreach. Her office had just completed eight focus groups across the state and had interviewed UC faculty and administrators. Her office was about to launch a large-scale quantitative survey. Ms. Holmes would provide a full report of key insights to the Committee at a future meeting.

Ms. Holmes commented that, while focus groups are not an ultimate arbiter of opinion, they are helpful. Some attitudes gleaned from the focus groups were that Californians have a good deal of anxiety, concerned about traffic, housing, and the cost of living in California. The focus groups expressed a desire for the opportunity that they saw as available in the past in California. Focus group participants were aware of UC, its campuses, and their varied identities. They understood UC's strengths and value to the state. However, participants were surprised to learn how many California students attend UC and how many of them are first-generation college students. Many of those surveyed assumed, wrongly, that non-California applicants had an advantage over California students. In addition, many surveyed were skeptical about any facts put forward. Personal anecdotes were more effective than facts and data put out by institutions. Although UC is seen as less expensive than private universities, focus group participants worry about the cost of college. There was concern about California's future prosperity and growth. Participants wanted to learn more about the benefits of UC research, as they see themselves as investors in UC. Ms. Holmes said it would be important for UC to find a way to tell its story by conveying personal stories of individuals to key audiences.

Regent Lansing said she had always been concerned about the degree of misperception of UC. She offered her assistance in developing a social media campaign, which could be inexpensive and reach vast audiences if done well.

Student Advisor Huang asked what forms of communication had been most effective in the past with the general public. Ms. Holmes said that UC used all available mechanisms, including regular news outlets, digital platforms, and limited paid media, depending on the intended audience.

Committee Chair Ortiz Oakley asked that Ms. Holmes' office coordinate its work with UC's State Governmental Relations (SGR). Ms. Holmes reported that a committee had been formed including SGR to inform this market research work. In a recent UC Office of the President reorganization, SGR and Federal Government Relations report to the Senior Vice President – External Relations and Communications. In response to a further question from Committee Chair Ortiz Oakley, Ms. Holmes said she reported to President

Napolitano, who commented that the consolidation of external relations with government affairs and communication into one department would be effective.

Chair Kieffer asked if the Regents' student advisors could be helpful developing social media. Student Advisor Huang said he would use the social media site developed by former Student Advisor Sands.

6. COMMITTEE PRIORITIES AND ITEMS FOR THE COMING YEAR

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

Committee Chair Ortiz Oakley asked Committee members for agenda suggestions for the upcoming year.

Regent Lansing recalled that the purpose of the Committee was to determine the best ways to advocate for the University. She suggested having an item about social media advocacy on the agenda of every Committee meeting, as she saw this as an area that could be further developed. Potential social media advocacy campaigns could be shown to the Committee.

Regent Sherman agreed with Regent Lansing's request, adding that he would like to see specific details and materials. He also suggested that Regents be provided a one-page paper containing key talking points about the University. Material could be developed for commercials to be aired during UC's televised football games. There are Committee members who could have positive input into the development of such materials. In order for the Committee to have input, it must be shown detailed materials and be able to comment.

Committee Chair Ortiz Oakley agreed that having materials available for the Regents would be helpful to clarify and coordinate key issues for communicating to members of the public, legislators, and elected officials.

Regent Sherman added that these advocacy efforts should be constant, rather than only during budget deliberations.

President Napolitano agreed with Regent Sherman's comments. She asked Interim Senior Vice President Holmes to provide all Regents with "UC at a Glance."

Chancellor Wilcox suggested inviting a few leaders of the California Legislature to Committee meetings. Committee Chair Ortiz Oakley expressed support for this suggestion, adding that it would be important to determine the best time and to work through UC State Governmental Relations (SGR). Members of the California Congressional delegation could also be invited.

Committee Chair Ortiz Oakley suggested considering ways to fulfil the Committee's charge of improving the Regents' engagement in University advocacy by effectively

deploying the Regents and equipping them to effectively advocate for UC. Many Regents have opportunities to engage with policymakers and to advance the missions of the University.

Committee Chair Ortiz Oakley recommended setting annual goals for the Committee and ways to measure its effectiveness in achieving them. He asked UC's offices of SGR and Federal Government Relations for suggestions for such an evaluation tool.

Committee Chair Ortiz Oakley asked President Napolitano if the vision of the University for the upcoming five years could be codified in some way to provide an anchor for advocacy. President Napolitano commented that such a vision could be linked to a four-year budget and enrollment plan. Chair Kieffer expressed support for clarifying the vision for the University in such a fashion.

Student Advisor Huang commented that the visibility of University leadership including Regents and chancellors helps encourage student advocacy and engagement.

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff