

The Regents of the University of California

PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

July 22, 2020

The Public Engagement and Development Committee met on the above date by teleconference meeting conducted in accordance with Paragraph 3 of Governor Newsom's Executive Order N-29-20.

Members present: Regents Guber, Kieffer, Lansing, Leib, Mart, Muwwakkil, Reilly, Sherman, Stegura, and Zettel; Ex officio member Pérez; Advisory member Gauvain; Chancellors Block, Wilcox, and Yang; Staff Advisor Tseng

In attendance: Regent Butler, Regents-designate Lott and Torres, Secretary and Chief of Staff Shaw, General Counsel Robinson, Provost Brown, Senior Vice President Holmes, and Recording Secretary Li

The meeting convened at 9:05 a.m. with Committee Chair Leib presiding.

Committee Chair Leib welcomed Regent Stegura as the new Committee Vice Chair. He invited Regent-designate Lott to introduce herself. Regent-designate Lott stated that she was the previous President of the UCLA Alumni Association and currently a member of the UCLA Foundation Board of Directors. She graduated from UCLA as an undergraduate and from UCLA School of Law, and she worked as an attorney. She thanked the Regents for including an alumni perspective.

Committee Chair Leib invited Regent-designate Torres to introduce himself. Regent-designate Torres stated that he was former Chair of the California Democratic Party, former State Senator, and currently Vice Chair of the Governing Board of the California Institute for Regenerative Medicine (CIRM). Regent-designate Torres was also a member of the Covered California board, which he had joined because of members of this Committee. He looked forward to working with the members of this Committee. Regent Lansing welcomed Regent-designate Torres and praised his leadership at CIRM. Regent Stegura noted that Regent-designate Torres graduated from UC Santa Cruz and UC Davis School of Law.

Committee Chair Leib invited Staff Advisor Tseng to introduce herself. Ms. Tseng stated that she was a UCLA staff member and alumna. She worked as a fundraiser focusing on student scholarships. She looked forward to the ability to advocate for staff.

Committee Chair Leib stated that, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, an off-cycle Committee meeting at a community college was postponed for now. In his view, it was unfortunate that meetings were not conducted in person, because the purpose of the Committee was to engage with the community. This off-cycle meeting was meant to give members adequate time to consider how the Committee could connect with constituents under the current circumstances, as well as how the Committee could make valuable contributions to the governance of the University.

1. PUBLIC COMMENT

Committee Chair Leib explained that the public comment period permitted members of the public an opportunity to address University-related matters. The following person addressed the Committee concerning the items noted.

Seema Burke, UCLA School of Law alumna, implored the Regents to mitigate the inequity created by school districts that do not permit a letter grade option for high school students in the spring 2020 term. She was the parent of a high school student in such a school district. She suggested that UC could provide applicants with an opportunity to show what their grade point average (GPA) with letter grades would have been and attach documentation. UC's policy of accounting for all letter grades to calculate GPA when some grades were pass/no pass would penalize students, especially given the competitive nature of UC admissions. Ms. Burke also suggested that an optional question that allowed students to explain how the pandemic has affected them should be included in the UC application. First-generation college students, students with low-income families, and students with special needs would be particularly harmed if they are unable to show their grades in their applications.

2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of March 18, 2020 were approved, Regents Lansing, Leib, Mart, Muwwakkil, Reilly, Stegura, and Zettel voting "aye."¹

3. LEGAL GUIDELINES FOR PARTICIPATION IN BALLOT CAMPAIGNS: CALIFORNIA 2020 BALLOT INITIATIVES – PROPOSITIONS 14 AND 16

[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.]

General Counsel Robinson stated that UC Legal – Office of the General Counsel (OGC) was asked to review rules governing how the Regents could communicate regarding ballot initiatives in their professional and personal capacity. He noted that some questions might need to be answered after the meeting in order to preserve attorney-client privilege.

Principal Counsel Ellen Auriti provided a brief review of the ballot measures that the Regents voted to endorse. Proposition 16 would repeal Proposition 209, the 1996 voter initiative that amended the State Constitution to prohibit State entities from discriminating or giving preferential treatment to certain demographic groups. Proposition 14 was the California Stem Cell Research, Treatments, and Cures Initiative of 2020, which would authorize \$5.5 billion in State general obligation bonds to fund grants from the California Institute of Regenerative Medicine. Under California law, public entities were not allowed

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

to campaign for or against ballot measures, and they were not allowed to use or allow others to use public resources for campaign activities. Public resources included staff time, equipment, and office space. Unlawful campaign activities included contributing to or raising funds for a ballot campaign, building a campaign team, and soliciting opposition or support from voters. In *Stanson v. Mott*, which was decided in 1976, the California Supreme Court held that, absent clear legislative authority and language, the California Department of Parks and Recreation could not use agency funds to campaign for a bond measure that would fund its facilities. The court reasoned that using public funds for campaigning would distort the integrity of the electoral process. Some activities related to ballot initiatives were permissible. First, an agency could objectively analyze a ballot measure's impact, and the agency's board could adopt a position at a public, open meeting based on that analysis, as the Regents did when they endorsed Propositions 14 and 16. Second, an agency employee could discuss that board's position in response to questions from the public as long as agency resources are not used to campaign for or against the measure. There was no bright-line distinction between permissible informational activity and impermissible campaign activity. Rather, courts considered the style, tenor, and timing of a communication to determine whether it was permissible. Third, individual employees and officials could act in their personal capacities without using agency resources. This included ballot measure campaign activities. When acting in their own capacities, UC employees and officials must make clear that they are not acting as UC representatives; this might involve using a disclaimer. Campaign activities should not be staffed by UC employees acting in their UC capacity, and an individual's campaign activities should be of one's own volition. Campus foundations and alumni associations were separate legal entities and permitted to engage in ballot measure campaign activity as long as they were not using UC resources and abiding by the rules attached to any funding received. OGC's guidelines on UC's participation in ballot campaigns were available online.

Provost Brown stated that UC had been central to public engagement on the value of affirmative action, which he defined as initiatives and programs intended to address enduring and historic inequality. On July 20, 1995, the Regents adopted resolutions SP-1 and SP-2, which prohibited certain demographic considerations in admissions, employment, and contracting. On November 6, 1996, Proposition 209 passed, and those prohibitions were incorporated into the California Constitution. Although the Regents later rescinded SP-1 and SP-2 on May 16, 2001, the State Constitution had not changed, and this issue remained. The passage of Proposition 16 would affect UC admissions and employment. A presentation on the effects of Proposition 209, how UC has worked within its constraints, and how the passage of Proposition 16 would affect UC was being prepared for the full Board. He invited the Committee to ask questions that could help him and his team prepare for the upcoming presentation before the Board.

Committee Chair Leib announced that he was establishing a working group to review the impact of Proposition 209 on UC admissions, employment, and contracting, as well as on the University's diversity efforts and examine what changes UC was considering if Proposition 209 is repealed. He asked Regent Butler to chair the working group and Regents Muwwakkil, Pérez, Stegura to join him in the working group.

Regent Butler stated that she was pleased to lead an effort that could potentially affect so many California students and the future of the University. UC was challenged to be at the forefront with regard to equity and inclusion once again. She looked forward to working with the working group, as well as with this Committee, the Board, students, alumni, and chancellors, on permissible ways to educate the UC community about Proposition 16 and how its passage could advance the University's mission.

Regent Stegura noted that all four alumni regents were part of this Committee. Campus foundations and alumni associations were separate legal entities that could choose to take action. Association staff who were UC employees would not be able participate, but this issue should be of interest to UC's 2.8 million alumni. At the last Alumni Associations of UC (AAUC) orientation for Regents-designate Lott and Torres, concern had been expressed that alumni associations were not allowed to get involved due to their U.S. Internal Revenue Code Section 501(c)(3) status. She asked if there were legal constraints on such involvement. Ms. Auriti explained that the rules for campaigning for candidates and parties differed from those for campaigning for ballot initiatives. 501(c)(3) charitable organizations were banned from electioneering, which applied to candidates and parties. Rules prohibiting UC as a State entity from ballot initiative campaigns did not apply to auxiliary organizations like alumni associations and campus foundations.

Regent Stegura stated that concern had been expressed in the context of these two initiatives. She asked whether an alumni association's board of directors could endorse a proposition as the Regents have done. There was a concern that an alumni association would lose its nonprofit status if it did so, even if it was not a substantial part of its activities. Ms. Auriti replied that doing so would not run afoul of an alumni association's 501(c)(3) status. Mr. Robinson suggested speaking after the meeting to learn about the source of the advice that alumni associations were receiving and to speak to that source.

Committee Chair Leib remarked that Regents, as individuals, could still exercise their First Amendment rights. He underscored the importance of Proposition 16 and noted that this situation was brought about by past Regents. It would be important to educate the UC community, alumni, and the greater community regarding the impact of Proposition 209, and it was within the Regents' purview to do so.

Regent Muwwakkil asked if there were any prohibitions on political activities for organizations like the UC Student Association or the UC Graduate and Professional Council. Ms. Auriti replied that individual students could be active in campaign activities as long as they were not using University resources. Student government was considered part of UC and rules that apply to UC would apply to student government. She offered to speak after the meeting and advise particular groups.

Regent Muwwakkil expressed his hope that the upcoming presentation on Proposition 209, like the presentation on standardized tests in admissions, would include history, different perspective, and the results of Regental action. He also asked that the presentation include how UC's mindset has developed from 1996 to 2020, what issues have changed in that time, and the intended outcome of Proposition 209 and the result.

Regent Lansing asked if 501(c)(3) organizations were allowed to endorse ballot propositions. She was under the impression that 501(c)(3) organizations were prohibited from endorsing propositions or using organization funding toward that. Ms. Auriti stated that a 501(c)(3) could not engage in electioneering, intervening in a political campaign, which was derived from federal Internal Revenue Service rules and applied to candidates for public office and political parties. Rules with respect to ballot initiatives were State law and applied to UC as a State agency or entity. These rules prohibited the use of a State agency's public resources for ballot initiative campaigns. UC's alumni associations and campus foundations were separate 501(c)(3) organizations prohibited from candidate electioneering but were not subject to the rules that applied to State agencies with respect to ballot initiatives.

Regent Lansing stated that, in her experience with another 501(c)(3) organization, she was prohibited from using the organization's offices, time, staff, or money to engage in any ballot initiative or endorse anything political. Mr. Robinson suggested that OGC respond to specific questions after the meeting. Regent Lansing noted that many Regents were involved in other foundations and might wish to participate in these ballot initiative efforts. Regents needed individual counseling on this question. She understood what she, as an individual, was permitted to do. Ms. Auriti clarified that there were rules regarding the amount of lobbying that 501(c)(3) organizations were permitted to engage in.

Regent Zettel echoed Regent Lansing's comments. When she was the president of a parent teacher association, she was told that a 501(c)(3) could not take a position on a bond measure. She warned the Regents to be cautious. Mr. Robinson agreed and advised people to seek legal advice.

Regent Reilly asked whether Regents' names could appear in campaign literature with the title "UC Regent" as long as there is a clarification that the title is being used for identification purposes. Ms. Auriti responded in the affirmative. Regent Reilly asked if Regents needed approval for this use of their names. Mr. Robinson replied that it would not require clearance. If Regents wished to deviate from that phrasing, then it might require OGC review to ensure that it sufficiently disclaims official action.

Regent Mart noted that the ten alumni associations' 501(c)(3) statuses might be different. Some were staffed entirely by UC employees, while others were completely independent. He suggested learning more about each individual association.

4. **STUDENT VOTER REGISTRATION 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.]

Committee Chair Leib stated that Regent Stegura suggested this presentation. He agreed that it was important to learn more about campus voter registration efforts since students were mostly starting the fall term remotely.

Senior Vice President Holmes stated that UC has launched a campaign to generate interest and participation in voter registration in partnership with students.

UC Student Association President Varsha Sarveshwar explained how UCSA's longtime campaign, UCWeVote, coordinated campus voter registration efforts. Each campus coordinator worked with stakeholders to register students and turn out student voters. Prior to remote instruction as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic, students campaigned in high-traffic areas on campus and in dormitories. UC Berkeley held a voter registration concert. About 20,000 voters registered or re-registered to vote before the March primary election through these efforts. UCSA worked with the Office of the President (UCOP) to create digital content and a voter guide, and a UCOP grant funded staff time and branded merchandise. In the 2019–20 academic year, UCSA identified student outreach for the 2020 Census as a top priority. Another UCOP grant funded staff time and student organizer stipends, and campus student associations also received grants. Online outreach has included sharing graphics on social media, hosting virtual town halls, and connecting with student organizations. UCSA garnered over 9,000 online impressions, and over 250 student organizations were engaged. UCSA planned to extend census efforts into the fall, given the 2020 Census deadline extension. Online census outreach has prepared UCSA for fully online student voter engagement for the November election. UCSA planned to share graphics on social media, as well as online contests and giveaways. UCSA aimed to engage larger numbers of students through campus student organizations' communications networks. Ms. Sarveshwar asked that campuses work with student leaders to make voting and completing the 2020 Census as easy as possible. She further suggested that campuses establish civic engagement committees so that students and key administrators could meet regularly to discuss effective joint strategies.

Regent Stegura asked how UCSA advised students in terms of registering to vote at home or at their campus location. Ms. Sarveshwar replied that, in a typical year, students had made this decision themselves. Some students were better informed or more involved in their home districts. UCSA would encourage students to register and be mindful of the mailing address they used. For this election, UCSA planned to make sure that students were updating their registration, because they would all be receiving vote-by-mail ballots. UCSA tried to remain neutral about where students should register. In response to a comment by Regent Stegura about mail-in ballots, Ms. Sarveshwar noted that many students would have to re-register or update registration information to receive their ballots.

Committee Chair Leib asked whether there was prior data on the number of UC students who were registered to vote and on voter turnout. Ms. Sarveshwar replied that UC had just conducted a YouGov poll on the issue. Ms. Holmes stated that, according to the poll, 70 percent of California youth surveyed were registered to vote. Those enrolled in college full-time were more engaged. She did not have exit poll information.

Regent Pérez shared that voter turnout among college students in California and nationwide increased significantly in 2018 compared to other off-cycle elections. It was reasonable to expect 2020 turnout to be higher than that of 2018, as 2020 was a presidential election year. Turnout in 2020 should also be compared to the turnout of other presidential election years.

The base number for turnout would be different because of different registration efforts. Turnout should be compared against the number of students registered to vote and the number of students eligible to vote. Regent-designate Torres added that turnout was usually 11 percent higher in presidential elections than in other elections.

Regent Lansing emphasized that voter turnout would determine the election outcome. She asked what the Board of Regents could do as a body. Mr. Robinson replied that a voter turnout effort would be nonpartisan provided that the direction of the vote was not urged. There was a fair amount of latitude for the Board to encourage people to vote.

Regent Lansing underscored that voter turnout, for both students and the general public, was an important issue for the Committee and suggested it as a topic for future meetings. Committee Chair Leib stated that UC could insert voter registration information in its frequent communications to students. Chancellor Wilcox explained that some campus communications went unread, which was why the partnership with students was so important. University messaging was not as effective as other strategies.

Regent Muwwakkil asked what this Committee and Regents could do to help ensure that students are highly engaged in the November election. Ms. Sarveshwar echoed Chancellor Wilcox's comments, adding that students often knew which channels reached students best. To ensure student engagement, Ms. Sarveshwar first encouraged campuses to set up regular meetings with student leaders. For instance, this worked well at UC Berkeley. Second, she suggested disseminating as much communication through as many channels as possible, such as through faculty or social media. Third, campuses could provide funding for student organizer stipends. Voter registration work was challenging, and paying students to do this work part-time was more effective than expecting them to work for free.

Regent Sherman asked whether not holding classes on election day might have an impact on voter turnout. Ms. Holmes replied that, according to UC's YouGov poll, students supported a voting holiday and all-electronic voting.

Regent Pérez asked Ms. Sarveshwar whether the issues encountered in previous attempts to engage with campus registrar's offices were resolved. This was an anomalous year because most students would not be on campus. In typical years, campus registrars would have many tools for engagement. Ms. Sarveshwar responded that there was a memorandum of understanding (MOU) between UC and the California Secretary of State regarding automatically registering students to vote. It had not been implemented because of privacy concerns and technological issues. UCSA has advocated for it. In fall 2019, UC Berkeley's student government worked with the campus registrar to develop a notification and link that appeared on a student portal. This module was developed entirely by students. There was potential for more engagement between registrar's offices and student leaders, especially after the pandemic.

Chancellor Block agreed that UCLA's student voter engagement efforts were most effective when the campus worked with student groups.

Ms. Holmes stated that UC signed the MOU with the Secretary of State in 2016. UC has regularly met some of the MOU's requirements but could improve in other areas. Per the MOU, UC agreed to commit to sending all-campus emails and social media messages, which has always occurred on or before election day; working with the local officials in each campus location to secure centralized polling places; identifying at least one office per campus responsible for student voter engagement efforts; and promoting and participating in National Voter Registration Day. The MOU called for software that pre-populates online voter registration forms, and such software was implemented at UCLA. UC hoped that the software would eventually be shared at other campuses.

Regent Pérez remarked that it was his understanding that the agreement was a statement of understanding, not an MOU. He asked if there was still an impasse, and, if so, what Regents could do to help resolve it. Ms. Holmes replied that, according to Student Affairs, both the Secretary of State and the University were at an impasse. She would need to consult with Academic Affairs about what to do. Regent Pérez suggested two considerations, what to do in 2020, an anomalous year, and what to do to resolve issues with the Secretary of State and campus registrars for future engagement. Committee Chair Leib asked Ms. Holmes to provide more information about the impasse. Ms. Holmes replied that the system developed for the UCLA pilot program could not be easily applied to other campuses, which regarded this as an unfunded mandate that was a lower-priority information technology expenditure. Committee Chair Leib stated that the Committee should express its concern and asked Ms. Holmes for an update so that student voter engagement becomes a greater priority.

Chancellor Yang shared that, according to the Rock the Vote ranking, UC was among those institutions with the highest percentages of registered student voters in the nation. In recent years, UC Santa Barbara has registered 40 percent of students during move-in days. Registering freshman students was a very effective tool.

Staff Advisor Tseng suggested expanding the voter engagement discussion to include the general population and UC staff. Committee Chair Leib agreed, noting that UC was the third largest employer in the state.

Provost Brown stated that UC voter participation data was available online. Voter registration and voting rates were increasing and outpacing the rates of other institutions in California. In 2018, 74 percent of UC students were registered to vote, and 59 percent actually voted. He asked Ms. Sarveshwar whether she had any insights into improving those numbers. Ms. Sarveshwar replied that, in addition to what she and others had suggested, she wished to underscore the burden on student leaders to develop solutions and overcome administrative obstacles. In order to register students at orientation, student leaders likely spent months working on implementation with campus leadership. Student leaders did not feel as if this was a top-down campus priority. She encouraged campus leaders to engage with students and prioritize the changes that needed to be made.

Ms. Holmes stated that UCOP had been working with campuses and supporting students to promote voter registration efforts for many years. UCOP's goal to increase voter

registration was now more complicated during the pandemic because of the issue of where to register, and UCOP was also part of the 2020 Census effort. UCOP efforts also focused on staff, faculty, retirees, and alumni. UC partnered with YouGov to conduct a poll on California youth voters and their preferences, and results were released this week. Seventy percent of youth surveyed were already registered to vote, and 69 percent were concerned that the pandemic would depress voter turnout in November. Those enrolled in college full-time were more politically engaged. California youth strongly favored measures that make voting easier, such as electronic voting, a voting holiday, and same-day registration. UCOP bought digital ads, conducted paid outreach in student media, and asked UC Advocacy Network ambassadors to conduct outreach. Digital toolkits were provided to UCSA, UC Graduate and Professional Council, and the California State University and California Community College systems. UCOP was working with the California Secretary of State to better understand the election process this fall and would communicate new information with UCOP partners and the campuses. With regard to the 2020 Census, President Trump's announcement to prohibit undocumented immigrants from participating presented many challenges. Ms. Holmes outlined ways in which Governor Newsom asked UC to support the 2020 Census, and every campus has met these commitments except for inviting the public to campuses to complete the Census, which was postponed due to the pandemic. She thanked Governor Newsom and the State for the funding that was distributed to the campuses and used for digital promotion.

Regent Pérez noted the distinction between polling and participation. UC had no control over transitioning to digital elections, and there was no indication that it would change voter participation. Based on his experience as a founder of a voter engagement nonprofit organization, voting was an individual activity, and engagement with college-age students could help set a habit of voting. A voting holiday would be helpful with in-person elections, but early and absentee voting was a separate issue. Polling places at UCLA were congested on election day because people were still treating voting as a one-day-only activity. Normalizing early and absentee voting could affect voter turnout. People get turned away at crowded polling places. On one occasion, he supplied food and tables for voters who were in line late into the night. This did not help set voting habits. The same tools that could set good voting habits and empower students with the greatest opportunity to vote could be applied to staff and other members of the UC community. Increased voter registration could make voter turnout appear to shrink. Regent Pérez suggested considering voter turnout among the number of students registered as well as among the number of students eligible to vote. Ms. Holmes stated that UCOP would continue to refine its messaging. Committee Chair Leib urged Ms. Holmes to leverage the experience among Committee members. Mr. Brown added that he would convey today's discussion to Vice President Gullatt so that she might engage campuses on shaping voter participation behavior. Ms. Holmes stated that she would provide a memorandum on the impasse between the University and the Secretary of State.

5. STATE AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENT 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.]

Senior Vice President Holmes introduced the item by stating that, to date, COVID-19 has had a \$1.77 billion fiscal impact on the University. UC received significant State and federal funding that would help students but would likely not be enough.

Associate Vice President Kieran Flaherty stated that California's March shelter-in-place directive had removed two months of work and hearings from the State legislative calendar. He praised Governor Newsom and the Legislature for passing a budget on time. The Legislature's summer recess was extended to July 27 due to COVID-19, leaving five weeks before the final recess of the 2019–20 legislative biennium, and there were 1,000 active bills. Many bills for vulnerable populations were unlikely to proceed, but the Legislature and Newsom Administration were addressing these issues in other ways. For instance, Governor Newsom issued executive orders to halt evictions, extend eligibility or waive redetermination of eligibility for CalFresh, and extend the deadline for verifying grade point average (GPA) for the Cal Grant. The Legislature could also pool policy bills into a budget bill or budget trailer bill. For example, State Senator Jim Beall introduced a bill for the Extended Foster Care program that required additional funding and accomplished it in the State Budget Act of 2020. Mr. Flaherty credited the work of student organizations for the progress UC has made in receiving ongoing State funding. The State Budget Act of 2019 allocated \$15 million to UC for basic needs and about \$3.5 million for rapid rehousing in ongoing funding. Governor Newsom and the Legislature worked together to establish a budget that minimized the pandemic's impact on UC revenue streams and could be revised to be more similar to Governor Newsom's January introductory budget, should federal funding materialize.

Associate Vice President Chris Harrington stated that UC was on target this year to receive \$10 billion through the normal federal appropriations process. The University already received \$800 million through COVID-19 supplemental appropriations bills such as the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act, \$260 million of which was from the Higher Education Emergency Relief Fund for minority serving institutions. Federal Governmental Relations (FGR) was working to increase the \$7.3 million allocation to UC's minority serving institutions. UC Health received \$480 million from the Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund, with additional funding anticipated, as well as \$900 million in advance payments from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. UC has also received millions of dollars in emergency funds for COVID-19 research. FGR was also working with the campuses to receive their Federal Emergency Management Agency reimbursements. Negotiations for a fourth supplemental appropriations bill were expected to be difficult, but FGR was confident that Congress would pass one in August. FGR and campus colleagues were working to ensure that UC interests would be reflected through correspondence and direct conversations with Senators Kamala Harris and Diane Feinstein, House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, and officials from the Trump Administration. FGR was also working with the UC Student Association, UC Graduate and Professional Council, and other organizations. FGR was communicating priorities with congressional staff, such as federal support for California's and UC's recovery, an additional \$47 billion to the Higher Education Emergency Relief Fund, and \$26 billion for research that was shut down due to the pandemic. UC Health priorities included additional investment in the Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund,

which would provide relief to medical centers, and legislative language that would preserve existing Medicaid financing. FRG has briefed congressional staff on COVID-19's impact on UC and provided them with access to UC expertise on the pandemic. Along with State Governmental Relations (SGR), FGR launched a UC Advocacy Network campaign for federal funding for State and UC priorities.

Regent Zettel asked if CalFresh and Extended Foster Care were well utilized by students. She referenced State Assembly Bill (AB) 2282 authored by Assemblymember Kevin McCarty. Mr. Flaherty stated that AB 2282 addressed CalFresh enrollment in institutions of higher education. SGR and its counterparts at the California State University system were working with Assemblymember McCarty's office. The bill's proposed notification system via texting would be expanded to include email. SGR planned to support the bill, which was likely to be set for a hearing in the Senate Education Committee. Other bills were held on the suspense file and unlikely to progress. SGR reports on UC initiatives to the Legislature every year. Mr. Flaherty would work with Institutional Research Academic Planning to provide the Regents with data on student satisfaction with these initiatives. In fall 2018, 1,700 current or former foster youth were enrolled in Extended Foster Care, up from about 1,500 students four or five years prior. UC enrollment had also grown. Some bills did not affect a large number of students but still mattered because they would affect UC students. Mr. Flaherty would provide participation data for CalFresh. Regent Zettel underscored the importance of Extended Foster Care because of the number of foster youth who were incarcerated or trafficked.

Regent Stegura asked whether undocumented students were still excluded from federal aid. Mr. Harrington replied that, while the CARES Act did not explicitly exclude undocumented students, the U.S. Secretary of Education Betsy DeVos interpreted it to exclude them. Several lawsuits were filed, and a preliminary injunction on Secretary DeVos' proposed rule was put in place. An interim final rule was released, and UC submitted a comment strongly opposing the exclusion of undocumented students. UC was able to provide financial support to undocumented students at this time but wished to see the U.S. Department of Education withdraw its rule.

Committee Chair Leib asked whether the Legislature was definitely reconvening on July 27. Regent Pérez stated that this was the expectation but there could be further delay. Several members of the Assembly and staff had tested positive for COVID-19. Committee Chair Leib noted that a delay could affect the passage of bills. Regent Pérez stated that both legislative houses prioritized resolving outstanding trailer bills, and COVID-19 legislation was a priority of leaders of both houses. Both houses modified how bills went to committee, and both leaders wished to see members move fewer bills.

Committee Chair Leib asked Mr. Flaherty what bills he wished would pass. Mr. Flaherty replied that SGR worked very hard to get bills passed earlier or through budget trailer bill language. SGR adjusted its priorities at the outset of the pandemic, which Mr. Flaherty believed was the right strategy. SGR refocused its energy on supporting students, faculty, researchers, and workers.

6. UPDATE ON PLANS FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA CENTER IN SACRAMENTO

[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.]

Provost Brown stated that the University, as a leading public research university, should train and educate future public servants. UC sought to disseminate research-based knowledge to inform public policy through UC Center Sacramento (UCCS). Due to seismic issues, UCCS planned to move to a new location across from the California State Capitol. UC would develop UCCS to be a national model for student-centered experiential learning in public service and scholarship. The building needed renovation in order to achieve this ambition. UC had significant internal resources but was actively trying to fundraise about \$8 million. President Napolitano had authorized the use of internal resources for UCCS.

Regent Kieffer suggested distributing the new building's design documents to the Committee. This had been a longtime effort, a small operation that had grown under UC Davis leadership, and a commitment to raise the remaining funds was needed. UCCS gave students across system the opportunity to study together and network in Sacramento, provided a different experience for students outside of this field, and educated the citizenry. He was confident that this could be achieved and looked forward to a building that served students and was a real presence in Sacramento. UCCS would offer programs to the greater UC community and the Legislature. Past and present Regents, alumni, and others would be contacted for fundraising purposes.

Committee Chair Leib underscored that this would give a tremendous opportunity to students and provide a space that would help UC better engage with the Legislature.

Regent Reilly stated that she was thrilled to be involved. The new location would allow double the number of student participants, better disseminate UC's research and knowledge to positively affect public policy, and enhance UC's visibility in Sacramento. UC would have a building specifically for inviting legislators, chancellors, policymakers, and other guests. She expressed her hope that Regents would join in the fundraising effort.

Committee Chair Leib thanked Regent Pérez for his involvement and support, as well as Regent Kieffer, who started this effort about ten years ago.

7. FUTURE COMMITTEE TOPICS FOR THE UPCOMING 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 Leib stated that an off-cycle Committee meeting at a community college was postponed, and he anticipated Committee meetings via teleconference for a while. He asked the Committee for suggestions of future topics, reiterating Regent Lansing's suggestion of voter registration. Student leaders provided him with a list of suggested

topics such as the transfer student experience, student-initiated recruitment and retention for underrepresented students, and UC's international student community.

Regent Lansing suggested that the Regents engage State legislators on the importance of UC via brief teleconference meetings. UC had not yet achieved its desired relationship with the Legislature. Regent Pérez could help identify key legislators. Committee Chair Leib added that these engagements could occur more regularly than Regents meetings. Regent Lansing suggested that each meeting could include several Regents and a student representative.

Regent Kieffer suggested teleconference meetings with key leaders from the California Community College and K-12 systems, as well as school superintendents. They could also share their concerns. These conversations might lead the Committee to stakeholders other than legislators, such as student leaders and those to whom UC has obligations as well. Committee Chair Leib suggested calls with California parents. There was a digital divide across the state, as demonstrated by Mann UCLA Community School, where three percent of students had internet access at home.

Chancellor Block suggested a briefing on how UC's health systems were growing and addressing public need through means such as free clinics.

Regent Sherman suggested that the University should embark on an aggressive branding campaign and produce promotional content for targeted audiences. Senior Vice President Holmes replied that the Office of the President (UCOP) was brainstorming appropriate messaging during the COVID-19 pandemic. The campuses and UCOP produced this type of content on a regular basis, but it required funding and time. Regent Sherman suggested using the talents of UC's theater and film school students in order to produce promotional content at no cost. UC should use available resources, such as talent from its English and science departments, for example. UC-made content would be compelling and much more cost-effective. Committee Chair Leib praised the suggestion.

Regent Mart suggested that Regents reach out to leadership from the alumni associations and campus foundations.

Regent Reilly shared that she learned about how campuses engaged with their communities during her visits prior to the pandemic, and campuses had likely built new partnerships with food banks and community nonprofit organizations since then. She suggested inviting campus representatives to speak about these new partnerships, best practices, and the leveraging of resources and talents.

Regent-designate Lott asked whether UC had connections with or pipeline programs for the middle and elementary school levels, noting that science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) education required engagement at the elementary school level. Senior Vice President Holmes replied that, as she recalled, UC Berkeley had reached out to middle schools in New York by sending alumni or students to the schools, teleconferences, and sending UC-branded merchandise. Partnerships varied by campus,

and the pandemic's impact on them was uncertain. Chancellor Block stated that UCLA's partnership with Mann UCLA Community School helped guarantee an early start STEM education and produce UC-ready students. Committee Chair Leib added that, from his experience serving on the Solana Beach School Board, parents were discussing this with their children.

Regent Stegura suggested presentations from innovative campus programs such as Aggie Square, which combined civic engagement and partnership with the local community, education and research, and corporate sponsorship. Other campuses might have similar programs.

Committee Chair Leib expressed his wish to proceed with a presentation on the transfer program. He also wished to determine what steps Regents could take to educate and interact with staff to encourage large donors to give to student services.

Regent Muwwakkil suggested that campus programs that work with the community college population could share their best practices and explain the transfer student pipeline. One such program was the Center for Community College Partnerships at UCLA.

Committee Chair Leib encouraged Committee members to contact him or Regent Stegura with more suggestions. He planned to provide the Committee members with a selected list of topics for their further input. He wished to put together a year's worth of potential presentations because of the time it takes to plan them, and he thanked Secretary and Chief of Staff Shaw and her staff for their work in preparing these meetings.

The meeting adjourned at 11:40 a.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff