

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