

The Regents of the University of California

**PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

January 21, 2021

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, Muwakkil, Ortiz Oakley, Reilly, Sherman, Stegura, and Zettel; Advisory members Horwitz, Lott, and Torres; Chancellors Block, May, Muñoz, Wilcox, and Yang; Staff Advisor Tseng

In attendance: Assistant Secretary Lyall, Managing Counsel Shanle, Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer Brostrom, Executive Vice President Byington, Senior Vice President Holmes, Chancellors Christ and Khosla, and Recording Secretary Li

The meeting convened at 9:45 a.m. with Committee Chair Leib presiding.

Committee Chair Leib announced that this was the last Committee meeting for Regents Kieffer and Zettel and thanked them for their contributions and service.

**1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of November 18, 2020 were approved, Regents Guber, Kieffer, Lansing, Leib, Mart, Muwakkil, Ortiz Oakley, Reilly, Sherman, Stegura, and Zettel voting “aye”.<sup>1</sup>

**2. CONVERSATION WITH SENATOR JOHN LAIRD**

[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.]

This item was deferred to a future Committee meeting. Committee Chair Leib announced that State Senator John Laird was unable to attend this Committee meeting and planned to attend a future one. Senator Laird, who was a graduate of UC Santa Cruz, would be playing a key role in State budget discussions as the Chair of the Senate Subcommittee for Higher Education. Committee Chair Leib noted that Senator Laird stated that he looked forward to working with President Drake.

---

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

3. **THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PARTNERSHIP WITH THE STATE ON CA NOTIFY**

[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.]

Executive Vice President Byington introduced UC San Diego Health Chief Information Officer Christopher Longhurst. Dr. Longhurst has been instrumental in much of the University's response to the COVID-19 pandemic, from CA Notify to the COVID-19 vaccine.

Dr. Longhurst explained that CA Notify was the product of a partnership between UC and the California Department of Public Health (CDPH). This was a privacy-preserving, Bluetooth-based, proximity notification system. Users who test positive for COVID-19 could voluntarily launch an anonymous exposure notification to any other users who were within six feet of them for a period of 15 minutes for the last 14 days. This technology did not use location tracking or send identifying information from one's device, and the privacy-preserving nature of CA Notify was key to UC's decision to adopt it. Advocacy to stakeholders began in May and June 2020, and State Governmental Relations introduced relevant State Assembly bills in July and August. In September, the State announced the pilot program that was launched at UC San Diego and UCSF. Early outcome data from UCSD in October showed that many students adopted the system and that earlier notification than traditional contact tracing methodology led to quarantining, which helped stop viral expansion. In November, UC asked the State for permission to expand CA Notify to other UC campuses, and, in December, the system was launched statewide and had seven million users within the first week of launching.

Dr. Longhurst shared some lessons learned. CA Notify was viewed as a health tool that was part of a larger pandemic response, which the San Diego campus referred to as a "Swiss Cheese Model" that had multiple interventions. With its comprehensive strategy, UCSD was able to keep COVID-19 rates on campuses lower than in surrounding communities. Healthcare providers, who were perceived as a more trusted source than the government or an employer, more effectively convinced individuals to adopt CA Notify. Clinical impact was maximized when users were able to launch notifications as close as possible to the time they tested positive for COVID-19. In other states, contact tracers would launch notifications days after a person tested positive. Dr. Longhurst thanked stakeholders from UC, State government, and the technology industry.

Regent Zettel asked if the age groups of users were being tracked, noting that senior citizens were often less adept at using mobile phone technology. Dr. Longhurst replied that CA Notify had no mechanism to identify who has adopted the technology. Its private nature was both a benefit and a drawback. UC was partnering with the State to reach out to underserved areas and different age groups. UC did know that 25 percent of California adults adopted CA Notify.

Regent Zettel stated that UC could ask health systems across the state to encourage their visitors to adopt CA Notify. Dr. Longhurst responded that UC campuses marketed CA Notify well to students and employees. Through UC's partnership with CDPH, there were highway signs for CA Notify, as well as outreach in different languages. Like Dr. Byington, he was trained as a pediatrician and saw the importance of preventive measures.

Regent Stegura asked whether the State was required to inform individuals of this tool upon their receiving a positive test result so that they could launch a notification. Dr. Longhurst responded that every positive COVID-19 test result was reported to CDPH but not necessarily in real time. Everyone who tests positive in California should receive a text message to send an anonymous notification. Over 110,000 individuals had launched exposure notifications.

Regent Muwwakkil encouraged students to activate CA Notify and asked how the technology could be used after the pandemic. Dr. Longhurst replied that 26 states were using this technology. Governor Newsom had recently signed the Western States Pact with Colorado, Nevada, Oregon, and Washington, and these states were sharing lessons learned and discussing future opportunities. Given the difficulty of scaling contact tracing for respiratory diseases, this seemed to be the right technology for future respiratory disease outbreaks. A mechanism would turn off the tool when the pandemic is declared over.

Regent Reilly recalled that she was prompted to join WA Notify when she traveled to Washington, and she asked if CA Notify shared user information with notification systems in other states. Dr. Longhurst replied that the notification systems in California, Washington, Colorado, and Hawaii were all interoperable. For instance, an individual from California who was exposed to COVID-19 in Washington would still be notified after the individual returned to California. The Association of Public Health Laboratories made this possible. Dr. Longhurst clarified that the notification that Regent Reilly received in Washington was a statewide alert, not one specific to user location. Apple and Google sent an alert about CA Notify to everyone in the state using their products, which helped to engage more users than would have been possible with a software application available for download.

Regent Reilly asked whether there was data showing that CA Notify was helping slow down the spread of COVID-19. Dr. Longhurst stated that there was anecdotal and qualitative data from UC's pilot program, such as someone who received an exposure alert more likely to test positive than anyone else who was being screened for COVID-19. UC was collecting stories from across the state, and CA Notify now gave users the option to provide anonymous analytics, which would hopefully yield more information.

Staff Advisor Tseng asked whether this was a software application or a device setting. Dr. Longhurst replied that, on mobile phones with the Android operating system, CA Notify was an application, and, on mobile phones with the Apple operating system, CA Notify was a device setting. He described CA Notify as an exposure notification system.

Staff Advisor Tseng asked if staff should activate CA Notify on both work and personal mobile phones. Dr. Longhurst responded that, if staff carried one phone without the other, then they should activate CA Notify on both. Ms. Tseng expressed concern about being counted twice if she activated CA Notify on both phones. Dr. Longhurst stated that there was no downside to activating it for both phones, but it was not necessary when carrying both phones at all times.

Senior Vice President Holmes noted that this was part of the University's public service mission. She acknowledged Dr. Longhurst, Dr. Byington, and her own staff for their efforts and advocacy. Verizon was promoting CA Notify to its customers, and CDPH was employing paid media. Dr. Longhurst acknowledged his team and thanked the Regents for their support.

Regent Stegura asked about approaching other telecommunications companies to do what Verizon had done. Dr. Longhurst replied that UC was working with CDPH on this and would like to see a similar push from other health systems, such as Kaiser Permanente or Sutter Health. Information being disseminated about CA Notify was also competing with information being disseminated about vaccines.

#### 4. **ANNUAL REPORT ON PRIVATE SUPPORT 2019–20**

[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 briefly summarized the report, which compared giving across different institutions by using national reporting standards. In fiscal year 2019–20, the University received \$2.9 billion in outright gifts and pledge payments from more than 300,000 donors, and this was UC's sixth year raising more than \$2 billion. UC added \$619 million to its endowment, which went toward scholarships, fellowships, endowed chairs, research, and faculty programs. Ms. Holmes presented a chart that demonstrated the role of campus foundations in UC's 20-year increase in private support. Gifts could be given to the Regents for the benefit of a campus or to a campus foundation. In recent years, more than half of UC philanthropy support was given through foundations.

Committee Chair Leib ask why donors gave to foundations versus to campuses. Ms. Holmes replied that how donors gave depended on what they were trying to accomplish. Some wished to give to a campus project instead of multi-campus programs.

Ms. Holmes stated that more than \$230 million went to scholarships and fellowships, an increase of \$19 million from the previous fiscal year. Almost half of the total gift amount went to the health sciences and medicine. UC received more than 400,000 gifts. Alumni gave over \$209 million, an increase of \$23 million from the previous fiscal year, and alumni foundations provided \$207 million. Unrestricted giving comprised one percent of total giving, which was consistent with national trends.

John Cash, Senior Consultant and Principal at Marts and Lundy, congratulated the University for an extraordinary fundraising year. UC was a national leader, with three campuses at or near the top in private fundraising among both public and private universities. UC also currently had three of the largest campaigns in the country and led in campaigns over \$1 billion. Each UC campus had a unique fundraising heritage, and some programs were less developed than others. About 72 percent of the money raised by UC would be supporting its research enterprise, a testament to UC's ability to attract these funds. There was a misconception that donors loved to give to buildings, but fundraising for capital projects was very challenging. At research universities, raising capital dollars was increasingly tied to the research enterprise, and the improvement of science and engineering facilities was essential to the recruitment and retention of faculty and students, as well as driving research. Many of the top private universities were expanding. He found concerning UC's need for funding in order to keep its research enterprise competitive. Giving patterns were similar across the campuses regardless of the maturity of a campus' development program. The University was more dependent on foundation and corporate giving, which was typical of public universities and part of a national trend. Individual and alumni giving drove private university development but was growing at UC as well. Big donors tended to support research, which presented a challenge to student support.

Mr. Cash stated that the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on giving was not yet clear. At the start of the pandemic, giving went more toward immediate relief, financial aid, food assistance, and emergency causes. UC saw more donations toward COVID-19 research, as well as research on the social consequences of the pandemic. As with the financial crisis in 2010, donors who gave \$50,000 to \$100,000 gifts had less disposable income. In his experience, the number of gifts at this level was declining. Individuals and foundations were making very large gifts because of the recent good performance of the capital markets. Mr. Cash underscored the importance of challenge grants for giving to student support. Donors enjoyed feeling as if they were leveraging additional funding. Mr. Cash attributed the growth of planned gifts and bequest intentions to both the idleness and tragedy caused by the pandemic, which has led many to contemplate their mortality. These types of gifts had grown across all sectors according to a Marts and Lundy study. This was important to consider, given the decline in direct endowment giving, with the exception of bequest intentions. Donors want to make an immediate impact.

Committee Chair Leib asked about the best practices for changing the culture surrounding student support giving. Perhaps UC could encourage donors to set aside a percentage of a major gift, which was intended for a building, for instance, for student support. Mr. Cash clarified that fundraising for buildings was extremely difficult, and a large percentage of giving went to research. Appealing to immediate need has been effective during the pandemic, but a longer-term strategy would involve challenge grants and well-marketed stories about students. His clients have tried to add maintenance costs when soliciting capital project gifts to little effect. Donors tended to be specific about how funds would be used.

Regent Stegura asked whether data showed a marked improvement in UC alumni giving. Ms. Holmes replied that it stayed roughly the same but that this year was extraordinary and not the best for comparison. Alumni giving had not reached desired levels.

Regent Stegura asked whether there was a systemwide strategy to engage a mega-donor who could make a transformational gift for systemwide initiatives. Ms. Holmes responded that the Hellman Foundation recently gave a multi-campus gift. There was no systemwide strategy yet, but a conversation had begun with President Drake.

Chancellor Block asked for advice for fundraising to support graduate students, especially those in Ph.D. programs. Mr. Cash acknowledged that this had been a challenge in his own career. Most alumni were undergraduate alumni and felt differently about graduate student support. At Stanford, large gifts for graduate fellowships had been made with challenge grants. He advised treating graduate student support differently than what is typically regarded as student support. Rather, graduate student support was part of academic or research support and could be built into fundraising for faculty and research initiatives. Graduate student support could also be tied to science and engineering facilities.

Regent Reilly, noting that 25 percent of giving came from individuals, asked about strategies for increasing individual giving aside from challenge grants. Mr. Cash stated that the figure did not account for gifts from institutional donors that had heavy direction from individuals. Individual donors were valuable because they were more likely to give to long-term infrastructure and endowments than foundations or corporations, which tended to give to activities. Aside from challenge grants, there were directed major gift programs, but this was a slow and steady process. UC was making progress in individual and alumni giving. In public university campaigns in the 1980s, alumni gave less than ten percent of the total.

Chancellor May remarked that student support was campus-specific. Student support made up 15 percent of what had been raised so far in UC Davis' current campaign. He cautioned against tying student support to other gifts. Capital projects gifts were often not sufficient for funding what they were meant to fund. UC Davis found that marketing something of no interest to a donor could be problematic. Committee Chair Leib explained that he had made the suggestion of tying capital projects gifts to student support because of the small amount that the State allocated to student services.

UC Berkeley Vice Chancellor for University Development and Alumni Relations Julie Hooper stated that, since the launch of UC Berkeley's \$6 billion campaign in February, the campus had already raised \$4.1 billion, from some 724,000 gifts and 183,000 donors, and was confident that it would meet or exceed its goal when the campaign ends in 2023. Of the \$4.1 billion raised so far, \$1.6 billion came from 111,000 UCB alumni, and \$1.2 billion came from 61,000 non-alumni individuals and donors. Corporation and foundation gifts made up 26 percent of the contributions, and support for undergraduate opportunities and experiences made up ten percent. UC Berkeley raised \$422 million of its \$800 million goal for this fiscal year. Following Big Give, the UCB online day of giving, the campus raised \$33 million in outright support from nearly 5,000 donors for a student emergency fund, COVID-19 research and testing, and chancellor's funds to address COVID-19-related

uncertainties. About half were first-time or lapsed donors. Staff were working to engage first-time and lapsed donors to give consistently.

One notable trend was the rise in support for the UC Berkeley Division of Equity and Inclusion, for which \$60 million was raised in FY 2018–21, up from \$15 million in FY 2014–17. Another trend was how difficult it has been for auxiliaries, such as athletics, museums, and performance venues, to raise money during the pandemic. Endowment giving had also declined but could be correlated to the pandemic-related giving. Widespread, international attendance at UCB’s first all-virtual Homecoming and Parents Weekend activities demonstrated the value of digital engagement even after the pandemic. Challenge and matching funds have been powerful tools for the campus’ current campaign. An anonymous donor gave \$10 million to launch a graduate fellowship endowment matching campaign, resulting in 11 new graduate fellowships thus far. These fellowships were distributed over a wide array of disciplines, including those that were not as well-known in private philanthropy. Bob and Colleen Haas personally donated \$24 million, \$14 million of which went to the Haas Scholars Program and \$10 million of which went to a matching campaign for undergraduate scholarships like the Fiat Lux Scholarship.

Regent Lansing underscored the success of online fundraising during the pandemic. Giving from the comfort of home has become attractive to donors, and she knew of some organizations that have opted to fundraise entirely online. She suggested holding some fundraising events online and some in person after the pandemic and comparing the results.

Regent Muwwakkil asked whether the Office of the President (UCOP) had a central role to play in fundraising. He observed that the pipeline from undergraduate education to the professoriate, which could span multiple campuses, could be funded philanthropically. Ms. Holmes replied that she could relay this suggestion to President Drake and the campus representatives, who meet with UCOP three times a year to discuss initiatives and projects. Campaigns typically evolved organically. UCOP was not staffed to engage in direct fundraising, and campuses determined opportunities. Ms. Hooper added that UC Berkeley and UCSF were collaborating on fundraising and shared a full-time employee. Sandy and Joan Weill had given a joint gift that went to both UC Berkeley and UCSF. Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer Brostrom noted that UCOP’s involvement in philanthropy was matching funds. Then President Napolitano had matched funds for endowed chairs, which was very effective. UC Berkeley was able to create fungible sources of money from restricted giving. Endowed chairs or graduate student fellowships would otherwise come from core funds. Funds raised for the Data Hub New Academic Building at UCB have helped with seismic issues.

UC Riverside Vice Chancellor for University Advancement Peter Hayashida stated that this was a record fundraising year for UCR despite the pandemic. The campus closed “Living the Promise,” its first comprehensive fundraising campaign, on December 21, 2020 and surpassed its goal of \$300 million two months ahead of schedule. Over ten percent of living graduates participated. UCR doubled its endowment and endowed chairs, due in part to matching funds from then President Napolitano. Donors were becoming more interested in supporting UCR students. Of undergraduate students at UCR, more than half

were first-generation, more than half were eligible for the Pell Grant, and 97 percent were California residents. Since the onset of the pandemic, the number of unrestricted gifts increased by 25 percent, a good sign of confidence in the campus, and the number of gifts supporting students rose 40 percent. For FY 2020–21, total dollars raised so far grew about 13 percent over FY 2019–20; this was UCR’s best first half-year performance. The campus also had its strongest Giving Tuesday, with half of the gifts coming from first-time donors and 18 percent of gifts from graduates of the last decade. UC Riverside’s next campaign would be a three-pronged initiative. The first prong, expanding access and opportunity, would entail fundraising for traditional scholarships and fellowships with matching and challenge grants, as well as for mentoring and pipeline and summer bridge programs. The second prong was energizing learning and discovery through internships, experiential learning, and creating inspiring spaces for exploration. For the third prong, enhancing students’ health, well-being, and sense of belonging, UCR would work with donors to address basic needs, transportation, childcare, and financial literacy, and to strengthen honors programs, transfer student success efforts, and ethnic and gender resource centers. The Riverside campus’ mission of advancing equity, social justice, and inclusion resonate with its donors. Being a younger campus and recent growth presented challenges to fundraising. Half of UCR alumni were under age 40 and had not yet reached the typical age of major gift donors. The strength of UC Riverside’s resolve, combined with the exceptional partnership of visionary academic leaders, committed volunteers, and talented staff, would continue drive the campus’ success. UCR’s values led *U.S. News and World Report* to rank it number one in the nation in social mobility for the past two years. Mr. Hayashida concluded his presentation by stressing that UCR students should enjoy the richness and depth of experiences comparable to those at better-resourced institutions.

Staff Advisor Tseng asked whether campuses were fundraising from staff. Ms. Hooper replied that UC Berkeley fundraised annually for its Basic Needs Center from staff. There was no comprehensive staff campaign, but many faculty and staff donated to the Big Give. Last year, Professor Emeritus Gordon Rausser gave \$50 million to name the College of Natural Resources, \$30 million of which went to a dean’s discretionary fund. A staff and faculty campaign could be launched at the end of the public phase of UCB’s current campaign, but the announcement of furloughs made it challenging. Mr. Hayashida stated that UC Riverside was engaged in a small, focused campaign for an employee emergency assistance fund. Chancellor Wilcox challenged campus leadership to raise an additional \$100,000, and the campaign had raised \$58,000 so far. Ms. Tseng underscored the importance of incorporating staff into the University’s culture of philanthropy.

Regent Muwwakkil asked how UCR fundraised for bridge programs. Mr. Hayashida replied that the campus gave donors options that appealed to their passions. The Inland Empire had very low college attainment and access to healthcare, so UCR’s summer bridge and medical summer bridge programs were very popular among donors. Messaging has focused on the lifecycle of a contributing, educated member of society. Some donors were interested in career pathways, and bridge programs seemed to be a part of that.

## 5. STUDENT SUPPORT FUNDRAISING



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

Chancellor Khosla began his remarks by emphasizing that all aspects of the University existed because of students. In 2012, UC San Diego launched a ten-year campaign to raise \$2 billion; in its ninth year, the campaign was on track to raise \$3 billion. UCSD has tried to change the culture to inspire feelings of connectedness and demonstrate the value of a UCSD education. The \$280 million raised for student support and success in this current campaign accounted for 45 percent of gifts but 11 percent of the dollars given. The many who were interested in student support were not large donors, and large donors were interested in giving to research. There were 1,051 UCSD undergraduate students who were guaranteed a loan-free education, which cost about \$10,000 per student per year and was supported by direct fundraising and the endowment. One creative approach that UCSD has taken was using endowment payouts for mortgage payments and student support. With this approach, UCSD has put millions of dollars into student support programs. The payout from endowed professorships supported the endowed faculty member's supported salary, which was typically supported by State funds, and then those State funds would go to student support and success. Not every aspect of a campus had to be supported in a silo. By setting the right goal for the community to support, UCSD also raised \$6 million for a COVID-19 relief fund in ten days, which enabled the development of testing and campus reopening strategies. In addition, 1,473 students had received COVID-19 relief grants to cover textbooks, transportation costs, laptops, and other expenses.

Chancellor Khosla expressed both pride in UC San Diego's ability to support student basic needs but also sadness that students experienced basic needs insecurity. About 5,700 students were receiving support from the campus basic needs center, and there had been 20,000 visits to the campus food pantry. UC San Diego Foundation trustees, along with Chancellor Khosla and the Office of the President (UCOP), were working to eliminate hunger on campus, and, since December 2019, trustees had committed more than \$100,000 to the food pantry. Forty students were in the temporary housing program. Mental health services were supported by internal resources, and students added a mental health fee that went to services and financial aid. Donors were supporting initiatives such as the Black Academic Excellence Initiative and the Latinx/Chicanx Academic Excellence Initiative. Chancellor Khosla stated that he took a holistic view to fundraising.

Regent Muwakkil complimented Chancellor Khosla on his attention to student basic needs. Chancellor Khosla stated that funds raised had an impact on high-need students. Thirty-three percent of Chancellor's Associates Scholarship recipients were transfer students, and more than 60 percent of recipients were first-generation students.

Regent Zettel thanked Chancellor Khosla for his leadership and passion for addressing student needs.

Chancellor Christ stated that, since the launch of UC Berkeley's "Light the Way" campaign in 2014, has it raised over \$247 million from over 32,000 donors for undergraduate student support. One key to this success was creating Student Experience and Diversity (SED), a

unit in the development office that focused on raising money for the Divisions of Student Affairs, Equity and Inclusion, and Undergraduate Education. SED raised money for K–12 programs, scholarships and student aid, internships, undergraduate research, student health and well-being, and increasing a sense of belonging among underrepresented students of color. Another key was setting a campaign goal of raising \$400 million for scholarships and creating 300 new graduate fellowships. Light the Way raised \$3.5 million for basic needs, and UCB made a commitment to raise \$1.5 million annually. Student support was very attractive to a wide range of donors during the COVID-19 pandemic. In fundraising for student housing, UC Berkeley received two extraordinary gifts, one that fully funded an apartment for graduate students and another that fully funded a dormitory for transfer students. Both donors required that the money saved from the absence of debt service would go toward financial aid for graduate and transfer students, respectively. UCB saw an increase of over 80 percent in giving for diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging. For example, the Evelyn and Walter Haas, Jr. Fund gave \$10 million to such programs. The campus also partnered with the San Francisco Foundation for the African American Initiative and for other student groups that historically faced prejudice and discrimination. Some of UC Berkeley's most successful campaigns involved matches, such as the \$10 million gift for the Fiat Lux Scholarship.

Committee Chair Leib asked Mr. Cash what percentage of giving should go to student support. Mr. Cash replied that it depended on the campus and the student population. The challenge in fundraising for student support was acquiring large gifts. Scholarship and student support were appealing during Big Give, and increasing alumni support towards student support was more effective than raising unrestricted giving. Every dollar had value, and the goal was to grow the amount raised, not reduce funds in one area to increase funds in another. Chancellor Khosla expressed agreement. He stated that campuses needed to assess how much was needed for student support based on current educational programs and student demographics. About 20 percent of that need met should be met with fundraising. Chancellor Christ stated that the frame of reference must shift from what the State was not giving UC to regarding philanthropy as a central strategy.

Regent Zettel asked whether funds raised for food and housing security could benefit both graduate and undergraduate students. Chancellor Christ replied that funds raised for student emergency and basic needs was for graduate and undergraduate students. Funds raised for graduate student fellowships were specifically meant to attract the best graduate students.

Regent Muwwakkil recognized Chancellor Christ for focus on graduate student fellowships. He commented that academic affairs and student services were inadvertently seen as separate, but, in his view, student support and research support were intertwined. UC should see student experiences as aligned with the success of its research endeavors, and this should be reflected in philanthropic support. For instance, the McNair Scholars Program and Mellon Mays Undergraduate Fellowship Program provided financial and mentorship support. This would align UC's goals of access and equity with its goal of research excellence. Chancellor Christ stated that UCB has had success raising money for similar programs, such as the Haas Scholars Program and the Miller Scholars program.

Chancellor Muñoz shared how student support programs at UC Santa Barbara and UCLA had helped him as a student UC should publicize widely, especially to stakeholders, how the combination of philanthropy and public support was producing excellence across all its campuses, which had an impact on the prosperity of the state. These conversations and fundraising successes were not the norm in other states. Committee Chair Leib praised Chancellor Muñoz's efforts at UCM and hoped that campuses were sharing best practices with each other.

Regent Stegura stressed the importance of building a culture of philanthropy. Those who were able to make larger gifts also attended UC when it was funded largely by the State, and they assumed that this was still the case. The UC Davis Student Foundation was created as part of the UC Davis Foundation to build that culture of philanthropy among students and share with them what philanthropy could do and why it was necessary.

Committee Chair Leib noted that some students did not choose UC, believing that they could not afford attendance, and because they did not know about the programs available to assist them. This was also a message that should be communicated widely.

## 6. STATE GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS UPDATE

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

Associate Vice President Kieran Flaherty stated that the federal funding that would have restored the \$300 million cut in ongoing funding that the State made last year cut did not materialize. In November, the Regents requested \$518 million from the State to restore that cut; funding for medical education, mental health support, and student equity; and \$250 million in one-time funding for deferred maintenance and energy efficiency projects. Governor Newsom's proposed State Budget in January would provide a \$104 million partial restoration in funding; \$12.9 million for the UC Programs in Medical Education (PRIME); \$15 million in ongoing funds for student basic needs, which included mental health support and technology purchases; and other one-time funds, such as \$175 million for deferred maintenance and energy efficiency projects. The proposed State Budget did not remove the line item for the Office of the President (UCOP) budget, an issue that State Governmental Relations (SGR) planned to pursue with the Legislature.

SGR was tracking the more than 500 bills that had been introduced since the Legislature convened on January 11. Some bills proposed that UC enhance its admissions practices based on recommendations from the State audit and aligned with UC's own internal audit. A \$15 billion educational facilities general obligation bond could go on the 2022 ballot. SGR would continue to work with the Legislature on UC capital funding and on community safety and policing. President Drake had been tirelessly meeting with State leaders to build relationships, highlight UC priorities, and discuss partnerships. SGR would soon be meeting with the UC Legislative Roundtable, a group of legislators who had a UC location in their district. At the Regents' request, SGR had scheduled meetings between Regents and key legislators. Nearly 1,300 people pledged to join SGR's State budget

advocacy campaign, including hundreds who were new to UC advocacy. Campaign partners included the California Coalition for Public Higher Education, students, faculty, and alumni, and other advocacy groups. Mr. Flaherty thanked chancellors and campus leadership for their advocacy work in Sacramento as well. He ended his remarks by indicating that the State must restore cuts to UC's budget in order to ensure student success and equity. UC had an obligation to help California meet workforce, healthcare, and research demands, so the University was both a worthy investment and the solution.

Committee Chair Leib credited Regent Lansing with suggesting that Regents meet with legislators via teleconference and thanked Mr. Flaherty for arranging them. Chancellor Wilcox thanked the Regents for their efforts with the Legislature. Regent Lansing shared that she participated in several very effective meetings with legislators via teleconference. This was a good time for advocacy. Committee Chair Leib shared that legislators were eager to work with President Drake.

Student Observer Amine El Moznine urged the Committee to be ambitious in its State funding advocacy now that there was an ally in the new Biden administration and there was more money in the proposed State budget. UC could not return to how it had been prior to the COVID-19 pandemic. He called for building momentum on the recent successes in acquiring basic needs funding by seeking targeted funds for student success. There was an opportunity to require even higher standards for campus mental health professionals than what was provided in State Senate Bill 660, and UC should pursue the suggested financial aid reforms laid out by the California Student Aid Commission. Students who are engaged early in the advocacy process would help maintain enthusiasm and be able to share memorable narratives with legislators. UC could also align its goals with student-led advocacy groups. Mr. El Moznine shared that the UCweVote campaign invited Regents to join their efforts to make voting easier for students, which could mean more votes for legislators who care about higher education.

## 7. **FEDERAL GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS UPDATE**

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

Associate Vice President Chris Harrington stated that the inauguration of U.S. President Biden and Vice President Harris showed the resiliency of the country and its democracy, in contrast with the Capitol riots in Washington, D.C. on January 6. The Biden-Harris administration faced daunting challenges, and its success would be determined by its accomplishments in the first 100 days. UC received \$11 billion to \$12 billion in federal support every year, and this was sustained this fiscal year. In this package, the Pell Grant maximum was increased to \$6,495, the first of UC's four targets toward doubling the maximum Pell Grant by 2024. There was funding for a basic needs pilot program and funding increases to the National Institutes of Health, National Science Foundation, and the U.S. Department of Energy Office of Science—all critical to UC research. There was also funding for 1,000 Direct Graduate Medical Education slots, \$900 billion in COVID-19 relief, and UC anticipated receiving some funding from these. UC would receive more

than \$391 million in higher education relief funds from the emergency spending package passed in December 2020. The package also funded research, contact tracing and testing, vaccine efforts, and the Public Health and Social Services Emergency Fund, and Federal Governmental Relations (FGR) would continue to work with the Office of the President, the campuses, and medical centers on accessing more of these funds. Among the executive orders President Biden signed after his inauguration were extending the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, rejoining the Paris Climate Agreement, and extending the pause on interest and principal payments for direct federal loans until September 30, with more executive actions expected. UC faculty, staff, and alumni were poised to hold positions in the new administration. After Election Day, UC leadership met with the Biden-Harris transition team multiple times to discuss UC budget and policy priorities. FGR would continue to engage the new administration. Congress must write spending bills for fiscal year 2022 and consider a number of reauthorizations, the Biden-Harris administration was expected to begin releasing its budget in April, and UC would present its priorities in March. Sequestration expired, which hopefully meant more robust funding for UC priorities.

Regent Stegura asked how Regents could help with federal advocacy. Mr. Harrington replied that FGR could build a model similar to that of State Governmental Relations (SGR) and facilitate similar conversations.

Committee Chair Leib asked which California members of Congress FGR wished to engage. Mr. Harrington responded that UC could enhance its relationship with the 55 California members of Congress. FGR welcomed Regental engagement with new Senator Alex Padilla, as well with more Republican representatives.

Committee Chair Leib asked if there were California members of Congress who took a position on higher education. Mr. Harrington replied that the House Committee on Education and the Workforce was reorganizing. Congresswoman Susan Davis had stepped down from her role there. Other members were attuned to UC issues.

Regent Lansing asked that SGR and FGR provide Regents with talking points for advocacy efforts. Mr. Harrington stated that he could provide them to Regents. FGR tailored its advocacy by seeking members' priorities that aligned with UC priorities. Associate Vice President Kieran Flaherty added that Regent Stegura has helped him maintain focus on the strategic imperative.

Regent Zettel stated that UC could engage with Congresswoman Sara Jacobs, who was part of the Jacobs family, a great supporter of UC.

Senior Vice President Holmes stated that SGR and FGR were now part of an integrated division that was able to share resources for all levels of advocacy. There has been a high volume of federal and State engagement, and Ms. Holmes' team was now better able to collect data to target its outreach to grassroots UC advocates. She encouraged the Regents to invite people from their network to join advocacy efforts as well.

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff