

The Regents of the University of California

ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

May 17, 2017

The Academic and Student Affairs Committee met on the above date at UCSF–Mission Bay Conference Center, San Francisco.

Members present: Regents Brody, De La Peña, Lansing, Ortiz Oakley, Pattiz, Pérez, Ramirez, and Reiss; Ex officio members Lozano and Napolitano; Advisory members Chalfant and Mancía; Chancellors Block, Dirks, and Wilcox; Staff Advisor Valdry

In attendance: Secretary and Chief of Staff Shaw, General Counsel Robinson, Provost Dorr, Senior Vice President Peacock, Vice Presidents Brown, Ellis, and Holmes-Sullivan, Chancellors Blumenthal and Leland, Interim Chancellor Hexter, and Recording Secretary McCarthy

The meeting convened at 10:30 a.m. with Committee Chair Pérez presiding.

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

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of March 15, 2017 were approved.

2. **CURRENT UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA POLICY ON RESIDENCY AND PLANS FOR REVIEW**

[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 Dorr explained that this discussion would provide background about University policy that determines whether a student is a resident of California for the purpose of charging tuition. For most students, this classification is very straightforward; however, in some cases determining a student's residency can be more complicated. A few cases had been brought to the Regents' attention through public comment from students who disagreed with the determination of their residency. Campus staff were addressing those specific cases within the context of the University's current policy. The questions raised by these cases merit some additional consideration of Regents policy.

Vice President Holmes-Sullivan noted that Regents policies were being reviewed to bring them up to date with current needs and circumstances. Provost Dorr had appointed a committee to review the Regents residency policy. The committee, chaired by Ms. Holmes-Sullivan and including representatives from the Secretary and Chief of Staff's office, the Office of the General Counsel, Student Affairs, and students, would consult with campus officials, including admissions staff and those who determine

students' residency. It was anticipated that the committee would bring recommendations to the Regents in early 2018 so that implementation of revised policies could begin with students entering UC in fall 2018. Director Christopher Carter commented that the review of the University's residency policy would include a review of State statutory provisions on residency and the changing federal financial aid policies that currently form a basis for a part of UC's residency policies.

Regent Ortiz Oakley asked how the University was addressing concerns expressed by students during public comment sessions about decisions regarding their residency status. Ms. Holmes-Sullivan replied that students' concerns about their residency determination were first handled at the campus level and appeals from campus determinations were handled at the Office of the President.

Committee Chair Pérez expressed hope that the review of the residency policy could be accomplished in advance of the admission of students in fall 2018. He sensed that campus staff would prefer more flexibility in dealing with residency determinations. In some cases, State law considers a student to be a resident, but UC policy does not. He expressed his view that UC residency policy should follow State law as closely as possible; areas in which UC policy was more restrictive than State law should be examined closely, so that UC students were not categorized as nonresidents if that did not fit their experience. Provost Dorr responded that the differences between UC policy and State law would be reviewed by the committee, which would work as quickly as possible.

Regent Pattiz asked if the goal of the policy review was to align UC residency policy with State law on California residency. Committee Chair Pérez stated that he had requested a clear delineation of the differences between State law governing California residency and UC policy governing student residency. His understanding was that UC policy was more restrictive than State law.

Regent Ramirez asked how many residency determinations were appealed and how many appeals were successful. Mr. Carter advised that the Office of the President received about 300 appeals annually, with five to ten percent resulting in reversals of campus-level decisions. Committee Chair Pérez asked how many more appeals would have been successful had UC used the State's requirement of one year of self-support to achieve residency instead of UC's requirement of two years of student self-support to establish residency status. Mr. Carter said this specific data was not tracked, but he would estimate that change would affect residency determinations of approximately 100 students systemwide.

Regent Reiss commented that residency status could affect students' admissions to UC in addition to their eligibility for resident tuition. Committee Chair Pérez noted that some students are categorized as residents of California during the admissions process, but then do not qualify for resident tuition.

Provost Dorr clarified that the committee would review the entire UC residency policy, California law, and federal guidelines for certain kinds of student support. Another issue

to be considered was notifying students earlier of their residency determination. The goal would be to arrive at a UC policy that would be clear, in accord with State and federal law, and that would provide students with notification of their residency status as early as possible.

Regent Reiss suggested a presentation to the Committee about differences among UC, State, and federal requirements as soon as at the next meeting. Committee Chair Pérez agreed that it would good to clarify State and federal legal requirements. Any area in which UC requirements are more stringent than State or federal requirements should be carefully considered.

3. **STRATEGIES TO INCREASE TRANSFER STUDENT ENROLLMENT AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

[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 Dorr recalled that, under the 2015 Budget Framework Agreement between Governor Brown and President Napolitano, UC committed to increase its proportion of undergraduate students entering as California Community College (CCC) transfers by the 2017-18 academic year, assuming the presence of qualified transfer applicants, to one-third of all incoming California undergraduates systemwide and at every undergraduate campus except UC Merced. The California Master Plan for Higher Education (Master Plan) recognized the importance of transfer students by stipulating that the UC system undergraduate enrollment be 40 percent lower division and 60 percent upper division. However, over time more UC freshmen entered with enough college credits to become upper division students during their second year, which affected the number of slots available for transfer students. Setting the proportion at 2:1 freshmen to transfer students would ensure the availability of those spots for transfer students. The Master Plan commitment was systemwide, while the Budget Framework Agreement added the new commitment that the 2:1 ratio would also be achieved at each undergraduate campus except UC Merced. Meeting this transfer agreement was challenging, as it depended not only on the actions of UC, but also on the CCCs' preparation of adequate numbers of students who are transfer-ready and who want to transfer. Ms. Dorr assured the Regents that the University takes this commitment seriously and anticipated that by 2017-18 it would accomplish these goals, except at UC Santa Cruz and UC Riverside, which were making progress toward the goal.

Regent Pattiz asked about the success of UC undergraduates who started as freshmen compared with resident transfer students and out-of-state students. Ms. Dorr expressed pride in the fact that freshman and transfer admittees perform equally well. International students complete their degrees in less time than any other group.

Vice President Holmes-Sullivan reported that UC's existing commitment to transfer students had been enhanced by the 2015 Budget Framework Agreement. The prior year UC enrolled the largest transfer class in its history, with a majority of those enrolling in

UC's most selective campuses. Since 2015, the UC system and its campuses have made progress meeting the 2:1 goal and she anticipated that the 2:1 ratio would be reached systemwide by the end of 2018. UC Davis, UCLA, and UC San Diego had already reached the 2:1 goal prior to the Agreement; UC Berkeley reached the goal in the current year despite enrolling a very large freshman class. By the end of the 2017-18 academic year, both UC Irvine and UC Santa Barbara would achieve the 2:1 ratio. UC Riverside and UC Santa Cruz were working strategically toward the transfer goal, but would need more time.

Associate Vice President Stephen Handel cited fundamental issues facing transfer students and UC's commitment to these students. First, UC must find the most productive ways to partner with the CCCs to increase the number of students who actively prepare for transfer to UC. CCC Chancellor and Regent Ortiz Oakley's Guided Pathways Initiative and a new strategic planning effort to boost transfer readiness among CCC students were encouraging. Second, students intending to transfer to UC must prepare well and apply. UC faculty work on transfer pathways had been an important step in providing clear guidance for students wishing to transfer to any UC campus and the pathways included sufficient rigorous preparation to enable success at UC. Third, surging freshman demand must be balanced with less robust demand for transfer admission, particularly in the short term. He noted that current freshman demand was a result of a long-term strategic commitment to accommodate the needs of these students; a similar long-term commitment toward the enrollment of students from CCCs must be developed and UC campuses are engaged in this effort. UC's recent partnership with the CCCs was a step in the right direction.

Chancellor Block reported that UCLA had been quite successful in enrolling transfer students at a 2:1 ratio or better since 2003. He attributed at least part of this success to UCLA's location, since about half of UCLA's transfer students come from Los Angeles area CCCs. In addition, UCLA had worked very hard through a number of programs to maintain this level of transfer students. UCLA had developed substantial relationships with 75 of the 113 CCCs through regular visits and provision of services. The other CCCs had a UCLA staff member assigned to them for regular contact. UCLA holds a number of information fairs throughout the state to encourage CCC students to visit UCLA. The past weekend, UCLA held its annual Bruin Transfer Day for accepted transfer students, welcoming 5,000 students and their families to campus. This event had been very successful in increasing yield. UCLA targeted certain CCCs from which it had not received many applications in the past for particular attention. Finally, UCLA had a Center for Community College Partnerships that has worked for many years with about 400 students per year who otherwise would likely not apply and be admitted to a four-year college. Chancellor Block expressed pride that 90 percent of those students go to a four-year institution. Each year about 200 of those students applied to UCLA and 65 percent of those were admitted. He noted that UCLA's transfer students add tremendously to the campus.

Chancellor Blumenthal affirmed UC Santa Cruz's commitment to reaching the 2:1 ratio. The campus was working to attract sufficient numbers of high-quality transfer applicants

who choose UC Santa Cruz. These efforts were producing results and the campus had been making progress in increasing its proportion of transfer students prior to the Budget Framework Agreement. However, the pool of well-qualified applicants for freshman admission had grown faster than the transfer applicant pool, and UCSC was enrolling a growing number of freshmen, also a state priority, which was increasing its freshman to transfer ratio. Regarding the pool of transfer applicants, data show that most transfer students enroll in a campus close to their homes. UC Santa Cruz has valuable, ongoing partnerships with the CCCs closest to the campus. UCSC is working with those CCCs and others throughout the state to increase the number of qualified transfer applicants. For example, UCSC has implemented the Cultivamos Excelencia grant, which the campus obtained in October 2015 in partnership with San Jose City College. This grant is funded by a Hispanic Serving Institution grant and would enhance transfer, particularly in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields.

Chancellor Blumenthal said that in the past year UCSC increased its fall visits to CCCs by 58 percent and was hiring additional outreach staff for this purpose. In an effort to maintain its number of transfer applications even though the number of systemwide UC transfer applications declined, the campus was using the new transfer referral pool and would begin to accept winter transfer students. UCSC currently admits all qualified transfer applicants who meet UC eligibility requirements and applicable UCSC major preparation requirements. About half of UCSC's majors have transfer requirements. UCSC increased its number of admission offers from each of 27 CCCs across the state by at least 50 percent, and increased its admitted transfer students by two percent over the prior year. UCSC also launched a new five-week summer transfer academy, which in its 2016 inaugural year attracted 80 students. Chancellor Blumenthal expressed pride in UCSC's success, despite the noted challenges, and anticipated further improvement, as the campus approached a 2.6:1 ratio for freshman to transfer enrollees in the upcoming academic year.

Chancellor Wilcox commented on the importance of a UC campus' geographic location in enrolling transfer students. The CCCs closest to UC Riverside are generally to its west and not far from UC Irvine and UCLA. In addition, while Riverside County is the nation's 11th largest county in population and sixth fastest-growing county, it lags the nation and the state in educational attainment. This region is attempting to address this issue. Two years prior, Chancellor Wilcox, California State University San Bernardino President Tomás Morales, leaders of local CCCs, and community leaders formed an alliance "Growing Inland Achievement" that won the Governor's Innovation Award for work in educational attainment. Local business leaders were interested in filling their workforce needs and student preparation for four-year institutions was key. Only seven percent of students entering Riverside City College were adequately prepared for community college-level mathematics, indicating the challenge of preparing these students for UC.

UC Riverside admitted about 60 percent of its transfer applicants, but only 20 percent of those chose to come to UCR; 53 percent go to other UC campuses. Chancellor Wilcox commented that limiting the number of transfer students at UC Davis could solve the

2:1 ratio at all UC campuses, although he viewed that remedy as counterproductive. The other key driver of yield was support for transfer students. He noted that UC San Diego students were supported by philanthropy and nonresident supplemental tuition received by that campus. UC Riverside was obtaining Hispanic Serving Institution and National Institutes of Health funding, and Howard Hughes Medical Institute funding targeted at STEM education, transfer students, and students of color. But without more support, UC Riverside would continue to struggle against other UC campuses and other institutions.

Chancellor Wilcox expressed pride that the prior year UC Riverside won a national award from the Association of Public Land-grant Universities for student success. UCR had raised graduation rates by 11 percent in three years and transfer graduation rates 15 percent over four years. The transfer student challenge includes helping these students graduate from UC.

Chancellor Wilcox suggested two strategies to achieve the 2:1 ratio at UC Riverside. One solution would be to reduce the number of entering freshmen by 30 to 40 percent, which he did not think would be prudent or aligned with the intentions of the Regents or the Legislature. The most realistic way to achieve the 2:1 ratio would be to reduce the number of the incoming freshmen a minimum of 20 percent or more than 700 students over a two-year period. He reaffirmed UCR's commitment to increasing transfer admissions, but also noted that he hoped the Regents and the Legislature would come to appreciate the larger context.

Regent Lansing expressed her strong support for increasing transfer enrollment to the 2:1 ratio. She noted that the cost of housing, even for students from middle-class families, motivates many transfer students to enroll at a UC close to home. In addition, the opportunity to transfer from a CCC to UC still needs to be further publicized. She noted the need to balance admission of California freshman students and transfer students.

Regent Ortiz Oakley expressed appreciation on behalf of the 2.1 million CCC students to Faculty Representative Chalfant and the UC faculty who were working with the CCC Academic Senate to improve transfer pathways. Since cost was a primary reason students choose to attend a campus near their home, any reduction in the total cost of UC attendance would increase students' options. He also expressed his view that academic readiness for UC, particularly in mathematics, was defined too narrowly. Readiness in mathematics was currently algebra-based, but algebra was not necessarily the only pathway to university majors in non-STEM fields. Faculty are working to create other mathematics pathways for appropriate majors. In addition, the pervasive use of standardized tests to measure mathematics readiness should be questioned.

Regent Ortiz Oakley said he would welcome UC to the Implementation and Oversight Committee, a joint committee of the California State University (CSU) and the CCCs focusing on improving the transfer function, finding ways to increase the number and improve the transfer readiness of CCC students, and advocating with the Legislature for funding to support these efforts. Provost Dorr gladly accepted this invitation and would take action to ensure UC's participation.

Regent Ramirez commented on the importance of the cost of attendance to middle-class and low-income families. Employment opportunities are already lacking in California's Inland Empire, so many hardworking families face difficult choices even if their children are academically prepared to attend UC. She noted the outstanding community outreach efforts of UC Riverside staff. Regent Ramirez expressed her view that UC Riverside and UC Santa Cruz may need additional financial support to reach their transfer goals.

Staff Advisor Valdry commented that both affordability and availability of housing were challenging to potential transfer students. He asked if on-campus housing was guaranteed for transfer students. Chancellor Blumenthal stated that UC Santa Cruz offered a two-year on-campus housing guarantee for incoming freshmen and one year for transfer students. In addition, certain transfer groups such as veterans receive a full two-year housing guarantee. Chancellor Wilcox said that while UC Riverside cannot offer similar on-campus housing guarantees, its off-campus housing market had been relatively affordable, although that had become less true in the past two years. Chancellor Block commented that UCLA could presently guarantee transfer students one year of on-campus housing and would be able to guarantee two years if planned student housing projects were approved at the current meeting. Mr. Handel said he could provide information about housing guarantees for transfer students on the other UC campuses.

Regent Reiss commented that the majority of transfers come to UC from a relatively small number of CCCs. She asked if increasing transfer enrollment improved UC diversity. Ms. Dorr responded that, in fact, the enrolled freshman student pool was more diverse than the pool of enrolled transfer students.

President Napolitano commented that the number of transfer applications for fall 2017 was four percent lower than the prior year. She asked Regent Ortiz Oakley for his opinion about reasons for this decline and ways to increase the number of transfer applications.

Regent Ortiz Oakley noted that, like high schools, CCCs in low-income communities tend to have lower transfer rates. CCCs with the highest transfer rates are in wealthier communities. Perceptions about UC affordability affect students. CCCs in low-income areas generally have students from high schools in those same areas. Targeted outreach to these CCCs, as the Local Control Funding Formula targets high schools in low-income areas, would be beneficial. The CCCs are focusing on increasing transfer readiness of students.

Regent Ortiz Oakley stated that the CCCs' ability to offer sufficient classes had been devastated during the Great Recession and this affected the number of student who were transfer ready at the present time. More courses were currently available and student demand was better met. Many urban CCC students who are UC-eligible choose to transfer to a CSU because they perceive CSU to be more affordable than UC. He expressed support for current efforts to publicize financial aid available at UC. The improved transfer pathways to UC would help increase transfer applications.

Chair Lozano stressed the importance of considering possible unintended consequences of focusing on only one aspect of an enrollment strategy. She encouraged taking a longer term view of an enrollment policy that serves California freshmen, nonresident students, and transfer students. According to the May revision of the State budget proposal, the University was required to demonstrate to the State Department of Finance progress in reaching the 2:1 transfer ratio. Chair Lozano asked for a clarification of the progress UC would need to demonstrate. She expressed strong support for directing additional resources to those campuses facing the biggest challenge in reaching the 2:1 ratio. Those campuses should come back to the Committee with very specific proposals of ways in which the Regents and the Office of the President could provide collaborative support for the extensive campus efforts to increase transfer enrollment.

Chair Lozano expressed concern that UC Santa Cruz's lowering its minimum Grade Point Average (GPA) requirement to 2.4 for transfer applicants could lead to decreased UC success of those students if they were not well-prepared. Chancellor Blumenthal stressed his shared concern about lowering admission standards. He clarified that the UC Santa Cruz division of the Academic Senate had decided to try out the lower minimum GPA for transfer students, after analyzing data and tentatively concluding that this change would not lower academic performance. He said the campus would have to determine if that would be the case. He affirmed that UC Santa Cruz wanted to increase its proportion of transfer students, but not if it resulted in reduced student success. Chair Lozano agreed that any enrollment strategy had to examine both admitting students and having them graduate successfully. Chancellor Blumenthal clarified that the 2.4 minimum GPA was specified in the Master Plan. Chancellor Wilcox added that UC Riverside would also consider reducing entrance requirements for transfer students, but acknowledged that this risks reducing graduation rates.

Committee Chair Pérez asked if UC Santa Cruz's transfer course requirements for some majors were typical of other UC campuses. Chancellor Blumenthal stated that about half of UC Santa Cruz's majors have course requirements for transfer admission. Since those were put into effect in 2013, the campus had seen dramatic improvements in graduation rates. For example, in two of its largest majors, economics and biology, two-year graduation rates among transfer students had increased by about 50 percent. Chancellor Blumenthal commented that CCC students who had not completed major course requirements would have great difficulty in graduating in two years or in some cases graduating at all. It would not be fair to give these students false expectations.

Committee Chair Pérez commented that ways to expand UC Santa Cruz's and UC Riverside's outreach to more CCCs should be explored. He expressed strong agreement that it would not be good policy to lower transfer admission requirements simply to reach a target transfer ratio. The extensive efforts of UC Santa Cruz and UC Riverside to make progress in increasing transfer admissions should be clearly articulated. If these two campuses take longer to reach the transfer ratio goal, the University's position would still be defensible.

Regent Reiss commented that the agenda for the current Committee meeting contained too many important items for the time allocated.

4. **FINANCIAL AID POLICIES AND FUNDING FOR STUDENTS IN PROGRAMS THAT ASSESS PROFESSIONAL DEGREE SUPPLEMENTAL TUITION**

This item was not discussed.

5. **GRADUATE STUDENT WELL-BEING SURVEY**

This item was not discussed. Committee Chair Pérez suggested that student Regent Ramirez be brought back as a guest to the subsequent Committee meeting when this and the following item would be discussed.

6. **ACCOUNTABILITY SUB-REPORT ON DIVERSITY: GRADUATE ACADEMIC STUDENT DIVERSITY OUTCOMES**

This item was not discussed.

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff