The Regents of the University of California

ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
March 15, 2023

The Academic and Student Affairs Committee met on the above date at UCSF-Mission Bay Conference Center, San Francisco campus and by teleconference meeting conducted in accordance with California Government Code §§ 11133.

Members present:	Regents Anguiano, Blas Pedral, Elliott, Hernandez, Park, and Timmons; Ex officio member Leib; Advisory members Steintrager and Tesfai; Chancellors Block, Christ, Larive, Wilcox, and Yang; Staff Advisor Lakireddy
In attendance:	Regent-designate Raznick, Staff Advisor Mackness, Regents Analyst Sheridan, General Counsel Robinson, Provost Newman, Vice Presidents Brown and Gullatt, and Recording Secretary Li

The meeting convened at 1:00 p.m. with Committee Chair Park presiding.

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

    Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of January 19, 2023 were approved, Regents Anguiano, Blas Pedral, Elliott, Hernandez, Park, and Timmons voting "aye." [1]

2. **APPROVAL OF MULTI-YEAR PLANS FOR PROFESSIONAL DEGREE SUPPLEMENTAL TUITION FOR EIGHT GRADUATE PROFESSIONAL DEGREE PROGRAMS**

    The President of the University recommended that the Regents approve the multi-year plans for charging Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) for eight graduate professional degree programs as shown in Display 1.

---

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

DISPLAY 1: Proposed Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition Levels[1] for Eight Programs

	Current Level		Proposed Level			
	2022-23	**2023-24**	**2024-25**	**2025-26**	**2026-27**	**2027-28**
Optometry, Berkeley						
Resident PDST Level	$22,022	$23,122	$24,278	$25,492	$26,766	$28,104
Nonresident PDST Level	$22,022	$23,122	$24,278	$25,492	$26,766	$28,104
Veterinary Medicine, Davis						
Resident PDST Level	$16,544	$17,370	$18,240	$19,152	$20,110	$21,116
Nonresident PDST Level	$16,544	$17,370	$18,240	$19,152	$20,110	$21,116
Nursing, Irvine						
Resident PDST Level	$12,795	$13,437	$14,112	$14,814		
Nonresident PDST Level	$12,795	$13,437	$14,112	$14,814		
Dentistry, Los Angeles						
Resident PDST Level	$30,294	$31,809	$33,399	$35,069	$36,822	$38,663
Nonresident PDST Level	$29,718	$31,809	$33,399	$35,069	$36,822	$38,663
Nursing, Los Angeles						
Resident PDST Level	$12,795	$13,437	$14,112	$14,814		
Nonresident PDST Level	$12,795	$13,437	$14,112	$14,814		
Nursing, San Francisco						
Resident PDST Level	$12,795	$13,437	$14,112	$14,814		
Nonresident PDST Level	$12,795	$13,437	$14,112	$14,814		
Pharmacy, San Francisco						
Resident PDST Level	$31,260	$32,196	$33,164	$34,160	$35,184	$36,240
Nonresident PDST Level	$31,260	$32,196	$33,164	$34,160	$35,184	$36,240
Physical Therapy, San Francisco						
Resident PDST Level	$13,362	$13,764	$14,178	$14,604	$15,042	$15,492
Nonresident PDST Level	$13,362	$13,764	$14,178	$14,604	$15,042	$15,492

[1] The amounts reflect the maximum PDST levels to be assessed, effective as of the academic year indicated. Assessing PDST levels less than the level indicated requires approval by the President with the concurrence of the Chancellor. PDST levels may be assessed beyond the period covering the program's approved multi-year plan but not in excess of the maximum levels specified in the final 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.]

Director of Operating Budget Cain Diaz introduced the item. The eight programs to be presented at this meeting have approved multi-year plans that expire at the end of the 2022–23 academic year. Each has submitted three- or five-year plans with PDST increases ranging from three to five percent for California resident students and three to seven percent for non-resident students. Program representatives had been available for questions from Regents prior to this meeting.

Mark Stetter, Dean of the UC Davis School of Veterinary Medicine, introduced the UCD Veterinary Medicine program and highlighted efforts to improve diversity. Dr. Stetter recently charged a diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) task force to provide a set of recommendations in the spring. The School hired its first chief diversity officer and was examining its admissions process to accept more Pell Grant recipient, underrepresented minority (URM), and first-generation students. The School would continue to focus on its K–12 outreach programs; building a strong candidate pool; financial aid, return-to-aid, scholarship programs; and student support programs. Student debt was a significant issue in veterinary medicine especially in light of lower salaries in previous years. The

Veterinary Medicine program has increased tuition three times over the last ten years. The program would evaluate the need for the proposed five percent increase every year; Dr. Stetter did not anticipate that the increase would be annually implemented. Every year, the School provided $8 million in return-to-aid and scholarships, the highest amount of support provided by any veterinary school in the country, and the School's endowment program to support student scholarships has grown from $67 million to over $100 million, and average student debt was reduced over the last five years and was the lowest of any veterinary school in the country. The number of students with debt has declined from 69 to 59 percent. Through the Native American Opportunity Program, four students received scholarships that covered all their tuition and fees.

Regent Hernandez, noting the low numbers of African American, Native American, and Hispanic students in the program, asked what budgetary changes would be made for outreach activities. Dr. Stetter replied that he anticipated recommendations from the DEI task force regarding outreach, such as summer camps and an ambassador program for middle and high school students. The School wished to transform children's enthusiasm for animals into careers in veterinary medicine. He did not yet know how much would be allocated. In the last six months, the School has focused on hiring a chief diversity officer, doubling the number of ambassadors, and seeking funding to expand summer camps.

Regent Elliott recalled a time when the diversity numbers were worse for this program and expressed appreciation for the detailed outreach efforts that were presented. Dr. Stetter replied that he was open to new ideas and best practices for outreach.

Regent Blas Pedral, referring to the written materials, asked if the program planned to continue awarding 25 percent of financial aid based on need. Dr. Stetter replied that the program planned to shift the amount of scholarship and return-to-aid as it increases the number of applicants who are Pell Grant recipient, URM, and first-generation students.

Regent Blas Pedral asked how much of the proposed financial aid would be need-based and merit-based. Dr. Stetter replied that the proposed financial aid was all return-to-aid. The program was looking into its future allocations to financial aid and to diversity efforts.

Regent Elliott asked how much of the PDST increase would be need-based aid as opposed to scholarships across the board. Mary McNally, UCD School of Veterinary Medicine Executive Assistant Dean of Administration, replied that the program planned to increase the percent of aid allocated to need-based individuals over the next five years, but a specific target had not yet been set.

Committee Chair Park stated that the Committee wished to understand the program's plan for increase and factors it would consider. Dr. Stetter explained that, previously, return-to-aid had been spread across all students and most of the scholarships were need-based. This was slated to change, and part of the increase would go toward a student success program. He stated that the School would provide Regents with a more detailed description of how the increase in return-to-aid would be used when that information is available.

Regent Anguiano asked if the School had strategies to reduce the cost of attendance for students. Dr. Stetter responded that, due to a workforce shortage, starting salaries were higher than they had been three to four years ago, up to $150,000 in urban areas. While this would help bring down debt, the shortage was also concerning. The School was interested in growing its class size from 150 to 200 students, as well as in enlarging its clinical training and veterinary hospital, but needed State support.

Regent-designate Tesfai asked about the program's faculty diversity. Dr. Stetter replied that the School had 130 residents training for faculty positions and had one of most diverse residency programs. This was a way to develop the pipeline to improve faculty diversity.

Regent-designate Tesfai asked what factors would go into a decision not to raise PDST in a given year. Dr. Stetter responded that starting salaries, debt, and cost would be factors. Medical inflation affected how the School operated its veterinary hospital and taught students. Regent-designate Tesfai remarked that it seemed more likely that the PDST would be increased. Dr. Stetter replied that cost of living and starting salaries would determine student debt. He underscored the high quality of the program and the low debt burden. The program planned to reduce the amount of return-to-aid given to all students and to focus on diversity programs.

Committee Chair Park if the School conducted research, consulted focus groups, or took surveys to determine why the applicant pool lacked diversity. Dr. Stetter replied that the profession has engaged in data gathering and has found that early K–12 students had a strong affinity for animals but were not mentored to pursue careers in veterinary medicine. The profession received many applications but had not considered the makeup of its applicant pool. Due to the success of UC Programs in Medical Education (PRIME), the School wished to partner with these programs with regard to recruiting and student support. Dr. Stetter remarked that there was a cultural and societal interest in becoming a successful medical doctor, and he wished to expand that interest to veterinary medicine.

Committee Chair Park asked that the program provide information on its plans for need-based financial aid within the next few months.

Chancellor Christ introduced the UC Berkeley Herbert Wertheim School of Optometry and Vision Science. UC Berkeley has offered optometric education since 1923 and first began offering its graduate program in 1966. The average class size was 68 students, and the School had a total enrollment of 270 students. The School offered a Doctor of Optometry (O.D.) and a Ph.D. in Vision Science, and an O.D. residency program. The program exposed students to patient care, clinical cases, and the opportunity to train with top clinical faculty, and was committed to community outreach and public access to primary care.

John Flanagan, Dean of the School of Optometry and Vision Science, stated that PDST revenues generated over the last five years were essential in establishing diversity initiatives and maintaining a student-faculty ratio of four-to-one. The requested increase would be used to address four main goals: improving affordability, access, and diversity; updating the curriculum; maintaining the student-faculty ratio; and continuing investment

in clinical equipment. Mr. Flanagan focused his remarks on the first goal. Over the past five years, URM student enrollment in the program has increased from eight to 14 percent, with Hispanic/Latino(a) student enrollment growing from six to 11 percent. Enrollment of Black students only increased from 1.1 percent in 2019 to a final 2022–23 figure of 3.2 percent. Black students represented 4.5 percent of first- and second-year classes, a trend that the School planned to maintain and improve. So far, the School had six Black students out of 62 acceptances for the incoming class; Black students would make up 9.6 percent of this class, the largest in the School's history, and Black student enrollment would be at six percent in 2023–24. Pell Grant recipients also made up 33 percent. These improvements were the result of recruitment and pipeline changes, such as attending diversity conferences and career fairs, as well as developing programs for high school, undergraduate, transfer, and California State University (CSU) students. In 2021, Ruth Shoge was hired as the Director of Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging. The program also partnered with Hispanic-Service Institutions and Historically Black Colleges and Universities. The program removed standardized testing from admissions and doubled the amount of need-based scholarship to over $660,000 per year. By the end of the five-year plan, the amount of need-based return-to-aid would be double the current amount, and need-based aid would make up 50 percent of total scholarships. This year, the program fundraised $300,000 in need-based aid.

Regent Hernandez asked if there was a plan to improve faculty diversity, remarking that a diverse faculty would attract a diverse student body. Mr. Flanagan expressed agreement and attributed faculty diversity issues to pipeline issues. When he served as President of the national Association of Schools and Colleges of Optometry, Associate Dean Mika Moy led a national program encouraging new faculty and Dr. Shoge led a national diversity committee. Less than four percent of the profession was Black, and the School was working with organizations like the National Optometric Association and Black Eye Care Perspective to diversify the availability pool. In Mr. Flanagan's view, the School was well positioned to recruit more diverse faculty as they become available.

Regent Elliott asked how many URM faculty were in the School. Mr. Flanagan responded that, out of about 100 faculty members, there were three Black faculty and two Latino(a) faculty. Regent Elliott expressed disagreement that the School was well-positioned based on these numbers. Mr. Flanagan replied that the availability pool of diverse applicants was extremely small. The School was trying to recruit individuals into residency and graduate programs and then into the faculty. Regent Elliott asked if these numbers were expected to change in the next five to ten years. Mr. Flanagan expressed hope that they would improve in five years, especially among clinical faculty. It took more time to change the makeup of ladder-rank faculty as that was dependent on retirement.

Regent Blas Pedral asked for clarification about use of the increase in return-to-aid. Mr. Flanagan replied that 100 percent of the increase in return-to-aid would be need-based, so that 50 percent of total aid would be need-based aid.

Regent Blas Pedral asked if the program struggled to recruit from UC undergraduate campuses. Mr. Flanagan responded that most students in the program came from UC

campuses, but the national applicant pool for optometry was small. Attracting URM groups remained a challenge; 120 Black students applied to all optometry programs combined. Mr. Flanagan believed that reasons for this included the lack of initiatives like UC PRIME, which were difficult to emulate without funding. However, reaching out to the UC campuses and CSU has made a difference.

Staff Advisor Lakireddy asked about outreach to the Central Valley, HBCUs, and to students interested in medicine but less familiar with optometry. Mr. Flanagan replied that the program was focusing on those students. There was heavy promotion of medicine and dentistry at HBCUs but not of other health professional programs. Ms. Lakireddy remarked that additional staff might be needed. Mr. Flanagan shared that the School launched its award-winning, national social media campaign, Optometry Gives Me Life, four years ago. Dr. Moy added that the School also recruited at the community colleges, but surveys have shown that there was interest in optometry at the high school level. Alumni could help recruit from their own young patients. HBCUs were more inclined to feed students into their own medical and dental programs, but the School has partnered with Black Eye Care Perspective to reach out to HBCUs.

Regent-designate Tesfai asked about retention and timely graduation strategies for the incoming class of Black students, adding that they could be ambassadors to other students. Mr. Flanagan replied that the School was considering jumpstart programs to acclimate students before the start of term, as well as mentorship. Dr. Moy added that more diversity improved students' sense of belonging, and Dr. Shoge was informing Black students about existing programs on the Berkeley campus.

Regent Anguiano asked about the labor market in optometry and whether the School has partnered with corporations to relieve students' debt burden. Mr. Flanagan replied that the shortage of optometrists was growing, so that demand was high and salaries were rising rapidly. More corporate and private practices were offering debt reduction bonuses. UCB Optometry students were well-regarded and offered many of these opportunities.

Committee Chair Park noted that Asian Pacific Islander (API) students made up 63 percent of enrollment and suggested learning from the success in recruiting from this demographic. Dr. Moy explained that API populations wore more glasses than other populations. Alumni could help spark interest in optometry among pediatric patients from non-API populations.

Committee Chair Park, referring to the written materials, asked why public interest careers in optometry were not available. Mr. Flanagan replied that optometry did not qualify for debt reduction programs, and the national organization has been lobbying for this for many years. The School had clinics in nine Federally Qualified Health Centers (FGHCs) in the state. Committee Chair Park suggested that UC State Governmental Relations become involved in this issue.

Lin Zhan, Dean of the UCLA School of Nursing, stated that the School, founded 1949, was one of the first in the nation to establish a B.S. in nursing and the first M.S. in nursing in the state. The School had 600 nursing students across five academic programs–one

bachelor's program, two master's programs, and two doctoral programs. The Master of Science in Nursing (MSN) included an Advanced Practice Registered Nurse (APRN) program, and the Master's Entry Clinical Nurse (MECN) program was meant for students who earned their bachelor's degree in another discipline. The School focused on evidence-based practice with cultural competency. Ms. Zhan emphasized that many students were working on the front lines during the COVID-19 pandemic. This was the first time a PDST increase has been proposed for UCLA Nursing since 2020, with inflation being a major consideration. PDST revenue would support five main goals: enhance academic programs, provide student services, ensure affordability and access, support inclusion, and expand student and faculty diversity. Currently, about 37 percent of students in the master's programs came from URM backgrounds, an increase from 33 percent in 2019. The graduate program was 70 percent from diverse backgrounds. Ms. Zhan acknowledged the School's lack of diverse faculty, especially Latino(a) faculty. The recent retirement of ten faculty members provided an opportunity to recruit diverse faculty. In 2021, the School recruited Associate Dean of Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Robert Lucero. In 2022, two ladder-rank offers were made to Latino(a) faculty and one accepted. Between 2020 and 2023, three of the five new tenure-track hires came from URM backgrounds. The School was awaiting the outcome of a UC-Hispanic-Serving Institution Doctoral Diversity Initiative proposal for a Ph.D. and a pathway program. The School has also partnered with the UCLA Chicano Studies Research Center for faculty recruitment, and submitted a request to hire additional ladder-rank faculty with careers focused on the Latino(a) experience. The School would continue to build its pipeline for diverse faculty through the National Clinician Scholars Program and through recruitment from the School's own doctoral programs.

Regent Anguiano, referring to the written materials, stated that the School had zero Latino(a) ladder-rank faculty. Ms. Zhan stated that the School has recruited one Latino(a) faculty member since the retirement of a Latino(a) faculty member in 2021. The School was interviewing a Latino(a) candidate, and Mr. Lucero was a ladder-rank faculty member of Latino(a) background.

Regent Anguiano noted the large Latino(a) population in the Los Angeles area. Chancellor Block stated that, five years ago, UCLA launched faculty diversity programs like Rising to the Challenge, the Hispanic-Serving Initiative, and the Faculty Forward Initiative.

Ms. Lakireddy asked where graduates worked and what efforts were being made to recruit from rural regions of the state. Ms. Zhan replied that 94 percent of graduates were employed within four to six months, and most stayed in California. Graduates worked in underserved communities and Federally Qualified Health Centers (FQHCs). Nurse practitioners from the School wished to return to their communities to serve.

Regent Hernandez asked if APRN program was being phased out as the Doctorate of Nursing Practice (DNP) was being introduced in order to maintain steady enrollment. He expressed concern about the resultant lower enrollment and tuition revenue. Ms. Zhan responded that the APRN program would be phased out gradually. The MECN program, which had many applicants, enabled students to take the licensure exam upon completion.

APRN enrollment was declining nationally, as nursing education was transitioning to competency-based education. A survey of alumni indicated that they preferred the DNP over the master's program. Ms. Zhan stated that the School could enroll more students into the MECN program.

Committee Chair Park asked if the School considered establishing a stackable credential, whereby those who complete the APRN program could complete the DNP program after a number of years. Ms. Zhan replied that the School was considering it. There were nurses who wished to pursue a master's degree or nurses with a master's degree who wanted to pursue the DNP. A stackable credential would create a more flexible educational pathway, and the School could learn from nursing programs that have already implemented it.

Committee Chair Park noted that UCSF also planned to phase out an older nursing program and phase in a doctorate program and asked if UCSF was considering a stackable credential. Catherine Gilliss, Dean of the UCSF School of Nursing, replied that UCSF was moving away from stackable programming, as it was taking students five or more years to complete the master's and doctorate programs. Instead, UCSF was consolidating the programs so that students could finish both degrees in four years.

Committee Chair Park asked if this reduced student debt. Ms. Gilliss replied that scholarships were being repurposed to support these students, and cost of attendance would be lower with one less year in school. Committee Chair Park asked that the UCSF School of Nursing provide information about students' perception of debt and how quickly they are able to work when the School presents its PDST program to the Regents.

Regent Elliott asked that future PDST presentations include information about how much total return-to-aid was allocated based on need and how much of the requested PDST increase would be allocated based on need.

Regent Elliott moved to amend the recommendation to approve the eight PDST plans for a period of three years (2023–24, 2024–25, and 2025–26) instead of five years.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the motion to amend the recommendation, Regents Anguiano, Blas Pedral, Elliott, Hernandez, Park, and Timmons voting "aye."

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the President's recommendation as amended and voted to present it to the Board, Regents Anguiano, Blas Pedral, Elliott, Hernandez, Park, and Timmons voting "aye."

3.   **SYSTEMWIDE DASHBOARDS TO ADDRESS EQUITY GAPS**

[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 Newman introduced the item. Progress toward the University's 2030 goals have been challenged by the COVID-19 pandemic. Per the funding Compact with Governor Newsom, UC must reach the halfway point of these goals by 2025 and collaborate with the other segments of California public higher education to develop new tools or use existing ones to identify gaps from data trends.

Vice President Brown detailed the three ways in which Office of the President (UCOP) dashboards supported campuses as they worked toward the 2030 goals. First was to increase transparency about campus efforts. Ms. Brown presented a dashboard with retention and graduation data that could be displayed by campus and subpopulations such as freshman entrants, transfer students, and Pell Grant recipients, first-generation students, and underrepresented students. These data helped campuses examine the impact of graduating in six years, such as additional debt and future earnings, and informed campus goal setting. Second was to support systemwide collaboration. Ms. Brown presented a summer enrollment dashboard that demonstrated the impact of summer enrollment on timely and overall graduation rates. This information was shared with campus leaders and was used to support systemwide initiatives, such as the work of the Systemwide Basic Needs Committee. Third was to provide campuses with access to data that they might not have. Ms. Brown presented a profile of undergraduate students who did not complete their degree that could be displayed by campus. UCOP conducted a survey of those individuals, asking about obstacles to completing their degree and if they were interested in returning, and provided the list of interested individuals to campuses with bachelor's degree completion programs. Currently, discussions about progress toward the UC 2030 goals included progress toward the Compact goals. Ms. Brown suggested conducting systemwide research in areas such as first-year retention. She presented a prototype dashboard examining course outcomes, data that has been managed by the campuses in the past. As next steps, UCOP has asked the chancellors to identify points of contact for the goals to improve timely graduation and closing equity gaps, as well as for dashboard creation; Institutional Research and Academic Planning (IRAP) would create an inventory of reporting and examine the efforts of other institutions; and UCOP would make improvements based on what it has learned.

Jeff Gold, California State University (CSU) Interim Associate Vice Chancellor of Student Success, shared that, eight years ago, CSU launched the Graduation Initiative 2025 with aggressive goals to increase graduation rates and eliminate equity gaps, and developed a customized Student Success Dashboard to democratize data. CSU also developed a three-month Certificate Program in Student Success Analytics for faculty, staff, and administrators, who would engage in a research project after completing the program. The dashboard had over 20,000 annual visits, and the program has had more than 1,500 participants, with participation from four UC campuses. Mr. Gold provided a demonstration of the equity gaps dashboard, which was password protected for internal use and was accompanied by various visualizations that helped turn the data into actionable goals. One visualization indicated the number of first-generation students CSU needed to graduate every year to close that graduation gap. These data could be filtered by campus, major, or other characteristics and shared with a particular campus or academic department for accountability. This was a change of culture for the system.

Jody Greene, UC Santa Cruz Associate Vice Provost for Teaching and Learning, stated that, in the last five years, the faculty role has transformed to include data-driven equity work. Dashboards needed to be bundled with services, resources, and support to make data actionable. Educational equity goals were introduced through the New Faculty Teaching Academy and advanced in departments and classrooms in collaboration with administrators and faculty. The UCSC Institutional Research, Assessment, and Policy Studies (IRAPS) office produced a dashboard and collaborated with the UCSC Teaching and Learning Center (TLC) to create secondary analyses for faculty. The TLC provided faculty with resources for next steps and hosted workshops for curricular redesign and educational equity practices. Associate Vice Provost Greene presented the Course Analytics Dashboard, which displayed grade distribution and average grade point average (GPA) by demographic group. The TLC could offer consultation to faculty and departments and offer course redesign opportunities. At the start of the quarter, faculty could access a Course Equity Analysis Report, which displayed demographics, major status, performance, as well as other courses being taken for better scheduling of tests. The TLC provided guidance on sense of belonging, essential prior concepts, and supplemental instruction. The Department Equity Dashboard, developed with a with $3 million federal Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI) grant, gave insight into a department's demographics, course outcomes, equity index, time to degree, major migration, and graduation rates. This dashboard could be reviewed annually by the dean or used as a reference when reviewing programs. The TLC developed guidance for these dashboards following its participation in the CSU Certificate Program in Student Success Analytics. As an example of cross-campus collaboration, UCSC replicated UC Davis' dashboard comparing the grades of the top ten courses taken by incoming freshman students to identify gaps that could be addressed to improve outcomes such as first-year retention. UCSC was also sharing its educational equity guidance with other campuses, another example of cross-campus collaboration.

Committee Chair Park emphasized that the Compact called for collaboration among the segments and identified the CSU Student Success Dashboard as a valuable tool.

Regent Anguiano asked whether UC was using a similar approach to CSU and visualizing equity gaps. Ms. Brown replied that UCSC had a similar dashboard for courses and departments. UCOP planned to change how it presented data on these gaps in advance of the next accountability report.

Committee Chair Park remarked that the CSU dashboard and visualizations were easier to understand. She asked about the intended audience for the UC data, opining that, by the time the Regents see these data, it seems too late to intervene. Ms. Brown responded that the data had different purposes. UCOP could use the data to raise public awareness, while faculty could use the data to better understand students and adjust their courses accordingly. When IRAP takes an inventory of dashboards, it would ask what was available and about their use and audience. Ms. Newman added that the UCSC dashboards presented were faculty- and classroom-focused and would be helpful for crafting classes. Associate Vice Provost Greene stated that the UCSC dashboards were part of an effort to involve

faculty in student efforts. These dashboards engaged faculty's interest in historical trends and were built to be easy for faculty to use.

Chancellor Larive recalled that, earlier in her career, she had led a campaign to move from lecture-based to problem-based learning but did not have the data to support her belief in the effectiveness of problem-based learning. These dashboards showed whether current pedagogy narrowed equity gaps in a class. A campus would see the effects over time.

Committee Chair Park asked if the majority of UCSC faculty use dashboards. Chancellor Larive replied that use was rapidly growing as the number of departments getting trained in how to use the dashboards was increasing. Associate Vice Provost Greene added that interest has grown as faculty were becoming more solution-oriented. About half of the departments on the Santa Cruz campus were expected to engage with these data. About 60 to 70 percent of UCSC Academic Senate faculty were using these dashboards. Chancellor Wilcox added that the data helped delineate complementary roles on campus.

Regent-designate Tesfai asked what pedagogical changes have been made in response to the data and if faculty were evaluated based on their engagement with the dashboards. Associate Vice Provost Greene replied that UCSC was careful not to use these data punitively in a personnel review, as faculty could not be expected to mitigate years of inequity. However, the faculty's role in that mitigation effort was being determined. UCSC could reward faculty who participate in course redesign, which included restructuring assessments, emphasizing the relevance of subject matter, and giving students opportunities to reflect on what they learned, as well as the designing of new courses. Regent-designate Tesfai expressed hope that this would present a positive new way for evaluating faculty rather than a punitive one.

Regent-designate Tesfai asked if the Regents would receive updates over time. Ms. Brown responded in the affirmative. UCOP was looking to improve how it provided information to the Regents, such as in the annual accountability report, and could inform the Board of changes made to publicly available information provided and internal dashboards.

Committee Chair Park asked if UC could have something similar to CSU's Student Success Dashboard. Ms. Brown replied that UCOP could build something similar to CSU's dashboard but was mindful not to duplicate or complicate what campuses have. UCOP was trying to determine whether campuses had sufficient data and how it could support them with existing dashboards or components from CSU. Ms. Newman added that UC aimed to have instruments that fit its mission and would seek common measures that could be shared among the campuses. UC might be able to learn from other universities in the country. In Ms. Newman's view, outcomes mattered more than the tools.

4.   **APPROVAL OF UC IRVINE MEMBERSHIP IN UNIZIN, A MEMBER-BASED NONPROFIT HIGHER EDUCATION DATA CONSORTIUM FOR STUDENT SUCCESS**

The President of the University recommended that the Regents approve the following:

A. UC Irvine and any other University of California campuses that elect to participate are authorized to participate as a member of Unizin under the following conditions:

   (1) **Purpose**. To advance the mission of student success by working collaboratively with other higher education institutions and share in the efforts and learning of building a technology and analytics platform for multi-institutional collaboration.

   (2) **Structure and Governance**. The Unizin consortium delivers software solutions, services, and a community of institutions that collectively tackle strategic challenges in scaling digital education. Unizin, Ltd. is a not-for-profit organization incorporated in Delaware, member led, and governed by its adopted bylaws.

   (3) **Financial Terms**. The annual cost of membership is determined by school enrollment and the initial annual rate for UC Irvine would be $260,000. There are also opportunities for members to purchase additional services from Unizin but is not a requirement of membership.

   (4) **Termination.** UC may terminate membership agreement by giving Unizin written notice as provided in the membership agreement. Following termination, Unizin must return all Institutional Information to UC Irvine and then dispose of the Institutional Information in their possession.

B. After consultation with the Office of the General Counsel, the President or his designee be authorized to approve and execute any agreements reasonably required to effectuate the above approval, including any subsequent agreements, modifications, or amendments thereto, provided that such agreements, modifications, amendments, or related documents are materially consistent with the terms above, and do not otherwise materially increase the obligations of the Regents or materially decrease the rights of the Regents.

C. After consultation with the Office of the General Counsel, the President or his designee be authorized to exercise, on behalf of the Regents, the authorities reserved to UC as a member of Unizin including appointment of representatives to the Unizin Board of Directors, except any authorities expressly reserved to the Regents in the Regents' Bylaws.

[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 Newman explained that Unizin was a national higher education consortium that analyzed data in university learning management systems (LMS). If this is a positive experience for UC Irvine, other campuses could also join.

Chancellor Gillman stated that joining Unizin was key to UC Irvine becoming a national leader in data-driven student success, accelerating UCI analytics efforts, and collaborating with other Unizin members.

Michael Dennin, UCI Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education, stated that, through Unizin, UCI would examine real-time LMS data and student success information and then connect these data with more traditional student data. Whether one was using real-time data in a positive way or triggering unintended consequences like bias was a research question. UCI offered a very diverse student body, and these tools would be used in an environment like UCI for the first time. Joining Unizin would accelerate UCI's research of that issue while reducing cost and workload for the campus.

Tom Andriola, UC Irvine Vice Chancellor of Information, Technology and Data, introduced "The Collaboratories @UCI," an initiative which aimed to build a platform for data from a diverse set of sources in order to gain a more holistic understanding of students. These data would be contextualized and given to faculty, advisors, and administrators,. As a Unizin member, UC Irvine would have access to the expertise of the consortium and would be able to contribute the campus' own expertise. With membership also came a community of practice, the ability to leverage size and scale for procurement, and discourse about the humanistic qualities of data.

Regent Blas Pedral asked how joining Unizin would improve institutional performance and advance educational equity at UCI. Mr. Dennin replied that, with tools from Unizin, UCI could provide real-time results to faculty making pedagogical changes and could also implement interactive tools that provide performance information to students. For the latter, research would be critical to determine if the tools have a positive effect, such as motivating the student to improve, or a negative effect, such as causing implicit bias or impostor syndrome. UCI wished to overcome existing biases without creating new ones. Chancellor Gillman added that the campus needed a more holistic understanding of the determinants of student success and persistence, beyond those found in data from the registrar's office and student learning modules. Chancellor Gillman opined that there were three versions of data-driven student success. Version 1.0 considered student performance and graduation rates, and version 2.0 made adjustments based on LMS data. Version 3.0 offered a more personalized approach to student success.

Regent Hernandez asked how UCI would ensure that students and faculty use the tools. Mr. Dennin responded that UCI has launched a Faculty Academy for Teaching Excellence to train faculty to use these tools, and Division of Teaching Excellence and Innovation Graduate Scholars were receiving training as well. UCI was determining how to introduce this training to students. Mr. Andriola added that student advisors were being trained as well. UC Irvine aimed to change campus culture and make every member of campus more data-driven. Chancellor Gillman shared that UCI enrollment management was becoming involved in this effort, and various constituent groups had their own roles to play. In his view, higher education was only beginning to understand how a diverse student body succeeds, and much research was needed. He viewed this as a four- to five-year process.

Faculty Representative Steintrager asked what kind of data was being collected from the LMS, how and with whom these data were being shared, if faculty and students were aware that data was being collected, what policies and procedures were in place to protect data privacy and ownership, and if the Academic Senate was involved in developing such policies. Mr. Dennin replied that UCI would be leveraging Unizin tools and using its own LMS and student information system data. The Academic Senate and faculty were aware that these data had been used in research and future plans. The Council on Teaching, Learning, and Student Experience was involved with potential policy issues. UCI was collecting data on website engagement and trying to avoid students' work or faculty intellectual property. Students would also be informed if their survey responses were being used this way. Mr. Andriola stated that the President's Ad Hoc Task Force on Health Data Governance and the Presidential Working Group on Artificial Intelligence provided strong guidance on data use. UCI was developing a governance body to discuss whether a new way to use data is appropriate and included faculty, legal, privacy, security, and compliance perspectives.

Committee Chair Park stated her understanding that tools from Unizin would complement campus dashboard efforts. UCI would have termination rights. She suggested that the University reflect on its pace relative to the pace of technological change. In her view, the tools used were integral to how quickly or easily the desired outcome is achieved, and joining Unizin was an experiment to that end.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the President's recommendation and voted to present it to the Board, Regents Anguiano, Blas Pedral, Hernandez, Park, and Timmons voting "aye."

5.   **STUDENT ACADEMIC PREPARATION AND EDUCATIONAL PARTNERSHIPS (SAPEP) FUNDING 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.]

This item was deferred.

6.   **IMPLEMENTING THE CCC-UC TRANSFER TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS FOUR AND FIVE 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 Newman introduced the item. Thirty percent of entering UC students were transfer students, compared with 18 percent at other selective public universities and 11 percent at selective private universities. Over 90 percent of UC transfer students came from the California Community College system.

Faculty Representative Cochran reviewed the three common avenues for transfer to UC. The Transfer Admission Guarantee (TAG) was an agreement between a student and a particular campus that guaranteed admission to a specific major upon the completion of general education (GE) requirements and some UC major requirements. About half of TAG recipients enrolled at other UC campuses. The Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) was developed by the California Community Colleges to meet California State University (CSU) minimum eligibility requirements and major preparation. For the last decade, UC has guaranteed that the applications of ADT recipients would be reviewed for UC admission. In fall 2021, roughly half of UC transfer applicants were pursuing an ADT. The UC Transfer Pathways (UCTP) provided a roadmap for major preparation that was accepted by all UC campuses offering that major. Recommendation Four of the CCC-UC Transfer Task Force final report called for streamlining lower division GE requirements and improving major preparation. In partnership with the California Community Colleges and CSU, UC created the new California General Education Transfer Curriculum (Cal-GETC) that did not have more units than the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC), in accordance with Assembly Bill (AB) 928. The Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS) Special Committee on AB 928 began work in spring 2022, which included faculty from the three California higher education segments and advisory members who were students, articulation officers, and administrators. After ICAS accepted the Special Committee's recommendation, each segment's Academic Senate vetted the Cal-GETC. UC Academic Senate Regulation 479 established the Cal-GETC, and Ms. Cochran highlighted how it changed UC GE requirements. Cal-GETC would take effect in fall 2025, and ICAS was expected to meet the May 2023 deadline set by AB 928. Recommendation Five called for improving the articulation of major preparation courses and transfer paths between the California Community Colleges and UC. In October 2022, the UC Academic Senate formed the Academic Council Special Committee on Transfer Issues to adjust policies and practices related to UC Transfer Pathways.

James Chalfant, UC Davis Professor Emeritus and Chair of the Academic Council Special Committee on Transfer Issues (ACSCOTI), explained that students admitted without sufficient major preparation took longer to graduate and were more likely to encounter academic difficulty, change majors, or drop out. Major preparation, which determined readiness to transfer, was a key component of comprehensive review, by which two-thirds of UC transfer students were admitted. ACSCOTI was reviewing every UCTP for courses that were not needed by a particular campus and documenting major requirements that could be completed before transfer in order to provide students with an expanded set of pathway descriptions. Clear guidance was needed for all approaches. In the Transfer Alignment Project, the three segments were assessing alignment of ADT with UCTP. While there was some overlap, the same major at CSU and UC might have different goals, such as an emphasis on current research or laboratory experience at UC. If existing ADTs do not adequately prepare students for UC, they should follow the UCTP. For some UC majors, the Cal-GETC and major preparation could not be completed within the AB 928 unit limit. In those cases, ACSCOTI recommended working with community college faculty to create associate's degrees based on UCTPs. ACSCOTI was working to add majors to existing pathways and create new pathways.

Eric Van Dusen, Outreach and Technology Lead for the Division of Computing, Data Science, and Society at UC Berkeley, discussed Data Science, a major that was launched in 2018 and was now the third largest major on the Berkeley campus. UCB has worked to ensure that this major is accessible to transfer students; the open source curriculum and teaching technology was available to all instructors, and a seminar and academic and career counseling were tailored to the needs of transfer students. Mr. Van Dusen presented diversity statistics for the 2022 Data Science graduating class, 18 percent of whom were transfer students. He stated that more must be done to improve diversity in the major and increase awareness of this major among community college students, and one should provide more guidance to instructors and counselors. The California Alliance for Data Science Education, an intersegmental collective of instructors interested in articulation and transfer, has drafted a proposal for a Data Science transfer pathway, which would build visibility for the major. A Data Science UCTP webpage could collate information regarding multiple UC campuses' data science majors.

Regent Blas Pedral asked if UC was tracking which community college campuses were offering which courses, noting the higher concentration of transfer students from some campuses. Vice President Gullatt replied that UC planned to work with 69 community college campuses that it has identified as needing additional support, noting that some students were taking courses from multiple community colleges to complete requirements. ACSCOTI was making sure UCTPs were not requiring more than what is needed. Regent Blas Pedral expressed hope that this would lead to a more diverse transfer applicant pool. Ms. Newman added that UC could build liaisons with faculty or contribute classes directly.

Committee Chair Park, recalling that only seven community college campuses offered the courses of the Philosophy UCTP, asked about the community colleges' ability to offer courses. Ms. Cochran replied that UCTPs represented core major preparation courses agreed upon by the nine undergraduate campuses and were not meant to limit accessibility. The segments were working to create an equitable and attractive transfer environment. Mr. Chalfant explained that few community colleges offered an epistemology course, and most UC campuses did not require epistemology for transfer or even the major. He recalled that one UC campus did require epistemology, which skewed the data. This course would be identified as not needed by certain UC campuses per Recommendation Five.

Committee Chair Park asked about the State's interest in transfer alignment. Ms. Newman responded that the University sought to broaden transfer opportunities as much as possible, and that both UC and the California Community Colleges were responsible for capacity building. She expressed hope that the State shared UC's interest in expanding these pathways to be more geographically diverse.

Committee Chair Park opined that the State might see more alignment with CSU as the way to expand those opportunities. Ms. Newman expressed agreement. UC wished to ensure that as many students as possible could participate, that they well prepared to do so, and could graduate in an economical time period.

Committee Chair Park stated her understanding that the UC Academic Senate has committed to finding transfer alignment. Ms. Cochran replied that ACSCOTI was examining the 20 UCTPs, developing new UCTPs, and keeping UCTPs up to date. Currently, there were five ADTs that were aligned with UCTPs, but there was good reason for the lack of alignment in some cases. For example, CSU business majors did not require calculus while UC did. Requiring calculus for all transfer students to both UC and CSU when 75 percent of business majors transferred to CSU could create a barrier to the major. Ms. Cochran stated that perfect alignment was not possible between different university systems.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff