The Regents of the University of California

**ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**
January 24, 2024

The Academic and Student Affairs Committee met on the above date at UCSF-Mission Bay Conference Center, San Francisco campus and by teleconference at 1021 O Street and 1430 N Street, Sacramento and Corral del Risco, 63727 Nayarit, Mexico.

Members present: Regents Anguiano, Batchlor, Hernandez, Park, Raznick, Sarris, and Tesfai; Ex officio member Leib; Advisory members Beharry, Pack, and Steintrager; Chancellors Block, Christ, Muñoz, Wilcox, and Yang; Staff Advisor Mackness

In attendance: Regent Chu, Assistant Secretary Bricker, Deputy General Counsel Woodall, Provost Newman, Interim Senior Vice President Reese, Vice Presidents Brown and Gullatt, Chancellor May, 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 November 15, 2023 were approved, Regents Anguiano, Batchlor, Hernandez, Leib, Park, Raznick, Sarris, and Tesfai voting "aye." [1]

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

The President of the University recommended that the Academic and Student Affairs Committee recommend that the Regents approve the multi-year plans for charging Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) for nine 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 Nine Programs**

|  | Current Level | | Proposed Level | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | **2023-24** | **2024-25** | **2025-26** | **2026-27** | **2027-28** | **2028-29** |
| **Public Policy, Berkeley** | | | | | | |
| Resident PDST Level | $12,442 | $13,064 | $13,716 | $14,402 | $15,122 | $15,878 |
| Nonresident PDST Level | $13,444 | $14,116 | $14,822 | $15,562 | $16,340 | $17,156 |
| **Social Welfare, Berkeley** | | | | | | |
| Resident PDST Level | $6,186 | $6,804 | $7,416 | $8,010 | $8,572 | $9,084 |
| Nonresident PDST Level | $6,186 | $6,804 | $7,416 | $8,010 | $8,572 | $9,084 |
| **Law, Davis** | | | | | | |
| Resident PDST Level | $40,390 | $42,310 | $44,320 | $46,424 | $48,630 | $50,940 |
| Nonresident PDST Level | $40,390 | $42,310 | $44,320 | $46,424 | $48,630 | $50,940 |
| **Law, Irvine** | | | | | | |
| Resident PDST Level | $41,670 | $43,750 | $45,940 | $48,240 | $50,650 | $53,180 |
| Nonresident PDST Level | $41,670 | $43,750 | $45,940 | $48,240 | $50,650 | $53,180 |
| **Public Policy, Irvine** | | | | | | |
| Resident PDST Level | $9,234 | $9,510 | $9,795 | $10,089 | $10,392 | $10,704 |
| Nonresident PDST Level | $9,234 | $9,510 | $9,795 | $10,089 | $10,392 | $10,704 |
| **Public Policy, Los Angeles** | | | | | | |
| Resident PDST Level | $11,307 | $11,871 | $12,465 | $13,086 | $13,740 | $14,427 |
| Nonresident PDST Level | $12,060 | $12,663 | $13,296 | $13,959 | $14,655 | $15,387 |
| **Social Welfare, Los Angeles** | | | | | | |
| Resident PDST Level | $8,286 | $8,532 | $8,787 | $9,051 | $9,321 | $9,597 |
| Nonresident PDST Level | $8,910 | $9,177 | $9,450 | $9,732 | $10,023 | $10,323 |
| **International Affairs, San Diego** | | | | | | |
| Resident PDST Level | $10,704 | $11,241 | $11,805 | $12,396 | $13,017 | $13,668 |
| Nonresident PDST Level | $10,704 | $11,241 | $11,805 | $12,396 | $13,017 | $13,668 |
| **Public Policy, San Diego** | | | | | | |
| Resident PDST Level | $10,704 | $11,241 | $11,805 | $12,396 | $13,017 | $13,668 |
| Nonresident PDST Level | $10,704 | $11,241 | $11,805 | $12,396 | $13,017 | $13,668 |

[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.]

Provost Newman introduced the item. Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) allowed UC professional schools to maintain and enhance program quality, diversity, and affordability. These programs had approved plans that would expire in the 2023–24 academic year. The Office of the President (UCOP) worked closely with campus representatives to ensure that proposals present strategies to maintain instructional quality and student academic support, minimize program cost and student debt, support student public service ambition, demonstrate effective student consultation, and advance diversity and inclusion. All nine proposals fully complied with the requirements of Regents Policy 3103: Policy on Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition. Program representatives were available to respond to questions over two information sessions.

Interim Associate Vice President and Director of Operating Budget Caín Díaz introduced the UC Berkeley Social Welfare program.

Chancellor Christ stated that the UCB School of Social Welfare consistently ranked among the top ten schools of social work and social welfare in the U.S. The School's vision was to improve lives of vulnerable individuals, families, and communities as it strives to transform the systems that perpetuate poverty, social disadvantage, and inequality. The Master of Social Welfare (MSW) program prepared practitioners to integrate multiple disciplinary sources of knowledge, build upon the strongest available empirical and practice-based evidence, and advance the pursuit of social and economic justice through anti-oppressive and antiracist policies. The School prioritized recruiting and supporting students and faculty who reflect the diversity of the state.

Dean of the UCB School of Social Welfare Linda Burton stated that, in the last five years, several coalescent social forces have driven the School to reconsider the training it provides as public service is requiring greater expertise than ever before. First, the COVID-19 pandemic eclipsed MSW students' opportunities to secure field internships, complete required internship hours, and hone skills in apprentice-like work settings. More innovative programs were needed to address this. Second, the recent racial reckoning exposed a critical need to train students more comprehensively about diversity, racism, culture, and identity. Despite efforts to diversify students, faculty, and staff over the last five years, there was still much to do to prepare students to work in a diverse world. Third, the growth of data science, information technology, and telecommunications might help students become more effective in their work. Fourth, students needed more support for their well-being before and after graduation. Ms. Burton stated that all PDST revenues benefited students. The School was fiscally conservative and responsible and would continue to be.

Regent Tesfai stated his understanding that the program proposed an average increase of eight percent over five years and asked why such an increase was needed. Dana Kowalski, Assistant Dean for Administration and Finance at the School of Social Welfare, replied that recent staffing cuts had not been beneficial to students, so the first PDST increase would go toward admissions and recruitment support. After the pandemic, too much hiring has overwhelmed managers and staff, so additional hiring later would support career services for students. The program proposed these increases to match its planned expenses.

Regent Tesfai asked why more of the PDST increase was not going to student aid. Ms. Kowalski replied that the School had many endowments and pursued workforce grants to provide stipends, so the majority of PDST revenue went to return-to-aid.

Regent Tesfai stated his belief that an eight percent increase was high and expressed hope that the program could find revenue elsewhere.

Committee Chair Park asked if the program's success in diversifying the student and faculty populations reflected an interest in the MSW program or outreach efforts. Ms. Burton stated that this reflected both an interest in the program and an understanding that students would likely work with diverse populations. The School has made sure to address diversity issues, particularly in the last five years, and was also looking to recruit more men of color to the School due to the need for male social workers.

Regent Sarris asked how the School planned to recruit men of color. Ms. Burton replied that the School would recruit from UC Berkeley groups that focus on undergraduate African American men. The School has also hired an African American male consultant who had a considerable community network.

Mr. Díaz invited representatives from the UC Davis and UC Irvine Law programs to make their presentations.

Austen Parrish, Dean of the UC Irvine School of Law, stated that the School's curriculum had a significant experiential component, which included clinic courses, pro bono programs, externships, and skills training, and that this has helped students launch successful careers and fill gaps in legal services. The School has been successful in achieving its founding goal of developing a work force for the burgeoning Southern California legal market. Graduates passed the California Bar Examination at very high rates, securing top jobs in the public and private sectors, and alumni were leaders in legal, business, and nonprofit organizations throughout Southern California. The School has also advanced its core goals, such as ensuring that its student body reflects diversity of the state by creating pathways for first-generation students and students underrepresented in law. The School recruited some of the nation's top faculty and staff who care deeply about student support and success. Programs and initiatives were designed so that students could thrive in an increasingly complex world. The proposed increase of five percent has been calibrated so that the School could continue to provide an education that ensures student success without unnecessarily increasing the cost of education and enabled the program to provide needed services while keeping pace with rising expenses. The increase was small due to careful resource management and expense-saving initiatives.

Kevin Johnson, Dean of the UC Davis School of Law, stated that the School was one of few law schools in the country with a majority-minority faculty and student body. The School had an annual population of about 600 J.D. students; a highly productive, regarded, and diverse faculty; and a diverse curriculum that reflected student and faculty interests. The School had a wide range of clinics and centers pertaining to areas such as immigration, family protection, critical race theory, civil rights, the environment, and innovation. The School had around 10,000 alumni, attorneys who practiced in every state in the U.S. and also 35 foreign nations, as well as distinguished alumni in the judiciary. These included former Chief Justice Tani Cantil-Sakauye and Justice Kelli Evans of the California Supreme Court. Last fiscal year, the School had the lowest fees and provided the most student aid compared with any law school in the state. Students also graduated with the lowest indebtedness compared with other California law schools. The PDST proposal sought a 4.75 percent increase to maintain the program's budget; keep pace with inflation; maintain access and affordability; continue student services such as mental health and diversity, equity, and inclusion programs; continue clinical programs in experiential learning; maintain teaching capacity and retention of faculty; and engage in renewal and deferred maintenance.

Regent Leib, noting that resident and nonresident PDST were the same for both programs, asked if the Schools had considered charging residents less and nonresidents more.

Mr. Parrish replied that the total cost of attendance was significantly higher for nonresidents. Mr. Johnson added that the School was competing in a national market for law students from diverse backgrounds. The more the School charged nonresidents, the more difficult it would be to compete in that market.

Regent Anguiano asked about overall revenue and how executive education and continuous learning fit into both Schools' total budgets. Mr. Johnson responded that many alumni and community members participated a racial justice speaker series established by UCD School of Law after the death of George Floyd. The series has also helped current students explore areas that had been mentioned in class. Mr. Parrish stated that UCI's Anteaters in Law was a program for UCI alumni who attended law school. Many of the School's revenue streams came from the LL.M. programs. The School was exploring a possible executive education program for alumni who were interested in leadership in nonprofit organizations or general counsel's offices. Nationally, similar programs have had mixed success but could provide additional revenue. Margins tended to be small for executive education, so programs were often in service to the community rather than an additional revenue stream.

Staff Advisor Mackness asked about competition for student talent among UC law schools. She noted that UC comparators were not included in the written materials. Mr. Parrish replied that this was deliberate in order to focus on a broader understanding of the market, which was highly competitive for students, faculty, and staff. UC law schools were well regarded in California, and students might be interested in multiple UC law schools. Mr. Díaz explained that, for fee-setting purposes, UCOP has directed programs not to use programs from other UC campuses as comparators. Mr. Johnson noted that UC Davis School of Law had the lowest fees among UC law schools.

Committee Chair Park noted that the cost of both programs far exceeded the cost of their public comparators. She asked if this was related to the cost structure in California. Mr. Parrish responded in the affirmative, noting that the cost structure was different at Indiana University Maurer School of Law, where he had previously served as dean. Out of the total average cost of $116,000 for the UCI program, $90,000 was allocated to predicted cost of living. Last year, UCI School of Law ranked 15th in the nation for value based on debt and likely salaries. In California, the cost of living and salaries in both the private and public sectors were significantly higher. In the proposed PDST, 52 percent would go back to student scholarships. The average cost of attendance at top schools was about $120,000, and UCI School of Law was quite reasonable in comparison. Mr. Johnson emphasized that UCD School of Law planned to devote 50 percent of PDST to financial aid and had always exceeded the Regental minimum. Currently, 17 percent of the program's funding came from the campus, mostly from fees. State support has declined over the last 30 years, while other States provided more financial support to professional schools. He has spoken to California legislators about the decline in State support and the need for attorneys to serve all sectors of the public. Having a certain debt load made public service and public interest work difficult.

Committee Chair Park, referring to the written materials, noted that UCD School of Law return-to-aid ranged from 35 percent to 55 percent. She asked if the program would commit

to giving more return-to-aid. Mr. Johnson responded that, this past year, 55 percent of students qualified for need-based aid, which would be provided for three years. The School remained committed to providing that level of aid and has done its best to ameliorate the strain of fees on students.

Committee Chair Park noted that UCD School of Law had lower student diversity than its private comparators. Mr. Johnson emphasized the importance of considering overall diversity, not just groups that are traditionally viewed as underrepresented. For instance, Asian Americans have been underrepresented in law, particularly Filipino(a) attorneys. In recent years, the School has grown from three African American students to 16 and from one Native American student to six. Faculty and student diversity in legal education required attention, care, and hard work, and the change at UCD has been dramatic. When he joined the UCD law faculty in 1989, the faculty and student body were nearly all white.

Mr. Díaz invited Caroline Freund, Dean of the UC San Diego School of Global Policy and Strategy (GPS), to present the International Affairs and Public Policy programs.

Ms. Freund explained that the Master of International Affairs (MIA) and Master of Public Policy (MPP), the two main programs at GPS, shared the same faculty, facilities, and staff. A five percent PDST increase has been requested in order to maintain program quality in an inflationary environment; keep pace with mandated compensation increases; maintain staffing, facilities, and fellowships; and fund student participation in various programs. Almost 60 percent PDST revenue went to student fellowships. GPS, the only international affairs school in the UC system, has had a focus on the Pacific—China, Korea, Japan, and India—as well as Mexico and Latin America. The Public Policy program also had an international, comparative focus. GPS required students to take a quantitative methods series so that they know how to use data and evidence in policymaking. GPS was highly interdisciplinary, and about one-quarter of the School's faculty had joint appointments with other schools on campus. The student body was intentionally half international and half domestic. The domestic cohort was increasingly diverse, and improving access and diversity was both a priority for GPS and aligned with campus strategy, but more work needed to be done. GPS had about 1,400 majors in 3+2 concurrent programs, which were bachelor's and master's programs that could be completed in a total of five years. These were offered in collaboration with other UCSD departments. These programs had a higher share of underrepresented groups.

Regent Anguiano, referring to the written materials, noted that the School's percentage of underrepresented groups was lower than that of public and private comparators. She noted that fees were substantially higher than those of public comparators. Ms. Freund replied that GPS had a large share of international students from Asia and Latin America; underrepresented groups made up 30 percent of domestic students. The high share of international students, which made sense given the School's Pacific and Mexico focus, obscured the makeup of the student body. With regard to fees, Ms. Freund echoed Mr. Parrish's comments about higher costs in California and lower State funding. Meredith D'Angelo, Assistant Dean for Academic Affairs at GPS, added that major competitors were other UC programs. Large competitors of the International Affairs program tended to

be private institutions in Washington, D.C. and New York, which had large international markets. Public comparators were in locations with a low cost of living and wage and salary differences, such as Texas. Historically, GPS has attracted students focused on China and the Asia Pacific region, which has been reflected in the student body. The School had programs in place and engaged in recruiting efforts to ensure that the domestic student population reflected the diversity of the state.

Regent Anguiano asked Ms. D'Angelo to expound on these efforts, noting the School's proximity to the U.S.-Mexico border and that Latino(a)s made up at least 40 percent of the San Diego population. Ms. D'Angelo replied that, in the last few years, underrepresented students made up 25 to 30 percent of the domestic student body, a large portion of whom were Latino(a) and Hispanic. GPS was recruiting from Hispanic-Serving Institutions, expanding to the California State University, and reaching out to community colleges to encourage transfer students to join the 3+2 programs. This fall, GPS was hosting undergraduate students who were traditionally underrepresented in public policy and international affairs for a weekend on campus to network and learn more about these fields. This was both a recruitment effort and an opportunity to encourage more diverse populations to pursue public policy.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the President's recommendation and voted to present it to the Board, Regents Anguiano, Batchlor, Hernandez, Park, Raznick, and Sarris voting "aye" and Regent Tesfai voting "no."

3.    **FINAL REPORT OF THE SYSTEMWIDE ADVISORY WORKGROUP ON STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES**

[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 stated that, in 2021, the Systemwide Advisory Workgroup on Students with Disabilities was charged with reviewing policies and procedures, examining existing data, and recommending actions. She underscored UC's commitment to ensuring that students with disabilities feel welcome and safe on campus, are supported in their pursuits, and graduate in a timely fashion. This effort combined physical infrastructure, technology, compliance, equity and inclusion, and careful review of policies and procedures.

UC Davis Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs Pablo Reguerín thanked the Workgroup members, stakeholders, and undergraduate and graduate student leaders from the disability community, and he highlighted the UC Student Association's ACQUIRE campaign. The Workgroup believed that the recommended actions and data could serve as a roadmap for better serving students with disabilities, as well as a call to action at all levels of UC for investment, policy reform, equity-minded leadership, and improvement to UC practices. The Workgroup examined data from all ten campuses, outside research, and national data, and considered academic accommodations, sense of belonging, facilities, housing, and physical and technology-based access. The Workgroup also considered students' intersecting identities and saw the need for a common framework that went beyond

compliance, such that meeting Americans with Disabilities Act standards was the minimum. The Workgroup needed to apply a holistic and equity-minded approach, moving from a medical model, which viewed disability as a deficit to be fixed, to a social model, which shifts responsibility of inclusion to the organization and the cultural environment. The Workgroup analyzed national indicators of success in higher education, including graduation and time to degree, disaggregating data by disability and race, and aligned its metrics to the UC 2030 goals. The Workgroup drew from a variety of data sources including self-reported surveys, ad hoc data sets, and data from student disability offices. Given the insufficient diagnosis of disabilities, population averages were used.

Committee Chair Park praised the breadth of recommendations and expressed appreciation for the Workgroup's approach to gathering data and robust engagement.

Regent Tesfai asked about the role of funding in infrastructure and staffing bottlenecks. Students had difficulty accessing accommodations and services. Mr. Reguerín replied that the staffing levels of student disability centers was a key concern, but the Workgroup did not wish to limit funding to accommodations. UC Berkeley Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs Stephen Sutton stated that campuses planned to match $1.5 million in disability justice funding from the State and $8 million in systemwide funding. The Workgroup made recommendations to the Office of the Chief Financial Officer on an allocation method that provided baseline support to each campus and funded the disability population as it was currently known. Interim Associate Vice President and Director of Operating Budget Caín Díaz noted that those recommendations have been approved by President Drake and that funding has been allocated to campuses, which were receiving both one-time and ongoing funding. How campuses planned to use one-time support might differ, and there would be additional guidance on building a funding model that would address ongoing needs.

Regent-designate Beharry, referring to the report's recommendation to revise Regents Policy 4400: Policy on University of California Diversity Statement, asked how the addition of language regarding intersectionality could create change instead of seeming performative. Mr. Sutton stated that the Workgroup did not wish to make this revision for performative reasons and envisioned a systemwide partnership between faculty, staff, the Regents, and the Office of the President (UCOP). There was an opportunity for the Regents to determine whether Regents Policy 4407, last reviewed in 2010, could better reflect students' intersectional identities. Mr. Reguerín added that the Workgroup disaggregated data and crossed it with race, ethnicity, and disability type. Vice President Gullatt noted that changes might not be made to the policy, but the University should always look at policies through these lenses to ensure that they fully reflect UC's intentions and vision. Mr. Reguerín added that the recommendation on identity development, disability identity, and cultural centers was also premised on the notion of multiple identities.

Regent-designate Beharry urged chancellors to assess disability services staffing needs. Students reported backlogs in case resolution and long wait times, and low staffing could make students feel undervalued. He asked what the Workgroup learned about disability services staff caseloads and burnout. Mr. Reguerín replied that a student panel informed the Workgroup about delays and about visibility as students with disabilities.

Regent-designate Beharry asked if the Workgroup spoke with disability services staff. Mr. Sutton responded in the affirmative. The Workgroup spoke with disability services directors and other constituents. Mr. Reguerín added that staff reported that caseloads affected how much attention they could give and their sense of satisfaction.

Staff Advisor Mackness asked what was not included in the report that should be of note to the Committee. Mr. Sutton responded that, instead of being prescriptive, the Workgroup wanted to give campuses flexibility in how they wished to proceed. Mr. Reguerín shared that some Workgroup members wished to make stronger recommendations for training given an insufficient baseline level of information. Workgroup members also wished to see more benchmarks when analyzing graduate and professional students. He believed that campus task forces should meet several times per year to share best practices.

Regent Ellis stated that the final report was an improvement on what was presented to the Regents one year ago. He agreed with the recommendation to evaluate Regents Policy 4400 and would have preferred if the final report had addressed housing. A priority system for housing would not address current shortages but could be a tool to prioritize students with disabilities. He stated that, if UC does appoint a chief accessibility officer, the individual should be respected and empowered to act. Regent Ellis expressed appreciation that the Workgroup explored funding although it was not charged with doing so. He called for an annual or biannual report to the Regents on the status of implementation, adding the need for continued student input.

Regent Anguiano commended the progressive nature of the report recommendations and called for a report on implementation methodology and progress over time.

Committee Chair Park asked Faculty Representative Steintrager to examine campus policies pertaining to "incomplete" grades and how they affected students' ability to apply for support. She referred to public comment made by Mia Terry, UC Santa Cruz student and UC Student Association (UCSA) Disability Justice Officer.

Committee Chair Park asked what policy areas could help resolve accommodation requests given that many such requests were related to examination time.

Committee Chair Park invited Student Observer Xavier De Anda to make remarks.

Mr. De Anda shared that he was a fifth year undergraduate student at UC Riverside studying neuroscience and political science, and that his hometown was El Centro in the Imperial Valley. Mr. De Anda thanked the Workgroup for working closely with UCSA and student leaders to ensure that the final report reflects the needs of students with disabilities, and he thanked Regents for providing a platform for feedback. He addressed two of the report recommendations. Students were concerned that chief accessibility officers would not be able to effect change at the campus level given UCOP's advisory role and campus autonomy. The job description and scope of responsibilities for this position should indicate an ability to enforce change and accountability. With regard to the recommendation to review Academic Senate regulations for incomplete grades and

academic standing, Mr. De Anda thanked Committee Chair Park and Regents Ellis, Tesfai, and Regent-designate Beharry for listening to student proposals about this issue at the November Regents meeting. He stated that some incomplete grading policies violated the Americans with Disabilities Act. Causes for incomplete work included serious illness, the death of a family member, or an accident, and campuses like UC Santa Barbara and UCLA engaged in flagging, in which the incomplete grade remains on a transcript despite the completion of work. This revealed that a student had received an accommodation and suggested that the grade received was less valid. Some campuses like UC Santa Cruz charged a fee to request a grade change, but UC Irvine, UC Berkeley, and UC Davis provided a timeframe for students to complete their coursework. Students with disabilities were more likely to accumulate incomplete grades, and incomplete grading policies created unnecessary stress for these students. Mr. De Anda suggested standardizing the policy, removing flagging and fees, and providing at least one year to complete coursework. He stated that disability funding should not be distributed using an allocation model solely based on reported percentages. This would leave, for instance, UC Merced with less than $600,000 and UC Berkeley with over $3 million. Rather, distribution should be determined by whether campuses meet the recommendations. Beyond the report, students asked for accessible transportation options at all campuses.

Chancellor Larive shared that, last fall, UC Santa Cruz decided to remove fees for changing an incomplete grade to a letter grade. Those changes went into effect on January 1.

4.  **UC ONLINE AND THE ECOSYSTEM OF ONLINE EDUCATION IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SYSTEM**

[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. When the Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) was created, most UC campuses lacked infrastructure for faculty to develop online courses. ILTI helped faculty develop courses that could be offered on a campus or in a systemwide course exchange, facilitated faculty review of online courses, and provided information about how credit for online courses transferred across the UC system. Many campuses now had the infrastructure and expertise needed for online instruction, and ILTI, now known as UC Online, has shifted toward policy guidance, technical assistance, and support for systemwide initiatives such as the UC Reengagement Consortium, the collective educational technology procurement process. In May 2023, UC Online hired its inaugural Executive Director, Rolin Moe.

Mr. Moe stated that, in 2018, UC Online presented its initial five-year findings to this Committee. This included the creation of one of the nation's first cross-campus enrollment systems, partnering with campuses in the development of hundreds of online courses, providing technical support and expertise, and assisting the UC community in navigating the UC Online ecosystem. Since the presentation of the five-year findings, all campuses were now participating in UC Online's Cross-Campus Enrollment System and investing in instructional designers and educational technologists. During the COVID-19 pandemic,

UC Online provided best practices to faculty, who were pivoting to remote emergency instruction, while showcasing the potential of online instruction. Even after the return to in-person instruction, there was a recognition of the role of online education at UC. The multi-year funding Compact with the State called for a doubling of online credit hours by 2030, a goal that UC reached last year, more than six years ahead of its target date. This demonstrated that online education could help the University achieve Compact goals related to access and enrollment, educational equity, and time to degree. More than 40 percent of UC students took at least one online course in 2022–23. Last fall, findings published by UC Santa Cruz indicated that online courses developed at a level consistent with expectations of a UC education were as robust as in-person courses. UC Online's Advisory Committee and Institutional Research and Academic Planning (IRAP) at the Office of the President (UCOP) were jointly developing an executive dashboard to track student engagement with online education as a means for strategic planning in online growth. In the future, UC Online aimed to partner with campuses, align initiatives to create collective impact, and provide systemwide value. For instance, UC Online supported cross-campus initiatives like Bending the Curve, a climate resiliency curriculum with a goal to reach one million individuals by 2030. To date, Bending the Curve has reached tens of thousands of learners across numerous environments.

UC Irvine Vice Provost for Teaching and Learning and Dean of Undergraduate Education Michael Dennin noted that Bending the Curve was an example of shared resources. In fall 2023, UC Irvine had nearly 20,000 enrollments in online courses and 230 enrollments were from other campuses. In just the last four years, 272 faculty participated in the Digital Learning Institute, which has awarded 160 certificates and supported 173 courses. Through the Division of Teaching Excellence and Innovation (DTEI) Pedagogical Fellows Program, a faculty member could partner with a graduate student to develop a course during the summer. As a systemwide resource, UC Online could develop culture or infrastructure of shared resources. Similar to open access educational resources, UC could develop high-quality assets coupled with professional development for faculty. Intellectual property and artificial intelligence issues would also need to be addressed.

UC San Diego Associate Vice Chancellor for Educational Innovation Carlos Jensen shared that the San Diego campus had the lowest pre-pandemic adoption of online courses at UC, which he attributed to campus culture, resourcing, and training available to faculty. During the pandemic, UCSD took advantage of the assistance that UCOP and UC Online provided, and, this past term, 11 percent of undergraduate students took at least one online course. With the high cost of living in the San Diego area and many students being from elsewhere in the state, online education has become the preferred modality during the summer. UCSD students who had previously taken summer courses at other UC campuses, a California State University campus, or a community college could now take a course directly from UCSD without facing transfer or articulation issues. Online courses at UCSD also had the largest wait lists. However, the campus had to do more to develop high-quality online courses and aimed to give students the option of taking one online course per term. With a course catalogue of over 4,000 courses, UCSD must be judicious in choosing which courses to bring online. The campus prioritized courses based on rates of failure or withdrawal, equity gaps, wait lists, whether a course is a gateway course, and large

enrollments. Online education itself would not necessarily fix these issues, but faculty developing courses with the help of an instructional designer tended to improve the outcomes of both the online and in-person versions of courses.

Ms. Newman stated that, at the third Systemwide Academic Congress, President Drake's newly formed joint administration-faculty task force would be recommending quality standards for online education and the investments needed to ensure that online courses are as engaging, interactive, and valuable as their in-person counterparts.

Regent Sarris expressed concern about pedagogy, noting that the experience for an instructor differed based on modality. He noted that some studies have shown that students taking online courses were graduating more slowly. Mr. Dennin stated that a study at UCI indicated that the rate of graduation for students who take online courses was the same or faster. These were summer courses taken before the pandemic, but the study still showed a narrow but positive use of online courses. Ms. Newman added that studies often do not take selection effects into account, such as the demographics of those enrolling in courses and the types of courses. She stressed the importance of collecting data from within the UC system. Data from fully online programs outside the UC system were coming from for-profit institutions which typically accepted the least qualified students. The new administration-faculty task force would interrogate the data and separate selection effects from modality effects. Mr. Jensen raised the question of whether the course being studied was offered via teleconference or an intentionally designed online course. Teleconference learning was needed during the pandemic but was not effective pedagogy. Students who sought online courses were trying to balance education with other life commitments, such as caregiving or employment, and these student populations tended to be more vulnerable to time to degree or graduation challenges. For the last three years, UCSD has offered Summer Bridge both in person and online, scaling the program from 300 students before the pandemic to 700 students last summer and aiming for 900 students this coming summer. The campus expanded Summer Bridge because first-generation, underserved, and high-need students could not make the financial and social commitment to come to San Diego prior to start of term. UCSD tracked the grade point averages (GPA), number of units completed, and retention rates of students who participated in Summer Bridge fully online and found that intentionally designed, fully online courses had a positive though not statistically significant effect on students.

Regent-designate Beharry asked if UC had data on student satisfaction and performance in online courses, and if these data challenged the belief that online instruction compromised the quality of education. Mr. Dennin replied that these data would be made available.

Regent-designate Beharry asked if demographic data on students with disabilities, parenting students, and international students were available. Mr. Dennin responded in the affirmative; these data could be examined by the task force.
Regent-designate Beharry asked if UC Online considered overseeing the implementation of online accessibility initiatives as recommended in the final report of the Systemwide Advisory Workgroup on Students with Disabilities. Mr. Moe responded in the affirmative. He has had conversations about these initiatives; UC Online would be involved.

Faculty Representative Steintrager shared that, anecdotally, some online courses were taken by students because they were easy and could help pad one's GPA. He asked whether this concern had been observed or addressed. Mr. Dennin replied that there were obvious ways to deliver both online and in-person instruction badly, and online instruction presented a new area of oversight, intervention, and support. The UCI Division of the Academic Senate was actively engaged in these conversations, recognizing that there was not much information about online courses after they are approved. Units needed to be given tools to better understand what was happening in their online and in-person courses. Mr. Dennin remarked that most students demanded high quality. Mr. Jensen added that most UC campuses had a wealth of data of student outcomes from online courses and did not have as much data on in-person courses with which to make comparisons.

Regent Anguiano remarked that the term "online" was not a monolith and should be used with more nuance. She asked about a systemwide strategy for growing online instruction in an increasingly digital world, and expressed concern about the speed of execution, asked how UC Online could help drive the quick adoption of innovation and technology.

Regent Raznick stated that this presented the University with an opportunity to envision this modality beyond being a delivery channel and to convey to students and parents that UC's online modality is as good as more traditional modalities. Ms. Newman responded that the task force could help create consensus where there is significant division of opinion. Data needed to be collected and managed. Ms. Newman was confident that the University and its faculty would be impactful.

Chancellor Yang recalled that, ten years ago, he had written a proposal and received a grant from the Systemwide Provost to develop an online course. Every fall, he taught a three-credit course that he also recorded. When in-person instruction resumed after the pandemic, he continued to offer his course remotely in the spring term. When asked, his students reported that they preferred his in-person course. Students also reported that they were incentivized to take online courses in the summer. Chancellor Yang asked what incentives were being offered to students to take online summer courses, and he asked about the maximum number of online courses taken in the summer. Mr. Dennin replied that UCI did not offer specific incentives for online courses but did have a "pay for eight" program, such that students paid for up to eight units during summer session. He observed that not many students were taking more than the average courseload of 11 units. Mr. Jensen stated that UCSD did not have a "pay for eight" program; all students paid in-state tuition during summer session. The savings for out-of-state students and from reduced time to degree made a significant impact. UCSD has seen successful courseloads of up to 32 units during the summer. Mr. Moe added that there were fewer obstacles to taking online courses during the summer. The desire to take online courses was not necessarily motivated by geography; many local students wished to take online courses as well.

Committee Chair Park highlighted that the State has allocated $10 million to UC online education every year since 2013, an amount that has now totaled $100 million. She requested a strategic plan for this funding and asked what UC Online wished to achieve in the next three, five, and ten years. Mr. Moe replied that UC Online began the strategic

planning process in June 2023 and also started working with the Strategy and Program Management Office at UCOP. Since 2015, between $5 million and $8 million has been earmarked for UC Online, but not the full amount.

Committee Chair Park asked where the balance of the $10 million allocation has gone. Vice President Gullatt replied that UCOP budget reductions have affected UC Online. The annual allocation was now about $7.75 million.

The meeting adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff