

The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

March 18-19, 2015

The Committee on Educational Policy met on the above dates at UCSF–Mission Bay Conference Center, San Francisco.

Members present: Regents Engelhorn, Gould, Island, Kieffer, Lansing, Leong Clancy, Lozano, and Saifuddin; Ex officio members Brown, Napolitano, and Varner; Advisory members Davis, Gilly, and Gorman; Staff Advisors Acker and Coyne

In attendance: Regents De La Peña, Elliott, Makarechian, Ortiz Oakley, Pattiz, Pérez, Sherman, and Zettel, Faculty Representative Hare, Secretary and Chief of Staff Shaw, General Counsel Robinson, Provost Dorr, Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer Brostrom, Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer Nava, Senior Vice Presidents Henderson and Peacock, Vice Presidents Brown, Budil, Duckett, and Sakaki, Chancellors Block, Blumenthal, Dirks, Gillman, Hawgood, Katehi, Khosla, Leland, Wilcox, and Yang, and Recording Secretary Johns

The meeting convened at 2:15 p.m. with Committee Vice Chair Island presiding.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of January 21, 2015 were approved.

2. BACKGROUND ON THE ORIGINS OF THE STRUCTURE OF UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

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

Committee Vice Chair Island introduced the presentation, recalling that Regent Kieffer had requested that there be discussion on the form and meaning of undergraduate education.

Chancellor Dirks provided a historical overview of important questions facing educators regarding the purposes and value of the University's educational mission at the undergraduate level within the larger context of UC's mission as a public research university. The debates dominant today have been shaping institutions of higher education for more than a century. On a curricular level, Western higher education's roots are far deeper, going back to classical thought of ancient Greece. The kinds of

classes offered in American universities well into the 19th century were tied to the body of knowledge put forth by classical philosophers, the root of the liberal arts.

Religion in the United States in the 17th, 18th, and early 19th centuries was critical for the establishment and development of higher education. Churches founded many of the first American colleges, in part to train their clergy and from a commitment to a moral education. The study of classical languages, introduced to read scripture, continued throughout the periods of the Enlightenment and the secularization of college education because these languages were also seen as media for classical debates about citizenship, the public good, and moral subjects. This broad classical inheritance was translated by the Founding Fathers into a responsibility of the new nation. Most civic and political leaders of that time did not consider it possible to educate everyone. But many saw value in producing what Thomas Jefferson called “the natural aristocracy” of learning and talent that was not tied to a specific class. Envisioning universities as essential in turning America into a true meritocracy, Jefferson also developed the first notion of a university education as a means of achieving social mobility. In founding the University of Virginia in 1819, he created the first publicly supported college and the first nonsectarian university in the United States, dedicated to educating leaders in practical affairs and public service rather than for the pulpit or the professions.

As American society became steadily more industrial, new practical and vocational interests came to the fore. Theoretical science began to include navigation, engineering, mechanics, and agriculture. The study of classical languages began to give way to the study of modern languages, French and German in particular.

On July 2, 1862, President Abraham Lincoln signed the Morrill Act, also known as the Land Grant Act, giving each state 30,000 acres of federal land for each senator and representative it sent to Congress, to be used to establish an endowment to support “at least one college where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies,...to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts....” Morrill’s ambition was monumental. In envisioning a comprehensive system of colleges for the industrial classes “accessible to all, but especially to the sons of toil,” he elevated the practical vocations to the same social standing as that which accompanied the liberal arts and sciences, while ensuring that all classes would have access to this previously only elite form of education.

From the beginning, relative inclusiveness set the land grant colleges apart from eastern private colleges, underscored by the fact that most land grant colleges were coeducational. The University of California, which admitted women by 1870, enrolled enough women to comprise 40 percent of the student body by 1894. The main debates of the time concerned the focus of the UC curriculum. Originally, lawmakers had opted to create an agricultural, mining, and mechanical arts college, but instead they decided to build a comprehensive university. This vision was reinforced in 1872 when Daniel Coit Gilman joined the budding institution as president. Recruited from Yale’s Sheffield Scientific School, he vowed to bring a more modern conception to the University, where

it would be adapted to the state's public and private schools, to its unique geographic position, to the requirements of its new society, and the state's underdeveloped resources.

However, soon after Gilman took office, an agriculture professor mobilized agricultural interests in California to condemn the University for neglecting the study of farming and procured support of the State Legislature, which conducted a formal investigation into the management of the University and the Board of Regents. While the University and its administration were exonerated, the ordeal led to Gilman's departure to lead Johns Hopkins University. The battle continued, with bills introduced to alter the governance of the University. Public distrust of the University was fanned by an economic depression at the time. In a constitutional convention in 1878, the University achieved a resounding victory by attaining autonomy from direct political management and being named a public trust "entirely independent of all political or sectarian influence and kept free therefrom in the appointment of its Regents and in the administration of its affairs...." The University of California continued its commitment to practical as well as general education, not just in engineering and agriculture, but as of 1898 in commerce as well.

A vision of an ever more comprehensive university founded in research activity was seen as foundational for both public and private universities, led in particular by the University of Michigan, Johns Hopkins University, the University of Chicago, and increasingly the University of California. This new vision had an important effect on undergraduate education. As the research foci of the university expanded, the variety of classes and specialized areas of study increased greatly. The formation of academic societies and the hiring of specialist faculty led to the proliferation of fields of study. New fields in social science were developed that began to address concrete social issues such as prison reform, poverty relief, crime, and social deviance. At the same time, the pillars of the traditional undergraduate education began to be replaced by curricula based on individual academic disciplines and increased student choice.

Although the University of Virginia had led the way in allowing students some degree of choice, the idea of the specialized focus of the major organized around academic disciplines only developed late in the 19th century. In 1905, the University of California divided the curriculum into lower and upper divisions, creating a framework for liberal study in the first two years of undergraduate education and increased specialization in the latter two, introducing the major as the organizing principle. Since then, the idea that undergraduate education should include general education as well as specialization, typically in the form of a major, has been a distinguishing feature of American higher education.

Around the same time, the collegiate experience also became an integral part of higher education, including activities outside the classroom, inspired in part by President Theodore Roosevelt's call for the strenuous life. Athletics became important to cultivating the student, the male student in particular. Fraternities grew; residential housing, student newspapers, glee clubs, and many other activities became a part of college life, rounding out what was called the extra curriculum. The university's new

focus on organizing these elements in the lives of collegians underscored a broader sense of the mission to mature and socialize young people into full adults.

In the 20th century, the influence of universities expanded, not just for the elite, but for the growing middle class. This led to steadily increasing demand and universities began to see value in supporting students before entry to college so that they could succeed once enrolled. For centuries, colleges admitted all students who met entry requirements or passed an entry exam. In the early 20th century, the University of California and other schools began to set standards for college preparatory courses. University faculty began to visit high schools and review their curricula. They defined specific courses of study that would prepare students for college and began creating benchmarks for accreditation soon taken up by professional accreditation organizations.

In 1907, at the urging of UC President Benjamin Ide Wheeler, the California Legislature passed the nation's first bill to establish local junior colleges as extensions of high school. This set the stage for what became the idea later enshrined in the California Master Plan for Higher Education (Master Plan), installed in three tiers of functionally differentiated institutions of higher education.

The promise of universal access to higher education as a right was made explicit in acts like the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, commonly known as the G.I. Bill, which Chancellor Dirks characterized as perhaps the most underrated piece of social legislation of the 20th century. President Truman's Commission on Higher Education, convened during World War II, reported in 1947 that every American should be enabled and encouraged to carry his education as far as his native capacities permitted.

The Master Plan of 1960 devised a formal working system for postsecondary education that gave specific roles to the three tiers, associating a general commitment to the liberal arts with the research work of the top tier of research universities. To accommodate and serve a rapidly increasing population in need of new skills and advanced training across a multitude of fields, UC President Clark Kerr argued that knowledge produced at universities had become the main fuel for the growth of the nation. Although students accused him during the 1960s of championing the corporatization of the University, President Kerr was describing a new reality about which he had both great optimism and abiding concerns. Although he believed that the University would lead the way to new economic possibilities, he worried that it risked becoming a knowledge factory, whose large classes, overuse of teaching assistants, and selection of faculty members based on their research expertise, could neglect and alienate its undergraduate student body.

Much has been done over the subsequent 50 years across the University of California, and many other institutions, to address these kinds of concerns, which were shared across many large research universities. One can point to the visionary college systems at UC San Diego and UC Santa Cruz and the investment of huge resources across the UC system in student support, advising, housing, career counseling, and undergraduate teaching. UC is at the forefront of efforts to redefine and rearticulate the centrality of

undergraduate education, not just for UC's teaching mission, but also for the other domains in which UC excels, namely its research and public mission.

The purpose of an undergraduate degree at the University of California is to combine the best of what is available in liberal arts education with the resources of a great research university, offering courses that cover an almost unimaginable range of opportunities for specialization in research and in selected professional fields, and opportunities to work with some of the best faculty in the world. The University begins with a commitment to develop critical thinking, the capacity to read and analyze primary texts and data with independent rigor and judgment. One of UC's primary obligations is to cultivate intellectual curiosity, not just to train students' basic intellectual capacities, but also to stimulate students to search relentlessly for new ways and approaches to acquire advanced knowledge. Increasingly, this means learning data numeracy as well as literacy, worldly understanding as well as civic values, and new skills across a variety of fields.

As the University builds a steadily proliferating architecture of academic offerings in majors and specialized programs, it seeks to balance the need to learn about subjects in sufficient depth to be prepared for graduate and professional education with the expectation that students will be prepared in their undergraduate education for careers across a multitude of fields. Courses and training in the foundational principles of discrete disciplines are balanced with a range of applications that have robust practical applications. Faculties struggle to build curricular paths moving students from general to specialized knowledge in ways that can accommodate both uneven levels of high school or community college preparation and the increasing technical challenges of almost every field. This is accomplished in the context of supporting a diverse student body toward shared goals of personal maturity and social responsibility.

Today's students face difficult, if exciting, prospects in an economy where jobs are changing at a faster pace than ever before, and in a world that challenges inherited values around social justice, environmental responsibility, and cultural and economic entitlement. Today's students will have an average of six kinds of jobs during their careers and will confront new challenges in a world defined by massive technological change and unprecedented global interdependence. The University addresses these challenges for UC's undergraduates by embracing change and innovation, while maintaining foundational traditions and values that have been a critical feature of the University of California. UC takes enormous pride in the fact that American universities are, for these reasons, still the envy of the world. The University of California has a place of distinction among all of its peers.

Professor Panos Papadopoulos, Chair of the Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate, described discussions taking place at UC Berkeley to ensure that UC's leadership in research and graduate training is matched by its commitment to undergraduate education. Professor Papadopoulos described the Undergraduate Initiative underway at UC Berkeley. For the past 14 months, a small group of faculty and administrators have been charged by Chancellor Dirks with creating a bold, new vision for the undergraduate experience, both in and out of the classroom. The goal is ambitious: a public research

university that, at a fraction of private competitors' cost, delivers to all of its undergraduate students an education and student life second to none in their quality and formative value, and in the process perhaps contributes to reasserting the historic leadership role of the University of California system in promoting change among American universities.

The Undergraduate Initiative focuses on four challenges: first, the development and sustainable delivery of a lower-division curriculum that is responsive to the widely varying needs of a diverse student body and yet underlined by academic rigor and broadly construed relevance. In envisioning such a curriculum, the Initiative has articulated the core competencies, such as numeracy and literacy, as well as dispositions such as worldliness and open-mindedness considered important by faculty and is now in the process of mapping them to a flexible, yet thematically coherent, set of courses, course threads, and extracurricular experiences. The second area of the Initiative's focus is the promotion of personalized mentorship of UC Berkeley undergraduates, both by faculty and non-faculty advisors, as an essential means of supporting and guiding students through their studies and into their postgraduate lives and careers. Preliminary efforts in this direction under the Berkeley Connect program suggest that the benefits of a mentorship program are tangible and significant. Third, the Initiative would focus on leveraging the University's research excellence in offering to all undergraduates a meaningful capstone research or other creative experience. UCLA's Capstone Initiative offers an invaluable starting point for this effort. Lastly, the Undergraduate Initiative would focus on re-envisioning undergraduate residential life, well beyond the conventional dormitory paradigm. Experience has shown that the community in which Berkeley's undergraduate students live, study, and interact has a profound effect on their personal growth as well as on their allegiance to their alma mater. To improve student life, the Undergraduate Initiative is exploring hybrid residential models that cover the full spectrum between dormitory and residential college living. Related experiences at UC San Diego and UC Santa Cruz offer good comparative measures.

Major improvements in the delivery of the undergraduate experience invariably require change, for instance in the administrative structures tasked with overseeing undergraduate matters. Designing such structures to be nimble and effective, and building consensus among many constituencies takes both effort and political will. Professor Papadopoulos expressed optimism about the outcome of the Initiative, even with current fiscal pressure on the University.

Governor Brown asked whether the pathway to a Ph.D., with its need to develop skills in a discipline, is compromised by the need to teach lower-division undergraduates and if the teaching path is very different from the research path. Professor Papadopoulos expressed his view that, while this dichotomy can exist, it is largely a problem of culture and incentives.

Regent Ortiz Oakley commented on UC's strength as a great undergraduate university, which is very important to Californians. He asked how UC evaluates the talent of its applicants, particularly of first-generation college students whose families may not be

familiar with traditional measures. Many talented applicants from underserved areas do not gain admission. Provost Dorr agreed that evaluating undergraduate and graduate applicants from various family backgrounds can be challenging, because the indicators of talent may be varied. UC uses a holistic review of applications, considering the context within which the applicant went to school, helping to broaden the types of indicators of talent that are considered. UC also uses other procedures for special admissions in certain fields such as the arts. Professor Papadopoulos added that UC Berkeley faculty were reviewing admission policies and would recommend some fairly significant revisions. Faculty are increasingly concerned about overreliance on standardized tests and would like the holistic review to be more attentive to noncognitive factors, such as personal integrity and the capacity to persevere and thrive in a challenging environment. Work is being done on ways to evaluate such factors from materials provided by applicants.

Regent Ortiz Oakley said that there should be clarity in how students move from one institution to another under the Master Plan. Efforts to improve the clarity of these pathways should be considered by the Regents, since it is the Regents' responsibility to ensure that UC is serving Californians by implementing the Master Plan in a way that supports the entire system. UC should coordinate its efforts with the work that has already been done by the California Community Colleges (CCC) and California State University (CSU). Expectations for students in all systems should be clarified. President Napolitano agreed, noting that her office is continuing work on clarifying and coordinating transfer pathways that would be accepted throughout the UC system. UC graduation rates for transfer students are very good.

President Napolitano asked about UC undergraduate students who want to change majors being limited in their ability to pursue a new field by not having the major prerequisite requirements. Chancellor Dirks responded that an increasing number of UC Berkeley students pursue double majors and the campus has been working hard to allow flexibility in the paths students can take. This requires a great deal of mentoring and advising, and has been helped by the investment of funds in courses that had been impacted. It is a campus priority to keep choices open for students and at the same time ensure that the campus can accommodate the needs of transfer students who also might want to change majors.

Faculty Representative Gilly commented that UC faculty want to build on the progress achieved through the Student Transfer Achievement Reform Act that established the Associate of Arts Degree for Transfer or Associate of Science Degree for Transfer for CCC students. She assured the Regents that the Academic Senate takes its authority over curriculum very seriously. The Academic Senate has a committee on educational policy on each campus as well as a systemwide committee. The undergraduate curriculum is constantly reevaluated by all the campus divisions.

Regent Pattiz agreed with Regent Ortiz Oakley's comments regarding the difficulty of finding students whose talent may not be revealed through standard admission measures. Californians need to have an understanding of the basic admission requirements.

Regent Pérez commented that it would be important to ask the right questions to gain information to evaluate applicants in the best way and to reevaluate the importance of standardized tests. Innate skills of applicants may be overlooked. UC Merced has the most diverse student body and receives referrals of students who were not accepted to their UC campus of choice. It would be important to consider whether the mix of students on all UC campuses maximizes students' educational potential. Perception of the campus climate of various UC campuses affects students' willingness to enroll. Regent Pérez expressed his view that it would be inappropriate to suggest that students from underserved areas begin their academic careers at a CCC, since many of these students would not progress at the CCC to the point of being able to transfer to a UC. Underserved communities would be most directly affected if the proper balance between increased funding and increased efficiency to maintain access were not achieved. He asked Provost Dorr to comment on CCC students who do not progress to the point of being able to transfer to UC. Provost Dorr noted that UC does a good deal of K-12 preparation and advising about preparation. Data from CCC indicate that many students who want to transfer to UC or a CSU campus do not achieve that goal, although it is difficult to know the causal factors. Community college students who transfer to a UC campus do as well as UC freshmen. UC has increased its ongoing involvement with students who participated in its academic preparation program and go to a CCC to assist them in planning and keeping on track for a successful UC transfer. It is not recommended to K-12 students in the academic preparation program that they begin at a CCC and then transfer; that is presented as one possible option.

Regent Pérez asked about holistic review as a way of maintaining a level of diversity. Professor Papadopoulos observed that holistic review, instituted at UC Berkeley in 1997 following passage of Proposition 209, was a successful effort to create a framework for admission review that would be in compliance with State law and take into account socioeconomics as one admission criterion. Holistic review is imperfect because it relies on individuals who spend a small amount of time reading complicated applications trying to find evidence that is difficult to extract.

Professor Papadopoulos observed that a significant increase in the number of applications to UC Berkeley is at least in part reflective of how easy it is now for students to apply to many campuses. It is difficult for UC to attract top-performing minority students because they are recruited heavily and often offered full scholarships by private colleges. These students are admitted to UC campuses, but often choose to attend elsewhere. One criterion used in holistic review is the likelihood of graduating. UC is unwilling to lower academic standards in order to admit a different cohort of students. Students admitted to UC Berkeley's School of Engineering, for example, all have outstanding grade point averages (GPAs), standardized test scores, and extracurricular activities, so there are many applicants with outstanding GPAs who are not admitted.

Regent Lansing added that she had advocated for holistic review when it was adopted. It was intended to take into account the whole student, not just standardized tests and GPAs in an attempt to admit the best students and most diverse student body. While the holistic process is not perfect, it has allowed consideration of broader criteria and individual

experiences. The three-part structure of California public higher education offers students excellent alternatives.

Regent-designate Davis commented that admission to a highly selective university is an imperfect predictor of life outcomes. He expressed his view that changes in technology and in the demographic composition of California's student body, along with the increase in the cost of a UC education would lead to a higher proportion of UC undergraduates' living at home. He asked what effect this would have on the UC undergraduate experience. Chancellor Dirks agreed that living on or near campus is expensive for students; this cost is factored into financial aid packages based on the belief that the availability of campus housing should not be dependent on students' economic background. There is currently a higher percentage of UC Berkeley students living in campus dormitories than ever before, in large part because significant resources have been invested into building dormitories and other residential facilities. The campus believes that the success of students' undergraduate experience depends to some extent on students' living accommodations as well as classroom experience. Ways to provide on-campus housing less expensively are continually being explored.

Regent Kieffer expressed hope that further consideration of the meaning of an undergraduate education would be taken up at future meetings. Even though curriculum is delegated to faculty, the Regents have continuing oversight responsibility in this area. Regent Kieffer commented that Chancellor Dirks' presentation showed that relevant issues about undergraduate education have changed over time. Fundamental questions of whom the University teaches, what it teaches, and how it teaches would continue to arise. He suggested a future examination of the University's research and its importance to the state's economy.

The Committee recessed at 3:30 p.m.

.....

The Committee reconvened on March 19, 2015 at 9:20 a.m. with Committee Vice Chair Island presiding.

Members present: Regents Engelhorn, Gould, Island, Kieffer, Lansing, Leong Clancy, Lozano, Newsom, and Saifuddin; Ex officio members Napolitano and Varner; Advisory members Davis, Gilly, Gorman, and Oved; Staff Advisors Acker and Coyne

In attendance: Regents De La Peña, Elliott, Makarechian, Ortiz Oakley, Pattiz, Pérez, Sherman, and Zettel, Faculty Representative Hare, Secretary and Chief of Staff Shaw, General Counsel Robinson, Provost Dorr, Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer Brostrom, Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer Nava, Senior Vice Presidents Henderson and Peacock, Vice Presidents Allen-Diaz, Budil, and Sakaki, Chancellors Block, Blumenthal, Gillman, Hawgood, Wilcox, and Yang, and Recording Secretary Johns

3. **AMENDMENT OF REGENTS POLICY 3106: POLICY ON WAIVER OF TUITION AND FEES TO COMPLY WITH THE VETERANS ACCESS, CHOICE, AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2014**

The President of the University recommended that Regents Policy 3106: Policy on Waiver of Tuition and Fees be amended as shown in Attachment 1.

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

Committee Vice Chair Island briefly introduced the item. Provost Dorr explained that active duty service members regularly relocate around the country and internationally, according to the needs of their service. Because of these frequent moves, service members sometimes do not have the opportunity to establish residency in the state where they or their dependents attend college. Under current policy, UC would charge those servicemen and their dependents nonresident tuition. The Veterans Access Choice and Accountability Act of 2014 stipulates that any higher education institution that charges such nonresident tuition to active duty servicemen or their dependents would lose all G.I. Bill benefits. For the students UC has currently, that amount would be at least \$30 million. The University appreciates the opportunity to expand the group of servicemen and women and their dependents who would be eligible to come to UC without paying nonresident tuition. This amendment must be made by the end of the fiscal year.

Regent Zettel expressed appreciation for the challenges faced by veterans and their families. She said this amendment was long overdue.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the President's recommendation and voted to present it to the Board.

4. **SERVING THOSE WHO SERVE – AN UPDATE ON STUDENT VETERAN SERVICES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

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

Provost Dorr provided an update on UC services for student veterans and for students on active or reserve duty. Vice President Sakaki introduced Ron Williams, Program Director for Re-entry Student and Veteran Services at UC Berkeley, and Charles Kim, veteran and senior at UC Riverside, both members of the President's Advisory Council on Student Veterans. Ms. Sakaki recalled that in 2008 Regents Lansing, Reiss, and Scorza supported efforts to enhance UC's services for student veterans. Much work has been accomplished since that time and now UC is again assessing progress, searching for more ways to assist veterans in successfully pursuing and completing a UC education. President Napolitano had convened student veterans from all ten UC campuses to discuss the needs and challenges of student veterans enrolled at UC. From that meeting, President Napolitano

created the President's Advisory Council on Student Veterans and charged the group with advising her on strategies to enhance students' success, from outreach to campus support services.

Ms. Sakaki explained that the term student veteran includes those students still on active duty and those in the National Guard or reserves. UC currently enrolls more than 2,000 veterans, including 1,600 undergraduates and 400 graduate or professional students. This number reflects an almost 50 percent increase since 2008, when enrollment hovered around 1,300; about 70 percent of UC's undergraduate veterans transferred from a California Community College (CCC). UC's veteran population is more diverse than ever before, with 27 percent self-identifying as white, 25 percent as Asian, 19 percent as Chicano-Latino, and five percent as black; 77 percent are male. UC student veterans' median age is 28. In comparison, only 47 percent of UC's total undergraduates are male and their median age is 21. While women make up only 14.5 percent of general U.S. active duty military personnel, UC is proud of the fact that women account for 23 percent of UC's student veteran population. For students entering UC between 2002 and 2008, four-year graduation rates for veteran transfer students increased from 80 to 84 percent, comparable to rates for transfer students in general.

Mr. Williams discussed specific campus services and the upcoming UC Summit for Student Veterans. While specific programs and services vary, each UC campus maintains an official veterans' resource center through which it provides admission and transition support, including workshops, priority enrollment, and advising to ensure timely access to post-9/11 G.I. bill and other Veterans' Administration (VA) programs, campus support teams, peer support and mentorship opportunities, community building and events including resource fairs and observances for Veterans' Day and Memorial Day, VA work-study, pre- and post-deployment support for students who are reactivated or deployed during an academic term, and training opportunities to raise campus awareness regarding student veteran issues. The greatest advances stem from increased responsiveness to UC's willing and invested veterans who seek opportunities to partner with UC's veteran services to ensure that UC communities welcome and provide pathways for returning service members. UC student veterans can provide mentorship to CCC veteran students. Program goals include better leveraging support for student veterans, demonstrating the value of a UC degree, and establishing a pipeline for service members separating from active duty. Returning service members face numerous higher education choices and receive extensive marketing for programs that advertise rapid degree completion and award credit for active duty service, in comparison with the rigorous and often lengthier preparation to earn a UC degree.

The UC Summit for Student Veterans would increase attention to the value and benefits of a UC education and the overall strength of California's higher public education system. Student veteran leaders representing CCC, California State University (CSU), and UC campuses would serve as public higher education ambassadors. Students would help identify best practices for increasing student veteran access and support, create ambassador action plans for the 2015-16 academic year, and enhance regional partnerships among public higher education campuses.

Mr. Kim, who spent four years on active duty as an infantryman, commented that information supplied to returning veterans through the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs Transition Assistance Program (TAP) is different from that needed to transition into a four-year university such as UC. The presence of for-profit universities in TAP was pronounced and created an environment in which student veterans were pursued for their G.I. Bill benefits. Outreach efforts would change the environment for veterans being discharged. Most veterans have a lack of knowledge about the process of applying or transferring to UC or graduating successfully. UC's outreach program would work with TAP programs, including having a UC representative available to answer questions from returning veterans thinking of pursuing a degree at UC. The President's Advisory Council on Student Veterans is working with campuses to continue to identify needs of student veterans and to suggest best practices for the campuses to implement. Transition programs offering career and graduate support to student veterans would be provided, such as UC Riverside's Operation Education. Student veterans have varied skill sets acquired during their service and they sometimes need assistance in presenting their military skills on a polished resume to prospective employers.

Ms. Sakaki said this work would continue. The amendment approved in the prior item would allow veterans to access a UC education at the resident tuition level, making a UC education much more affordable. Outreach efforts would be intensified. The original G.I. Bill stands among the most transformative pieces of legislation in the nation's history. UC is working to ensure that it continues to deliver on the democratic promise of the G.I. Bill to so many Americans who in turn make the nation's educational institutions stronger.

Regent Ortiz Oakley, who noted that he attended a CCC as a returning veteran and then UC Irvine, expressed support for these efforts to assist returning veterans, a special group of people who understand service and want to continue to serve. He asked how the 30 percent of student veterans who do not transfer from CCC arrive at UC. Ms. Sakaki responded that some transfer from other institutions outside California and some are admitted as freshmen. Regent Ortiz Oakley stated that the more UC could lay out clear transfer pathways, the better off these students would be. Transfer pathways to CSU are robust, but veterans do not receive much information about UC. UC should make more effort earlier in veterans' military careers to increase their awareness that UC welcomes them. Private institutions are marketing to veterans more effectively than UC. Granting veterans academic credit for their work in the military should also be explored.

President Napolitano agreed with Regent Ortiz Oakley's comments about the desirability of clear transfer pathways. She added that UC would seek to engage with the California and U.S. Departments of Veterans Affairs which do not effectively screen material provided to active duty military who are preparing to separate and want to continue their education. For-profit educational institutions have made huge inroads. President Napolitano has been engaged with the Departments of Veterans Affairs in Sacramento and Washington, D.C. to encourage screening of promotional materials designed to exploit veterans' G.I. Bill benefits.

Regent Gould asked about the current status of offering credit for veterans' service experience that has particular application to degree requirements. Ms. Sakaki responded that the awarding of credit for work or military experience would be determined by the faculty. Faculty Representative Gilly remarked that this idea could be considered, although it is difficult to find courses that are comparable to military experience. Colleges that offer that type of credit often do not have the rigorous curriculum of UC. Regent Gould said this would be an idea worth pursuing. He requested a briefing on this topic, including what areas of military experience might be applicable for UC lower-division course credit. Regent Island asked that President Napolitano make a formal inquiry on this topic and report back to the Board. Ms. Gilly said all students can gain course credit by examination.

Regent Lansing expressed appreciation for the work that has been accomplished for student veterans. She emphasized the importance of supporting student veterans as they transition to careers. Student veterans are often uniquely skilled in areas of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, and some make excellent mathematics teachers.

Chairman Varner asked that he be provided with the date of the UC Summit for Student Veterans. Provost Dorr noted the Summit would include all three segments of California public higher education.

Regent-designate Davis asked Regent Ortiz Oakley about pathways that CSU employs for student veterans transferring from CCCs. Regent Ortiz Oakley explained that those pathways resulted from Senate Bill 1440, which created 120-unit pathways to a CSU bachelor's degree, including 60 units at a CCC with the guarantee of receiving an associate's degree and achieving junior status at a CSU, with another 60 units leading to a bachelor's degree. Twenty-one such pathways have been created between the Academic Senates of the CCC and the CSU. This ensures that students declare a major early and that they avoid taking units that would not lead to a degree.

Regent Pérez suggested partnering with the State Legislature to help reframe the presentation of veterans' access to higher education. He noted that support for reservists and the National Guard had been lacking and the Legislature initiated programs targeting those branches. Mental health services for student veterans are also important. In discussions about land for baseball fields at UCLA, veteran-specific student housing close to the UCLA campus should be considered in a way that would be consistent with the original expectations for that land.

Ms. Gilly observed that the Associate of Arts or Associate of Science Degree for Transfer was becoming the way all students, including veterans, view the transfer process to four-year institutions. The Academic Senate has endorsed the transfer action team's recommendations regarding the transfer process and has started organizing meetings of campus representatives to identify opportunities to have a common set of requirements in preparation for transfer for ten UC majors this year and an additional 11 majors the following year. These discussions would benefit all transfer students, including veterans.

Committee Vice Chair Island thanked Mr. Olson and Mr. Kim for their service and presentation, and President Napolitano for her leadership in this critically important area.

The meeting adjourned at 9:55 a.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff

**Additions shown by underscoring; deletions shown by strikethrough.
Ellipses indicate intervening portions of the policy that remain unchanged.**

REGENTS POLICY 3106
POLICY ON WAIVER OF TUITION AND FEES

1. The University of California shall exempt students from tuition and/or fees or waive tuition and/or fees, as set forth below. (All statutory references herein, unless otherwise noted, are to the California Education Code.)

...

- F. A student who meets the definition of “covered individual” as defined in federal law in Section 702 of the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-146) shall be exempt from paying nonresident tuition at the University.