

The Regents of the University of California

ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

January 25, 2017

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

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

In attendance: Regents Blum and Elliott, Secretary and Chief of Staff Shaw, Provost Dorr, Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer Nava, Senior Vice President Peacock, Vice Presidents Brown, Budil, Ellis, and Holmes-Sullivan, Chancellor Yang, Interim Chancellor Hexter, Deputy General Counsel Friedlander, and Recording Secretary McCarthy

The meeting convened at 10:45 a.m. with Committee Chair Island presiding.

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

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of November 16, 2016 were approved.

2. **UPDATE ON ADDITIONAL STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES PROVIDED WITH ONE-TIME FUNDING IN 2016-17 STATE BUDGET**

[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 Chair Island briefly introduced this discussion. Provost Dorr said the presentation would provide an update on UC's 2016-17 one-time \$20 million State funding for support services for low-income students and students from underrepresented minority groups. Targeted students include those enrolled in high schools known as Local Control Funding Formula Plus (LCFF+) schools, defined as those at which more than 75 percent of the students are English-learners, eligible for a free or reduced-price meal, or identified as foster youth. Systemwide, UC currently enrolled 29,000 undergraduates from LCFF+ high schools, including both freshmen and transfer students. The Office of the President allocated nearly \$19 million of the \$20 million to UC undergraduate campuses based on their proportion of LCFF+ students; \$300,000 was allocated to UCSF for outreach services; and the remaining \$1 million would be used to fund new, promising programs.

Each UC campus is expected to use these funds to address two goals: to increase applications, admissions, and enrollment of students from LCFF+ schools; and to provide academic support services to enrolled students from LCFF+ schools, from low-income families, first-generation college students, or from otherwise educationally disadvantaged backgrounds. Distribution of the funding at each campus is somewhat flexible, but each campus must use a greater portion of funds to provide support services to enrolled students. The average use of funds at all campuses is 30 percent for recruitment and 70 percent to support student success. Provost Dorr emphasized how critical these funds are to support the success of UC undergraduates and to expand access to a diverse undergraduate student body.

Vice Provost Yvette Gullatt discussed how UC campuses were using the portion of funding aimed at increasing applications and admissions. This one-time funding allowed UC to reach more schools and offer more services than it had through previously existing programs. UC offers support in LCFF+ high schools throughout the state, including workshops, informational sessions, individual academic advising, rallies, and classroom visits by senior UC leaders to increase awareness of UC. Throughout the academic year and in the summer, UC campuses provide test preparation, academic enrichment, Scholastic Aptitude Test and ACT workshops and boot camps, Advanced Placement support, college preparation advising, and mathematics and English academic enrichment. This fall and winter, UC professionals conducted numerous additional application and financial aid workshops for students and their families. Beginning this spring, campuses would increase their yield activities at LCFF+ high schools to encourage enrollment of students admitted to UC. Admitted students would visit UC campuses, stay overnight, participate in residential programs to learn more about UC, meet UC faculty and students, attend classes and special workshops, and connect with UC students who would serve as peer mentors.

UC Merced used a portion of these new funds for a program through which current UC Merced students who graduated from its local LCFF+ partner high schools would be trained to return to their schools as ambassadors. UC Irvine used the funds to develop a program specifically for parents of students who would soon apply to UC from UCI's LCFF+ partner high schools. While on campus, these parents would be provided with guidance on the application process from UC outreach and admissions staff, information about supporting students' transitions from high school to college from student services staff, and information about student budgets, paying for college, and UC's financial aid packages from UC financial aid professionals. Campuses are using some of these funds to expand their partnerships with community and faith-based organizations to raise awareness of the value of UC, pathways to UC, and UC affordability.

Vice President Holmes-Sullivan discussed campuses' use of these one-time funds for academic support services to help enrolled UC students who are from LCFF+ high schools, low-income families, first-generation college students, or otherwise educationally disadvantaged, succeed and graduate in four years. Campuses can use 60 percent to 80 percent of their funding to provide academic support services. The funding is used for programs such as academic early warning systems that identify

students most likely to need academic support and target services to those students; summer bridge programs to help students get off to a strong start in college; additional writing and mathematics support; advising services that connect students with peer mentors; and learning communities to enhance student engagement and sense of belonging.

Ms. Holmes-Sullivan described two examples of such programs. UC Davis was launching an academic coaching program for enrolled students from LCFF+ high schools to connect these students with successful peer mentors from similar backgrounds. UC Santa Barbara planned to increase participation greatly in its Promise Scholars Program, through which eligible students who demonstrate financial need are provided a comprehensive personal, social, and intellectual orientation to UCSB and a full commitment of financial aid as long as they maintain eligibility. Currently up to 130 students participate in the program and the new funding would allow the addition of 100 students. Campuses would provide short progress reports on their use of these funds in February 2017 and final reports by August 2017.

Regent Pérez expressed support for programs allowed by this one-time funding, but noted that these needs would be ongoing. He commented that there was a population of students with similar educational challenges at many schools that were not LCFF or LCFF+. Such students at other schools may not be surrounded with a network of similarly situated students. He asked if any of the one-time funding had freed up previously designated campus funding that could be used for students in this profile who came from other than LCFF+ schools. Provost Dorr agreed that it can be challenging to identify all such students. UC campuses have partner schools, not all of which are LCFF or LCFF+ schools. She noted that enrolled student support services provided with these funds did not go only to LCFF+ students. However, these one-time funds were not to be used to replace funding for existing programs. Some programs were being established that would have longer term benefits even if the funds were one-time only, such as the outreach program at UC Merced described earlier.

Regent Ortiz Oakley said his questions would focus on how systemic change could be created over time. He asked how UC would measure the success of these efforts. Ms. Gullatt responded that success could be measured by whether more students from these schools apply to UC, are admitted, enroll, and persist at UC to graduation. Regent Ortiz Oakley asked if UC had considered using similar programs to serve California Community College (CCC) students in the same regions as LCFF+ schools, since CCC students in those areas would generally have similar educational needs. Ms. Gullatt expressed support for this suggestion.

Regent Ortiz Oakley asked how lessons learned about admission policies and practices from this one-time investment would be applied more broadly in the future. Ms. Holmes-Sullivan responded that some efforts were underway, such as partnering with California State University and CCCs to engage more proactively with potential transfer students, seeking more transfer students from CCCs from which UC had traditionally not received

many transfer students, and generating materials that signal to such students that UC would be a good fit for them.

Regent Ortiz Oakley added that it would be important to confirm that these investments were in programs that actually reached the intended students. He noted that LCFF+ schools also receive college readiness block grants and asked if UC had considered partnering with K-12 school districts to ensure that efforts were not being duplicated and that the two sets of resources were being well coordinated to reach the same goal of getting more students into and through quality public higher education.

Chair Lozano expressed strong support for this program. She asked how the number of LCFF+ students per UC campus was determined and if the funding per student was equal across all campuses. Provost Dorr responded that the funding is the same for each LCFF+ student at every campus; each undergraduate campus' funding was based on the ratio of the number of its enrolled students from LCFF+ high schools to its overall undergraduate population.

Chair Lozano asked whether students from low-income families were being automatically granted application fee waivers, rather than being required to apply for them as had been the practice. Provost Dorr said her office had conducted an analysis of the need for the waiver, since low-income students could already apply to four UC campuses with no application fee. Waiving the fee to apply to more campuses did not appear to encourage students to apply to more than four campuses, so that change had not yet been implemented. Provost Dorr said she would find more information about the status of the fee waiver.

Regent Elliott asked why 60 percent to 80 percent of the one-time funds were allocated for enrolled student support rather than to recruitment, particularly since it would be harder to measure the effect of one-time funding on student success. Ms. Gullatt said that the determination had been made to try to ensure success of admitted students. In addition, LCFF+ schools already received college readiness block grants to assist with recruitment. Regent Elliott expressed his view that it would have been preferable to allocate more funds toward recruitment.

Regent Pérez expressed agreement with Regent Elliott on the importance of recruitment of diverse students. He said that recruitment from LCFF+ schools had been more successful for first-generation Latino/a students than African-American students. He asked if the allocation of these funds among UC campuses was negotiated with the State or decided by the UC Office of the President. Provost Dorr said that proportional allocation was proposed by the University and discussed with the State administration during budget negotiations.

Regent Pérez asked why \$300,000 was allocated to UCSF when it had no undergraduates and what kinds of projects would be supported by the \$1 million not yet allocated. Ms. Gullatt responded that UCSF would use the funds for recruitment outreach at local LCFF+ schools with which UCSF has relationships to support students' application to

UC undergraduate campuses. Provost Dorr added that several campuses had proposed ideas for using the \$1 million not yet allocated. Her office was seeking proposals involving new ideas that were promising and that could be effective with one-time funding or that could be supported with other funds for a longer time.

Regent-designate Monge asked to what extent LCFF+ students were involved in identifying programs to be supported by this one-time funding and if the students would be so consulted should funding be renewed. Ms. Holmes-Sullivan replied that participating students were asked to report on how well the programs were serving them. She expressed hope that mentoring programs would become self-perpetuating.

3. **SUPPORT FOR DIVERSE CAREERS FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS**

[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 Chair Island briefly introduced this discussion about career support for UC graduate students. Provost Dorr led the discussion about ways in which UC prepares its graduate students for a range of careers in addition to traditional academic careers.

Vice President Ellis noted the importance of graduate students to UC's education and research enterprise. He affirmed that the skills UC's doctoral students acquire during their training prepare them for a wide range of opportunities following graduation. UC's graduate deans have been successful in attracting federal and private support for such training. UC's Council of Graduate Deans meets monthly to share best practices.

UC Berkeley Graduate Division Dean Fiona Doyle also affirmed the importance of academic doctoral students to the University's research and teaching. Graduate students are essential in educating UC undergraduates and mentoring increasing numbers of undergraduates seeking research experience. UC currently enrolled 26,000 doctoral students and awarded 3,700 doctoral degrees annually, seven percent of the nation's doctorates, 64 percent of California's doctoral degrees, and 70 percent of the state's doctoral degrees in the fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM).

Following graduation, UC's doctoral recipients contribute at a high level to social and economic well-being through a broad set of career paths. Survey data show that UC's doctoral graduates get, hold, and create good jobs across a broad range of sectors, drawing on expertise acquired through their graduate education. Many UC doctoral degree recipients have established companies based on work done as graduate students. These companies create jobs and make important contributions to California's economy.

Ms. Doyle commented that UC's current graduate students were very discerning and usually choose from multiple graduate school offers. In addition to academic excellence, prospective doctoral candidates increasingly expect a broader range of services, including excellent career preparation. UC's graduate deans have placed a high priority on working

with colleagues and students on their campuses, along with the Office of the President, to provide a broad range of professional development opportunities to prepare students for diverse careers.

UC Irvine Graduate Division Dean Frances Leslie said a survey of UC doctoral degree recipients from 1974 to 2013 showed that two-thirds of respondents worked in education, the majority of those in tenure-track positions and a significant minority in other academic positions such as career staff, postdoctoral positions, or K-12 education. The majority of the remaining one-third worked in the private sector, and a significant number work for government or non-profit organizations. Data about more recent UC doctoral alumni who received their degrees in 2013-14 showed that 42 percent worked in academia and 24 percent went directly to positions in the private sector. Of these recent graduates, 46 percent stayed in California, 23 percent went elsewhere in the United States, and nine percent were employed outside of the U.S.

Ms. Leslie agreed that UC's prospective doctoral students are discerning and most hold excellent competitive offers of admission and funding. They expect world-class academics and, increasingly, professional development programs for a wide range of careers. Ms. Doyle commented that, in order to meet this need, graduate deans at all UC campuses are working with colleagues and faculty to provide strong professional development programs and make them visible to students. These programs include online resources, workshops, classes, certificate programs, and innovative use of UC's career centers. The engagement of faculty in these efforts is essential; student groups are also invaluable. Ms. Doyle reported that UC Berkeley allocated funding to student groups engaged in career preparation activities.

Ms. Doyle provided some examples of career preparation programs for UC graduate students. At UC Berkeley, the program Beyond Academia was established in 2012 for doctoral students interested in careers outside of academia. The group convenes workshops and tutorials, and sponsors an annual conference with speakers who are exceptionally successful alumni in non-academic careers. The program Versatile Ph.D. provides subscription-based web resources for doctoral students interested in non-academic careers, including access to information and postings, a Ph.D. career finder tool, and online networking and blogs. The program grAdvantage, initiated at UC San Diego with input from non-academic employers, provides resources aimed at developing skills in leadership, teamwork, and communication to better prepare graduates for a business environment. A systemwide graduate career program Humanists@Work, organized by a group based at UC Irvine, offers career workshops that provide resources on writing resumes, networking, and community building; the cost of these workshops is defrayed by funding from the Office of the President and an Andrew W. Mellon Foundation grant.

Ms. Leslie added that there is increasing national recognition of the importance of preparing academic graduate students for diverse careers. UC graduate deans and faculty have been successful in securing competitive grants to support these initiatives. Federal agencies have been encouraging efforts to improve graduate students' professional skills

and much of UC funding in this area comes from various programs of the National Institutes of Health, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the National Science Foundation. Other very influential awards come from foundations, particularly the Alfred P. Sloan foundation and the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. Private philanthropy also provides important funding. The UC Office of the President has played a key role in providing professional development opportunities systemwide, such as the 2014 UCOP/Bay Area Science and Innovation Council roundtable “Bridging the Ph.D.-Industry Employment Gap,” the popular UC Grad Slam competition, and the Annual Graduate Research Day at the State Capitol.

Regent Ramirez advocated obtaining one-time State funding for graduate student support services. She said it would have been helpful to include demographic data about UC doctoral students in this presentation, and discuss recruitment and retention of low-income graduate students. Ms. Leslie commented that graduate deans work actively to foster broader pathways to graduate admissions. UC’s graduate schools are less diverse than their undergraduate campuses, and there are proportionally fewer graduate applications from underrepresented groups. At UC Irvine, graduate students are involved in programs to create an environment of equity and inclusion. Regent Ramirez urged support for State investment in graduate school readiness among diverse undergraduate populations.

Regent Ortiz Oakley commented that, since the majority of UC doctoral graduates work in academia, it would be necessary to increase graduate student diversity to increase UC faculty diversity. Realistically, this change would take a long time, so it would be important to increase current efforts. He saw two fundamental challenges to increasing diversity in graduate programs. Many graduate programs want students to come with funding and the networks of most students of color do not expose those students to that type of opportunity. Also, standardized graduate admission exams can be challenging to students from underrepresented groups who may not have comparable resources for admission test preparation programs. Ms. Leslie responded that she is on the Graduate Record Examination (GRE) Board and would chair its Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee. She continually brings these issues to the attention of the educational testing services. She expressed her view that an examination such as the GRE, which had been intended to level the playing field, should not be used to exclude applicants. The GRE should be changed to increase access. She also noted that, when he was UC Irvine Provost, Chancellor Gillman guaranteed five-year funding to accepted graduate students; they were not expected to have their own funding. Ms. Doyle added that at UC Berkeley for several years her office had discouraged doctoral programs from relying on the GRE and encouraged holistic evaluation of applications. She noted that it was a constant challenge to find funding for all of UC Berkeley’s doctoral students. In many STEM fields, doctoral students have support through research appointments from faculty advisors who have extramural funding. Encouraging faculty to pursue such funding provides a gateway for students who do not have their own funding.

Regent Pérez agreed that more attention should be given to increasing the diversity of UC's graduate student population. The current enrollment growth and related opportunity to hire faculty presented a window to increase faculty gender and ethnic diversity.

Regent Lansing asked if graduate applicants had to have their own funding before they would be admitted. Both Ms. Doyle and Ms. Leslie answered in the negative.

Regent Reiss asked to have information presented at a future Committee meeting about the percentage of in-state and nonresident graduate students at each UC campus, the percentage from each of those groups who remain in California upon graduation, recruitment efforts to increase diversity of graduate students, and financial support of graduate students.

Regent Pattiz asked that a future presentation include information about how UC's graduate students are funded and recruited.

4. **UPDATE ON WORKGROUP ON UNDOCUMENTED/AB540 MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY**

[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 introduced this update on the Workgroup on the Undocumented/AB540 Members of the UC Community. Among President Napolitano's first priorities upon taking office was to provide \$5 million in one-time non-State funds to support enhanced services for undocumented students at UC. The goal was to ensure that these students could achieve academic success and receive financial support commensurate with other UC students. When the recent U.S. presidential election raised a series of concerns and questions regarding the safety and status of undocumented members of the UC community, President Napolitano responded swiftly in forming the Workgroup on the Undocumented/AB 540 Members of the UC Community.

Deputy General Counsel Julia Friedlander explained that the University of California Statement of Principles in Support of Undocumented Members of the UC Community that President Napolitano issued on November 30 could be summarized with four key ideas. First, the University of California admits students at all levels based on their merit, their prior accomplishments, and their ability to contribute to a particular academic field, all without regard to their race, ethnicity, religion, citizenship status, or other protected characteristic. As a result of this basic principle, UC has many highly accomplished students who are undocumented immigrants. Just as UC is committed to admitting those students on a nondiscriminatory basis, the University also strives to support them to matriculate and graduate successfully.

Second, UC maintains campus police departments to protect the public safety and a safe, secure environment on campus. The role of campus police is profoundly different from the role played by federal immigration officers. While a small number of local police

departments have entered agreements to assume certain immigration enforcement responsibilities that are typically held by federal officials, nothing requires a local university or local police department to do so. The University has decided not to divert the resources that it uses to maintain the safety of its campuses to this purpose. Accordingly, UC police will not contact, detain, or question individuals on the basis of their suspected undocumented status.

Third, the University acts to protect the privacy of members of the UC community. In fact, UC is required by State and federal law to do so. The University understands that undocumented members of the community have great concern about disclosure of their personal information. Federal and State laws create broad protection for student records and protect the privacy of all members of the UC community. When the University receives a request for records that involves the privacy rights of individuals, the Office of the General Counsel will work closely with its clients to protect the privacy of community members as the University is required to do, unless there is a countervailing law that requires it to make disclosures.

Fourth, in their capacities as major health care providers in California, UC medical centers treat patients who need their services without regard to race, ethnicity, religion, national origin, citizenship status, or any other protected characteristic. Because it is essential that patients be able to trust their providers, UC medical centers will vigorously enforce the University's nondiscrimination and privacy policies, and standards of professional conduct.

Ms. Friedlander stated that there were federal and State policies that provide the foundation for the University's efforts to ensure that undocumented students have equal access to UC programs and opportunities.

Staff Advisor Valdry commented that staff in all departments would need guidance on responding should they be contacted about students' immigration status. Ms. Friedlander responded that the Workgroup was in the process of preparing materials that would help inform UC employees of their responsibilities.

5. **ESTABLISHMENT OF A SCHOOL OF NURSING, IRVINE CAMPUS**

The President of the University recommended that Section 15 (a) of the Academic Units and Functions, Affiliated Institutions, and Related Activities of the University, as provided for in Standing Order 110.1, be amended as follows:

Additions shown by underscoring

* * *

15. Professional Schools

- (a) There are established the following schools, with curricula based on two or more years of undergraduate work as well as graduate curricula as listed:

* * *

- Sue and Bill Gross School of Nursing, at Irvine, with curricula leading to the degrees of Bachelor of Science, Master of Science, and Doctor of Philosophy and to a Post-Master's Nurse Practitioner Certificate.

[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 introduced this action item requesting approval of establishment of a School of Nursing at UC Irvine. She assured the Committee that all required reviews on the campus, at the Office of the President, and by the Academic Senate had been carried out and had been very positive. The School would be supported by a generous gift.

Chancellor Gillman enthusiastically supported this proposal to elevate UC Irvine's existing Program in Nursing Science (PNS) to school status, a long-desired goal of the campus, recently made possible by an unprecedented \$40 million gift from the Gross Family Foundation. UCI's PNS has robust, nationally accredited nursing programs, a strong and well-respected faculty, a mission involving extensive community engagement to promote community health, and an existing administrative structure similar to that of a school. Each year more students seek admission to UCI's nursing program. In addition to filling the terms of the naming agreement, developing the School of Nursing was well-aligned with UCI's Strategic Plan and the mission of the University. The proposal would address a growing need to create a pipeline of nurses and nursing faculty educated at the doctoral level, and would also improve the quality and breadth of the University's current academic programs in nursing science, solidify the PNS' already successful accreditation, expand the faculty's extensive community engagement in promoting health and preventing disease, and play an anchoring role in UCI's newly revitalized College of Health Sciences.

As a result of UC Irvine's resourceful financial planning, the Sue and Bill Gross School of Nursing would start with a strong fiscal foundation. The generous gift of the Gross Family Foundation would enable the School to maintain its financial stability even as it expands to serve more students and train more leaders of the nursing profession. Chancellor Gillman confirmed that this proposal had been extensively reviewed and endorsed by the UC Irvine Division of the Academic Senate and the systemwide Academic Council.

Regent Lansing expressed enthusiasm for this proposal and gratitude to the Gross family.

Regent De La Peña also expressed support, adding that the development of a School of Nursing at UC Irvine was long overdue.

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

Committee Chair Island commented that this would be his last meeting as a Regent. He remarked that it had been an honor and a pleasure to chair the Committee through interesting and challenging times. He expressed appreciation for the contributions of the Regents and of Provost Dorr.

The meeting adjourned at 12:20 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff