

accompanying research enterprise. They seek to enhance their reputations, rankings, and visibility and to reap the many benefits resulting from academic leadership.

UC is committed to being as inclusive as possible in recruiting faculty and doctoral students. The University needed to make the investment required to recruit and retain top talent. At future Regents' meetings, more would be presented about UC's graduate research enterprise and what could be done to enhance UC's preeminent position in research and graduate education.

Regent Tauscher expressed the importance of this area and the Committee's ongoing involvement. She asked Provost Brown what he would want the Committee to do. Provost Brown expressed his hope that the critical importance of UC's graduate enterprise to all aspects of the University would be appreciated and embraced. The prestige of UC's undergraduate programs is linked to its graduate programs, where UC graduate students extend the impact of the work of UC's faculty.

5. **THE UNIVERSITY'S TRANSCRIPT EVALUATION SERVICE**

[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 Brown explained that applicants must satisfy the University's "a-g" requirements for freshman eligibility at UC and California State University (CSU). Access to these courses is critical for student success, for UC's ability to educate, and for the state's ability to thrive economically. The Transcript Evaluation Service (TES), created by UC, is a data tool that analyzes large volumes of high school student transcripts to provide school districts and students information about "a-g" course availability, completion, and requirements for UC and CSU admission.

Vice Provost Yvette Gullatt described TES, one way UC supports K-12 schools to raise student achievement and to close opportunity gaps. She pointed out that only 45 percent of California high school graduates meet eligibility requirements for UC or CSU. The access issue disproportionately affects underrepresented minority students. One of the best ways to ensure that high school students stay on track for college is to assess their progress early and often, in order to advise them appropriately about required classes and to catch missteps quickly. Transcript evaluation is one of the best ways to anchor strong college advising and to address patterns of course completion that impede otherwise talented students from achieving UC and CSU eligibility.

UC's TES helps high schools address "a-g" course access by providing a school-level view of access and success for underrepresented, first-generation, low-income, and other underserved students. TES lets students and schools know which students are on track, off track, or close to fulfilling "a-g" requirements by grade level. A TES student report shows a student's grade point average (GPA), performance against grade level "a-g" requirements, and individual course grades, with filters showing the types of course, such as advance placement and honors, and UC and CSU eligibility. TES also provides a school-

level report with information by grade level of students meeting requirements, close to meeting requirements, and students' average GPA, and more specific information about each area. Schools can access information by gender, race or ethnicity, and socioeconomic status. Administrators have additional access to run special data queries. UC's studies on the efficacy of TES have shown that schools that have participated in four consecutive years of the program increased student eligibility for CSU by 32.1 percent and for UC by 21.6 percent.

UC Santa Barbara Executive Vice Chancellor David Marshall said that the expansion of UCOP's TES in the Oxnard Union High School District was made possible by a one-time State allocation to support low-income student enrollment at UC. TES enables high schools to improve course planning, student registration, and academic advising. Over the past ten years UC Santa Barbara had developed successful partnership programs in the Oxnard Union High School District. TES assisted these outreach efforts. Preliminary results indicated that TES was having an effect in increasing college applications. UC Santa Barbara staff play a key role in the implementation of TES, working with UCOP and the school district administrative staff.

Oxnard Union High School District Director of College Readiness Maricruz Hernandez said that district had 76 percent Latino/a students and 67 percent of its students experiencing poverty. The district had a long and robust partnership with UC Santa Barbara through many college preparation programs. The district and UC Santa Barbara made a collaborative decision to implement TES at all district high schools, with UC Santa Barbara providing professional development to school district counselors and related administrators. Data from TES allows counselors to better utilize time with students, with annual course registration, to encourage completion of "a-g" requirements, and to identify interventions when needed. Counselors can show students the TES report to demonstrate why they should take or remediate courses. TES data can also: show specific classes the district's juniors and seniors had failed to take, so the administration could schedule extra sections of those courses; help identify and celebrate students who are on track to meet "a-g" requirements, serving to strengthen a college-going culture; help students prepare college and financial aid applications; and help students better understand the requirements for college admission over the course of their high school careers, showing students not only how to qualify, but how to be a competitive UC applicant.

TES assisted the district in updating its "a-g" course offerings. UCOP provided training in using TES data as a quality tool to correct discrepancies between course names in the district and the approved "a-g" courses in the UC A-G Course Management Portal. TES helped the district code its classes more accurately, including classes that students take outside of the district, and helped the district actively engage students and parents in academic preparation for college. District schools are beginning to hold "a-g" awareness sessions for parents in both English and Spanish. As a result, the district experienced an increase in the percentage of students competing "a-g" requirements from 33 percent to 38 percent from 2016 to 2017.

Regent Tauscher asked if all high schools offered the “a-g” requirements and clearly communicated information about these requirements to students and their families.

Regent Newsom asked if TES was proprietary to UC and if UC worked in partnership with CSU in its deployment. Ms. Gullatt explained that TES was UC’s intellectual property. UC used the validation and “a-g” rules of UC and CSU for the courses that are in the A-G Course Management Portal. Every high school in California has a list of courses that are approved by the University as meeting the “a-g” requirements. UC works with CSU to ensure that TES calculates CSU eligibility accurately. Regent Newsom asked if there was a cost for high school districts to use TES. Ms. Gullatt said UC wants TES to be as available as possible. Only high schools that do not have a relationship with UC are charged a small cost of about \$3.25 per transcript, or about \$5,000 for a mid-sized high school. Schools send their data for every student and every grade to UCOP; UCOP works with the school’s data team to match that data to the A-G Course Management Portal. This produces a preliminary report for the school. Then, the same data is reviewed by UCOP evaluators to accurately capture courses that students may have taken at other schools. Schools then receive a fully vetted set of outcomes for their students.

Regent Newsom asked what impediments existed to having this service in all the state’s school districts. Ms. Gullatt said TES was being used by about 50 percent of the state’s Local Control Funding Formula Plus (LCFF+) schools. She said it would cost about \$4 million for TES to be used by all the state’s LCFF+ schools. The budget for TES was currently slightly less than \$700,000. Regent Newsom pointed out that CSU would also be a beneficiary. Mr. Marshall remarked that participating school districts also receive training from UCOP. Regent Newsom expressed his willingness to work on expanding the scope of TES.

Regent Ortiz Oakley commented that the State had already invested in the California College Guidance Initiative (CCGI), which evaluates transcripts for all 23 CSU campuses, and currently serves more than 15 percent of California sixth through 12th graders, and has a partnership with the California Department of Education, and both the California Community College and CSU Chancellors’ offices. He expressed concern that this presentation was about only TES and did not include information about CCGI and the amount of money the State had already invested in it. He questioned investing more in a UC-only solution when CSU was already using CCGI to evaluate transcripts. Using CCGI had been presented to UC as an option, but UC rejected it.

Ms. Gullatt responded that TES was the foundation upon which CCGI was built. She explained a major difference between TES and CCGI relating to the A-G Course Management Portal. CCGI’s transcript analysis was self-reported, meaning that the school indicates the courses that it believes satisfy “a-g” requirements. On the other hand, TES’ approved set of courses is derived from the A-G Course Management Portal, yielding a different evaluation. She explained that the A-G Course Management Portal is a database that stores courses that have been submitted for approval as “a-g” requirements. TES also helps schools identify courses that could satisfy an “a-g” requirement, but have not been approved, allowing schools to expand their “a-g” course offerings. Some courses might be

considered by the high school as meeting an “a-g” requirement, but had not in fact been approved. TES can also help schools submit courses for approval as “a-g” requirements.

Regent Ortiz Oakley said he would like to hear from CCGI before any additional investment was made in TES. He acknowledged that transcript evaluation is a problem for all the systems, and much investment and momentum had gone in the direction of CCGI, in which only UC does not participate. There may be good reasons for UC’s nonparticipation that should be addressed. In order to benefit all Californians and not have different systems for students pursuing different university systems, it would be important to resolve how to bring CCGI and TES together.

Regent Monge asked if TES was planned to pay for itself or as a potential source of revenue for the University, and about plans to bring it to those high school districts not in proximity to UC campuses. Ms. Gullatt said the intent was not to bring revenue to UC, but rather to develop partnerships with school districts to expand “a-g” offerings and completion rates. The fee structure supports the cost of development. UCOP sends teams to remote school districts to assist with TES data usage. The program’s highest priority was at high schools that had partnerships with UC, so that the combination of that partnership and TES data would result in positive changes in students’ eligibility for UC and CSU.

Staff Advisor Main asked about UC’s Scout program, which offers free online “a-g” courses, integrated with TES. Ms. Gullatt said UC Scout was UC’s repository of online high school honors and advanced placement courses. Ms. Hernandez added that in the prior year, as a result of TES data, the Oxnard Union High School District rewrote 42 courses that had no longer been approved as “a-g” requirements.

Regent Newsom expressed regret that he was unaware of CCGI and asked how these two systems could be resolved.

Regent Tauscher suggested that she confer with Committee Chair Pérez and Provost Brown to establish a working group to address assisting California high schools in offering “a-g” requirements, helping high schools obtain approval for “a-g” courses, and resolving differences between CCGI and TES.

6. **INTRODUCTION TO ACADEMIC QUALITY INDICATORS OF THE UNIVERSITY**

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

This item was postponed.

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff

Pending
Approval

Attachment 1: Proposed PDST Levels for California Residents* for 2018-19 through 2022-23

Campus	Program	Years in Plan	Current Year PDST	Proposed PDST Levels for California Residents					Percent Changes				
			2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23
Berkeley	Development Practice	5	\$18,600	\$19,344	\$19,924	\$20,522	\$21,138	\$21,772	4.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
	Educational Leadership (M.A.)	5	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Engineering (M.Eng.)	5	\$33,700	\$33,700	\$33,700	\$33,700	\$33,700	\$33,700	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Journalism	5	\$7,500	\$7,500	\$7,876	\$7,876	\$7,876	\$8,270	0.0%	5.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.0%
	Optometry	5	\$17,258	\$18,120	\$19,026	\$19,976	\$20,974	\$22,022	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%
	Product Development	5	\$25,466	\$28,000	\$29,400	\$30,870	\$32,414	\$34,044	10.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%
	Teacher Education	5	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Davis	Educational Leadership	5	\$4,410	\$4,410	\$4,542	\$4,680	\$4,818	\$4,962	0.0%	3.0%	3.0%	2.9%	3.0%
	Preventive Veterinary Medicine	5	\$5,886	\$6,060	\$6,240	\$6,426	\$6,612	\$6,810	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	2.9%	3.0%
	Veterinary Medicine	5	\$15,594	\$16,062	\$16,542	\$17,034	\$17,544	\$18,066	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
Irvine	Biotechnology Management	5	\$13,230	\$13,230	\$13,890	\$14,586	\$15,315	\$16,080	0.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%
	Engineering Management	5	\$13,230	\$13,890	\$14,583	\$15,315	\$16,044	\$16,845	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	4.8%	5.0%
	Public Health	5	\$6,498	\$6,822	\$7,164	\$7,521	\$7,896	\$8,292	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%
Los Angeles	Art (M.F.A.)	2	\$8,478	\$8,478	\$8,478	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.0%	0.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Dentistry	5	\$26,127	\$26,913	\$27,720	\$28,554	\$29,412	\$30,294	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
	Public Health	3	\$7,200	\$7,200	\$7,200	\$7,200	N/A	N/A	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	N/A	N/A
Riverside	Medicine	3	\$21,756	\$22,848	\$23,988	\$25,188	N/A	N/A	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	N/A	N/A
	Public Policy	3	\$5,952	\$5,952	\$5,952	\$5,952	N/A	N/A	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	N/A	N/A
San Diego	Pharmacy	5	\$21,456	\$23,388	\$25,494	\$27,789	\$30,291	\$33,018	9.0%	9.0%	9.0%	9.0%	9.0%
San Francisco	Pharmacy - 4 Year	3	\$21,456	\$22,101	\$22,764	\$23,445	N/A	N/A	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	N/A	N/A
	Pharmacy - 3 Year		N/A	\$29,468	\$30,352	\$31,260	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.0%	3.0%	N/A	N/A
Santa Barbara	Technology Management	5	\$32,970	\$33,960	\$34,980	\$36,030	\$37,113	\$38,229	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%
Santa Cruz	Applied Economics and Finance	5	\$8,001	\$8,418	\$8,838	\$9,192	\$9,561	\$9,942	5.2%	5.0%	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%
	Games and Playable Media	5	\$30,980	\$8,415	\$9,051	\$9,504	\$9,978	\$10,476	-72.8%	7.6%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%
	Serious Games	5	N/A	\$8,415	\$9,051	\$9,504	\$9,978	\$10,476	N/A	7.6%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%

* The amounts in the display reflect the maximum PDST levels to be assessed, effective as of the academic year indicated. Assessing PDST levels less than the level indicated in the display 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. Assessing PDST levels greater than the amounts in the display requires Regental approval of a new multi-year plan.

Proposed PDST Levels for Nonresident* Students for 2018-19 through 2022-23

Note: Nonresident students are also assessed nonresident supplemental tuition, which is expected to be \$12,245 in 2018-19.

Campus	Program	Years of Plan	Current Year PDST	Proposed PDST Levels for Nonresidents**					Percent Changes								
			2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23				
Berkeley	Development Practice	5	\$18,600	\$19,344	\$19,924	\$20,522	\$21,138	\$21,772	4.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%				
	Educational Leadership (M.A.)	5	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%				
	Engineering (M.Eng.)	5	\$24,700	\$25,900	\$27,100	\$28,400	\$29,700	\$31,100	4.9%	4.6%	4.8%	4.6%	4.7%				
	Journalism	5	\$7,500	\$7,500	\$7,876	\$7,876	\$7,876	\$8,270	0.0%	5.0%	0.0%	0.0%	5.0%				
	Optometry	5	\$16,436	\$17,422	\$18,468	\$19,576	\$20,750	\$22,022	6.0%	6.0%	6.0%	6.0%	6.1%				
	Product Development	5	\$18,522	\$28,000	\$29,400	\$30,870	\$32,414	\$34,044	51.2%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%				
	Teacher Education	5	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%				
Davis	Educational Leadership	5	\$4,410	\$4,410	\$4,542	\$4,680	\$4,818	\$4,962	0.0%	3.0%	3.0%	2.9%	3.0%				
	Preventive Veterinary Medicine	5	\$6,351	\$6,540	\$6,738	\$6,936	\$7,146	\$7,362	3.0%	3.0%	2.9%	3.0%	3.0%				
	Veterinary Medicine	5	\$15,594	\$16,062	\$16,542	\$17,034	\$17,544	\$18,066	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%				
Irvine	Biotechnology Management	5	\$12,303	\$12,303	\$12,918	\$13,563	\$14,241	\$14,952	0.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%				
	Engineering Management	5	\$13,230	\$13,890	\$14,583	\$15,315	\$16,044	\$16,845	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	4.8%	5.0%				
	Public Health	5	\$6,498	\$6,822	\$7,164	\$7,521	\$7,896	\$8,292	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%				
Los Angeles	Art (M.F.A.)	2	\$5,298	\$5,298	\$5,298	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.0%	0.0%	N/A	N/A	N/A				
	Dentistry	5	\$23,280	\$24,444	\$25,668	\$26,952	\$28,302	\$29,718	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%				
	Public Health	3	\$7,656	\$7,656	\$7,656	\$7,656	N/A	N/A	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	N/A	N/A				
Riverside	Medicine	3	\$21,756	\$22,848	\$23,988	\$25,188	N/A	N/A	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%	N/A	N/A				
	Public Policy	3	\$5,952	\$5,952	\$5,952	\$5,952	N/A	N/A	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	N/A	N/A				
San Diego	Pharmacy	5	\$21,456	\$23,388	\$25,494	\$27,789	\$30,291	\$33,018	9.0%	9.0%	9.0%	9.0%	9.0%				
San Francisco	Pharmacy - 4 Year	3	\$21,456	\$22,101	\$22,764	\$23,445	N/A	N/A	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	N/A	N/A				
	Pharmacy - 3 Year		N/A	\$29,468	\$30,352	\$31,260	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.0%	3.0%	N/A	N/A				
Santa Barbara	Technology Management	5	\$32,970	\$33,960	\$34,980	\$36,030	\$37,113	\$38,229	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%	3.0%				
Santa Cruz	Applied Economics and Finance	5	\$8,001	\$8,418	\$8,838	\$9,192	\$9,561	\$9,942	5.2%	5.0%	4.0%	4.0%	4.0%				
	Games and Playable Media	5	\$30,980	\$8,415	\$9,051	\$9,504	\$9,978	\$10,476	-72.8%	7.6%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%				
	Serious Games	5	N/A	\$8,415	\$9,051	\$9,504	\$9,978	\$10,476	N/A	7.6%	5.0%	5.0%	5.0%				
Total: 24																	

** The amounts in the display reflect the maximum PDST levels to be assessed, effective as of the academic year indicated. Assessing PDST levels less than the level indicated in the display 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. Assessing PDST levels greater than the amounts in the display requires Regental approval of a new multi-year plan.