

The Regents of the University of California

ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

May 23, 2018

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

Members present: Regents Elliott, Lansing, Mancina, Monge, Newsom, Ortiz Oakley, and Tauscher; Ex officio members Kieffer and Napolitano; Advisory members Graves and White; Chancellors Block, Christ, Leland, Wilcox, and Yang; Staff Advisor Main

In attendance: Secretary and Chief of Staff Shaw, General Counsel Robinson, Provost Brown, Vice Presidents Brown, Budil, and Holmes-Sullivan, and Recording Secretary McCarthy

The meeting convened at 1:30 p.m. with Committee Vice Chair Tauscher presiding.

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

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of March 14, 2018 were approved.

2. **AMENDMENT OF REGENTS POLICY 3105: POLICY ON RESIDENCY; RESCISSION OF REGENTS POLICY 3106: POLICY ON WAIVER OF TUITION AND FEES; AND RESCISSION OF STANDING ORDER 110.2: MATTERS RELATING TO RESIDENCY**

The President of the University recommended that the Regents:

- A. Amend and rename Regents Policy 3105: Regents Policy on Residency and Waiver of Tuition and Fees, as shown in Attachment 1 with definitions in Attachment 2, to be effective for residency determinations applicable in the 2019-20 academic year.
- B. Rescind Regents Policy 3106: Policy on Waiver of Tuition and Fees effective for residency determinations applicable for the 2019-20 academic year, as shown in Attachment 3.
- C. Rescind Standing Order 110.2, as shown in Attachment 4, following service of appropriate notice.

[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 Tauscher briefly introduced this item. Provost Brown noted the historic support California citizens and taxpayers have provided to the University. Californians who enroll in UC benefit directly from the State's investment in its citizens and pay less than the full cost of tuition, which nonresident students must pay. This benefit is increasingly valuable, given the high demand for UC admission. The Regents policies on residency and waivers of tuition and fees serve as a guide for UC staff in determining which students qualify for resident tuition. This item proposed revisions to Regents Policy 3105: Policy on Residency and consolidation of that policy with Regents Policy 3106: Policy on Waiver of Tuition and Fees.

Mr. Brown stated that this proposal reflected good governance, as it would simplify a complex policy area and more closely align UC policy with State policy involving establishing residency, in a way that reflects the investment of Californians in the University. The increasing significance of nonresident supplemental tuition charged to UC's nonresident undergraduates had made it far more important in practical terms. Classification as a resident allows an undergraduate student to avoid more than \$110,000 in nonresident charges over the course of four years of enrollment. The proposed revised policy would clarify to students and their families UC's qualifications for resident status and would make it easier for campus officials to make these determinations fairly and consistently across students and campuses.

Vice President Holmes-Sullivan commented that the recommended changes to policy would be in effect for the 2019-20 academic year. Policy changes would be incorporated into guidance documents used by campus residency deputies, who would begin working with revised residency documents in late 2018. Resident students alone qualify for the State's Cal Grant Program and the University's need-based financial aid program. Also, only qualified California residents benefit from guaranteed admission to the UC system under the California Master Plan for Higher Education, while students classified as nonresidents must compare favorably to resident applicants in order to be admissible to UC.

Ms. Holmes-Sullivan explained that UC's current residency is determined by two core concepts: physical presence in California and the intent to make California a primary and permanent home. This two-pronged policy is consistent with State requirements. State law specifies a few small groups of students in unique circumstances for favored treatment in residency determinations; those students are not subject to the basic presence and intent requirements. UC's policy provides similarly favorable treatment to these same students. Students exempt from presence and intent requirements in both State and UC policy receive a resident classification even if they have not been in California for a year or have not documented their intent to make California their permanent home. Notwithstanding these similarities with State policy, UC's current and proposed policies do differ from State policy in several important respects.

Director Christopher Carter explained that there was one substantial difference between State and UC residency policy. State policy generally applies residency and intent standards to students, unless they are under age 18. Under State policy, residency is a

function of the student's presence in California for more than a year and the student's demonstrated intent to make California a permanent home. However, under the current and proposed UC policy, the standards for residency are applied to both students and their parents for most undergraduates. This aligns with federal financial aid standards that make financial aid eligibility a function of student and parent resources for most undergraduates under age 24. There are exceptions built into both residency and financial aid policies to accommodate unique circumstances of individual students.

Mr. Carter described the proposed changes to UC policy involving these exceptions. The first proposed policy change would update the UC policy to align with current financial aid policy for students under age 24 who are independent of their parents. Current UC policy aligns with federal exceptions that were in place several decades ago. Updating UC standards to align with current federal standards would expand the list of students whose residency can be determined independent of parents to include, for example, some students who were unaccompanied youth and homeless or at risk of homelessness. The second key policy change would shift UC from a two-year to a one-year standard for students to establish self-supporting status. This would allow self-supporting students under age 24 to have their residency determined independent of their parents if they can document that they had been fully self-supporting for one year instead of the current standard of two years. This would more closely align UC policy with State policy, which states that a nonresident student can be reclassified as a resident upon documenting self-supporting status for one year. Mr. Carter said the consolidation of two Regents policies would not result in policy changes, but was proposed because both policies centered on student fees.

Committee Vice Chair Tauscher expressed support for this proposal to align UC policy with federal policy and to increase clarity.

Regent Ortiz Oakley asked how many currently enrolled students would have their status changed from nonresident to resident under the proposed change. Mr. Carter said that very few admitted students classified as nonresidents and ineligible for financial aid actually enroll in UC. A small number of students enrolled as nonresidents would be reclassified as residents under the proposed policy change.

Regent Ortiz Oakley also asked if individuals who had been incarcerated in California, but transferred to and released from facilities outside of California, would be considered California residents. Mr. Carter said that UC policy did not explicitly address this situation. Ms. Holmes-Sullivan added that UC campus residency officers can make exceptions to policy to allow for individual circumstances.

Regent Newsom asked how the intent to make California one's permanent home was defined under residency policy. Mr. Carter said intent is judged by broad, cumulative evidence, and not by a set of specific actions a student would be required to take. A student would have to show, through a preponderance of a long list of indicators, that the student plans or already has, made California his or her permanent home. In the overwhelming number of cases, indicators such as paying taxes in California, and having a California driver's license or identification card are used.

Regent Newsom asked how often the system is abused by students and families obtaining residency by artificially manipulating requirements, given the large economic incentive to gain a residency determination. Ms. Holmes-Sullivan said, while she did not know the number of such cases, she knew of anecdotal evidence of families taking deceptive actions to make it appear that their student was a California resident, when that was not the case. UC's policy of considering both the student's and the parents' presence was intended to reduce such cases.

Regent Monge asked about the appeals process for meritorious residency petitions that were denied. Ms. Holmes-Sullivan said students could first appeal at their campus and then could appeal the campus' determination to the Office of the General Counsel, which has residency experts who regularly handle such appeals. Regent Monge asked how students who might be affected by the proposed change to a one-year independence requirement would be informed. Mr. Carter said his office works with campus admissions staff, who had records of students who had applied for residency based on self-sufficiency under the two-year requirement.

Regent Monge inquired about the recent approval of SB 68 that expanded eligibility for in-state tuition and financial aid, and if that change was incorporated in UC's tuition waiver policy. Mr. Carter answered in the affirmative.

Student Observer Hayden Jackson expressed support for the discussion item at this meeting about the student experience, which is important for the Regents to understand. He also expressed support for proposed adjustments to UC's residency policy, but noted the importance of accessibility for nonresident students as well as residents. Support for enrolled students was vital; Mr. Jackson noted overcrowded classrooms, overworked teaching assistants, student housing shortages, and overbooked student health and counselling centers. The ability of UC students to live safely and be healthy affects the core of the University's mission and its ability to remain competitive. He noted the importance of continuing to involve students in University deliberations.

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

3. **TRANSFER TASK FORCE UPDATE**

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

Provost Brown observed that the transfer route to UC is a vital feature of the opportunity built into the California Master Plan for Higher Education, an engine of social mobility. In the past two years, UC had enrolled more transfer students than at any other time in its history. As a system, UC had met the two-to-one ratio of freshmen to transfer students. More than one-third of UC's transfer students come from underserved populations. Transfer students who meet UC's requirements fare well at UC, graduating at rates comparable to students entering as freshmen. Mr. Brown and former Chair of the Academic

Senate James Chalfant co-chaired a transfer task force convened five months prior by President Napolitano to analyze transfer admission options with the goal of obtaining more and better prepared transfer students by ensuring greater transparency of UC requirements for transfer. With the intention of increasing inclusive access to a four-year UC degree for California Community College (CCC) students and ensuring their academic preparation and support, President Napolitano developed and signed a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the CCC to establish a partnership to pursue a systemwide transfer guarantee predicated upon UC's transfer pathways, seek new resources needed to increase advising an outreach, support partnerships between UC campuses and CCCs in their geographic areas, and develop a culture of institutional research in which data collection and analysis strengthen the transfer function.

Professor Chalfant updated the Committee on the transfer task force's findings and core recommendations to advance President Napolitano's transfer initiative in partnership with the Academic Senate. He noted that the partnership between the Academic Senate and the Regents was critical for ensuring that Californians can have confidence in the fairness and thoroughness of UC's admissions policies. The task force's recommendations were grounded in the importance of a student's academic preparation for transfer to UC, aimed at communicating UC's interest in transfer students, while reinforcing how students can best prepare for UC by completing major preparation requirements so they are able to graduate two years after transferring. The task force assumed that (1) UC would continue to enroll all eligible students for whom it has funding; (2) UC would continue to enroll one transfer student for every two freshmen; and (3) current admission policies would continue. Each campus would admit students based on its own implementation of comprehensive review according to Regents policy. UC would continue to expand transfer enrollments, already at historic highs, as overall funded capacity expands.

The task force recommended several steps to help bring about transfer admission guarantees. Professor Chalfant emphasized that UC would continue to admit many students other than those admitted under this system of admission guarantee. Admission guarantees would represent a commitment to students that their investment in academic preparation would be rewarded and would incentivize students' academic preparation of taking the right courses. For the 21 most popular majors for transfer students, UC faculty defined the courses that represent the best ways to prepare for the entire UC system by creating the transfer pathways. Each pathway defines major preparation for every UC campus offering that major. The task force recommended a systemwide transfer guarantee, whereby a student who completes a UC transfer pathway with a Grade Point Average above some minimum would be guaranteed a place at a UC campus. If qualified transfer students were not admitted to any campus to which they applied, they would be considered by other campuses through a systemwide guarantee pool. The transfer pathways would achieve for UC what the Associate Degree for Transfer did for the California State University (CSU) system.

The task force also recommended that faculty groups from all three segments of public higher education seek to improve the articulation of lower division courses across the segments to ensure that the pathways include the right courses. The task force saw value

in associate degrees and recommended a pilot program for associate of science degrees based on the Chemistry and Physics transfer pathways and would suggest creation of more associate degrees if the pilot is successful.

A culture of ongoing institutional research would be important to learn from data. Transparent accounting and analysis of admissions data would be critical to gauge success. The Academic Senate would have to strike a balance between campus autonomy concerning individual majors and curriculum on one hand, and systemwide coordination to fulfil guarantees on the other.

Chair Kieffer asked about the efforts of UC Santa Cruz and UC Riverside to meet the two-to-one freshman to transfer ratio. Professor Chalfant said recommendations of the task force would help these campuses reach that goal, for instance through targeted outreach to local CCCs. He emphasized that no UC campus would limit freshman enrollment to achieve the two-to-one ratio. Chair Kieffer asked how the goal was established that each campus should have a two-to-one ratio, rather than a systemwide goal. President Napolitano explained that the 2015 multi-year budget framework she negotiated with Governor Brown contained what she thought was a systemwide two-to-one freshman to transfer student ratio. However, there was ambiguity in the drafting of the agreement and Governor Brown subsequently took the position that the two-to-one ratio applied to each campus and made that a condition of releasing \$50 million sequestered from the State's 2017 appropriation to UC. The Department of Finance subsequently agreed that UC Santa Cruz and UC Riverside could deliver a plan for reaching the transfer enrollment goal. Both campuses had experienced some increase in transfer applications and enrollments.

Regent Monge suggested that waiving the application fee for transfer applicants to those campuses could increase applications.

Regent Ortiz Oakley expressed appreciation for the efforts of the task force. He pointed out that the MOU between the CCC and UC had a sunset date. The desired changes were practical but also cultural, involving the way CCC students view UC, particularly at those CCCs that had not traditionally transferred many students to UC. It would take a consistent effort over time for these efforts to succeed. Professor Chalfant agreed that a permanent commitment was required.

Faculty Representative White commented on the importance of UC and CCC faculty collaborating on the worthy goal of improving the transfer function. He expressed concern that performance metrics in the Governor's May budget revision would give the CCCs a larger incentive for having students earn an Associate Degree for Transfer than for transferring to UC. Regent Ortiz Oakley explained that the performance metrics were intended to encourage having students in programs and courses that would lead to a beneficial educational outcome, to encourage both transfer and attainment of Associate Degrees for Transfer. CCC faculty and administrators were concerned that, while they could prepare students for transfer, they could not guarantee them admittance to UC or CSU, as the CCC cannot control the capacity of UC or CSU. The MOU was intended to address this issue.

4. **UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA EXTENSION**

[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 introduced this presentation about the nine UC campus Extensions, which serve hundreds of thousands of Californians at no cost to the state. Many Extension students are nontraditional, including older students, working adults, veterans, professionals, and those seeking to become professionals from all walks of life. UC Extension is a self-contained and self-supporting enterprise. When its revenues exceed its self-support needs, it provides the main UC campuses and their academic departments with sorely needed, fungible additional revenue. UC Extension is a huge provider of education, and personal and professional development options to mostly adult Californians, and especially to individuals in the workforce needing to upgrade their skills to remain current in their jobs or to change to a new career. Since Extension is market-based, it must be nimble to tailor its offerings to the needs of working adults, putting it at the forefront of educational innovation and new pedagogical approaches.

UC Irvine Dean of Continuing Education Gary Matkin informed the Committee that the prior year more than 400,000 people enrolled in UC Extensions' 27,000 courses at no cost to the state. Total Extension revenue the prior year was \$282 million. Extension courses support students through major life transitions. Mr. Matkin said the UC Extensions could help address some of the most important issues facing the University such as: awarding more degrees; aligning UC education with California workforce needs; increasing the number of California Community College (CCC) transfer students; generating more revenue; and adopting new learning and teaching technologies.

Because of its market orientation and familiarity with the needs of working adults, UC Extension is in a unique position to help UC campuses develop online and terminal master's degrees for working adults. Mr. Matkin cited examples of such programs at UC Extensions. UC Extension has an extraordinary capacity to provide a market orientation for degree offerings. Mr. Matkin suggested that there is a large untapped need to serve the estimated 3.5 million Californians who have some college, but have not gotten a degree. UC Extension online access is appropriate for working adults.

To address California's workforce needs, UC Extension has many professional certificate programs, typically five or more courses. Extension courses can fill individuals' needs throughout their lives, during and after college, their careers, and in retirement. UC Extension is experienced in offering alternative digital credentials, known as digital badges, which Mr. Matkin said were a higher education imperative to fill workplace needs. Because UC Extension can serve non-matriculated students, it also has the ability to create partnerships with the CCC to improve the number and quality of CCC transfer students.

Dean of UC Berkeley Extension Diana Wu commented that Extension extends the reach of UC to many who might otherwise not have access. Extension offers outcome-based programs to prepare students for the next stages in their education or their careers.

Extension helps build the education pipeline by serving K-12 students, college students, domestic, or international students. Its K-12 teaching credential programs collaborate with UC's schools of education and with local school districts. Its pre-collegiate and gap year programs help prepare students for success when they enter college.

UC Berkeley Extension's Fall Program for Freshmen (FPF), established in 1983, provides an outstanding first semester for Berkeley freshmen admitted for the spring semester, allowing UC Berkeley to serve more California residents in the freshman class. Currently all students admitted to Berkeley for the fall term have the option of choosing this program. UC Berkeley extension would like to extend the FPF model of the small cohort experience to as many Berkeley freshmen as possible, because since its inception FPF student outcomes have been outstanding: FPF alumni have higher graduation rates than their non-FPF peers. Starting in FPF was like being in a small liberal arts college for the first semester. The FPF curriculum includes courses required as prerequisites for majors, reading and composition courses, breadth requirements, and rich electives.

Another avenue for increasing access to UC is concurrent enrollment, through which UC Extension offers members of the public the opportunity to enroll in UC campus classes on a faculty permission and space available basis. Courses are taken for UC credit.

UC Extension is able to offer programs that are a service to both the community and the campus because it is self-supporting. The Extensions are valued for their expertise in market research, marketing, and financial modeling and analysis. The Extensions' up-to-date knowledge of employment trends allows them to offer courses that students and employers want. The Extensions have lean, efficient, scalable infrastructures that enable them to respond quickly to workforce needs.

Ms. Wu discussed future opportunities for Extension programs that could increase access to UC. Highly successful student programs such as UC Berkeley Exentions's FPF could be replicated, perhaps in partnership with CCCs. Extensions could develop equivalents of impacted campus courses that could be offered online or in the classroom. Extension has expertise in creating experiential learning programs, internships, and cooperative programs for incoming and current students, and is interested in creating such programs for third-and fourth-year UC students to round out their skill sets. Extension would like to create Massive Open Online Courses and other courses leading pre-collegiate and transfer students into undergraduate or graduate degree programs. Extensions could develop, offer, and administer degree programs, possibly for specific student segments.

Ms. Wu summarized that UC Extension is a large and unique higher education provider, self-supporting, scalable, business-oriented, revenue-generating, and known for educational innovation. She invited the Committee to consider the capability of UC Extension to increase access to a UC education. It is well-positioned to partner with CCCs to help students satisfy transfer requirements, help address the demand that UC more clearly align its educational programs with the needs of the state's workforce, and increase UC's already significant contributions to the development of California's regional economies.

Chair Kieffer commented that each campus Extension is different. He asked the presenters how the Regents could assist them in reaching their goals. Mr. Brown said this presentation was intended to inform the Committee about UC Extension programs. He noted the Regents' previously expressed strong interest in expanding UC's reach and innovating instruction to serve the needs of Californians. Mr. Matkin commented that many deserving populations in California do not reap the benefits of Extension programs because of the Extensions' need to be self-supporting. However, with appropriate funding, the Extensions' infrastructure could be used to serve those populations.

Regent-designate Graves asked if completion rates were available for Extension programs. Mr. Brown stated that for the most part completion rates were tracked by the Extensions. Regent-designate Graves asked about the demographics of Extension users and the cost of its programs. Mr. Matkin commented that UC Irvine Extension issued 2,400 certificates the prior year. Generally, about 86 percent of its students already had undergraduate degrees. It did not track ethnic diversity, as it practices open enrollment. Ms. Wu added that most Extensions do not administer federal financial aid, because they do not offer degree programs. However, the Extension offerings include free programs and very reasonably-priced certificate programs. Costs vary by discipline and by campus. Higher-priced courses in engineering technology or business cost about \$800 to \$1,000 for a three-unit semester course. Regent-designate Graves said it would be helpful to include those data if there were future presentations about the UC Extensions.

Regent Lansing suggested that the Extensions explore course offerings to the Baby Boomer population, those born between 1946 and 1964, many of whom seek an encore career. Developing certificate programs for this group in careers needed by the state could be both socially beneficial and profitable.

Regent Ortiz Oakley commented that UC Extension is a tool that could be used and suggested that its potential in areas such as micro-credentialing or badging should be further explored. Possible concerns of the Academic Senate should be heard.

Chancellor Christ commented that UC Extension is an enormously powerful tool well-suited to address three critical challenges facing UC: degree production, enrollment capacity, and the inequity of high school preparation. UC is generally ill-suited to meet the needs of both part-time students and working adults. UC Extension is an outstanding model, economically much more efficient than the University, without the University's capital expenses and research responsibilities, and with greater flexibility in faculty employment, allowing it to be more agile and market-sensitive. She suggested that the campuses be charged with considering this issue, and the related issue of degree production.

Faculty Representative White noted the impressive ability of UC Extension to expand the reach and capacity of the University, leverage its resources, and provide classes to existing UC students. However, he expressed concern that its financial model could make those classes inaccessible to the students who most need them. If the mismatch between the

Extension's funding model and that of the University were remedied, Extension could improve access and timely graduation for UC students.

Regent Newsom expressed appreciation for this presentation, which indicated the capacity of UC Extensions. He asked about Extension's ability to offer courses for adults no longer enrolled in UC or the California State University, but who were near completion of their undergraduate degrees, and about developing a strategy to fund the Extension for such a purpose. Mr. Matkin said UC Merced Extension was considering that degree completion function. UC Irvine was also having early discussions about a degree completion initiative, which would require a great deal of consultation with the Academic Senate, as undergraduate degree completion by part-time students had not been part of UC's thinking. He suggested that UC could partner with the CCCs in a degree completion initiative.

Regent Newsom asked about the consistency of UC Extension enrollment over time and the capacity to increase its enrollment. Mr. Matkin said Extension enrollment had been generally static over time. At UC Irvine Extension, 70 percent of its courses are online, giving it a relatively large capacity to scale quickly. Regent Newsom asked what was being done to align course offerings with California's workforce needs. Mr. Matkin observed that UC Extension's fundamental market orientation necessitates mapping the needs of the California business community and individuals. However, in many areas business institutions are not well-connected with educational institutions. It would be valuable to improve the partnership between the Extension and the business community to ensure that Extension programs lead to good-paying jobs. Regent Newsom expressed his view that the Extension's potential in this area represents a real opportunity for California.

Chancellor Block commented that many fourth-year UC students would welcome the opportunity to earn an Extension certificate while completing their undergraduate degree. He asked if the Extension offered any discounts to fully enrolled UC students. Mr. Brown commented that UC Santa Barbara Extension had offered a discount to matriculated UC students, but all UC Extensions have their own policies in that regard. Ms. Wu said UC Berkeley Extension had recently piloted a program offering FPF alumni a free Extension course upon their graduation from UC Berkeley and was interested in expanding that program.

Faculty Representative White suggested offering a free Extension course to incoming transfer students. Mr. Matkin reported that UC Irvine Extension had reviewed the entire UC Irvine course catalogue to find courses that articulated to Extension certificate programs, so that students taking regular courses on campus would already have one or two courses toward an Extension certificate program.

Staff Advisor Main suggested consideration of offering Extension courses to UC staff for career development.

5. INSTRUCTIONAL INNOVATION AND DIGITAL ACADEMIC PROGRAMMING 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 Brown stated that, across the UC system, innovation in teaching and learning was being driven by increasing digitalization in students' lives and in the workplace. UC faculty develop digital technologies and use them to deliver engaging and effective learning experiences for UC students.

Innovative Learning Technology Initiative (ILTI) Project Coordinator Ellen Osmundson recalled that ILTI was launched in 2013 with dedicated funding earmarked for online education. The program built on existing campus efforts. At that time, ILTI defined two primary goals: to increase the number of courses available to UC undergraduates and create a robust catalogue of online and hybrid (partially online) courses; and to make those courses accessible to undergraduates across all campuses. In the past five years, ILTI had facilitated significant progress toward these goals. Faculty participation in competition for ILTI course awards had accelerated, yielding more courses and interest across the system. Campus participation in ILTI infrastructure and other technical projects had increased campus capacity to build and offer online and hybrid courses. To date, ILTI had funded 270 courses, 220 of which were completely online, representing 47 percent of UC's total undergraduate online courses. More than 100,000 students have enrolled in ILTI-funded courses. Each campus has its own enrollment and student information systems. To bring these disparate systems together, ILTI in collaboration with all ten campuses funded and developed a central enrollment system that electronically connects all ten campuses to create a catalogue of online courses available during the academic year.

UC Irvine Professor Oladele Ogunseitan described the online program in global health and the UC Global Health Institute's goal to create major and minors in global health on every UC campus. Creating an online program made possible through ILTI took advantage of the particular expertise available on different UC campuses. ILTI funds were used to develop global health courses. Collaborations across UC campuses to create courses led to increased research collaboration. To date, eight global health courses had been developed and proposals for a few more were pending. Other academic disciplines were considering this model.

UC Berkeley Professor Glynda Hull, a pioneer in the use of digital tools to enhance learning, described the faculty perspective in teaching an online course. With ILTI support, she turned her lecture course into a hybrid version, and then a fully online version. She introduced a pedagogical innovative weekly arc of digital activities to engage students in exploring the course subject matter. Her team built digital tools, called Suite C, to support these activities, enabling students to collaborate in real time. Over the past two years, Professor Hull and department colleagues created an online version of UC Berkeley's Education minor degree, offered during the academic year and in the summer. Student interest in summer online courses had been high. Suite C tools had been used in more than

1,000 UC Berkeley courses and at several other universities. She had been able to expand Suite C with a grant from the National Science Foundation.

Regent Mancina asked how often Professor Hull's courses met in person. Professor Hull responded that a hybrid course met in person for sections each week, with the balance of their work being online. The online version used a teleconferencing program for section meetings.

Regent Elliott asked why some UC campuses had developed more online courses than other campuses. Ms. Osmundson commented that when this work was begun five years prior, three campuses, UC Irvine, UCLA, and UC Berkeley, already had robust online offerings, while several campuses had no online courses. The ILTI funding helped provide infrastructure and funding to hire instructional design teams for those campuses that had no prior access to them. Campus cultures vary in faculty and department interest and willingness to have students enroll in online courses. Five years after ILTI initiation, she was happy to report that all UC campuses have online course offerings and students from all campuses were taking online courses offered by other campuses.

Faculty Representative White said the ILTI had been seeding a new culture by funding individual courses. The funding is competitive and sought by faculty through peer review, getting the best ideas from the most motivated faculty. ILTI also provided each campus with both hard and soft infrastructure to support faculty development of online courses. The establishment of the cross-campus enrollment system was a difficult, important project that was not limited to online courses; it could be used for in-person courses also and would have a lasting impact.

Chancellor Yang said he had developed an online course with competitive ILTI funding. He had taught the course for two quarters and had experiences he never had lecturing in the classroom. He expressed support for the further development of such courses.

Mr. Brown thanked his predecessor, former Provost Dorr, for her work on ILTI and its structure with key involvement of the Academic Senate.

6. THE STUDENT EXPERIENCE 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.]

Committee Vice Chair Tauscher explained that, at the suggestion of Regent Monge, this item would briefly introduce a series of upcoming items focusing on different types of UC students. Provost Brown added that UC has a number of different student populations with different profiles, experiences, and needs.

7. FUTURE ENROLLMENT AND CAPACITY NEEDS

This item was deferred.

The meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff

Additions shown by underline; deletions shown by strikethrough

Proposed amendments to Regents Policy 3105: Policy on Residency

Regents Policy on Residency and Payment or Waiver of Tuition, Non-Resident Supplemental Tuition and Mandatory Systemwide Fees

POLICY SUMMARY/BACKGROUND

As a state-supported institution, the University of California confers on California students the benefit of attending the University at lower cost than students who attend from outside the state. Students classified as California residents are not charged Nonresident Supplemental Tuition (NRST). For most students, determining whether they qualify as a California resident is very straightforward. For a minority of students, the determination requires close examination. State law and University policy authorize some students to be considered California residents based on social policy considerations consistent with the mission of the University even if they don't meet the standard criteria for determining residency. This policy identifies the criteria for being classified as a California Resident (either by meeting standard Residency Requirements or special circumstances residency requirements) or for being classified as otherwise eligible for waiver of NRST. Further details are provided in Residence Policy Guidelines (Guidelines), maintained by the Office of the President (with the assistance of the Office of General Counsel) to facilitate implementation of this policy. Terms that are capitalized in this policy are defined in the Guidelines. This policy is informed by both the California Education Code and financial aid standards issued by the U.S. Department of Education. In light of the combined effect of a Student's Residency Classification and financial aid eligibility on the cost to attend UC and resources available to support attendance, wherever possible, this policy seeks to maximize consistency between University financial aid determinations and Residency Classifications to improve transparency for Students. All references to the California Education Code are for informational purposes only.

POLICY TEXT

- A. **Principles Governing Residency Determinations:** A Student's Classification for purposes of the Student's responsibility for payment of Nonresident Supplemental Tuition ("NRST") as either Resident, Non-Resident or NRST Exempt ("Residency Classification") shall be made based on information provided by the Student before initial Enrollment, upon re-Enrollment, or as may otherwise be required. Each Residency Classification shall be made by authorized University employees on the basis of this Policy and the implementing Guidelines adopted by the President pursuant to this Policy. Consistent with Regents Policy on Admissions Decisions, Residency Classifications shall not be motivated by development considerations or financial, political or other such benefit to the University. The Board recognizes that correspondence or inquiries received from individual Regents or from elected officials may be appropriate, but efforts to inappropriately influence the outcome of individual residency classifications are not.
- B. The burden is on each Student to demonstrate eligibility for classification as a resident or as NRST Exempt. A Student initially classified as a nonresident will retain that status

unless and until the Student is deemed eligible for Resident Classification or an NRST Exempt Classification in a subsequent quarter or semester. A Student initially classified as a Resident who becomes a Non-Resident by virtue of acts of the Student or a Qualifying Individual is required to notify the Student's campus registrar immediately.

C. The University may request that information submitted by a Student or a Qualifying Individual to support a Resident Classification or NRST Exempt Classification be sworn under penalty of perjury. The University may reconsider a Resident Classification or NRST Exempt Classification upon good cause. Where a Resident Classification or NRST Exempt Classification is found to have been based on inaccurate or incomplete information, the University may:

1. bill the Student for NRST for periods of previous Enrollment in which NRST was not charged;
2. hold a Student's registration until full payment of amounts due has been received;
3. hold release of Student records until full payment of amounts due has been received;
4. notify appropriate regulatory agencies;
5. initiate discipline under the Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline ("PACAOS 100");
6. impose an administrative penalty no greater than the amount of NRST for each affected quarter or semester where a Student, Parent, or Qualifying Individual intentionally misrepresented or withheld relevant information, and/or
7. pursue any civil, criminal or other remedies that may be appropriate under the circumstances.

I. Residency Classifications and Tuition Policy

A. Each Student shall be charged Nonresident Student Tuition except as provided in this policy. A Student shall not be subject to payment of NRST if the Student and one Parent (or other Qualifying Individual, as applicable):

1. satisfy the Residency Requirements identified in Section B below; or
2. demonstrate(s) at least one of the special circumstances warranting a Resident Classification identified in Section D below; or
3. otherwise demonstrate(s) eligibility for exemption from payment of NRST as identified in Section E below.

B. Residency Requirements. A Resident Classification at the University of California shall be granted where the Student and one Parent or other Qualifying Individual as applicable demonstrate that they have established a primary and permanent home in California by providing evidence that they satisfy the following Residency Requirements:

1. Physical Presence: Continuous physical presence in California for more than one year immediately before the Residence Determination Date, as further defined and explained in the Guidelines. Physical presence in California solely for

educational purposes does not constitute the establishment of California residence, regardless of length of stay. The impact of absences from California on a Student's Residency Classification shall be addressed in the Guidelines.

2. Intent: Except as otherwise provided in the Guidelines, intent for more than one year immediately before the Residence Determination Date to make a primary and permanent home in California, as demonstrated by indicia of intent identified in the Guidelines.

Evidence to demonstrate satisfaction of Residency Requirements for Students (and, where relevant, Parents or other Qualifying Individuals) who are not U.S. citizens or permanent residents are addressed in the Guidelines.

C. Who Must Satisfy Residency Requirements:

1. Student and Qualifying Individual: Except as provided in Subsection 2, undergraduates who will not reach the age of 24 by December 31 of the academic year for which Resident Classification is sought must demonstrate that the Student and a Parent (or other Qualifying Individual as applicable) satisfy the Residency Requirements.
2. Student Alone: The following Students may demonstrate satisfaction of the Residency Requirements on their own without regard to information about a Parent or other Qualifying Individual:
 - a. Graduate Students, regardless of their age;
 - b. Undergraduates who have reached the age of 24 by December 31 of the academic year for which Resident Classification is sought;
 - c. Undergraduates who are married as of the Residence Determination Date, regardless of their age;
 - d. Undergraduates who otherwise meet the independence standard for purposes of eligibility for federal financial aid; and
 - e. Undergraduates who demonstrate that they have been Self-Supporting for at least one year before the Residence Determination Date according to criteria set forth in the Guidelines.

D. Special circumstances resident classification: A Resident Classification (or Contingent or Limited Duration Resident Classification, as specified below) at the University of California shall be granted where a Student demonstrates any of the following Special Circumstances:

1. Student Member of the U.S. Armed Forces: A Student who is a member of the U.S. Armed Forces stationed in California on active duty, except if assigned for educational purposes, is eligible for a Contingent Resident Classification. Such a Student may retain a Contingent Resident Classification if the Student is transferred outside of California pursuant to military orders, so long as the

Student remains continuously enrolled at a California public post-secondary institution. See section 68075.

2. Student Dependent of Member of the U.S. Armed Forces: A Student who is a dependent of a member of the U.S. Armed Forces stationed in California on active duty is eligible for a Contingent Resident Classification. Such a Student may retain a Contingent Resident Classification if the member of the armed forces is transferred outside of California pursuant to military orders, or retires from the armed forces, so long as the Student remains continuously enrolled at a California public post-secondary institution. See section 68074.
3. Ward of the Court: A Student who resides in California and who is currently a dependent or ward of the state through California's child welfare system, or was a dependent or ward of the state and is no longer being served either due to emancipation or aging out of the California child welfare system, is eligible for a Resident Classification. See section 68085.
4. Non-Resident Dependent of a California Resident: A Student who does not satisfy the Residency Requirements but who has a Parent who both satisfies the Residency Requirements and either claimed the Student as a tax dependent or continually contributed court-ordered child support for the Student during the one year immediately before the Residence Determination Date shall be eligible for a limited duration Resident Classification for one academic year. Such a Student may thereafter be eligible to receive a Resident Classification if the Parent continues to satisfy the Residency Requirements and the Student demonstrates timely satisfaction of the Residency Requirements. See section 68076.
5. Student Under Care of An Adult Qualifying Individual Other than a Parent: An undergraduate Student who was under the continuous direct care and control of an adult Qualifying Individual other than a Parent for at least two years before reaching the age of 19 is eligible for a Resident Classification when both the Student and Qualifying Individual(s) demonstrate that they met the Residency Requirements for more than one year immediately before the Residence Determination Date. See section 68073.
6. California Public School Teacher: A Student who is employed by a California school district in a full-time position requiring certification qualifications shall be eligible for a contingent Resident Classification while completing course work to meet credential requirements according to the additional conditions set forth in the Guidelines. See section 68078.
7. Graduate of Bureau of Indian Affairs School: A Student who is a graduate of a school located in California run by the United States Bureau of Indian Affairs is eligible for a Resident Classification. See section 68082.

8. Amateur Student Athlete Training at a U.S. Olympic Training Center: A Student who is an amateur student athlete training at a U.S. Olympic Training Center in California is eligible for a limited duration Resident Classification for one academic year. Such a Student may thereafter be eligible to receive a Resident Classification if the Student demonstrates timely satisfaction of the Residency Requirements. See section 68083.
 9. Refugees / Victims of Trafficking, Domestic Violence or Other Crimes: A Student who has been classified as a refugee, as specified in the Guidelines, or who holds a visa provided for victims of trafficking, domestic violence or other serious crimes (any “T” or “U” visa) is eligible for a limited duration Resident Classification for one academic year. Such a Student may thereafter be eligible to receive a Resident Classification if the Student demonstrates timely satisfaction of the Residency Requirements.
 10. University / Laboratory LLC Employees: An individual who is a full-time employee of the University assigned to work outside the state of California or a full-time employee of an LLC holding a contract to manage a university laboratory, as well as the dependent spouse, registered domestic partner or Child of such an individual, shall be eligible for a contingent Resident Classification. The Contingent Resident Classification shall expire at the end of any quarter or semester in which the Qualifying Individual no longer has an employment relationship that qualifies the Student for this contingent Resident Classification.
 11. Dependent of Member of Academic Senate: A Student who is the spouse or registered domestic partner or unmarried dependent Child of a member of the University faculty who is a member of the Academic Senate shall be eligible for a Resident Classification. See section 68078.
- E. Students Exempt from Payment of NRST (“NRST Exempt”): A Student who does not qualify for a Resident Classification under Section B or D above may nonetheless be eligible for exemption from payment of NRST under the following circumstances:
1. “AB 540”: A Student who qualifies under the provisions of section 68130.5 of the California Education Code (commonly known as AB 540) is eligible for an NRST Exempt Classification.
 2. Student Discharged from U.S. Armed Forces: Subject to limitations set forth in the Guidelines, a Student who was a member of the U.S. Armed Forces stationed in California on active duty for more than one year immediately prior to being discharged is eligible for NRST Exempt Classification for one academic year so long as the Student files an affidavit stating the Student’s intent to establish California residence at the time the Student seeks the NRST Exempt Classification. The one year NRST Exemption must be used within two years of being discharged. Such a Student may thereafter be eligible to receive a Resident

Classification if the Student demonstrates timely satisfaction of the Residency Requirements. See Education Code section 68075.5.

3. Federal Law Addressing Veteran Higher Education Access: A Student who meets the definition of “covered individual” in section 702 of the U.S. Veterans Access, Choice and Accountability Act of 2014 (Public Law 113-146; 38 U.S.C. §3679(c)) or the eligibility requirements of the U.S. Higher Education Opportunity Act (20 U.S.C. §1015d) (or any other federal law addressed in the Guidelines regarding access to higher education for veterans of the U.S. Armed Forces) is eligible for an NRST Exempt Classification.

II. Tuition / Mandatory Systemwide Fee Policy

Each Student shall be charged Tuition and other Mandatory Systemwide Fees except where they demonstrate any of the following circumstances, subject to further details in the Guidelines:

1. Recipient of Congressional Medal of Honor: A Student who has a Resident Classification and received or is the Child of someone who received the Congressional Medal of Honor and satisfies all requirements set forth in the Guidelines is eligible for exemption from payment of Tuition and Mandatory Systemwide Fees. See section 66025.3.
2. Student Dependent of Deceased or Disabled Veteran/CA National Guard: A Student who has a Resident Classification and who is the Child or dependent or surviving spouse or registered domestic partner (who has not subsequently married or registered as a domestic partner) of a deceased or disabled veteran or member of the California National Guard who was killed or permanently disabled while in active service of the United States Military or California National Guard, shall be exempt from payment of Tuition and Mandatory Systemwide Fees so long as the Student satisfies all requirements set forth in the Guidelines. See section 66025.3.
3. Student Survivor of Law Enforcement or Fire Suppression Personnel: An undergraduate Student who is the surviving spouse or registered domestic partner or Child of a California resident whose principal duties consisted of active law enforcement service or active fire suppression and prevention and who was killed on active duty shall be exempted from Tuition and Mandatory Systemwide Fees. See section 68120.

COMPLIANCE/DELEGATION

The President or designee, in consultation with the General Counsel, or designee, is authorized to adopt and amend implementing Guidelines consistent with this policy. The President or designee may delegate responsibility for applying and implementing this policy.

NO RIGHT OF ACTION

This policy is not intended to, and does not, create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law or in equity by any party against the University of California or its Board of Regents, individual Regents, officers, employees, or agents.

Regents Policy 3105: Policy on Residency

Approved March 29, 2012

- ~~1. The residence of each student at the University of California shall be determined in accordance with rules governing residence as set forth below. (All statutory references herein, unless otherwise noted, are to the California Education Code.)~~
 - ~~A. Legislative Matters: Legislative intent, Legal action, and Applicability to the University: as provided in Sections 68000, 68133, and 68134.~~
 - ~~B. Residence Procedures: Student classification; Information and evidence concerning residence; Oath or affirmation; Person administering oath or affirmation; Nonresident not obtaining residence as a result of maintaining continuous attendance; and Nonresident tuition: as provided in Sections 68040-68043, and 68050.~~
 - ~~C. Residence Definitions: "Institution"; "District"; "District governing board"; "Governing board"; "Parent"; "Student"; "Continuous attendance"; "Resident"; "Nonresident"; "Resident classification"; "Residence determination date": as provided in Sections 68011-68012, 68014-68018, and 68022-68023.~~
 - ~~D. Physical Presence and Intent: Every person has a residence; Residence of persons who are married or 18 years of age; Determination of place of residence: as provided in Sections 68060-68062.~~
 - ~~E. Financial Independence: Rules and regulations concerning student's classification:
 - ~~1. As provided in Section 68044, but excluding the words "classified as a nonresident seeking reclassification" from Paragraph 1 and substituting the words "seeking classification," and excluding Paragraph 3 of Section 68044.~~
 - ~~2. In addition to the provisions of Section 68044, as amended by this policy, a student shall be considered financially independent if the applicant:
 - ~~a. is at least 24 years of age by December 31 of the year the applicant requests residence classification;~~
 - ~~b. is a veteran of the U.S. Armed Forces;~~
 - ~~c. is a ward of the court or both parents are dead;~~
 - ~~d. has legal dependents other than a spouse or registered domestic partner;~~
 - ~~e. is married, or in a registered domestic partnership, or a graduate student or professional student, and will not be claimed as an income tax deduction by any individual other than his or her spouse or domestic partner for the tax year immediately preceding the request for residence classification; or~~
 - ~~f. is a single undergraduate student, and was not claimed as an income tax deduction by his or her parents or any other individual for the two years immediately preceding the request for residence classification, and demonstrates self-sufficiency for~~~~~~

two years. The two years used to demonstrate self-sufficiency are the two years immediately preceding the request for residence classification.

2. Each nonresident student at the University shall pay a nonresident tuition fee for each term of attendance at the University, except that such fee, with the approval of the President of the University, may be remitted or waived in whole or in part in the case of any student who qualifies as a graduate student with a distinguished record, a foreign student, a teaching assistant or teaching fellow, or a research assistant; or in the case of a nonresident student who is an unmarried dependent son or daughter under age twenty-one, or a spouse or registered domestic partner, of a member of the University faculty who is a member of the Academic Senate.
3. The following exceptions shall grant students a resident classification for purposes of tuition and fees:
 - A. Minor under age 18 who is a student who remains in California after his or her parent moves elsewhere; Self-supporting student; Minor who has not been an adult more than one year preceding residence determination date; Student under care of adult: as provided in Sections 68070-68073.
 - B. Dependent of member of the Armed Forces; Member of Armed Forces; Armed Forces members; Remaining in state following discharge: as provided in Sections 68074-68075.5.
 - C. Dependent of California resident of more than one year; Parent residing in California for one year and contributing court-ordered support for student: as provided in Section 68076.
 - D. Graduate of California school operated by the United States Bureau of Indian Affairs: as provided in Section 68077.
 - E. Student holding credential; Other conditions: as provided in Section 68078.
 - F. Amateur student athlete in training at a U.S. Olympic Training Center: as provided in Section 68083.
 - G. Student 19 years of age or under; Current or former dependent or ward of state: as provided in Section 68085, amended to read: "Notwithstanding any other provisions, a student who resides in California and is 19 years of age or under at the time of enrollment, and who is currently a dependent or ward of the state through California's child welfare system, or was served by California's child welfare system and is no longer being served either due to emancipation or aging out of the system, shall be entitled to a resident classification as long as he or she remains continuously enrolled."

Definitions of Terms used in the Proposed Amended Regents Policy on Residency

The following is a subset of definitions in the Residence Policy Guidelines, which are published by the Office of the President for the campuses to use in implementing the Regents Policy on Residency. The terms defined here appear in the proposed amended Regents Policy on Residency (Attachment 1).

Term	Definition
Adult	Any person who is 18 years of age or older
Child/Children	A natural or adopted son or daughter. The term “child” does not include stepchild unless expressly noted.
Contingent Resident Classification	A California resident classification that is contingent on factors other than residency requirements as specified in Regents Policy.
Enrollment	The date the student has actually signed up for classes, or the date the student’s fees are paid, whichever occurs first
Graduate Student	Includes graduate academic students, graduate professional degree students, and students enrolled in a teacher credential program
Mandatory Systemwide Fees	Uniform fees assessed to all registered students; fees under this definition include Tuition, the Student Services Fee, and any other mandatory fees that may be adopted
Nonresident Supplemental Tuition (NRST)	The university-wide mandatory charge assessed across all campuses of the University against each student who has not obtained a resident classification or an NRST exempt classification
NRST Exempt Classification	A classification provide to students who have demonstrated that they are not subject to payment of NRST in accordance with the Regents Policy on Residency

Parent	The natural or adoptive father or mother or, if both parents are deceased, the legal guardian with whom a minor resides. The term “parent” does not include step-parents or foster parents, unless expressly noted.
Qualifying Individual	An adult whose presence, intent, or other relevant characteristics contribute to a student’s classification as resident, nonresident, or NRST-exempt. While a qualifying individual is typically a student’s parent, other individuals may also be a qualifying individual.
Residence Determination Date (RDD)	The day instruction begins for the term
Residency Classification	Classification that determines whether a student is charged nonresident supplemental tuition. Residency classifications include: resident, resident who satisfies special circumstances, nonresident exempt, and nonresident.
Resident Classification	The residency classification associated with being a California resident and that results in no nonresident supplemental tuition being charged
Residency Requirements	The standards of physical presence and intent needed to establish classification as a resident
Self-Supporting	The ability to totally support oneself financially without support or assistance from others
Student	A person applying for admission, admitted to, or enrolled at the University of California
Tuition	A University-wide mandatory charge assessed against each student (resident and nonresident) uniformly across all campuses of the University

Additions shown by underscoring; deletions shown by strikethrough

Proposed Changes to 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.)~~
 - A. ~~Tuition and fees excused; Surviving spouses or children of employed or contracted law enforcement and fire suppression personnel: a student who is the surviving spouse or registered domestic partner or child of a resident law enforcement officer or fire fighter killed on active duty shall be exempted from nonresident tuition and mandatory systemwide fees in accordance with Section 68120.~~
 - B. ~~Dependents, children, or surviving spouse of deceased or disabled veterans: a student who is the child or dependent of a deceased or disabled veteran, or who is the dependent of or the surviving spouse who has not remarried or registered domestic partner (who has not subsequently married or registered as a domestic partner) of any member of the California National Guard who was killed or permanently disabled while in active service of the state, shall not be exempted from nonresident tuition fees, but may be exempted from mandatory systemwide fees in accordance with Section 66025.3.~~
 - C. ~~Nonresident tuition at California State University and California Community Colleges; Payment exemptions; Requirements: as provided in Section 68130.5 (AB 540).~~
 - D. ~~Students who have obtained a "T" or "U" nonimmigrant visa and otherwise would meet the requirements of Section 68130.5 shall be exempt from paying nonresident tuition at the University until they are eligible to establish a resident classification pursuant to Regents Policy 3401.~~
 - E. ~~In the case of out-of-state employees and non-University employees at Los Alamos and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratories (LANL and LLNL):~~
 1. ~~An individual who is a full-time University employee assigned to work outside the State of California, or the dependent child, spouse, or registered domestic partner of such an employee, shall be entitled to resident classification for tuition purposes.~~
 2. ~~So long as the University continues to participate as a member of a limited liability company holding the contract for the management of LANL or LLNL, an individual who is an employee of such company, or a dependent child, spouse, or registered domestic partner of such an employee, shall be entitled to resident classification for tuition purposes to the same extent as if the employee were an employee of the University assigned to work outside of California.~~
 3. ~~An individual who is a full-time employee of the University assigned to work at LANL or elsewhere outside of California, or who is a full-time employee of a company described in (2) above in which the University is a principal, and who transfers without a break in service to full-time University employment within the State of California, shall be entitled to resident classification for tuition purposes. Any dependent child, spouse~~

~~or registered domestic partner of such an employee also would be entitled to resident classification for tuition purposes.~~

~~4. An individual who is a full-time University employee at LANL or LLNL, or any dependent child, spouse or registered domestic partner of such an employee, and who is enrolled as a student in a degree-granting program at a UC campus at such time as the University contract to manage LANL or LLNL expires and the University's participation in the management of LANL or LLNL ceases, shall be exempted from payment of nonresident tuition fees for the remainder of the current quarter or semester.~~

~~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~~

Additions shown by underscoring; deletions shown by strikethrough

Proposed Changes to Standing Order 110.2: Matters Relating to Residency

~~The Regents shall establish policies governing the determination of California residence for purposes of University of California's tuition and fees and the exemption or waiver of such tuition and fees. The President, in consultation with the General Counsel of The Regents, shall implement such policies by establishing all necessary regulations.~~