

Vice President Pamela Brown presented a new dashboard on the UC Information Center website that included UC Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES) responses regarding COVID-19 and remote instruction. Instructors have had more time, access to course development technology, and feedback on remote instruction to improve fall 2020 courses. Campuses were using management system technology to increase faculty and student engagement and offer additional student advising and support. This was a direct response to faculty and student feedback on challenges with classroom interaction, as well as students' increased concerns about mental health issues such as loneliness. Laboratory and studio courses, internships, and practicums from the arts, education, and health science disciplines were more likely to be cancelled. In the fall, the Office of the President (UCOP) planned to collect data that would inform future research and analyses.

Dean of the UC Irvine School of Education Richard Arum stated that UCI launched the Next Generation Undergraduate Success Measurement Project last September, with the support of the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and UC leadership. The project involved many UCI faculty members, undergraduate and graduate students, and research scientists. The project's goals were to develop and disseminate new measures of undergraduate experiences and outcomes, help improve institutional performance and educational equity, and demonstrate a deeper understanding of educational processes and educational value. This project was unique in that it used both traditional administrative data and clickstream data from the learning management systems. Data was collected using innovative performance assessments, surveys, and other instruments. Data collection began in September 2019 with 1,200 students and captured the transition to remote instruction. This academic year, the project was following 1,200 students who were starting college or transferring juniors. The project based growth and development not only on cognitive ability and institutional dispositions, but also psychological human development, social capital, and civic engagement. That growth could be connected to adult life course outcomes, such as employment, health, social, psychological, and civic outcomes. In one assessment, students received a one-minute survey 50 times per year that captured student life at that time. Another assessment, developed in partnership with the Educational Testing Service (ETS), assigned a complex problem to four students to solve separately and together as a group. A sub-sample of 350 students was surveyed weekly on issues such as mentoring, apprenticeships and internships, and microaggressions on campus. Mr. Arum presented charts with preliminary data generated from learning management systems, which could be disaggregated by gender, major, as well as underrepresented minority, first-generation student, or international student status. With remote instruction due to the COVID-19 pandemic, a gap in the number of sign-ins emerged between male and female students in the spring term. Survey data helped researchers understand that gap. Students had different challenges and responsibilities at home. Mr. Arum presented a chart of weekly data collections showing that stress levels rose as the pandemic began and declined with campus intervention, although they were still higher than what they were before the pandemic. The data collected could be used to design interventions to support students during this time.

Regent Park expressed her wish to see the six dimensions of postsecondary growth that were presented measured regularly among all student populations. She asked about the

University's progress in embracing this model for all undergraduate education. Mr. Arum replied that this project, an interdisciplinary collaboration of UCI faculty researchers and with the advice of national experts, was at the forefront of the field. Technological advances allowed the integration of multiple data streams at scale. For example, researchers could now disaggregate the number of hours that students spent in a learning management system or the number of clicks onto sessions. He predicted that this data collection would be ubiquitous in the next two to three years. Survey collection products made data easier to collect and integrate into a measurement system. A future challenge would be ensuring that the measures gathered would work to improve institutional performance through innovative educational practices and intentional curriculum design.

Regent Park compared the project to a series of levers that could be moved to create success and enhance the student experience, which could be applied to remote, online, or in-person instruction. This work was tremendously exciting. Conducting the surveys was an intervention, and the questions being asked demonstrated a concern for students. UC must embrace this data to make a difference. Regent Park thanked Mr. Arum. Mr. Arum stated that the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation invested in UC Irvine because of its academic capacity. UCI had six National Academy of Education scholars, as well as a diverse student body, which he credited to President Drake when he was chancellor and to others. The Irvine campus was also open to data-driven improvement efforts, which was not always the case systemwide. Mr. Brown added that this project was integrated into the institutional and instructional improvement efforts of the campus itself. Mr. Arum remarked that, while the State's requirement that UC admit one junior transfer student for every two freshman students was innovative, UC must track junior transfers, freshman students, and continuing junior students in order to identify the minimum residential exposure for desired outcomes. This was achievable with the integrated data being collected.

Committee Chair Anguiano asked how components of the undergraduate experience that might not be associated with specific courses, such as the development of social capital or self-regulation skills, were collected. Mr. Arum responded that data collection tools must be designed creatively. With regard to social capital, students would be asked about the number of friends they made on campus and the extent to which they could rely on friends for support in academic, career, and life course matters. Social capital relationships were not confined to peers, but also adults such as faculty, support staff, and mentors from apprenticeships and internships with campus partners.

Regent Ortiz Oakley asked Mr. Brown what was learned about the impact of the pass/no pass grading policies on transfer and entering freshman students. Mr. Brown stated his belief that the UCI project had the ability to track this. All campuses had projects that evaluate those impacts, and UCOP was tracking data systemwide. Hopefully, these data could be amassed and integrated to inform decision-making.

Regent Ortiz Oakley asked whether campuses used the same learning management system, adding that UC should have a common learning management system and ensure that every course is in it in order to obtain the needed data and engagement. UC could learn from fully online universities that constantly mined the data on their students. Georgia State

University was a public institution that also relied on data. Mr. Brown stated that different learning management systems had different capacities. The ones at UCI facilitated the collection of these data; not all learning management systems currently had this capability. Mr. Arum added that faculty adoption of learning management systems was relatively ubiquitous at UCI, but they were still not used with small seminar courses. Large gateway courses for launching successful academic trajectories were completely covered. Three learning management system providers held nearly the entire market share: Canvas, Blackboard Learn, and Moodle. Once a small set of measures for tracking student engagement progress has been identified, UCI could ask these providers to make those measures available for every course offered on campus. UCI had a very close relationship with the researchers at Canvas. Regent Ortiz Oakley stated that UC had no leverage over Canvas. The California Community College system had the buying power of 116 campuses but could not compel Canvas to meet its needs. While the University might wish to honor academic freedom, it would encounter problems in data collection if there were multiple learning management systems. The segments of higher education could join forces to increase buying power and gain leverage over learning management system providers.

Regent Stegura shared her conversation with Syreeta Nolan, a UCSD student and co-chair of the UC Student Association/UC Graduate and Professional Council Disability Ad Hoc Committee. According to Ms. Nolan, students with disabilities were not included in this data. These students might not have confidence in their tools for remote instruction and might withdraw at higher rates. They were reestablishing relationships with healthcare providers after moving home during the pandemic. Regent Stegura asked if data would be collected on students with disabilities. Ms. Brown stated that an item on disabled students was proposed for an upcoming meeting. Data might be available from the most recent UCUES responses during the pandemic period, as well as from individual campuses. Regent Stegura suggested that a data-driven approach be used to develop interventions for the disabled student population as well.

Regent-designate Zaragoza asked whether there was data on how the pandemic was affecting older students and parenting students, and transfer students as compared with four-year students. Ms. Brown replied that she and her team could review the data, including written responses to survey questions. Faculty and students with children faced unique challenges. Other challenges included finding a quiet study space and internet access with multiple users at home. Transfer students, who already spent a shorter period of time on campus, were missing on-campus activities and the connections made on campus because of remote instruction. Regent-designate Zaragoza noted the low confidence levels reported in the data and asked whether there were trends related to them.

Regent-designate Zaragoza asked whether there were systemwide best practices for faculty. Anecdotally, students seemed to prefer some teaching methods over others. Mr. Brown replied that one of his units continually convened campus instructional developers to share best practices. The Academic Senate's University Committee on Educational Policy also met regularly, as did faculty in various disciplines. Mr. Brown noted the uniqueness and newness of present circumstances. Campuses were learning about, adjusting to, and improving their approaches to these circumstances, and he and the

executive vice chancellors planned to meet in November. Ms. Brown added that UCOP worked with the Academic Senate to ask the same questions in UCUES and in a faculty survey. Data were shared across the campuses. Each campus created a teaching website that has been updated regularly. A brief on parenting students was being updated with responses about COVID-19 and remote instruction and could be shared with the Regents. Mr. Brown stated that campus centers for teaching and learning were collecting resources and best practices. He believed that more could be done and that President Drake had a particular interest in this. Committee Chair Anguiano urged Mr. Brown to track how vice chancellors of student affairs were responding to the pandemic so that best practices in addressing student welfare and physical and mental health could be shared at a future Regents meeting. Mr. Brown stated that a staff member focused on student mental health has been added to Vice President Gullatt's team.

Chancellor Larive expressed her eagerness to learn more and shared the experience of piloting a similar project at UC Santa Cruz. The UCSC Center for Innovations in Teaching and Learning worked with faculty during the spring and summer to improve online and remote instruction. It was important to remember that instructors and students faced a complex set of challenges that were physical, emotional, or based on student status. She cautioned against reaching a false conclusion that online instruction was ineffective, for instance. Mr. Arum agreed, stating that one must be careful to disentangle the factors involved in order to identify findings that could guide institutional action. The project at UCI not only identified gaps in performance by group, but it was also asking students about responsibilities they had, where they were living, the conditions in which they were attempting remote instruction, and limitations in their resources.

3. **UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA STUDENT ACADEMIC PREPARATION STRATEGIES**

[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 this presentation and the next would provide an overview of UC's approaches, outcomes, and challenges. When he was Chair of the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) and Vice Chair of the Academic Senate, Mr. Brown had served on the Regents' Study Group on University Diversity, which focused on the impact of Proposition 209 on UC. The report he coauthored highlighted the inequality in the state's educational landscape and the severe disparities predating Proposition 209 that were associated with race, ethnicity, geography, and other factors, and it called for a comprehensive education pipeline repair plan. UC currently offered research-based programs, services, tools, and partnerships to improve college preparation and attendance, but declining resources affected UC's ability to grow its programs. UC's traditional student support programs have reached only five percent of K–12 students from underrepresented groups and 15 percent of California K–12 public schools. The University once had a permanent budget of \$85 million for these programs, but this was not enough. Mr. Brown was disappointed to learn that the current budget for Student Academic Preparation and Educational Partnerships (SAPEP) was closer to \$25 million. Most

programs have experienced cuts of over 50 percent. More could be done, including intersegmental partnerships, with more investment. As the COVID-19 pandemic demonstrated, inequity in opportunity and access was a statewide problem that UC efforts alone could not solve.

UC Irvine Assistant Vice Chancellor Stephanie Reyes-Tuccio stated that many schools were prematurely ending contracts and shifting resources for college-going support to instruction. Moving to a triage model of college-going support would reduce the long-range, intersegmental planning that the most vulnerable students needed. SAPEP programs helped UC move beyond cohort programs, which could not serve every student. UC must work with the other education systems to address inequity and enable a more seamless transition to higher education. UC partnered with stakeholders such as educational institutions, community-based organizations, and industry partners to set common goals using shared data and to implement collective interventions. A continuous improvement model was used to review data, adjust, and set new goals. UC Irvine's Santa Ana Partnership, for example, successfully advocated for the alignment of high school graduation requirements with the A–G curriculum and developed model programs, but college-going stalled. Fifteen percent of students, who were mostly Latino(a) and from low-income families, were eligible to apply to UC or the California State University. UC and its partners spent several years on data sharing. Community colleges revised placement policies before they were required by law to do so and saw immediate gains, with fewer students in remedial courses. This work made the K–12 system, community colleges, and four-year institutions equally accountable for increasing applicants and enrollment, persistence, and completion. With new programs at UCI, student persistence was within the margin of error or exceeded that of the general population. UCI applied what it learned from the Santa Ana Partnership to partnerships with the El Monte, Anaheim, and Compton school districts. Through the Anaheim Pledge, a partnership among high schools, UCI, local community colleges, and California State University, Fullerton, there was a 43 percent increase in applications to UCI in its first year and a 105 percent increase in enrollment. With campus support programs, 100 percent of Anaheim Pledge students persisted at UCI last year. Partnership work magnified all other SAPEP investments, helping UCI raise more than twice the amount it has received in SAPEP funding. Investing in a systemwide strategy to accelerate and target this work could yield transformative results in this critical moment.

President Drake stated that, in the wake of the passage of Proposition 209, UC applied more resources to outreach and engagement, but these programs were cut during times of economic stress. Mr. Brown stated that now was the time to invest in the future of California, its young people. Ms. Reyes-Tuccio added that this work has been able to flourish at UC Irvine through the support of its chancellor. Hopefully, the Regents would be in a position to help champion these efforts.

Regent Zettel asked how UC could obtain more funding. Mr. Brown replied that he and his team were exploring more philanthropy as an option. These programs not only helped students get into college; they helped students succeed after college. Higher education means the most to those who have the least.

Committee Chair Anguiano asked about UC's ability to partner with the State or other segments for more funding. Mr. Brown stated that UC needed to scale up UCI's partnerships. Ms. Reyes-Tuccio stated that this funding would contribute to undergraduate success, graduate and faculty diversity, campus climate, community and government relations goals, and advancement. This work not only supported K-12 or community college students, but also the University's strategic priorities. Committee Chair Anguiano expressed her wish that members of the Finance and Capital Strategies Committee could be present for this presentation. This topic required a conversation about finance and budget. Mr. Brown agreed.

Staff Advisor Tseng noted the need to make students, staff, faculty, and alumni aware of what the Regents were discussing. Ms. Tseng planned to encourage staff to listen to Regents meetings so that more staff would be apprised of the work the Regents were doing.

Regent Zettel asked whether UC reached out to school administrators to present the effectiveness of UC programs. She asked if development teams were approaching foundations focused on education, such as the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation or the Emerson Collective. Ms. Reyes-Tuccio responded in the affirmative. UCI worked with hundreds of administrators through these partnerships. President Drake shared that, when he was chancellor, UCI invested more in outreach when there was less funding. He recalled that the Office of the President provided seed funding for programs.

Regent Lansing stated that these programs were essential to improving diversity and suggested that Regents reach out to their own contacts. There were many potential donors who might be interested in supporting this cause.

Regent Stegura asked whether these programs would continue if Proposition 16 passed. Ms. Reyes-Tuccio replied that these programs helped students prepare and become eligible to apply for UC, and they also encouraged admitted students to enroll. Proposition 16 might improve application and admission, but preparation and enrollment required extra work.

Regent Ortiz Oakley suggested reaching out to the College Futures Foundation for help with philanthropy. He could connect UC with a board member there. He was unsure what the Regents or this Committee were being asked to do and asked what the next steps were. Mr. Brown replied that this presentation was an update and provided Regents with information that would help them support these goals when President Drake presented his budget. These efforts would benefit from the Board's creativity, ability to face challenges, and its connections within State government and outside of it.

Committee Chair Anguiano stated that the University must also expand its capacity so that students who are prepared and eligible for UC are able to attend.

4. **UC SCOUT: ONLINE A–G COURSES TO SUPPORT STUDENT ACADEMIC PREPARATION**

[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 UC Scout, which offered A–G, honors, and Advanced Placement (AP) courses online, was one component of the University’s academic preparation strategy. UC Scout was managed by UC Santa Cruz Extension.

Executive Director Ehren Koepf presented a brief video introducing UC Scout, which provided supplemental and credit-bearing online instructional resources for California students and teachers. The Basic program supplemented direct instruction. The Plus program, which represented 51 percent of UC Scout enrollments, offered 65 free, pre-built courses for online or in-person instruction. With the On Demand program, students could take asynchronous courses taught by UC Scout teachers for credit. UC Scout’s growth stemmed from \$4 million in one-time funding in 2016, which UC Scout used to create 45 new courses. In 2018 and 2019, UC Scout launched these new courses, with a digital outreach and media campaign to increase enrollments. UC Scout’s goal was to prioritize California’s educationally disadvantaged or underrepresented students, and an outreach coordinator was hired to focus on California students who attend high-poverty and high-minority schools, increasing access to A–G and credit-bearing courses, partnering with UC outreach programs, and cultivating awareness earlier in the pipeline. With the COVID-19 pandemic, enrollment rose significantly. Schools regarded UC Scout as a solution to their distance learning needs, but many requests could not be fulfilled. UC Scout was meant to complement in-person instruction and enhance course offerings, not replicate online high school. UC Scout could fill college preparatory course gaps and increase A–G course completion, raising the competitive eligibility of students who lack educational opportunities. UC Scout’s outreach strategy must prioritize students who most represent the UC mission. These goals could only be achieved with resources and partnerships.

Mr. Brown reported that the program currently reached about 10,500 students who were enrolled in 18,000 courses, a growth of about 250 percent since the start of the pandemic. However, demand outstripped current capacity. Enrollment constraints reflected UC Scout’s financial circumstances. He underscored that these matters were closely connected to finance and capital planning.

Chancellor Larive praised the accomplishments of the program, which was central to UC’s mission of access. One’s high school should not determine UC eligibility or preparation.

Committee Chair Anguiano asked how else UC Scout was growing its budget aside from State investment. Mr. Koepf replied that the Basic and Plus programs were free for California public schools. The fee for the On Demand program helped pay for the Basic and Plus programs, full-time and part-time teachers, and subject matter experts who constantly update courses. Just in the last several months, UC Scout had a 475 percent increase in enrollment over last year and doubled its enrollments for several years before

that. In Mr. Koepf's view, the focus should be on reaching out to the right students. These were not courses for the average California student. Mr. Brown stated that he interpreted Committee Chair Anguiano's question as a suggestion to have a strategic plan for growth. Committee Chair Anguiano suggested that this could be discussed at a future meeting.

Regent Mart asked if UC Scout tracked enrollments by geography or demographics. Mr. Koepf responded in the affirmative. The data was shared with Student Academic and Educational Partnerships (SAPEP) annually. UC Scout wished to do further tracking of student success patterns, whether they attend UC, and how their outcomes changed. Regent Mart asked how many school districts UC Scout reached. Mr. Koepf replied that, in the 2019–20 academic year, Approximately one percent of California's public K–12 student population. In 2018–19, UC Scout served students from 685 K–12 schools. Mr. Koepf remarked that UC Scout has struggled with its growth in the last six months Very large school districts were asking UC Scout to provide all of their distance learning, but UC Scout was not built for that. Mr. Brown added that UC Scout needed more support to maintain its quality.

Regent-designate Zaragoza asked if students would take On Demand courses when their school does not provide a certain A–G course. Mr. Koepf responded in the affirmative. On Demand was also used by schools who did not have a teacher for a course, and UC Scout could provide teachers with a curriculum. One student or a small group of students might need access to a course, and hiring a full-time teacher would be unfeasible. Regent-designate Zaragoza asked if there were scholarships for lower-income students. Mr. Koepf replied that UC Scout committed part of its revenue to a large number of scholarships and wished to provide more. The On Demand program was not SAPEP-funded and meant to generate revenue. UC Scout created a community-based scholarship fund for Central California students and was reaching out to Silicon Valley businesses. Committee Chair Anguiano stated that the strategic plan should include these types of metrics.

Regent-designate Zaragoza asked if a UC Scout course could replace a high school course. Mr. Koepf replied that some students took UC Scout courses for remediation while others wished to improve their transcript.

Regent-designate Zaragoza asked whether UC Scout reached out to individuals or school districts and about UC Scout's level of involvement in its school district outreach. Mr. Koepf replied that UC Scout focused its outreach on school districts and schools, particularly those eligible for supplemental funding under the Local Control Funding Formula, as well as SAPEP programs and community-based organizations. UC Scout was targeting schools with limited UC applications, acceptance, and attendance; low A–G course completion rates, minimal access to A–G courses, or a low percentage of teachers qualified to teach A–G courses. Over the summer, UC Scout partnered with seven UC campuses and several SAPEP programs, which resulted in over 2,400 enrollments, and the California Subject Matter Project to raise awareness of UC Scout among teachers.

Committee Chair Anguiano reiterated her request for a strategic plan in the coming year for expanding UC Scout.

5. UPDATE ON UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS TEST FEASIBILITY STUDY

[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 the feasibility study steering committee was comprised of key stakeholders, such as senior leaders from the California State University (CSU), California Community Colleges, and independent colleges and universities; the Academic Senate; a campus enrollment management official; an educational equity expert; and a fair testing expert. Mr. Brown and Faculty Representative Gauvain were co-chairing the steering committee, which would recommend to President Drake whether or not to pursue a modified or new standardized test for admissions. The steering committee would guide the efforts of a work group charged with evaluating the viability of developing a test that would align with UC college readiness standards and be ready for fall 2025 applicants. Faculty Representative Horwitz and Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) Chair Eddie Comeaux were co-chairing the work group, which was comprised of representatives from the education segments, UC faculty, researchers, and practitioners with expertise in psychometrics, educational assessment, college readiness and success, educational equity, and admissions policy and practice. Some of the experts were nationally renowned. The work group would examine measurement, as well as test development, integrity, safety, access, and equity, and would provide the steering committee with an evidence-based recommendation of whether it was possible to pursue a new or modified test. Both groups had begun meeting. The work group was meeting weekly until November, and the steering committee was meeting monthly until December. The steering committee would deliver its recommendation to President Drake in mid-December, and the President's decision, rationale, and next steps would be reported to the Regents at the January 2021 Regents meeting. In August, an informational website was launched, with milestones updated monthly. The website would be sent to the Regents.

Regent Kieffer noted the short timeframe and asked whether there was enough time to finish this feasibility study before the January meeting. Mr. Brown responded in the affirmative. The work group made a big commitment in meeting weekly, and the steering committee was energized.

Regent Kieffer asked Mr. Brown to expound on other purposes of such a test. Mr. Brown stated that, aside from admission, selection, and eligibility, such a test could be important for educational preparation, the lack of which was a challenge to college access and performance. Preparing for such a test would not be done outside of school, but rather through the right curriculum that is well taught on an equitable basis. A test that aligns with UC and CSU college preparatory requirements would reinforce current A–G requirements, provide an independent assessment of college preparation, and gauge the quality of that schooling. Instead of punishing students who receive poor-quality schooling, resources would be targeted, which would have long-term effects on educational equity. Mr. Brown believed that this test would have highly significant implications.

Regent Kieffer agreed. In order to improve, one must assess. Students across the U.S. were falling behind students from other countries in basic areas like mathematics. This was an important experiment if UC could do it. Mr. Brown added that the goal would be identifying educational preparation challenges and targeting resources would require partnerships, as reflected in the makeup of the steering committee and work group. Regent Kieffer remarked that UC and CSU would have to require the test in order to create momentum, even if the test is not used for admissions.

Committee Chair Anguiano asked how this test could be implemented without excluding certain populations. A–G requirements were meant to serve the same purpose but had become a barrier, with 50 percent of students lacking access to the A–G courses. Mr. Brown replied that A–G requirements had the effect of democratizing college preparation, but more work was needed to make the curriculum universally available and to improve its quality. The Office of the President had data on where A–G courses were available but not the on the quality of what was available. That information was necessary in order to improve educational equity.

Regent Ortiz Oakley noted that an admissions examination and an assessment were very different. An assessment already existed, the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) test. He questioned whether the development of a test could solve the problems raised and what resources UC would have to do it. Mr. Brown explained that the feasibility study would help determine whether a test is needed. The working group would determine whether tools already exist. Perhaps the SBAC test might work with modifications.

Regent Kieffer stated that the Regents voted for this unanimously because of the way it was written and believed that these questions would be examined. In his view, this was a bigger issue than admissions.

The meeting adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff