

The Regents of the University of California

PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

November 18, 2020

The Public Engagement and Development Committee met on the above date by teleconference meeting conducted in accordance with Paragraph 3 of Governor Newsom's Executive Order N-29-20.

Members present: Regents Guber, Kieffer, Lansing, Leib, Mart, Muwwakkil, Ortiz Oakley, Reilly, Sherman, Stegura, and Zettel; Advisory members Horwitz and Lott; Chancellors Block, Muñoz, Wilcox, and Yang; Staff Advisor Tseng

In attendance: Regent Kounalakis, Regent-designate Zaragoza, Staff Advisor Jeffrey, Assistant Secretary Lyall, Chief of Staff and Special Counsel Drumm, Senior Vice President Holmes, Vice President Gullatt, and Recording Secretary Li

The meeting convened at 9:45 a.m. with Committee Chair Leib presiding.

Committee Chair Leib noted that today's meeting, which would focus on the transfer student experience, was originally scheduled to be held last spring at Chaffey College, one of the California Community Colleges. This was part of an ongoing effort to include constituents in Committee meetings. He hoped to learn what the University could do improve the transfer process. Committee Chair Leib announced that the construction of the new UC Center Sacramento building was progressing well and thanked Chancellor May for his efforts.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of October 6, 2020 were approved, Regents Guber, Lansing, Leib, Mart, Muwwakkil, Ortiz Oakley, Sherman, Stegura, and Zettel voting "aye".¹

2. ENDORSEMENT OF COMPREHENSIVE CAMPAIGN, DAVIS CAMPUS

The President of the University recommended that the Regents endorse the public phase of the UC Davis campus fundraising campaign, Expect Greater, with a dollar goal of \$2 billion, supporting four campaign pillars: preparing change makers, reimagining medicine, sparking innovation and creativity, and sustaining healthier communities

[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.]

¹ Roll call vote required by the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act [Government Code § 11123(b)(1)(D)] for all meetings held by teleconference.

Regent Stegura stated that UC Davis was ranked the fourth best public university in the U.S. by *Money* magazine, the fifth best public university by the *Wall Street Journal*, and the second best public university for social mobility by *Washington Monthly*. Philanthropy was a tool to improve social mobility. The over \$1.2 billion raised to date would fund a wide range of projects, including Aggie Square and research at UC Davis Health. According to the Council for Advancement and Support of Education, UC Davis' fundraising program was among the top two percent in the country.

Chancellor May stated that this campaign has provided an opportunity to gather resources for UCD students, researchers and faculty, and facilities. The campaign would add \$2 billion in new resources to fund a new veterinary medical center; a technology initiative for the aging population; a "smart farm" initiative; and Aggie Launch, which would mentor and prepare tomorrow's leaders. Through this campaign, UC Davis established 40 endowed chairs and professorships, the Edwards Family Athletics Center, and the Tschannen Eye Institute. Thus far, donors had committed over \$182 million to student support scholarships and fellowships.

Vice Chancellor for Development and Alumni Relations Shaun Keister stated that philanthropists have continued to give in recognition of the role that UC Davis played in creating solutions to society's challenges. The campaign's priorities were organized into four categories: "Sparkling Innovation and Creativity" by creating environments for learning and discovery, such as Aggie Square, the Engineering Student Design Center, and the new veterinary medical center; "Sustaining Healthier Communities" by addressing inequality in health care access, violence, and climate change; "Preparing Change Makers" by supporting students and faculty with endowed chairs, scholarships, and fellowships; and "Reimagining Medicine" through medical breakthroughs and technologies developed at the Tschannen Eye Institute and the Institute for Regenerative Cures. \$1.2 billion, or 60 percent of the \$2 billion goal, had been raised during the quiet phase of the campaign. The entire campaign was expected to conclude in 2024. He provided data showing fundraising progress in major areas of support, progress that was being made for six interdisciplinary fundraising initiatives, and data from the campus' last capital campaign. Mr. Keister highlighted several transformational and leadership gifts. This campaign's success was made possible by over 600 campus volunteers and 54 philanthropic boards.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the President's recommendation and voted to present it to the Board, Regents Guber, Lansing, Leib, Mart, Muwwakkil, Ortiz Oakley, Sherman, Stegura, and Zettel voting "aye."

3. **PERSPECTIVES ON INCREASING COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRANSFERS IN 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.]

Regent Ortiz Oakley briefly introduced the speakers, Hans Johnson, Senior Fellow at the Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC), and Michele Siqueiros, President of the Campaign for College Opportunity.

Ms. Siqueiros explained that the Campaign for College Opportunity was focused on closing persistent racial and equity gaps in preparation, admission, and success in college. One of the most critical challenges for California higher education was how to improve transfer and provide equitable educational opportunity for students. The California Master Plan for Higher Education (Master Plan) directed most undergraduate students to community colleges. The majority of low-income students of color began their higher education in community colleges, including those who eventually earned doctorate degrees. Community college transfers were also key to greater State funding for the UC system. She asked the Regents to consider how the transfer process benefited or hurt specific populations of students (e.g., by race, ethnicity, gender, economic status, and region) while not grouping them broadly as “underrepresented.” In 2010, the Campaign for College Opportunity sponsored legislation to create the Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) to provide a clear path to transfer and ensure guaranteed admission to the California State University (CSU) system. The Campaign for College Opportunity also passed a partner bill that urged UC to align its requirements with the pathway. She expressed appreciation toward former President Napolitano for her leadership; UC aligned 21 pathways to the ADT. Much work remained to define clear and consistent pathways. She suggested that the University continue to align its transfer requirements with those of the ADT and provide a guaranteed path to UC admission for students with an ADT. This would not preclude UC from requiring a higher grade point average (GPA) threshold than CSU. In addition, she asked that the University expand the number of available slots for students who had earned an ADT. More students were transferring, and, because of COVID-19, more students were beginning their college education at a community college. Finally, she urged the University to support outreach and partnerships between UC and community college campuses in order to help students better understand the requirements.

Mr. Johnson stated that PPIC focused on empirical data to drive policy recommendations. He highlighted findings from PPIC’s September 2020 report, “Increasing Community College Transfers: Progress and Barriers,” which examined transfer pathways from all 114 California Community College (CCC) campuses. According to the Master Plan, UC was to be available for the top one-eighth of California students, CSU for the top one-third of California students, and CCC for all California students. As a result, the CCC system had a more diverse population than UC. The vast majority of CCC students intended to transfer, and the report described barriers to transfer, identified progress that had been made to overcome them, and projected potential numbers of new transfers expected to apply to UC in the next four to five years. Transfers to UC increased by 27 percent over the last four years, and increases in African American and Latino(a) transfers were even greater. However, far too few CCC students successfully transferred to four-year universities; only 19 percent transferred within four years of being in a community college, and only 28 percent did so within six years. Equity gaps remained a significant problem: although Latino(a) students comprised more than half of the CCC students who intended to transfer, only one-third did. African American students made up seven percent of CCC students

who intended to transfer, and only five percent did. Early progress was key. Students who took transfer-level courses in English and mathematics in their first year of community college were substantially more likely to transfer. Agreements between CCC and CSU and UC mattered. The ADT and UC's Transfer Admission Guarantee (TAG) programs were critically important. Recent reforms to reduce remedial education at the CCC have made it possible for more students to have access to and complete college-level English and mathematics courses. This reform drove the largest change for the most students in memory. Therefore, the number of transfer-eligible students applying to UC would likely increase by at least 50 percent in the next four to five years. To accommodate this demand, UC and CCC must work together to help transfer-eligible students enroll. Programs like TAG and ADT were piecemeal, and agreements about lower division requirements for specific majors common to UC, CSU, and the CCC systems were needed. Accommodating this increase in transfer-eligible students would result in more diversity among college graduates. The promise of higher education—educational and economic mobility—would be realized.

Regent Zettel asked about student performance without prerequisite remediation courses in mathematics and English. Mr. Johnson replied that success rates from placing students in college-level courses were higher for every group than when prerequisite remediation courses were required. Some students in co-requisite remediation and college-level courses performed just as well in subsequent courses. PPIC was examining when co-requisite remediation was effective. While long-standing equity differences persisted, there had been huge gains in college-level completion among African American, Latino(a), and other underrepresented students. Ms. Siqueiros added that remedial education represented the soft bigotry of low expectations. The Regents had the power to remove practices that did not serve students equitably and to ensure that educational institutions promoted greater equity and access.

Regent Stegura asked about the prevalence of academic counseling in community colleges and high schools in order that students knew which courses to take. Ms. Siqueiros stated that there were not enough counselors, so systemic reform and alignment of requirements were critical. Transfer was a very complicated process. Regent Ortiz Oakley noted that CCC students often did not have a network of family or others to advise them. UC should take responsibility to make the path as clear as possible. Students should not have to choose where to transfer before selecting courses.

Regent Kounalakis noted that, with over two million students enrolled in the CCC system, the opportunity to attend a community college was part of the fabric of the California experience. She underscored that the ADT, pathways, and efforts to help CCC students had made an enormous difference in transfer rates. However, she had heard anecdotally from students that the transfer process was difficult to navigate, especially because the requirements were different for UC and CSU. UC, CSU, and CCC had the ability to create an easier process, and she urged more to be done. She commended Regent Ortiz Oakley for his efforts to simplify the process.

Regent Mart asked whether there was capacity at CSU and UC to accept all eligible transfer students. Regent Ortiz Oakley commented that this was an issue that UC should strive to have. He suggested revisiting the policy governing the admission of transfer students, including whether the ratio of freshmen to transfer students should stay the same, which was in the Regents' purview. As Chancellor of the CCC, Regent Ortiz Oakley sought contracts with universities across the country to create access for CCC students. If students had done everything asked of them in order to transfer, the University should enroll them. The State must fund greater capacity at CSU and UC, and CSU and UC should prioritize capacity.

Regent Lansing asked whether students were guaranteed admission to CSU and UC if they completed all transfer requirements. Regent Ortiz Oakley replied that this was the case for CSU, although the student would not necessarily be admitted to the campus of their choice. Some eligible students were unable to transfer for financial or other reasons. Monica Lin, Director of A-G and Transfer Policy Analysis and Coordination, replied that, for UC, a student who fulfilled the requirements of the Transfer Admission Guarantee (TAG), which is available at six of nine UC campuses, was guaranteed admission to the student's chosen campus and intended major.

Regent Lansing asked about UC's two-to-one ratio of freshman admits to transfer admits. Ms. Lin responded that this ratio was a target admissions rate and included TAG students and general transfer students. UC was nearing this target at a ratio of 1.9 to one. Mr. Johnson added that the TAG was UC's version of the Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT). The vast majority of students did not complete the TAG; many students were not even aware of it. UC Berkeley, UCLA, and UCSD did not participate in the TAG due to capacity constraints. Unlike the A-G requirements for freshman admissions, there was no agreed-upon set of lower-division course requirements for transfer admissions. He advocated developing consistent requirements across the segments of higher education. Regent Lansing called for guaranteeing admission to eligible CCC or CSU students who wished to transfer to UC.

Staff Advisor Tseng stated she would like to learn more about whether UC had the capacity to provide transfer engagement and alumni engagement.

Student Observer Amine El Moznine, a UC Berkeley transfer student, remarked that transfer pathways were a step in the right direction and agreed that there was a need for greater clarity and consistency across campuses on which classes were needed. CCC enrollment had dropped during the pandemic; students who had the least support were putting their college educations on hold. Mr. Moznine suggested a roadmap from the community colleges in order to reengage these students and ensure that they could transfer. Otherwise, there would be a generation of marginalized students and the progress made would be lost. He also suggested amending transfer requirements during the pandemic.

4. UNDERGRADUATE TRANSFER TO 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.]

Regent Ortiz Oakley introduced Henry Shannon, President of Chaffey College. Mr. Shannon remarked that the segments of California higher education were a model for other states. Chaffey College, which was located in San Bernardino County and enrolled 20,000 students, epitomized the successes of the transfer system. Chaffey College was a Hispanic-serving institution, and most students were first-generation students. Chaffey College students' application, admission, and enrollment to UC increased in the last decade. In 2019–20, two-thirds of Chaffey College students who applied to UC were admitted, and 79 percent of those who transferred to UC were students of color. Most students transferred to UC Riverside, followed by UC Irvine, UC San Diego, and UCLA. For the UCR transfer process, Chaffey College worked directly with UCR staff, and Chaffey College graduates at UCR helped students with their UCR applications. Chaffey College enjoyed high student success rates. Mr. Shannon asked that UC share its data on transfer student outcomes so that Chaffey College could better serve its students. He wished to work with UC to boost Chaffey College graduates' confidence regarding attending UC and to demystify the UC financial aid process.

Regent Ortiz Oakley shared that he and former President Napolitano had signed a memorandum of understanding (MOU) on improving the transfer process. The four-year transfer graduate rate at UC was 89 percent, which was on par with the freshman graduation rate. Community college students were ready for a UC education and needed to be valued like freshman admits. These students would benefit greatly from a University education, and UC will benefit greatly from them, but these students lacked the network to understand the Transfer Agreement Guarantee. The process should be as easy to understand as possible.

Laura Hope, Associate Superintendent of Instruction and Institutional Effectiveness at Chaffey College, stated that San Bernardino County had a dearth of bachelor's degrees, so Chaffey College was committed to ensuring that students earn baccalaureate degrees for social and economic mobility. In 2016, Chaffey College formalized its relationship with UC Riverside. Ms. Hope shared the themes that arose from this partnership. The first was significant synergy and collaboration. California State University (CSU), San Bernardino, UCR, and Chaffey College built an alliance to help students without a network or capital navigate the transfer process. The second theme was transparency. Chaffey College made more aspects of the transfer process transparent to students. The last theme was intentionality, both in determining challenges and addressing them.

For Chaffey College students, visiting UC Riverside with a former Chaffey student made a significant difference. Seeing a Chaffey graduate on campus helped boost their confidence in their ability to transfer to and be competitive at UC. More personal attention to the transfer process was also helpful, but individual efforts, such as hand-delivering applications and transcripts to UCR, were not systemic reforms. Hopefully, this

conversation might bring about more systemic reforms. Chaffey College staff needed more training on the UC application and application review processes. Chaffey College needed access to comprehensive student data, and, most importantly, needed CSU and UC to share their transfer requirements. Through Regent Ortiz Oakley's leadership, the CCC system was working to implement the Guided Pathways framework to reduce time-to-completion and the number of required units for transfer. Students were acquiring multiple associate degrees to meet both CSU and UC transfer requirements, which took more time and money and created confusion. Working with UCR shed some light on the transfer process, but much of it remained unclear. She implored the Regents to consider formally adopting the Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) so that students would not have to meet the requirements of two public systems before deciding where to transfer.

Emily Engelschall, Interim Associate Vice Chancellor of Enrollment Management at UC Riverside, stated that the Riverside campus was trying to create a transfer access point and key partnerships with Inland Empire community colleges. In 2020–21, the campus expected to enroll over 2,300 California resident transfer students, a 53 percent increase from 2016–17. After UC Riverside and Chaffey College signed the MOU to increase community college transfer to UC in 2016, transfers from Chaffey College to UCR increased by 23 percent. This partnership had three essential components. The first was understanding Chaffey College students' barriers to transfer. UCR dedicated an admissions counselor and student representative to Chaffey College after learning from one focus group that Chaffey College students lacked the confidence to transfer to UC and did not know about available financial aid programs. Since 2016, UCR had conducted 50 visits to Chaffey College for advising, tabling, and workshops. Another component was providing Chaffey College students opportunities to engage with UCR staff and faculty, ensuring mentorship. Chaffey College students were bussed to UCR events and were able to network with Chaffey College transfers in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields. A financial aid literacy counselor explained the Blue and Gold Program and the net cost of attendance. UCR also created transfer documents specific to Chaffey College. The third component was data sharing of key milestones during the admissions process. As a result of the efforts of the consortium of UCR, CSU San Bernardino, and Chaffey College, final transcripts from students who wished to transfer to UCR were delivered directly to the campus. Institutionalizing and broadening the scope of data sharing could ease community college students' transition to UC, and more work needed to be done.

Ebony Lewis, Executive Director of Undergraduate Admissions at UC Davis, stated that about 36 percent of students entering in fall 2020 were transfer students, and about 95 percent of newly enrolled transfer students, many of whom were first-generation, low-income, and underrepresented students, came from the CCC system. UCD was the only UC campus to have a community college, Sacramento City College, on campus, which strengthened UCD's relationship with the Los Rios Community College District and provided students with greater exposure to UC. About 58 percent of Los Rios Community College District students transferring to UC went to UC Davis. Through the Transfer Opportunity Program, UC was partnering with 20 community colleges for additional services such as advising. The Aggie Transfer Scholars Weekend helped prepare students

who intended to transfer to UC, and Aggie To Be worked with high school students. UC Davis provided advising through the Transfer Admission Planner (TAP) and Transfer Admission Guarantee (TAG) programs, with a focus on underrepresented student organizations. Connecting CCC students with current students and resources was critical. The College Futures Partnership was a data sharing agreement among UCD, Sacramento State University, Los Rios Community College District, Sacramento Unified School District, and UC Merced.

Faculty Representative Horwitz shared Faculty Representative Gauvain's remarks. Ms. Gauvain shared that she had been a transfer student at UC Irvine. The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates, which included the academic leadership from the CCC, CSU, and UC systems, met regularly to discuss higher education matters, and a recent topic was transfer. In 2015, UC introduced the UC Transfer Pathways, which described the requirements for the 20 most sought after majors and was also related to the TAG. In 2019, Pathways Plus was launched to help students navigate UC Transfer Pathways and the TAG most effectively and was suited for students interested in one of 20 transfer pathways. Through Pathways Plus, eligible students were guaranteed admission to a specified UC campus for a specified major. The UC Academic Senate was working to identify lower division courses that would go toward completion of the pathway majors and graduation within two years after transfer, and was working with the CCC Academic Senate to provide that information to potential transfer students.

Dolores Davison, California Community Colleges Academic Senate President, stated that progress on the ADT had been slow because of an inability to secure faculty participation, as well as issues with some CSU campuses and majors. Overcoming these issues would require resources and structural changes to admissions. Nearly five years ago, the CSU and UC Academic Senates proposed a transfer pathway for chemistry and physics, but few community colleges were able to create an ADT that provided the necessary coursework. A pilot program with a revised transfer pathway framework was approved for this fall, but information now being given differed from what was agreed upon. Students who could navigate the different transfer pathways were not first-generation or under-resourced students. UC Transfer Pathways did not include CCC faculty, which made attempts to align CSU and UC pathways difficult. The TAG required more paperwork and was only available at six of the nine undergraduate UC campuses. UC campuses needed clear direction from the Office of the President, and faculty needed the support of both UC and CSU system offices.

5. **THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT TRANSFER EXPERIENCE**

[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.]

Regent Muwwakkil underscored the importance of making research opportunities available to all UC students and stressed that UC must explicitly explain the logistics of college attendance to community college transfer students, who did not have the same

amount of time as freshman admits to learn them. He shared that he transferred to UCLA after ten years in the California Community College system. His lack of experience as a first-generation student contributed to this delay. The transfer process took much guesswork, and it was difficult to book time with counselors, who sometimes provided inconsistent information. Accessing transcripts was very expensive and complicated, especially since he attended many community colleges. The Center for Community College Partnerships at UCLA helped him greatly, but outreach programs tended to be funded at the California Community College (CCC) level. UC needed to be more clear about transfer requirements and the time it takes for a transfer student to graduate from UC. Regent Muwwakkil expressed his hope that this conversation would continue. Benefitting transfer students benefitted the wider community, which aligned with the UC mission.

Valerie Johnson, a UC Berkeley transfer student, stated that she was serving in the UC Student Association (UCSA), the Associated Students at UC Berkeley, as well as on the UC-CCC Transfer Task Force. Despite her acceptance into UCB, her dream school, she continued to experience “imposter syndrome” and lacked guidance. Ms. Johnson spent her first semester on the Berkeley campus seeking resources when she could have connected with professors or sought research opportunities. The two-year timeline passed quickly for transfer students, and there was a transfer student community but not always the infrastructure or space to help it grow. She chaired the systemwide UCSA transfer coalition and learned that transfer struggles were replicated systemwide. Transfer students lacked representation in decision-making, and the lack of systemwide planning meant a lack of transfer resources. She expressed excitement that the Student Regents this year were transfer students, and she hoped to see increased systemwide attention to and Regental-level improvements for this population of students. She suggested forming a systemwide transfer committee that reported to the Regents. The lack of resources could affect transfer graduation rates, and transfer student centers serving as a centralized resource would give transfer students more time to make connections and pursue extracurricular activities. UC Berkeley’s transfer center informed Ms. Johnson about the Educational Opportunity Program, which provided wraparound services to low-income students. Transfer students had the capabilities and ingenuity to succeed but needed more support, including tailored counseling, fully staffed transfer centers, and UC policies for transfer pathways.

Regent-designate Zaragoza shared that she entered Modesto Junior College, serving on the Community College Board, and stayed there for three years because of the time she spent becoming politically active. She attended three other community colleges at the same time, which was common for students pursuing classes that were not available at their campus, and earned two degrees. Despite having two jobs while at Modesto Junior College, Regent-designate Zaragoza still accumulated debt because many community colleges did not offer student loans at the time. In addition to UC debt, she had \$20,000 of additional debt, which was also typical of community college students due to the lack of financial resources. Transcript and application fees totaled hundreds of dollars, and a work colleague lent her the money to apply to UC Berkeley. Cal Grant reform could help transfer students enter UC without as much debt, which affected transfer student retention. Many transfer students did not participate in graduate school preparation programs, research programs, and leadership experiences, and this created a barrier to pursuing graduate school. Resources

were unavailable to transfer students, and programs had prohibitive recommendation letter and grade requirements. Transfer students' first-semester grades tended to be their lowest, and they could not use community college grades to apply for programs.

Samantha Kaplan, a UCLA transfer student, stated that she worked at the UCLA Transfer Student Center, served in the UCLA Undergraduate Student Association, and served on the UC-CCC Transfer Task Force. Prior to transferring, Ms. Kaplan attended Moorpark College, where she experienced tremendous self-growth, sat on the board of a national honor society, and completed an honors program. Despite being well-equipped to transfer, she experienced self-doubt and engaged in self-sabotage. Her family encouraged her to apply to UCLA, where she found a wonderful transfer student community fighting to eliminate the stigma and challenges associated with transfer. Half of communications the Transfer Student Center received came from prospective transfer students who had many questions about transfer requirements and the transfer process but Transfer Student Center staff such as Ms. Kaplan were students, not counselors. Transfer students across the state had made great strides in addressing transfer issues but needed more representation, unity, clear pathways, and active support at every stage of the transfer experience, which was crucial. Transfer students should not have to base life-altering decisions on the availability of resources. Ms. Kaplan expressed her hope that this conversation would lead to better policies and a better future for the transfer student community.

Regent Park encouraged transfer students to persevere despite experiencing imposter syndrome. She suggested creating a list of goals and a timeline. Committee Chair Leib stated that he would meet with Regent Ortiz Oakley and others to determine what should be on the such a list. Regent Pérez echoed Regent Park's words of encouragement.

The meeting adjourned at 12:10 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff