

The Regents of the University of California

ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

November 17, 2021

The Academic and Student Affairs Committee met on the above date at UCSF-Mission Bay Conference Center, 1675 Owens Street, San Francisco and by teleconference meeting conducted in accordance with Paragraph 3 of Governor Newsom’s Executive Order N-29-20.

Members present: Regents Anguiano, Elliott, Hernandez, Lansing, Park, and Torres; Ex officio members Drake and Estolano, Advisory members Blas Pedral, Cochran, and Timmons; Chancellors Block, Larive, May, and Yang; Staff Advisor Tseng

In attendance: Faculty Representative Horwitz, Assistant Secretary Lyall, General Counsel Robinson, Provost Brown, Vice Presidents Brown and Gullatt, and Recording Secretary Li

The meeting convened at 1:40 p.m. with Committee Chair Park presiding.

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

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of September 28, 2021 were approved, Regents Anguiano, Elliott, Hernandez, Lansing, Park, and Torres voting “aye.”¹

2. **UPDATE ON ELIGIBILITY IN THE LOCAL CONTEXT**

[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 Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) drew UC-qualified, California resident students from among the top nine percent of each participating high school based on the grade point average (GPA) for A–G courses. One of two UC eligibility pathways, ELC compared students within the same local context and was a critical tool for broadening geographic and other diversity among UC undergraduate students. In fall 2020, 40 percent of the admitted class were ELC students, and seven percent were ELC-only students. Recently, the State Auditor recommended that the Office of the President (UCOP) resume annual outreach regarding ELC participation, which had been discontinued in 2012 when ELC eligibility was expanded from the top four percent to the top nine percent.

Executive Director of Undergraduate Admissions Han Mi Yoon-Wu explained that participating schools must be accredited, be located in California, offer the minimum A–G courses needed for UC admission, and obtain parent or guardian authorization to share

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

student transcripts with UCOP. Currently, over 1,600 schools were participating in ELC, representing 86 percent of eligible schools. Each year, less than one dozen schools have withdrawn from ELC, often due to closure. As part of renewed outreach efforts, UCOP requested that the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) extend ELC eligibility to online and virtual schools, contacted nearly 1,000 schools regardless of eligibility, and surveyed 950 non-participating schools. UCOP found that some schools had closed or had not provided updated accreditation documentation. As of September, 53 new schools joined ELC. According to feedback, UC needed to increase awareness about ELC and its benefits. UCOP developed the following annual strategy: engage non-participating school with active and complete A–G course lists, engage online and virtual schools, host an ELC webinar every spring and provide written information to a counselor and advisor bulletin, survey non-participating schools, and streamline student-level data sharing.

Regent Torres recalled that, at the last meeting, he had asked what UCOP was doing to increase admission of African American students to UC. He reiterated his offer to work with UCOP and suggested that the California Legislative Black Caucus be included in these efforts. Committee Chair Park asked UCOP to contact Regent Torres.

Regent Lansing asked what made a school ineligible for ELC, noting that ineligible schools might have the most underserved students. Ms. Yoon-Wu replied that a school needed to offer a minimum of 15 A–G courses in various subjects. Regent Lansing, referring to the written materials, noted that 1,500 high schools did not offer A–G courses and that several hundred schools offered A–G courses but were not participating in ELC. She attributed non-participation to lack of awareness and stated the University must reach out to eligible schools. UC also had a responsibility to inform students, particularly in underserved and highest-poverty areas, where they could access A–G courses. Regent Lansing did not believe that UC would be successful in recruiting underserved students without all 3,700 California high schools participating in ELC. Vice President Gullatt stated that not every school met ELC criteria. UC asked the 2,200 schools why they were not participating, and reasons included administrative burden or not having enough students to make the process worthwhile. With Student Academic Preparation and Educational Partnerships (SAPEP) funding, UC would be able to help those schools become ready to participate in ELC in the future. The University also reached out to ineligible schools to determine if UC could help them.

Regent Lansing suggested that UC send staff to schools to help with the administrative aspects of ELC participation. Ms. Gullatt noted this was the first year that alternative schools joined ELC.

Chancellor Larive noted that the UC Scout website had a list of UC-approved A–G courses that it offered. A SAPEP program, UC Scout helped schools and individual students.

Regent Hernandez asked if ELC students were guaranteed admission into UC. Mr. Brown responded in the affirmative. In response to Regent Hernandez's question, Mr. Brown

clarified that ELC students were guaranteed admission into the system but not necessarily their campus of choice.

Regent Hernandez, referring to the written materials, noted increasing ELC admissions from 2018 to 2020 with the exception of UC Irvine, which had a declining admission rate. Ms. Yoon-Wu responded that UC Irvine's popularity has increased significantly in recent years. With more applicants and more admitted students wishing to attend UCI, the campus would have to enroll a smaller percentage of admitted students.

Regent-designate Blas Pedral asked how schools that joined ELC from 2012 to 2020 learned about the program and where these schools were located. Ms. Yoon-Wu replied that UCOP spoke about ELC at conferences and workshops, and that new schools contacted UC as they became eligible. Schools that joined ELC were spread throughout the state. Mr. Brown added that the intent of ELC was to expand access and college preparedness throughout the state, and it did have that effect.

Regent-designate Blas Pedral asked about the legal requirements for sharing student-level data. Ms. Yoon-Wu explained that this was a privacy issue. Schools have traditionally chosen to have parents opt in to release student data to the University, and UCOP was consulting the Office of the General Counsel (OGC) to determine if schools could have an opt-out process instead. It would still be the school's and the school district's prerogative how they would obtain authorization from parents and guardians.

Committee Chair Park asked for more information about ELC schools that did not meet statewide index requirements and suggested generating maps of non-ELC schools in order to focus the University's outreach. She emphasized the potential of UC Scout and suggested experimenting with various models using the program, such as hybrid or team-teaching. She noted that when the authorization issue was being brought to parents was also important, and she asked to be apprised of OGC's determination. Noting high participation rates in the past, Committee Chair Park asked to see historical ELC participation data, particularly participation trends over time. Mr. Brown replied that the potential of ELC was not only in student eligibility, but also building schools college-sending capacity and putting resources where they were needed. In his view, ELC aligned with Governor Newsom's agenda of recovery with equity. Ms. Gullatt stressed the importance of keeping momentum in outreach, and that educational partnership centers could connect with admissions offices to help schools without the requisite A-G courses.

Regent-designate Timmons asked if UC Scout was subsidized by UC or school districts. Ms. Gullatt replied that, as a SAPEP program, UC Scout was subsidized by the State and the University. UC Scout offered three models of service delivery at a very reasonable cost and was expanded during the COVID-19 pandemic as schools needed high-quality, interactive courses for students. Committee Chair Park added that K-12 schools could use some materials for free. Executive Director Ehren Koepf was interested in expanding the scholarship aspect so that UC Scout could be offered to students in need at no cost. The paid model would not be used to expand access to A-G courses. Committee Chair Park called for advocating the permanent restoration of SAPEP.

3. **THE STUDENT EXPERIENCE WITH FINANCIAL AID**

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

Provost Brown explained that Regent-designate Blas Pedral had asked for more information about the student experience with financial aid. The University deployed about \$3.6 billion annually in undergraduate financial support, including \$1.1 billion of UC-funded support. While UC has occasionally relied on estimates, students' lived experiences varied. Mr. Brown briefly introduced the presenters.

UC Davis Interim Associate Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Management Deborah Agee shared her experience as a low-income, single parent college student and her struggle to apply for financial aid. Access to financial aid information continued to present a significant barrier for first-generation students. As an administrator, she now focused on regulations, annual audits, logistics, and operations, but she believed that UC should focus not only on the soundness of its policies, but also on students accessing the help they need.

Ms. Agree shared recent innovations in financial aid at UC Davis. The financial aid office made forms available online, could receive student documents submitted via mobile phone, and automated financial aid delivery. These changes gave staff more time to meet with students. Financial aid offices must find ways to help students despite bureaucracy, and there was an opportunity to learn from campus basic needs centers, which were welcoming places for students. During the COVID-19 pandemic, the federal government allowed financial aid offices to pay work-study students even if they could not work. UC also provided \$690 million in emergency aid grants graduate and undergraduate students across the system. Financial aid offices found that many students wished to continue meeting remotely, which presented another opportunity to meet students' needs.

UC Davis undergraduate student Stephanie Piñeda shared that, coming from a low-income community, she did not believe attending UC was possible and had not considered leaving her hometown. She feared that applying for federal financial aid would result in the deportation of her undocumented parents. After being accepted at UC Davis, Ms. Piñeda's ability to attend depended on how much financial aid she would receive. As a first-generation student with undocumented parents, she continued to experience anxiety and face barriers after enrolling. When she was selected for Federal Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) verification, she translated the documents for her parents and completed the forms. Ms. Piñeda later sought help from the financial aid office, where she was reassured that submitting sensitive documents would not harm her parents. She applied to work at the financial aid office and was hired, and the regular income helped cover food costs when she could not afford a meal plan. At the onset of the pandemic, she stopped working when the campus closed, and both her parents lost their jobs. Before the financial aid office helped Ms. Piñeda sign up for CalFresh, she was rationing her meals. She eventually received an emergency relief grant and began working from home, which restored her financial stability. Through her work at the financial aid office, she has learned more about the financial aid process and helped other students in similar situations.

UC Santa Barbara undergraduate student Yuval Cohen stated that choosing which university to attend was primarily a financial decision. As a first-generation student, she applied for financial aid without her family's help. As a Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) recipient, she had fewer financial aid options. UCSB provided her with scholarships to cover her expenses and she qualified for in-state tuition under Assembly Bill (AB) 540. The campus' help with the financial aid process made the decision to attend UCSB easier. During the pandemic, Ms. Cohen lost her on-campus job, and her father lost his job, and she regularly commuted to Los Angeles to help her family. The UCSB Financial Crisis Response Team, which gave her a housing grant and a meal, has promptly assisted many students. Ms. Cohen did not qualify for a Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act grant; however, she was able to receive an American Rescue Plan (ARP) Act grant that sustained her through the peak of the pandemic. She did not qualify for CalFresh, but UCSB Undocumented Student Services (USS) provided her with grocery vouchers. She was able to research her options, but other students might not have the same access to information. Programs like USS and the Financial Crisis Response Team needed more funding to meet demand. She suggested lowering the self-help contribution amount, because loans were often insufficient and undocumented students were not eligible for federal work-study.

Regent-designate Blas Pedral cautioned against holding financial aid meetings via teleconference, because students might not be able to find a quiet place to discuss private matters. She asked if students could apply for more aid from the Higher Education Emergency Relief Fund. Ms. Agee responded that financial aid offices were releasing the third round of HEERF grants; UC Davis dispersed an additional \$45 million. While UC did not anticipate more federal pandemic relief funds for students, they could always appeal to their financial aid office for more aid. At UC Davis, the financial aid office partnered with the basic needs center to provide assistance to students. UC Davis students had the option of interacting with the financial aid office via email or in person, and meetings could be private, at a walk-up window, or via teleconference. The campus found that teleconference meetings were more sought after than expected. Executive Director of Student Financial Support Shawn Brick added that there was \$15 million in emergency funding from the State budget, which might ease financial burdens in the winter and spring.

Regent-designate Blas Pedral asked how many work-study jobs were available to students. Ms. Agee replied that she did not know the exact number, but she shared that UC Davis was trying to understand why it had difficulty hiring student workers. Perhaps students were uncomfortable with the level of interaction in positions at dining halls or as bus drivers. UCD was also trying to hire more peer advisors and campus tour guides. The work-study program was small in comparison with the overarching student employment on campus. Mr. Brick stated that about 11,000 students had work-study jobs systemwide, about five percent of total student employment. There were more job openings than interested students at other campuses as well, likely an effect of the pandemic.

Committee Chair Park asked the student speakers what changes they would make to the University's financial aid process. Ms. Cohen suggested improving access to services. Without federal assistance, undocumented students did not know what services were

available, and more funding for services was needed. Ms. Piñeda suggested more outreach to first-generation students, who were often a resource to their own families. Students did not know what was available to them.

Committee Chair Park noted that, according to a uASPIRE survey, financial aid administrators were not certain that students had the information they needed, and students were surprised by ancillary expenses. She asked how UC could bridge these knowledge gaps and how campuses could further their outreach. Mr. Brick expressed hope that student feedback would help improve the way financial aid offices communicate with students. Financial aid offices needed to better communicate not only net cost, but also what that net cost meant in the fall term. Ms. Agee suggested that inviting students to places where they could receive support, such as the undocumented student center, financial aid office, or career center, would be particularly helpful to less outgoing students. Ms. Cohen shared that UCSB USS invited every undocumented student to attend an informational meeting at the beginning of the school year. Financial aid offices could do something similar.

Staff Advisor Tseng shared that UCLA raised \$285,000 in 14 days for its Economic Crisis Response Fund at the beginning of the pandemic, which supported safe housing, internet access, telephone bills, and computer equipment for students. She invited UC to continue being creative in its financial support ideas. When student basic needs are met, student affairs staff would be able to provide services other than basic needs and emotional support.

Chancellor Block stated that about 10,500 students had on-campus jobs at UCLA.

Chancellor May thanked Ms. Piñeda, Ms. Cohen, and Ms. Agee for sharing their personal stories. He added that Ms. Agee's personal history informed the compassion in her work.

Committee Chair Park stated that this presentation was part of a series on financial aid. Future topics included expected family contribution and the path to debt-free college.

4. **THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA GRADUATE STUDENT 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.]

Provost Brown stated that, in spring 2021, the University administered its first Graduate Student Experience Survey (UCGSES), a companion resource to the UC Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES). UCGSES consolidated items from prior graduate student surveys and incorporated input from stakeholders such as graduate deans and students. This survey would provide insights from students in academic doctoral and master's programs, professional doctoral and master's programs, and professional practice degrees. This new resource was now available to support campuses and Regents items.

Vice President Pamela Brown stated that, like UCUES, UCGSES was meant to provide insight into the student experience and help UC prioritize outreach. The Office of the President (UCOP) planned to administer UCGSES on years that it was not administering

UCUES. Detailed survey results were sent to the campuses, and results were also published online in the UC Information Center. Ms. Brown gave a demonstration of the UCGSES dashboard in the UC Information Center, as well as an overview of the results. The dashboard compared the overall population with respondents to determine response rates and whether respondents reflected the overall population. Surveys helped UC collect information that it did not have centrally such as data on first-generation graduate students. UCGSES collected data on advising and mentorship, program quality, climate, and career progress, which could support academic program review and Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) accreditation efforts. Financial and mental health data would help campuses enhance graduate health and wellness programs, support professional development workshops, and engage faculty and student leadership on critical issues. UCGSES asked respondents to prioritize areas that needed attention or resources. Overall, graduate students identified financial support, faculty advising and mentorship, and professional and skills development as top priorities. The order of these priorities differed by program. Data could be filtered by various demographics, academic discipline, and campus. Tabular data were also available and could be filtered by category.

Chancellor May shared that, according to graduate students at UC Davis, these surveys were fairly long and that it took time to tabulate and present these data. He asked if UCOP could administer shorter surveys that could be reported quickly. Ms. Brown replied that UCGSES was administered from spring to summer 2021, and results were published last week. She acknowledged that this survey was longer than other previously administered surveys, adding that UCOP would be evaluating the utility of the data collected with graduate deans and others. UCOP tried to consolidate different surveys to avoid “survey fatigue” from numerous surveys. Provost Brown stated that UCOP would continue considering survey methodology.

Regent Anguiano, noting the large number of graduate students who reported experiencing depression, asked how this would be addressed. Noting that 40 percent of doctoral students somewhat disagreed or disagreed about the quality of their program, she asked how a curriculum was reviewed in academic program review. Ms. Brown replied that 38 percent of graduate students reported experiencing depression in the UC Graduate Student Well-Being Survey administered in 2016. Forty-one percent reported experiencing depression in UCGSES, which was administered during the COVID-19 pandemic. Data from UCUES and UCGSES reflected a challenging time. Graduate deans became very focused on student mental health after the Graduate Student Well-Being Survey, and UCOP would continue to discuss opportunities with them. Campuses could examine these data by program and direct support where it was needed. With regard to program reviews, isolating survey data by program would be helpful to campuses. Provost Brown stated that these data could now be given to program review teams. With regard to mental health data, he noted that the pandemic has been severely disruptive to the entire UC community. Drawing from his training as a psychologist, he explained that people would experience depression in response to such a situation. The pandemic has not only had an impact on students; UC had data indicating the impact of the pandemic on faculty and staff mental health. This issue might require a more concerted and broad-based focus. Chancellor Block added that the campuses were in alignment with national mental health trends. UCLA observed a decrease

in the use of telehealth during remote instruction, possibly due to privacy issues. After the campus reopened, there was a noticeable increase in telehealth visits. He hoped the student depression would decrease over time.

Regent-designate Blas Pedral noted that underrepresented graduate students reported less confidence in their financial situation. She asked how UC could mitigate stressors and what services it could offer to this population of students. Ms. Brown replied that the University has continued to seek ways to provide additional support and better communicate available services. In UCUES, students reported lower confidence in managing finances but greater confidence doing so with existing resources. With cohort-based tuition, undergraduate students would know their tuition costs over time, which could be helpful. Campuses were considering providing multi-year funding packages to give graduate students more confidence and support, especially academic doctoral students. Provost Brown added that subsets of graduate students experienced certain issues disproportionately, and there were equity gaps that needed to be closed.

Chancellor Larive stated that, through her experience mentoring graduate students, she observed a relationship between feelings of depression and career prospects and opportunities for professional development. She saw a correlation in UCGSES responses. There were additional opportunities to prepare graduate students, such as helping them see the value of their degrees, providing professional development, helping them envision new career pathways, along with more robust mental health support.

Committee Chair Park asked chancellors if there were any surprising survey results and if there were items that were immediately actionable. Chancellor May replied that there were not many surprises. UC Davis was trying to provide the same basic needs resources to graduate students that the campus was providing to undergraduate students. Chancellor Larive replied that disagreement regarding family/student life balance and campus support at UCSC was higher than she anticipated. The UCSC Slug Support Program provided emergency funding and housing, food support, and case management. Graduate students did not feel comfortable visiting Slug Support because the students they were teaching might be there, so a Slug Support staff member was now stationed in the graduate division. Chancellor Block agreed that there were not many surprises. Graduate students needed many of the same support services as undergraduate students, which demonstrated a culture shift from the past. With fewer positions available, many graduate students were not going to have the jobs of the past and needed support for alternate careers, such as UC Extension certificates or help from business and management schools, to reduce their anxiety.

Committee Chair Park asked Ms. Brown if there were differences in responses based on a graduate student's program year. Ms. Brown replied that UCOP would perform this analysis and predicted that there would be variations in responses in doctoral programs, particularly those closer to candidacy. Similar patterns were observed in earlier surveys.

Committee Chair Park noted the responses of African American, American Indian, Hispanic/Latino(a) academic doctoral students regarding feelings of inclusion of respect and called for improvement.

5. **GROWING OUR OWN: GRADUATE ENROLLMENT AND DIVERSIFYING PH.D. PATHWAYS**

[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 Growing Our Own initiative sought to advance educational equity and to diversify the pathway to the professoriate by increasing the proportion of Ph.D. students that come from UC, the California State University (CSU), Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs), historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs), and Tribal Colleges and Universities (TCUs). Targeting institutions with greater diversity would ensure future researchers better reflect and understand the state's diversity, and would also create an availability pool that supports UC, CSU, and the California Community Colleges' faculty diversity efforts. The University planned to request State support to grow graduate enrollment and hoped this initiative would garner support.

UC Merced Provost Gregg Camfield stated that educational institutions in the Central Valley were under-supported. Students were not transferring to UC Merced because partner community colleges lacked faculty to teach required courses. Many academic jobs were available. This was an intersegmental challenge; CSU was also concerned about diversifying its faculty. UC transfer students often came from the least diverse community college campuses. A diverse faculty improved student success by creating a better sense of belonging, was more just, and was more creative. At UC Merced, undergraduate research cultivated an interest in inquiry and made better citizens and employees. A high percentage of UCM students pursued academic graduate work, many at other UC campuses, and he wished to make this a deliberate effort. Summer research experiences should be available systemwide so that undergraduate students could create connections and the system could be made aware of the richness of the UC undergraduate population. Examples of lowering the threshold included mentorship and cohorts, which create a sense of belonging, and summer stipends for research experiences. He stated that white students from wealthier backgrounds tended to enter the professoriate because their families could afford unpaid internships and research experiences, which were needed for building a network and connections. UC could help provide these things to low-income and first-generation students without the same opportunities. UCM signed memoranda of understanding (MOUs) with a number of CSU campuses for a student exchange program, and was developing MOUs with five HBCUs and one university in Colorado with a student population that was 40 percent Native American. The Merced campus aimed to build a consortium for long-term mentorship programs, and to provide faculty from students within this consortium of schools.

UC Berkeley Graduate Dean Lisa García Bedolla stated that UC needed a systemwide strategic framework that connects incentives, resources, policies, practices, accountability, training and recognition to make a significant impact on the professoriate. UC needed to expose undergraduate students to research early and show them what a successful academic career is. UC has begun investing in outreach, recruitment, and maximizing the impact of research opportunities. Programs like Cal-Bridge were attracting students from CSU and

Minority Serving Institutions to doctoral study at UC. UC Berkeley was developing new strategies to improve departmental climates. In 2019, UCB faculty and students felt that the financial situation for doctoral students was untenable, while the Office of the President (UCOP) was urging campuses to adopt five-year guaranteed funding packages for all doctoral students. Ms. García Bedolla developed a plan that would provide a minimum five-year guarantee of \$34,000 per year for all UC Berkeley doctoral students. However, central funding for graduate students has been flat at UCB for over five years, so implementing this plan would require a significant decrease in the doctoral population and an increase in external funding. UC Berkeley could not attract diverse graduate students with insufficient funding packages. More privileged students could rely on family and other sources of support, but minority students were often on their own.

Provost Brown asked Ms. García Bedolla to share an example of the value of diversifying UC's graduate student population. Ms. García Bedolla shared an anecdote about an astrophysicist who, while losing her sight in graduate school, developed an intricate system to assign sounds to stars and studied them using her hearing. UC must consider who was being brought into its programs and how they were being trained. Ms. García Bedolla underscored the importance of including the full range of human capacity.

Chancellor May emphasized the critical role of faculty as role models and mentors. This could not be an administrative edict; ladder-rank faculty support and involvement were needed. UC could bring in mid- and late-career faculty from certain demographics to serve as mentors and help with this effort.

Faculty Representative Cochran noted that the UC President's Postdoctoral Fellowship Program (PPFP) has been successful at diversifying faculty and received over 1,000 apps per year for 24 spots. Mr. Brown added that, following President Drake's outreach, the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation expanded the humanities aspect of PPFP by \$15 million over five years. More could be done across the system and across the segments. Mr. Camfield noted that there were many successful diversity programs that were too small. He called for an intersegmental request of State investment in these efforts. Furthermore, the high technology industry was eager for diversity in order to appeal to a wider clientele, and the same was true of other fields as well. The PPFP rewarded faculty participation. Funding for summer undergraduate research would also support graduate students as mentors. Graduate faculty would not have to worry about their students finding summer placements.

Regent-designate Blas Pedral asked if there were programs that support first-generation graduate students pursuing unpaid internships. For example, the UC Berkeley School of Law offered an Edley Grant for students in a public interest internship. This allowed students to seek mentorship, hands-on experience, and opportunities working in the community. Mr. Brown replied that this type of support needed to be built into existing programs. He noted that transfer students did not have the same amount of time to look for research experiences that would prepare them for a career in scholarship, so summer experiences were vital to transfer students as well.

Chancellor Larive stated that all undergraduate campuses had summer programs that engaged transfer students in research opportunities. UCSC was involved with Cal-Bridge, a partnership of UC and CSU campuses that created a pathway for underrepresented students to earn a Ph.D. in the physical sciences, where students from this demographic were particularly underrepresented. Chancellor Larive underscored the importance of such intersegmental efforts. Cal-Bridge was achieving very good results. In her view, UC should take advantage of existing programs that were successful by expanding them.

Regent Hernandez shared that he had received the GEM Fellowship while pursuing his graduate degree at UC Santa Barbara. UC should make a more concerted effort to make programs like National Science Foundation (NSF) fellowships known to students. The Southern California Hub, for instance, could identify students interested in pursuing graduate degrees. Regent Hernandez envisioned a partnership between UC, students, and industry. In his view, students would pursue a graduate education if they are made aware of a pathway early in their undergraduate careers.

Chancellor Block stated that the PFP has been very helpful for hiring faculty. UCLA had a Chancellor's Postdoctoral Fellowship Program, and several campuses had similar programs of their own. Chancellor Block highlighted the importance of early investment. He recalled appointing an African American biologist for a postdoctoral grant when he led an NSF Center about 20 years ago, and recently learned that UCLA recruited him as a distinguished professor several years ago.

Committee Chair Park, referring to the written materials, asked why the goal of recruiting academic doctoral students from UC, CSU, HBCUs, HSIs, and TCUs was set at 41 percent. Vice President Brown replied that goals were set based on what campuses identified as possible given existing resources. Committee Chair Park asked if a goal could be set higher with more available resources. Vice President Brown and Provost Brown responded in the affirmative. Committee Chair Park suggested that the University distinguish realistic goals from desired goals. Ms. García Bedolla noted that UC needed a multi-faceted set of resources that could profoundly change intellectual life and meet different types of student needs, such as those of parenting students. These resources were different from what they had been historically. Staffing and other support structures also needed to be changed.

Committee Chair Park, referring to a table in the written materials, asked if UC conducted any surveys to better understand why a lower percentage of African American Ph.D. recipients wished to stay within the UC system. Mr. Camfield replied that there was a substantial body of research on the high percentage of minority Ph.D. recipients, especially African American Ph.D. recipients, who departed academy when they complete their degrees. In the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) fields, postdoctoral programs were multi-year extensions of graduate education; they were financially precarious and difficult for those with families, and the prospect for employment was not particularly good. UC Merced launched a faculty diversity initiative six years ago that hired Ph.D. recipients after sending them elsewhere for a postdoctoral placement.

Committee Chair Park reiterated her question, noting that the table in the written materials compared all UC Ph.D. alumni working as tenure-track faculty or lecturers. Ms. Brown replied that there were data from prior alumni surveys that could be examined. Provost Brown added that Vice Provost Carlson was overseeing a data infrastructure initiative using UC Recruit that would allow the evaluation of University recruitment efforts. Chancellor Yang added that not every discipline's Ph.D. recipients entered academia. Two Gates Fellows at UCSB, both minority Ph.D. students, had job offers or plans to creating their own company after graduation. Some STEM Ph.D. recipients have decided to work for government, National Laboratories, or private industry. Committee Chair Park remarked that the University would want those who remain in academia to choose UC.

6. **THE CHANGING LANDSCAPE OF TRANSFER POLICY 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.]

Provost Brown stated that the University has engaged with the California State University (CSU) and the California Community Colleges in ongoing policy work to support incoming transfer students' academic preparation and to strengthen the transfer pipeline.

Director of A–G and Transfer Policy Analysis and Coordination Monica Lin stated that the intersegmental transfer policy goal was preparing transfer students for timely degree completion and inclusive access so that transfer students could pursue degrees at the same rate as their freshman admit counterparts. Two key considerations have guided both long-established and more recent transfer policy. First, incoming transfer students must have completed their general education and major preparation requirements completed at the community college level to proceed to upper division coursework. The second consideration pertained to the minimum criteria set by faculty for transfer eligibility, selection, and admission.

Given that community college students might wish to explore various courses, subject areas, and majors, policies have balanced academic exploration with planning and guidance. Transfer policies from all three segments have taken a student-centered approach, such as the CSU Transfer Model Curricula (TMC) and UC Transfer Pathways, which focused on major preparation. Prospective transfer students might be more suited to a particular university system based on their academic or career goals. CSU, which focused more on practical applications and less on research-oriented careers, offered degrees not offered at UC, and not all CSU lower division requirements would be identical to those at UC. When developing UC Transfer Pathways, UC faculty adjusted course expectations after comparing CSU TMC requirements with UC lower division requirements. In some cases, the same community college course could fulfill both UC and CSU requirements, and course requirements tended to differ in the second year of coursework. The California Community College system developed the Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT), in which transfer students were offered guaranteed priority admission to a CSU campus in a specific or similar major. ADT has since expanded to UC and independent California colleges and universities. UC Pathways+ combined Transfer Pathways, or UC major preparation, with

a transfer admission guarantee (TAG) to a campus of the transfer student's choosing. Pathways+ made transfer students more competitive for admission into any UC campus and encouraged timely degree completion after transfer.

The University's overarching transfer goal was to advance equitable transfer for a larger and more diverse transfer population that was reflective of the full range of California Community Colleges, expand the quality of student preparation, and support student success. Governor Newsom recently signed Assembly Bill (AB) 928, which would establish a single lower division general education course pattern for UC and CSU transfer and would place prospective transfer students on a transfer pathway.

Provost Brown stated that this presentation explored the transfer policy foundation laid by the three segments, which continued to engage each other in new and existing issues.

Committee Chair Park underscored the profound nature of the goal of drawing transfer from the full range of California Community Colleges. Currently, students were coming from a concentration of community college campuses. She asked how this goal would be met. Mr. Brown responded that it troubled him and his team that 40 percent of UC transfer admits came from nine community colleges, and that the success of these campuses must be augmented. UC sought deeper intersegmental partnerships. For instance, UC Merced has sent UC faculty and graduate students to Bakersfield College to meet instructional resource needs. Vice President Gullatt stated that community colleges needed a thriving and diverse faculty to teach required courses, as well as transfer-affirming culture, infrastructure, and professional learning for faculty and counselors. UC could build on practices from an 18-month pilot program that focused on 39 lower-sending community college campuses. Mr. Brown stated that the issues were complex but definable.

Committee Chair Park asked Faculty Representative Horwitz about alignment challenges he had mentioned in remarks made earlier in the meeting. Mr. Horwitz responded with the example of a communication transfer pathway. Every UC communication or media studies department had a particular profile; the UCSD Department of Communication was history-oriented, while the UCLA Department of Communication was more statistics-oriented. The UC communication transfer pathway course expectations did not fully match major preparation at UCSD. Creating a common transfer pathway was difficult because departments approached their scholarly discipline differently.

Committee Chair Park asked where the decision to exclude nonresidents in the two-to-one transfer student to freshman admit ratio originated. Campuses with more nonresident students might meet this ratio more easily than campuses with fewer nonresident students. Mr. Brown replied that he did not recall when the decision was made. UC policy reflected its understanding of the State's concern about California transfer students in mind. Committee Chair Park suggested establishing a minimum number of transfer students instead. For instance, a campus of UC Berkeley's size might have more transfer students than other campuses in general. Mr. Brown noted that the freshman undergraduate demand was astronomical compared with transfer demand, and it was a challenge at every campus to satisfy both. There was a deep hunger for inclusive access to educational excellence, but

supply was limited and additional resources were needed. Committee Chair Park remarked that expanding capacity while maintaining quality was one of Regent Estolano's priorities as Board Chair.

Regent Estolano stated that California Community Colleges were spread throughout the state, so the easiest way for University to expand opportunity throughout California was to improve transfer for lower-sending campuses. She asked for more information about the 18-month pilot program with 39 community college campuses, expressing concern that such a program might not be compatible with 116 very different campuses. Ms. Gullatt responded that, in 2016, UCOP partnered with California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office and identified campuses with historically low transfer rates. Of the 112 campuses at the time, 39 participated using resources from the California Community Colleges and UC. The participating campuses had a transfer infrastructure and enrolled a significant number of underrepresented students but were not transferring students to UC at desired rates. UC worked to improve transfer-affirming culture between the receiving and sending institutions, offered professional learning for faculty and counselors, and provided direct services to students. Some community colleges saw a dramatic increase in the number of transfer applications. UC deployed staff to those campuses but were unable to continue doing so after resources were exhausted. With the right resources and incentives, Ms. Gullatt believed that this work could be scaled. These efforts had to be sustainable or trust would be lost.

Chancellor Larive recalled that, when she was working to improve transfer as Provost at UC Riverside, certain courses were a barrier to transfer because so few community colleges taught them. UC could assemble a list of barrier courses and include them in dual enrollment programs, which has worked well for community college campuses that were close to UC campuses. For more distant colleges, UC could offer courses online through a program like UC Scout. Mr. Horwitz stated that, while he did not prefer online education, UC Online could be utilized to offer transfer pathway courses not taught at community colleges. This could help address other issues like graduate student employment. Another challenge that community college students faced was being bound to their location. Regent Estolano stated that some students might not wish to move or were unable to move due to family obligations, but UC could still have a presence. For instance, an outpost could be established at a distant community college campus that offered UC and CSU courses that were tailored to local needs and economic opportunities. Such an outpost could revitalize a dying retail community and create wealth, for instance. State investment would be needed. Mr. Horwitz stated that the Academic Senate was in agreement.

Regent Hernandez suggested offering UC courses to high school students so that they had completed college credits at graduation. There were many possible solutions.

Committee Chair Park invited Student Observer Kyle Schmidt, a transfer student at UCLA, to make remarks.

Mr. Schmidt shared that he transferred to UCLA from Pasadena City College and was studying economics and political science. He had participated in student government as a California Community College student and currently as a UC student as well. At the

community colleges, there were resources for the transfer process but fewer resources for acclimating students to UC. Transfer students were very diverse and some of most marginalized, including nontraditional, parenting, first-generation, low-income, and commuter students, as well as students affected by incarceration. Transfer students offered new viewpoints and life experiences, contributing to the University's excellence. Pasadena City College was one of the nine community college campuses that sent the most transfer students to UC. Mr. Schmidt commuted to the better funded Pasadena City College because his local community college campuses had fewer resources, but he acknowledged that few had the same privilege of commuting to school by car without having to work. At Pasadena City College, he had access to an honors program, research opportunities, and student support services. When he was a community college student, he advocated for menstrual equity, which meant introducing menstrual products in college bathrooms. This was a necessary commodity that many community college students could not afford. Addressing basic needs even on a smaller scale helped students continue their education, which in turn could help more students transfer to UC. Noting Chancellor Larive's remarks about concurrent enrollment, Mr. Schmidt shared that he was the first to ask about it at his community college campus. The Pasadena City College transfer center had no knowledge of concurrent enrollment. While community colleges had many resources and opportunities, many first-generation and low-income students might not know about them. In his view, the California Community College system should better communicate what these resources and opportunities were. Policies like AB 928 would help fill institutional gaps, eliminate unnecessary course requirements, and ensure that the California Community Colleges make transfer pathways clear. Mr. Schmidt transferred to UCLA with 135 units, most of which were not required for transfer but were required by the community college. Many prospective transfer students also struggled with course availability and articulation. A streamlined process was necessary for a successful transfer policy.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff