

The Regents of the University of California

ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

March 17, 2021

The Academic and Student Affairs 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 Anguiano, Butler, Elliott, Lansing, Mart, Ortiz Oakley, Stegura, and Sures; Ex officio member Drake, Advisory members Horwitz, Torres, and Zaragoza; Chancellors Block, May, and Yang; Staff Advisor Tseng

In attendance: Assistant Secretary Lyall, General Counsel Robinson, Provost Brown, Vice President Brown, and Recording Secretary Li

The meeting convened at 3:30 p.m. with Committee Chair Anguiano presiding.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of January 20, 2021 were approved, Regents Anguiano, Butler, Elliott, Lansing, Mart, Ortiz Oakley, Stegura, and Sures voting “aye.”¹

2. APPROVAL OF MULTI-YEAR PLANS FOR PROFESSIONAL DEGREE SUPPLEMENTAL TUITION FOR SEVENTEEN GRADUATE PROFESSIONAL DEGREE PROGRAMS

The President of the University recommended that the Regents approve the multi-year plans for charging Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition for 17 graduate professional degree programs as shown in Display 1.

DISPLAY 1: Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition Levels for 17 Programs²

	Current	Proposed Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition Levels ³				
	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
Civil and Environmental Engineering, UC Berkeley						
Resident PDST Level	\$6,490	\$6,686	\$6,888	\$7,096	N/A	N/A
Nonresident PDST Level	\$12,654	\$13,034	\$13,426	\$13,830	N/A	N/A
Information Management and Systems, UC Berkeley						
Resident PDST Level	\$8,264	\$8,264	\$8,678	\$9,112	N/A	N/A
Nonresident PDST Level	\$8,264	\$8,264	\$8,678	\$9,112	N/A	N/A

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

² Redlined text reflects revisions to the original multi-year plans recommended by the workgroups.

³ The amounts reflect the maximum PDST levels to be assessed, effective as of the academic year indicated. Assessing PDST levels less than the level indicated requires approval by the President with the concurrence of the Chancellor. PDST levels may be assessed beyond the period covering the program’s approved multi-year plan but not in excess of the maximum levels specified in the final year.

Product Development, UC Berkeley						
Resident PDST Level	\$30,870	\$32,414	\$34,044	N/A	N/A	N/A
Nonresident PDST Level	\$30,870	\$32,414	\$34,044	N/A	N/A	N/A
Translational Medicine, UC Berkeley (Jt. UCSF)						
Resident PDST Level	\$35,154	\$35,154	\$35,154	\$35,154	N/A	N/A
Nonresident PDST Level	\$35,154	\$35,154	\$35,154	\$35,154	N/A	N/A
Nursing, UC Davis						
Resident PDST Level	\$12,795	\$12,795	\$12,795	N/A	N/A	N/A
Nonresident PDST Level	\$12,795	\$12,795	\$12,795	N/A	N/A	N/A
Preventive Veterinary Medicine, UC Davis						
Resident PDST Level	\$6,060	\$6,060	\$6,243	\$6,429	N/A	N/A
Nonresident PDST Level	\$6,540	\$6,540	\$6,741	\$6,939	N/A	N/A
Nursing, UC Irvine						
Resident PDST Level	\$12,795	\$12,795	\$12,795	N/A	N/A	N/A
Nonresident PDST Level	\$12,795	\$12,795	\$12,795	N/A	N/A	N/A
Urban and Regional Planning, UC Irvine						
Resident PDST Level	\$6,489	\$6,489	\$6,489	\$6,489	N/A	N/A
Nonresident PDST Level	\$6,489	\$6,489	\$6,489	\$6,489	N/A	N/A
Art, UCLA						
Resident PDST Level	\$8,478	\$8,478	\$8,478	N/A	N/A	N/A
Nonresident PDST Level	\$5,298	\$5,298	\$5,298	N/A	N/A	N/A
Nursing, UCLA						
Resident PDST Level	\$12,795	\$12,795	\$12,795	N/A	N/A	N/A
Nonresident PDST Level	\$12,795	\$12,795	\$12,795	N/A	N/A	N/A
Public Health, UCLA						
Resident PDST Level	\$7,200	\$7,200	\$7,200	N/A	N/A	N/A
Nonresident PDST Level	\$7,656	\$7,656	\$7,656	N/A	N/A	N/A
Medicine, UC Riverside						
Resident PDST Level	\$25,188	\$25,188	\$25,188	\$25,944	N/A	N/A
Nonresident PDST Level	\$25,188	\$25,188	\$25,188	\$25,944	N/A	N/A
Public Policy, UC Riverside						
Resident PDST Level	\$5,952	\$5,952	\$5,952	\$5,952	N/A	N/A
Nonresident PDST Level	\$5,952	\$5,952	\$5,952	\$5,952	N/A	N/A
Pharmacy (4-yr), UC San Diego						
Resident PDST Level	\$27,789	\$28,626	\$29,487	\$30,375	N/A	N/A
Nonresident PDST Level	\$27,789	\$28,626	\$29,487	\$30,375	N/A	N/A
Nursing, UCSF						
Resident PDST Level	\$12,795	\$12,795	\$12,795	N/A	N/A	N/A
Nonresident PDST Level	\$12,795	\$12,795	\$12,795	N/A	N/A	N/A
Pharmacy (3-yr), UCSF						
Resident PDST Level	\$31,260	\$31,260	\$31,260	N/A	N/A	N/A
Nonresident PDST Level	\$31,260	\$31,260	\$31,260	N/A	N/A	N/A
Physical Therapy, UCSF						
Resident PDST Level	\$13,362	\$13,362	\$13,362	N/A	N/A	N/A
Nonresident PDST Level	\$13,362	\$13,362	\$13,362	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

Committee Chair Anguiano explained that Regents Butler and Stegura led work groups that reviewed the Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) programs and asked the campuses questions about these programs. Regents Lansing and Ortiz Oakley were in Regent Butler's work group, and Regents Elliott, Regent Mart, and then Regent Kieffer were in Regent Stegura's work group.

Regent Butler recognized the efforts of her work group and thanked Director Cain Diaz for his support. In her view, these were thoughtful proposals that seemed to match the future

occupational needs of the state. She acknowledged that, at this time, any tuition increase would be difficult for some PDST candidates and their families.

Regent Lansing stated that the work group reviewed the programs very carefully, engaged in discussion, and asked many questions. The work group was comfortable with how well it explored these programs and with its recommendation.

Regent Ortiz Oakley echoed Regent Lansing's comments.

Regent Stegura thanked members of her work group and Mr. Diaz. She believed that the work group's recommendations were fully vetted. Not all of the proposals were seeking tuition increases. Both work groups also made overall recommendations.

Regent Elliott thanked Mr. Diaz for seeking answers to Regents' questions. He learned more about the PDST programs than what was presented in the written materials.

Regent Mart echoed Regent Elliott's comments. He noted that the review process was much work but very worthwhile.

Committee Chair Anguiano stated that the work groups recommended that the multi-year plans be no more than three years long so that the Regents may reassess them and track their progress based on various metrics. The work groups also recommended that these programs be examined to ensure that they prioritized Californians and that in-state PDST levels for these programs did not exceed or were lower than out-of-state PDST.

Provost Brown briefly explained the item. PDST supplemented State support and enabled UC professional schools to maintain program quality and diversity. The proposed programs were designed to address the employment markets of the given fields. PDST was not assessed for academic doctoral programs. Before Regental review, staff at the Office of the President (UCOP) worked closely with campuses to ensure that these programs would maintain instructional quality and student support; minimize program costs and student debt; support student public service ambitions; demonstrate effective student consultation; and advance diversity and inclusion. All 17 proposals met the requirements of Regents Policy 3103: Policy on Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition. The Regental work groups recommended that these programs be no more than three years long, with the exception of UC Berkeley's Product Development program, which the work group recommended should be two years long. Eleven programs proposed no fee increases for the duration of those programs.

Regent Stegura stated that her work group asked campuses questions about students' ability to repay loans taken out while in a program, and the work group suggested paying attention to this in the future. There was good data available on debt at graduation, but not on job placement six months after graduation. The work group also suggested paying attention to how loans were distributed by demographic and whether some groups of students were disproportionately affected by debt.

Regent Butler stated that her work group discussed the level of student loan debt in as well. Regent Lansing had suggested that UC include student loan debt in its federal advocacy, which included advocating for doubling the Pell Grant. Regent Butler noted the trillions of dollars of student loan debt that had accumulated across the country. The work group focused on whether these programs could produce California professionals without the burden of lifelong debt.

Regent-designate Zaragoza asked how Regents could ensure that campuses appropriately reach out to and work to retain diverse students. Regent Butler replied that Regents so prioritized retention and diversity in these proposals that campuses now knew to include information about student involvement and progress since the last PDST request. Some campuses had achieved their goals since the last PDST request, while others had not, which was why the Regents were trying to engage campuses on various diversity and retention metrics. Mr. Brown added that he encouraged campuses to envision the mission and success of a program from a diversity lens rather than view diversity as an additional aspect. Programs differed in the degree to which they addressed this issue.

Regent-designate Zaragoza suggested expanding PDST application fee waivers by raising the income threshold as a way to improve the diversity of the applicant pool. Provost Brown stated that some programs did build in scholarships.

Regent Elliott noted the value of the work groups and suggested including chancellors in future ones.

Regent Lansing remarked on the effectiveness of work groups, which enabled Regents to more closely examine issues and be more efficient. She encouraged the Regents to employ more work groups in the future. Regents trusted their colleagues who participated in them.

Committee Chair Anguiano recognized the efforts of the work groups, adding that each reviewed hundreds of pages of written materials.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the President's recommendation and voted to present it to the Board, Regents Anguiano, Butler, Elliott, Lansing, Mart, Ortiz Oakley, and Stegura voting "aye."

3. **USING CURRICULAR INNOVATIONS AND ENHANCEMENTS TO ADDRESS EQUITY GAPS**

[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 briefly introduced the item and the speakers. He explained that, as part of the UC 2030 goals, a number of campuses wished to invest in closing equity gaps.

Professor Linda Adler-Kassner, Associate Dean for Undergraduate Education at UC Santa Barbara, noted that the resources necessary for successful learning had been inequitably

allocated for decades, and many UC students came from under-resourced K–12 schools, where a meritocratic system of testing and funding perpetuated those inequities. These students faced great pressure to succeed, as well as large gateway courses for majors related to the most desirable careers. Campuses were committed to addressing these issues using data- and evidence-based practices, as well as employing ideas from “Recovery with Equity,” a report from the California Governor’s Council for Post-Secondary Education.

Marco Molinaro, Assistant Vice Provost for Educational Effectiveness at UC Davis, shared findings from studies performed at the Davis campus. African American students and Hispanic students left UC Davis at twice the rate of Asian and white students. With the added factors of being first-generation and low-income, UC Davis lost one in five African American students and one in seven Hispanic students. The lack of resources in communities and K–12 systems affected not only retention, but also first-year outcomes in top-enrollment introductory courses. At UC Davis, the vast majority of these courses had 200 to 1,000 students per instructor. The more risk factors a student had, the worse the student’s average performance, with the lowest average performance among African American and Hispanic students. At UC Davis and other UC campuses where these studies were replicated, students who tended to be successful in their first year persisted in success.

Ms. Adler-Kassner stated that she and Mr. Molinaro were collaborating with faculty to design gateway courses in which students build disciplinary knowledge, develop self-efficacy and a sense of belonging, and see the broader applications of what they learned. Improved student performance in these courses helped decrease equity gaps. Faculty must also engage in their own learning. While experts in their disciplines, faculty might have forgotten ways of creating knowledge in their disciplines. She and Mr. Molinaro were working with faculty to create access and opportunity for students, which would enable them to develop expertise. Since 2015, UC Santa Barbara faculty who taught courses with a large number of students have attended the Opening Doors to Accelerating Success (ONDAS) seminar, which taught faculty how to provide access to novices, create opportunity using inclusive and anti-racist strategies, and restructure courses and curricula. UC Davis, UC Santa Cruz, UC San Diego, and UCLA had similar teaching institutes.

Mr. Molinaro stated that, at UC Davis, the Know Your Students tool enabled faculty to review survey responses from students, course demographic measures and other metrics, and grade gaps over time. Faculty could then consult with Just-In-Time Teaching materials or teaching and learning professionals. Faculty also had access to other surveys and analytic tools that they could use to improve their courses. UC Santa Barbara and UC Irvine developed similar tools.

Ms. Adler-Kassner shared that, at UC Santa Barbara, Access to Practice (AtP) and ELI Review enabled students to complete writing and peer review activities. AtP was used in both large introductory courses with 150 to 500 students and smaller courses. Faculty from other institutions also joined AtP. The ECoach platform, built into some of UCSB’s largest courses, provided coaching to students and course-specific study strategies. Messaging in ECoach was tailored to students based on their performance.

Mr. Molinaro stated that the Davis, Santa Barbara, and Irvine campuses were among ten R1 public universities in a collaborative known as the Sloan Equity and Inclusion in STEM Introductory Courses (SEISMIC). Data from SEISMIC allowed these campuses to do valuable comparative work, understand the differences among them, and improve equity.

Committee Chair Anguiano asked about the scope of these efforts and how best practices were being implemented across all campuses. Committee Chair Anguiano also asked what was preventing UC from implementing successful tools such as ECoach systemwide and about the extent of the resources needed for implementation. Ms. Adler-Kassner replied that, at UCSB, ECoach was used in larger gateway courses, and AtP had been used by about 8,000 students since it was implemented. Her team had worked with about 60 percent of faculty teaching larger gateway courses across all divisions. Through a collaborative among the nine undergraduate campuses and sometimes UCSF, teaching and learning groups could learn from and build on each other's work. Implementation of tools like ECoach and AtP required much effort. ECoach, for instance, required funding, working with faculty, building the right teams, and both technological and teaching and learning expertise. More than 40 percent of UCD faculty who taught undergraduate students used the Know Your Students tool, a great improvement from the two or three percent engagement in the past, and Mr. Molinaro attributed this to the COVID-19 pandemic and having personalized information about students. The Davis campus was working to increase the reach of other tools. UC Davis reached out to over 400 faculty regarding programs such as Accelerate and the Pathway Courses Innovation Program, and there was much more interest in hybrid learning because of the pandemic. Through SEISMIC, UC Davis could share data and lessons learned. Vice President Pamela Brown added that \$60 million had originally been planned for these efforts over the next four years, but UC asked for \$35 million in its last proposed budget to the State. This amount would be dedicated to addressing equity gaps.

Mr. Brown noted that President Drake was involved in catalyzing instructional excellence at his former institution. Campuses were already working together, but, with increased flexibility, the Office of the President (UCOP) could have a role supporting and coordinating the expansion of the scope of these programs.

President Drake shared that, with proper support for faculty incentives and professional development, there was more than 75 percent overall faculty participation and 65 percent intense participation in similar programs at his former institution. Thousands of faculty per campus took part, and faculty participation correlated with student success rates. Faculty who had participated also encouraged their colleagues to do so as well. Recalling his experience from his career in medical education, President Drake noted that gathering and sharing data on hospital performance incentivized each institution to raise its standards, which raised the performance level for all. He expressed his hope that UC would have a modest ability to incentivize and support these programs, which produced a great return on investment for students.

Regent Ortiz Oakley stated that discipline faculty across all three segments of public higher education taught gateway courses and suggested connecting these faculty. Community

college faculty focused on teaching and learning in some of the most difficult circumstances within gateway courses. He offered his help in promoting a dialogue regarding teaching and learning innovation. Mr. Molinaro added that UC greatly valued its California Community College and California State University partners. UC Davis had a California Education Learning Lab proposal that would begin programs at the community college level. The acculturation that occurred through gateway courses was very important to ongoing student success, and much could be learned about that systemwide.

Regent Ortiz Oakley remarked that, despite the University's emphasis on research, the teaching component of gateway courses was critical to the success of undergraduate students from communities of color, low-income students, and first-generation students. He called for a continued focus on teaching and learning, as well as support of faculty. He asked how teaching and learning could be valued when assessing faculty in the tenure process. Mr. Brown recalled that, when he was a professor, he was told to prioritize scholarship and research over teaching in order to make tenure. The culture was changing; teaching and teaching excellence must be included in order to achieve University excellence. Leaders like Ms. Adler-Kassner and Mr. Molinaro were spearheading this culture shift, and UCOP must be in a better position to support it. He was committed to improving his efforts in light of greater equity in UC outcomes.

Regent Stegura noted that student performance was tied to sense of belonging. Given that 40 percent of UC students were first-generation, the strategies presented would be helpful, and Regent Stegura agreed that they should be expanded systemwide. She believed that diversifying the professoriate would help improve students' sense of belonging. Ms. Adler-Kassner stated that teaching well demonstrated a commitment to and care for students and was a way to welcome students into disciplinary communities. She and Mr. Molinaro were helping faculty, who were trained as expert researchers, to become pedagogical experts as well. The pandemic showed that faculty enjoyed teaching and engaging with students, and it also showed the importance of social learning.

Committee Chair Anguiano asked if these efforts were embedded in faculty orientation or other training. Ms. Adler-Kassner responded that UC Santa Barbara had a two-session pedagogy seminar for new faculty that included additional learning opportunities. UCSB's Center for Innovative Teaching, Research, and Learning and UCD's Center for Educational Effectiveness both offered faculty training and worked directly with departments. Nearly all of these new innovations required faculty. Mr. Molinaro shared that UC Davis convened small groups of new faculty, meaning those in their first three years of teaching, for these programs. Ms. Adler-Kassner echoed President Drake's statement that these efforts had a significant return on investment.

Regent-designate Zaragoza emphasized the opportunity to enhance relationships between students and faculty beyond office hours, such as creating space for organic conversations about graduate school, what faculty were teaching, and how to improve classes. She asked if course reserves were available through UC libraries and whether they could be implemented systemwide. Ms. Adler-Kassner replied that UCSB has found that faculty-student get-togethers were very important to building students' sense of belonging.

ONDAS and individual departments hosted faculty-student dinners, which were very effective. These were small investments that yielded huge benefits.

Committee Chair Anguiano noted that a discussion regarding open access to resources for students was planned for a future Committee meeting.

Chancellor May stressed that these concepts were considered in promotion and tenure, and they were covered in faculty orientation at UC Davis. These concepts also made up a pillar of the Davis campus' strategic plan. Mr. Molinaro was the speaker on the topic at a retreat last year. He had considered making deans' internal resource allocation reflect their proficiency in closing these gaps, and deans paid attention to this.

Regent-designate Zaragoza noted that transfer students did not always read or learn the same things as other students, which presented barriers. She asked whether UC would share recommended curricula and concepts with community colleges. Mr. Brown recalled that, when he served as Chair of the Academic Senate's Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS), that there had been an Intersegmental Major Preparation Articulation Committee (IMPACT). It was designed to convene discipline faculty to discuss their disciplines and goals. This process of engagement led to improved articulation of what faculty from all three segments of public higher education were looking for within courses and disciplines. Mr. Brown believed that these discussions could resume if people wished to engage in them.

Chancellor Yang stated that UC Santa Barbara emphasized both undergraduate instruction and research, which was used as a teaching tool. About 50 percent of undergraduate students participated in some form of research. Even during the pandemic, UCSB prioritized contact between undergraduate researchers and faculty. Colleges and divisions had faculty equity advisors for the hiring process. Candidates needed to demonstrate their teaching ability, and teaching was a major criterion for faculty merit increases and tenure evaluation. Retired faculty offered to teach undergraduate students during the pandemic. UCSB Student Affairs provided tutoring services to students. Chancellor Yang taught several large undergraduate courses online in order to have a better understanding of the situation for faculty at this time and to have meaningful discussions about teaching.

Student Observer David Miller Shevelev began his remarks by addressing item A2, *Approval of Multi-year Plans for Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition for Seventeen Graduate Professional Degree Programs*, and recognizing the work that Regents had done outside of Regents meetings. He stated that many departments did not allow students to take major requirement courses on a pass/no pass basis, which could help students who were struggling in an online learning environment preserve their grade point averages without dropping a course or taking a leave of absence during the pandemic. Mr. Shevelev disagreed with three arguments in support of letter grading during the pandemic. First, he disagreed that grades were necessary to show competency, suggesting that the threshold for pass/no pass grading could be raised instead. Next, he disagreed that grading needed to be maintained during the pandemic for awarding honors; departments could still award honors based on grades given before and after the pandemic. Third, Mr. Shevelev disagreed

that pass/no pass grading would interfere with students' ability to gain admission into graduate school, because UC faculty had the power to influence the admissions policies of many graduate programs. At UC Santa Cruz, there was a correlation between departments that did not implement pass/no pass grading and departments with decreased enrollment. When making decisions about pass/no pass grading, equity has been a secondary concern.

Mr. Shevelev called attention to ProctorU, an examination software program that collects personal information, some of which had been compromised in data breaches. Test takers were required to show the proctor their room and to stay still during timed examinations. In his view, the desire to prevent cheating must be balanced with the intrusive nature of these programs. He relayed the experience of one student, who was accused of misconduct while experiencing a panic attack during an examination, and another student, whose examination was interrupted by the calls of wild peacocks. For many students, completing a UC degree now became contingent upon losing one's privacy or control over one's data. Testing and grading policies had an impact on equity gaps. Many faculty continued to use high-stakes tests and intrusive proctoring, and they continued to ignore valid practices such as pass/no pass grading. Robust incentives and binding best practices were needed.

Since this Committee's discussion of disability services in November 2020, Mr. Shevelev shared that some campuses took remarkable steps to improve accessibility, demonstrating that, despite a global pandemic, budget turmoil, and significant leadership changes, positive changes could be made. However, UCOP planned to convene a disability work group without disabled students, staff, or faculty, and also without disability services staff. Mr. Shevelev credited Regents from this Committee for UCOP's decision to change the work group's membership, but it had not been communicated to student leaders. Regents should not have to spend time micromanaging work group composition, and stakeholder input should always be included. With regard to the UC Student Association (UCSA) proposed fee increase, Mr. Shevelev called for an opt-in fee, not an opt-out fee. Low voter turnout for student government elections indicated that most people did not know that student government exists or what it does. Because the ability to opt out of the fee was not well known, the fee would become a de facto tuition increase, and stakeholders should be consulted. Student government that was funded based on its ability to engage its constituents would be more representative and a more powerful ally to the University.

Mr. Brown stated that he would discuss Mr. Shevelev's remarks with his team at Academic Affairs.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff