

The Regents of the University of California

ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

July 21, 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, Park, Torres, and Zaragoza; Ex officio member Estolano; Advisory member Horwitz; Chancellors Block, Larive, May, and Yang; Staff Advisor Tseng

In attendance: Regents-designate Blas Pedral and Timmons, Faculty Representative Gauvain, Assistant Secretary Lyall, General Counsel Robinson, Provost Brown, Vice Presidents Brown and Maldonado, and Recording Secretary Li

The meeting convened at 1:35 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 May 12, 2021 were approved, Regents Anguiano, Butler, Park, Torres, and Zaragoza voting “aye.”¹

2. **FULFILLING THE ACADEMIC MISSION: ACADEMIC SENATE SURVEY OF UC FACULTY AND INSTRUCTORS ABOUT THEIR EXPERIENCES DURING THE PANDEMIC, MARCH 2020 TO MAY 2021**

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

Provost Brown introduced the item, underscoring the unprecedented nature of the COVID-19 pandemic and its impact on faculty.

Faculty Representative Gauvain stated that the Academic Senate conducted a survey in spring 2021 that asked UC faculty and instructors (faculty) about their teaching and learning environment, work conditions, and research experience during the pandemic. There were over 4,300 participants, most of whom were Senate faculty, from all ten campuses and from a wide range of disciplines. Eighty-one percent of respondents had no prior experience with online instruction. Throughout the pandemic, enrollment has been steady, and students have been able to take courses and advance in their programs, and the survey demonstrated that faculty did much to enhance the teaching environment. Most faculty reported having reliable internet connection, electricity, and devices. One-quarter to one-third of faculty purchased devices or a service, and over 50 percent invested in

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

improved internet service. About three-quarters of faculty paid for these using personal funds or a mix of personal and other funds. About 65 percent of respondents were very to somewhat satisfied with resources provided by the campuses. In the open ended responses, many faculty expressed disappointment that UC provided little financial support for setting up home teaching arrangements at the onset of the pandemic.

Faculty Representative Horwitz shared that 75 percent of respondents reported a larger workload than before the pandemic, and 41 percent had obligations affecting teaching experience, mostly identified as caregiving, with women reporting this more than men. This was similar to national reports. Remote instruction efforts had a significantly negative impact on research productivity, especially for women and junior faculty. This also reflected national trends. Faculty were unable to go to field sites, performance spaces, and libraries, and many expressed frustration and anxiety in open ended responses. For synchronous remote classes, 58 percent of faculty rated graduate student attendance as excellent and very good, and 35 percent rated undergraduate student attendance as excellent and very good. Faculty reported that it was difficult to confirm undergraduate student attendance in medium to larger classes because many students turned off their cameras. Lack of student engagement was one of the most often mentioned observations in the survey, and one faculty member noted the difficulty of engaging students who were looking at a computer screen all day. Faculty also reported that it was difficult to write high-quality letters of recommendation for students, because it was difficult to get to know them. Forty-two percent of faculty reported that undergraduate students understood the course material less, and 31 percent stated that students experienced more academic difficulty. Sixty-four percent of faculty reported that students participated less, 44 percent reported that students attended office hours less frequently, and 53 percent of faculty perceived that students were less satisfied with remote instruction. In order to support students, 81 percent of faculty reported being more accommodating during remote instruction. However, academic integrity was becoming a greater concern, and 54 percent of faculty perceived that there was more academic dishonesty during remote instruction. Seventy percent of respondents preferred in-person instruction, and 16 percent preferred remote instruction. While 45 percent expressed increased interest in online teaching, the reasons provided were not always based on the intrinsic value of online instruction. For instance, one reason was reduced commute time, which was of particular importance to younger faculty who were unable to live near campus. Mr. Horwitz appealed to the University for help in this regard, as commute time was directly related to lost time for research and other campus activities.

Ms. Gauvain stated that faculty reported students expressing more hardship in meeting class expectations due to problems ranging from class-related difficulties to personal challenges. Other types of student hardships shared by faculty could be categorized as related to stress, living conditions, and schoolwork. Faculty were providing mental health support to students, which many faculty found overwhelming. One faculty member shared that students did not turn to campus counselors first and that it was not possible to teach effectively and do research at the same time. Ms. Gauvain concluded the presentation by summarizing what was discussed, adding that faculty should be the ones who study how online teaching is incorporated into instruction.

Mr. Brown noted that the University's younger faculty tended to be its most diverse faculty and expressed concern about the impact of the pandemic on their careers. A systemwide group co-chaired by Mr. Horwitz would examine these issues and seek interventions.

Staff Advisor Tseng shared that, unlike faculty, staff preferred to work from home. Work could be adjusted such that staff do not have to be on campus to support faculty. Job-sharing among staff and restructuring how staff support faculty could make a hybrid work environment more feasible. Ms. Tseng questioned whether students wished to return to in-person learning. In a recent survey of academic advisors, respondents indicated that 95 percent of students preferred advising online.

Regent Anguiano asked about the process of collecting and analyzing follow-up questions, such as what the teaching plans were for faculty who preferred remote instruction, why there was an increased interest in online teaching for some faculty, and which students benefited from remote instruction. Ms. Gauvain replied that faculty might be considering how they could shift from a remote class to a fully-prepared, online course or a course that was a mix of both online and in-person experiences. The Academic Senate did not have data on the types of students who benefited from remote instruction, but this could be presented to the Regents in the future. Mr. Brown added that the University was in the midst of critical analysis. There would soon be results from a study on the future of instruction, a topic to be presented at a future meeting. The Academic Senate and Academic Affairs were working to combine discussions from different campuses into systemwide lessons learned and implications for the future.

Regent Estolano asked whether faculty were reimbursed for expenses they incurred when transitioning to remote instruction. Mr. Brown responded that he had heard anecdotally that faculty were being reimbursed, but he had not canvassed all the campuses. Chancellor Block stated that UCLA was paying for chairs, desks, and computers, while faculty paid for their own internet services. The campus was trying to develop an equitable reimbursement plan while accounting for faculty cost savings from working at home, such as parking and transportation. Mr. Brown stated that UC should have a bank of resources for instructional resilience given disruptions like earthquakes and wildfires.

Regent-designate Blas Pedral asked if data on faculty impressions had been broken down by discipline, where student learning could differ. She asked that the Academic Senate, when evaluating the student experience, be mindful of the amount of learning that occurred in informal settings outside of the classroom, particularly for first-generation students. Faculty could become mentors through these interactions. Ms. Gauvain stated that the Academic Senate did have data by discipline and that this was available online. She stated that learning outside of the classroom should not be lost and must be better understood.

Regent-designate Timmons asked how much time faculty used to transition to remote instruction and how much time was needed to design an online course. The amount of time faculty would have to commit to teaching an online course could affect how much time they had for research and service. This should be considered before any choices are made.

Committee Chair Park asked if survey respondents reflected the faculty populations at the campuses. Ms. Gauvain replied that gender was appropriately represented, but the data needed to be examined further. She believed that the respondents were representative of UC faculty as a whole, although those who conduct surveys always wish that more people would respond.

Committee Chair Park remarked that insight into faculty mindset or mood was not common. The Regents were interested in learning more from future surveys. She noted that UC was comparing in-person learning with remote instruction in the context of a pandemic, when faculty did not have a choice. Mr. Horwitz stated that the Academic Senate was concerned about asking faculty to participate in this survey, yet another thing to do during the pandemic, but faculty provided some 3,000 comments. They wanted to have their views known. Those comments helped the Academic Senate draw some conclusions from the quantitative data. Committee Chair Park noted the stress reflected in the survey responses.

3. **INSTRUCTION AND RESEARCH AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA:
COVID-19 IMPACT AND PLANS FOR FALL 2021**

[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 recalled that President Drake and the chancellors had wished to avoid opening and shutting down the University during the COVID-19 pandemic as other universities had done. UC wished to create as much certainty and as little disruption as possible, and its decision to remain open while shifting to remote instruction helped students maintain degree continuity. The outcomes of the research enterprise varied by discipline. Newer, younger, and caregiving faculty needed to make up for one year of lost data and productivity, which could have an effect on their careers for years. Mr. Brown underscored the mental, physical, and economic toll of the pandemic, police killings, and other social disruptions on students, faculty, and staff.

UC Santa Cruz Campus Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor Lori Kletzer stated that the campus drew on values of compassion, sensitivity, and flexibility when planning a return to on-site operations in the fall. During the pandemic, undergraduate students enrolled in more credits and participated robustly in summer session, and UCSC's three-year graduation rate rose. In addition to instruction, academic advising, student health, and counseling services became remote or virtual as well. UCSC would offer a hybrid of remote and in-person advising and student services in the fall. Although travel restrictions impeded archival, field-based, and human-subject research, UCSC was able to engage in essential research in its laboratories. Productivity was diminished due to capacity restrictions, but laboratory-based research was on track to recover. Early-career and caregiver faculty lost research time and productivity. At the beginning of the pandemic, journal submissions decreased, particularly among women faculty. The Academic Senate's faculty survey found that 75 to 80 percent of research faculty felt that their research had suffered. Over the next three years, UCSC was adopting an approach to the faculty merit review process, consistent with the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) – 201-1-d, that recognized

COVID-related productivity decline so that faculty would not lose salary growth. One UCSC survey found that 20 to 25 percent of early-career doctoral students were reporting two to three quarters of delay, which would affect funding and time-to-degree. The UCSC Center for Teaching Innovations and Learning helped faculty and instructors convert remote courses to fully online courses. UCSC showed faculty that the campus would support them as they employ new technologies and engage in inclusive and active pedagogies. The campus also took time during the pandemic to develop its leadership team and focus on campus priorities, such as addressing economic, health, and educational inequities, as well as reimagining the future of learning. Current initiatives included developing an online degree program and expanding summer session.

Vice President Maldonado explained she and the Council of Vice Chancellors for Research had been meeting regularly since March 2020 to deploy a research-informed emergency response. The Council decreased almost 90 percent of UC's \$7 billion research enterprise and worked with campuses without a UC Health presence to determine how they would test for COVID-19. UC Santa Cruz converted an existing laboratory for testing, and UC Merced used courier services to send test samples to other campuses. In response to the CZU Lightning Complex Fire, UCSC shut down all research operations and evacuated all animals, and the Council helped the Lick Observatory with its recovery effort. The Council then developed phased approaches to resuming each campus's research programs. UCLA shared its comprehensive document envisioning post-pandemic research with the Council as a best practice. The pandemic's disruption of research delayed graduations and career prospects of graduate students, left international students vulnerable to federal policy changes, and shortened postdoctoral researchers' research terms. Early-career faculty career advancement was also affected. This loss of faculty research productivity could have a profound impact on the future success and diversity of the professoriate. In light of the Delta variant of COVID-19, occupancy at research laboratories and performance spaces varied. Research awards exceeded totals from last year, with UC Berkeley and UCLA each reporting over \$1 billion in new awards. Research laboratories at seven campuses were helping the California Department of Public Health (CDPH) expand the state's genomic sequencing capacity in order to determine which COVID-19 variants were among the population. CDPH also awarded UC Santa Cruz with a \$3.2 million contract to establish a statewide pandemic genomic sequencing data hub. UC must assess its research expenditures and the status of its faculty, postdoctoral researchers, and students.

Chancellor Block shared some unanticipated positive outcomes at UCLA. He found that remote instruction could be a tool for closing graduation gaps for underrepresented students, first-generation students, and Pell Grant recipients. The three-year graduation rate increased among students entering UCLA in fall 2017, with underrepresented students nearly doubling their three-year rate relative to the prior cohort. Total student credit hours during summer 2020 increased by nearly 31 percent compared with summer 2021, with a seven to eight percent increase in credit hours among underrepresented students, first-generation students, and Pell Grant recipients. Chancellor Block stated that UCLA needed to determine how to reduce barriers to summer instruction. Grade point average (GPA) increased during remote instruction among all students, while increases in GPA among

underrepresented students, first-generation students, and Pell Grant recipients were above average. While more studies were needed, Chancellor Block found these data encouraging.

Mr. Brown stated that Academic Affairs and the Academic Senate were planning a set of systemwide meetings to share lessons learned and reimagine the future of instruction and research. There was an opportunity for the University to lead in these areas.

Chancellor May called attention to the preponderance of academic misconduct raised by the Academic Senate and, presumably, divisional Academic Senates.

Regent Lansing asked if performance improved, particularly among underserved populations, because students were able to take more classes in a remote environment. Chancellor Block responded that it could be the case and added that the remote environment was also sociologically different from a classroom. For instance, some students might feel more comfortable asking questions online than in person. These data might suggest that remote programs should be available, especially during the summer. Ms. Kletzer cautioned against drawing conclusions from remote instruction conducted during a pandemic. She suggested considering outcomes from the upcoming fall term, which would be less remote and less of an emergency situation.

Vice President Pamela Brown shared that an increase in course-taking was observed in spring 2020, when UC shifted to remote instruction and many were sheltering in place. Grading practices also changed during this time. Ms. Brown believed that summer enrollment contributed to the growth of the three- and four-year graduation rates. Students also might have benefited from taking courses in summer from their own campus online.

Regent Zaragoza remarked that the remote environment made professors easier to access and approach. This was particularly helpful for anxious students to get to know their professors and gain confidence. Classes had not become easier; rather, faculty were becoming more understanding about students' situations.

Regent-designate Timmons stated that, while GPA and time-to-degree were good indicators, UC's measure of success should be students' educational experience.

Regent-designate Blas Pedral noted that better academic performance could be attributed to students having more time to devote to studies because they could not work during the pandemic. She underscored that there was more to student success than just academic performance, and on-campus experience, work, and internships were just as important.

Committee Chair Park suggested creating a faculty assessment to determine whether changes to instruction and research made during the pandemic should remain in place afterward. The Committee would be interested in learning what is discussed in systemwide meetings regarding these topics. She asked for more information about what campuses were doing to mitigate the impact of the pandemic on junior faculty. The Committee would be interested in helping drive any action related to these topics.

4. **UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA EFFORTS TO ADVANCE AFFORDABLE COURSE MATERIALS AND OPEN EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES**

[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 reported that, last September, all nine undergraduate UC campuses ranked among the top 100 universities in the country, with some campuses among the top in social mobility and serving low-income students. It was incumbent upon the University to continue its work in lowering the total cost of education. To that end, scaling efforts to reduce the cost of course resources while meeting faculty teaching needs would require ongoing investment, coordination support, and stakeholder collaboration.

UC Davis Professor of Chemistry Delmar Larsen, who was founder and Director of the LibreTexts Project, as well as Co-Chair of AggieOpen, explained that authors who adopt open licenses do not relinquish ownership of open education resources (OER) content. Rather, they establish allowable permissions known as “the five Rs”—the right to retain, reuse, revise, remix, and redistribute content. According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, the average cost of textbooks in the U.S. has increased three times more quickly than inflation. While textbook costs made up a small percentage of the total cost of attendance, a number of UC students were choosing between purchasing textbooks and meeting basic needs, with similar trends nationwide. In Mr. Larsen’s first-year chemistry course, about 30 percent of students reported not purchasing textbooks primarily due to cost. A 2016 Florida Virtual Campus study found that rising textbook costs had an impact on the number and nature of courses taken, as well as failure or course dropping rates. OER allowed faculty to update research data, add contemporary issues, address biases, implement culturally responsive pedagogy, and enhance accessibility and usability. Still, there were multiple barriers to faculty adoption of OER. The four pillars to any OER program were adoption, adaption, construction, and curation. In Mr. Larsen’s view, the University was able to pursue each of these pillars due to UC’s size, resources, and the subject matter expertise of its faculty.

The LibreTexts Project was a construction, dissemination, and learning platform used by thousands of faculty on over 600 campuses, and has received nearly \$7 million from multiple campus, State, and federal organizations and agencies. Fourteen libraries hosted OER content using wiki and ancillary technologies, and the goal was to build an interconnected OER textbook infrastructure that provided the strength and efficiency of a centralized system with the flexibility of a decentralized approach. Faculty could use the OER content stored in the system or customize textbooks themselves. The LibreTexts Project was the most popular OER project on the internet, with over 650 million page views since 2008 and over 5,000 years of confirmed student reading. In California, LibreTexts traffic was concentrated at UC campuses and major metropolitan areas. The project has saved about \$5 million annually nationwide, with \$1 million saved at UCD alone, and has grown 30 percent annually over the past decade. To ensure quality, the LibreTexts Project has pursued studies demonstrating that it could be a suitable substitute for conventional textbooks. LibreTexts could be disseminated online, while embedded in learning

management systems, as portable document format (PDF) files, physical books, and more. Since last year, the Project has distributed 130,000 PDF files and over 150,000 physical books. In 2020, the Project partnered with the UC Davis Library to launch AggieOpen, which facilitated OER efforts on the Davis campus. Funds saved through AggieOpen were diverted back to campus. In 2020–21, AggieOpen received \$50,000 from this model. A systemwide program would be a more effective use of resources and was estimated to cost about \$1 million per year, and foundations have expressed strong interest in supporting such a program. Its success would rely on faculty involvement at every level, and incentives for faculty adoption could include merit and promotion action, as well as support for departments that adopt OER.

UC Merced University Librarian Haipeng Li stated that, in 2018, the UC Merced Library and the Center for Engaged Teaching and Learning established the Zero-Cost Course Materials Initiative in order to reduce students' financial burdens, promote open scholarship and open access, and ensure access to materials at the start of a course. \$30,000 of internal funding was allocated for a three-year pilot program from spring 2019 to fall 2021. A request for proposals took place every semester, with priority given to introductory undergraduate courses with high enrollment. By the end of the pilot period, the program would have supported 17 courses and over 2,500 students, saving students over \$276,000. Preliminary data from a survey of participating students indicated that a majority did not perceive a decrease in the quality of OER and library resources. In one of the supported courses, there was no significant difference in final grades when using zero-cost materials, which aligned with published OER research data. Faculty engagement, sufficient funding, and adequate operational capacity would be needed for the future success of the program. The Council of University Librarians has made OER a priority for the coming year, with a major focus on engaging faculty and various stakeholders.

Mr. Brown stated that all UC campuses were engaging in such affordability efforts, which appeared to be effective in lowering costs for students while maintaining faculty academic freedom and high academic standards. Partnerships with a number of UC stakeholders and investment would be required to grow these efforts.

Regent Anguiano asked about the barriers to growing the LibreTexts Project. Mr. Larsen replied that, because faculty decided whether to adopt OER independently, their individual needs had to be identified, and this was a slow process. Two aspects of success were platforms like LibreTexts, which were essential to consolidating construction and dissemination efforts, and institutional support so that faculty could see a committed effort.

Committee Chair Park remarked on the potential multiplier effect of OER, whereby one faculty member adopting OER could have an impact on multiple students. In her view, UC was at the forefront of a discussion about the future of course materials.

Committee Chair Park asked how UC could encourage faculty, who were likely exhausted from teaching during the COVID-19 pandemic, to embrace OER. She also asked how much faculty would need to commit to adopt OER. Mr. Li replied that faculty needed to be given flexibility. The Zero-Cost Course Materials Initiative focused on the adoption and adaptation

pillars of OER. Creating new materials would require more effort from faculty, librarians, and other partners. Adoption and adaptation were not as time consuming, because the materials already existed and faculty had access to some of them. Mr. Brown added that the Council of University Librarians was well connected to faculty and Senate committees. Mr. Larsen stated that the multiplier effect of OER had a much broader impact; creating good OER would benefit any students and faculty who use it. He likened OER to building a “textbook of the people” as well as a “textbook of the future.” Faculty were motivated by the customization aspect of OER and also by the amount of effort needed. Mr. Larsen had a team of students helping build the OER infrastructure based on faculty requests.

Committee Chair Park asked the Office of the President to track the University’s OER investment and its return on investment.

5. **EXPLORING THE TRANSFER PIPELINE 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.]

Provost Brown introduced the first panel, a discussion of the progress made on goals set in the 2018 memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the University and the California Community Colleges to enhance transfer: increasing the number of California Community College transfer-ready students; guaranteeing UC admission for qualifying California Community College students; and UC enrolling one transfer student for every two freshman students. The MOU detailed the following initiatives to increase transfer opportunities: partnerships and programs that help community college students meet transfer requirements; communications about the value and benefits of transfer preparation; and targeted professional development for community college counselors and advisors.

Vice President Gullatt shared that she and Marty Alvarado, Executive Vice Chancellor for Educational Services at the California Community Colleges, co-chaired the task force that monitored progress toward meeting the MOU’s goals, which were consistent with the University’s 2030 goals. To meet these goals, UC and the California Community Colleges have been offering transfer admission programs, informational resources, academic programs, advising, summer bridge programs, and more. Admits and enrollees to UC were increasing as a result of ongoing efforts. From 2016 to 2020, California Community Colleges applications to UC increased by 11.5 percent, admissions increased by 17.6 percent, and enrollment increased by 12.8 percent. For fall 2020, 36,900 California Community College students applied for transfer and 27,771 were admitted, a 75 percent admission rate. In 2020, UC admitted its largest and most diverse transfer class, and admission of California Community College students from underrepresented groups (URGs) increased by eight percent. Students from URGs made up 34 percent of the admitted class, and Chicano(a)/Latino(a) students made up 28 percent. The MOU called for a new admissions guarantee based on UC’s transfer admission guarantee (TAG), for which a community college students prepared for a specific major at a specific campus. Per the request of then President Janet Napolitano, the Academic Senate developed

Pathways+, which combined the transfer pathways with TAGs. Currently, there were 20 transfer pathways, or sets of courses toward intended UC majors. Students could apply for one TAG per campus. Pathways+ guaranteed a student admission to a specific UC campus, prepared the student for any UC campus, and placed the student in a systemwide transfer referral process. The program would build on already strong transfer student outcomes—a 75 percent admission rate, a 73 percent yield rate, an 89 percent four-year graduation rate, and an average time-to-degree of 2.4 years. Several community college campuses were piloting associate degree programs that followed the Pathways+ model. The transfer class of 2021 was the first to use Pathways+. Enrollment growth and freshman demand affected the MOU goal of a new transfer enrollment ratio. In 2017, the ratio was 2.3 freshman admits to one transfer student. In 2018–19, UC met the two-to-one goal ratio and maintained it in 2019–20. Improving time to degree was another MOU goal; transfer students from California Community Colleges had an average time to degree of 2.39 years. The two-year transfer graduation rate was 60.9 percent and rising, and the four-year graduate rate was 88.5 percent. Despite these outcomes, critical gaps remained. In fall 2020, about half of new transfer enrollees came from 18 California Community Colleges campuses. Ms. Gullatt remarked that UC should prioritize transfer among first-generation, underrepresented, and low-income backgrounds, as well as transfer from community colleges that did not traditionally send students to UC. The University should also invest some Student Academic Preparation and Educational Partnerships (SAPEP) funding to assess the institutional barriers to transfer.

Ms. Alvarado stated that the California Community College system could improve transfer preparation by explicitly communicating expectations to students and creating a structure that supported all students. She underscored the importance of centering students in these efforts and cautioned against providing them with support within existing structural inequities. In addition to improving equitable transfer outcomes, the California Community College system's priorities for 2021–22 included the Course Identification Numbering System efforts; alignment among discipline faculty and streamlining curricula from different segments of higher education; and establishing shared outcome metrics and strategies like dual admission.

Virginia May, Vice President of the Academic Senate for the California Community Colleges, remarked that information about transfer pathways was not clearly articulated online. Discipline faculty from all three segments must address major preparation requirements, and the Academic Senates from the three segments must address general education requirements. Faculty needed time away from their teaching duties to do this work, funds to convene with other faculty, and staff to facilitate and document these meetings. Faculty-led efforts to align transfer pathways would not need additional faculty buy-in. Ms. May estimated that faculty would need to meet once for every pathway.

Faculty Representative Gauvain stated that the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) identified the need for improved transfer advising and wrote to Governor Newsom and State Assemblymember Marc Berman for more funding for community college advising. Community college students were typically provided with 30-minute advising sessions that combined academic advising with other concerns, such as basic

needs and mental health. Ms. Gauvain stated that academic leaders aimed to provide transfer students with the best academic information possible. If community college students are admitted to UC without proper preparation for their majors, they could experience more stress, which would affect their studies and chances of graduating. UC faculty were committed to convening discipline faculty from the different segments to identify overlaps in major areas of study. For instance, psychology was a broad discipline, and no one program provided the background training for the wide range of career goals. Students needed to know the differences in advance so they could match their preparation efforts to the program that would meet their career goals. The Academic Senates of all three segments embraced and strived to meet goals of equity and nondiscrimination.

Committee Chair Park asked if the required grade point average (GPA) for a TAG varied by department or major. Ms. Gullatt responded in the affirmative. TAGs were specific to majors and campuses, and they required that students complete coursework and achieve a GPA that could range from 2.8 to 3.4. Committee Chair Park asked why more students were not taking advantage of the TAG. Executive Director of Undergraduate Admissions Han Mi Yoon-Wu stated that admissions guarantees displaced other students. The students who knew about and tried to meet the requirements of the TAG tended not to be as diverse as the overall transfer applicant pool. Campuses were turning away students from the regular applicant pool with strong GPAs because some programs were filled with TAG students. The percentage of TAG applicants was slowly increasing, and some programs have opted to admit students from the full applicant pool instead of using the TAG.

Regent Zaragoza stated that many of these issues could be addressed by fixing academic advising. Students of color and commuting students were less likely to know about the TAG. She asked if there were any discussions about changing the ratio of transfer students to freshman admits in light of changing economic circumstances for many across the state. Mr. Brown responded in the negative, adding that the two-to-one ratio was developed under the assumption that some freshman admits would not complete their degree, creating room for transfers, but the University's approach was evolving; it was now trying to increase graduation rates and close graduation gaps. UC still believed in the goals of the Master Plan for Higher Education in California. Community colleges were generating more transferring students, and high schools were graduating more college-ready students. Ms. Alvarado added that programs like the TAG were the result of the University's limited space. Frank conversations were needed in order to determine what had to change.

Regent Zaragoza suggested that UC have more of a presence at community colleges that were not "feeder schools," in other words, community colleges that are close to UC campuses. She also suggested that the University improve transfer centers and transfer student orientation. Mr. Brown stressed the need for resources to implement such changes. Chancellor Block acknowledged that some community college campuses were more optimized for transfer than others. Other community college campuses needed help developing similar infrastructure to ensure successful transfer.

Committee Chair Park asked how UC could be a better partner to the California Community Colleges and how the next iteration of the MOU should be structured.

Ms. Alvarado responded that the next iteration of the MOU should focus on equity while establishing shared priorities, outcome metrics, and intentional strategies that center on student perspectives. Administrators needed to leave their comfort zones. Ms. May added that the next phase of the MOU should focus on convening faculty and clear communication regarding UC transfer pathways, and the differences and similarities between UC and California State University (CSU) pathways, and that being UC-eligible did not guarantee admission.

Mr. Brown briefly introduced the second panel, a discussion about institutional relationships pertaining to student transitions in the transfer process.

Chris Vitelli, Superintendent/President of Merced College stated that, last year, the Merced Promise was launched to create a pathway from Merced College to UC Merced, with the hope that keeping graduates in the region would help transform the San Joaquin Valley. Every year, about 16,000 students from 14 feeder high schools attended Merced College; over 50 percent were first-generation students, and more than 80 percent identified as low-income. The Merced Promise had 11 components, including streamlining the transfer pathway to UCM; earlier engagement; concurrent enrollment opportunities; summer research opportunities; K–12 outreach; improving UC affordability for transfer students; and professional development for staff regarding the transfer process. Mr. Vitelli underscored the close relationship between Merced College and UC Merced.

UC Merced Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Gregg Camfield stated that community colleges in the area have not focused on transferring students to four-year universities, because there were few four-year universities nearby and few job opportunities for people with degrees. The location of UC Merced was chosen to change circumstances of the San Joaquin Valley by breaking down many traditional barriers. For example, one barrier to transfer was the lack of faculty at community colleges to teach the courses that were offered. UCM wished to engage community college students with summer research opportunities with the hope that these students transfer, pursue graduate school, and join the professoriate locally. Like its MOU with Merced College, UC Merced was also compiling similar MOUs with other local community colleges.

UC Merced Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs Charles Nies noted the prominence of community colleges in statewide and nationwide discourse, citing Regent Ortiz Oakley's advisory role for the U.S. Secretary of Education and State Assembly Bill 1456, which would reform the Cal Grant. Although UC Merced was exempt from the transfer student ratio in the MOU, the campus used the MOU as the framework for its own transfer initiative. The five strategic pillars of this initiative were increased administrative partnerships, eliminating curricular barriers, enhanced presence on community college partner campuses, pre-transfer engagement, and the expansion of transfer student success efforts. For instance, UCM entered into intersegmental agreements so that community college students could take UC courses before they transferred, and UC Merced faculty were consulting with community colleges as they developed new curricula. With grant funding, UCM admissions staff were able to work at community college transfer centers. UC Merced was linking its student groups with those at the community colleges. The

campus has also set a three-year transfer graduation target of 90 percent. Transfer applications increased by 24 percent over last year, and statements of intent to register increased by 44 percent. Mr. Camfield added that UC Merced had much work to do to increase its transfer student population.

Mr. Brown introduced the third panel, a demonstration of Program Mapper, a transfer pathways mapping tool from Bakersfield College.

Sonya Christian, Chancellor of Kern Community College District, stated that the tool was significant not because of technology, but rather the convening of discipline faculty across the segments of higher education to determine the nuances of the various transfer pathways. Faculty had to continue their dialogue in order to keep the tool up to date. She expressed her hope that UC, CSU, and the California Community Colleges all adopt the tool.

Craig Hayward, Dean of Institutional Effectiveness at Bakersfield College, provided a demonstration of Program Mapper. The tool included data about program outcomes, the corresponding major at a four-year university, and careers and the labor market.

James Zimmerman, Senior Associate Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education at UC Merced, stated that the Merced campus was eager to integrate Program Mapper into its academic support services. Community college advisors and counselors needed up-to-date degree pathways information, and Program Mapper could help address this issue. UC Merced wished to expand on the success of the tool, along with other intersegmental collaborations, in the upcoming academic year. With the help of the Central Valley Higher Education Consortium, UCM has invited 15 Central Valley community colleges to join the second phase of its transfer initiative, and all 15 have accepted the invitation.

Mr. Camfield underscored the importance of these efforts and remarked that they were part of a full cycle of change in the way education is delivered in the Central Valley.

6. **FUTURE GOALS OF THE COMMITTEE FOR THE UPCOMING YEAR**

[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 Park invited Committee members to share what they would like to address in the upcoming year.

Chancellor Block suggested a discussion of ways UC campuses could increase their capacity without increasing their density.

Faculty Representative Gauvain suggested a discussion on academic integrity in light of the websites that offer assistance to students beyond what faculty believed was appropriate.

Chancellor Larive suggested discussions about how the system could facilitate the development of high-quality, online programs and how programs from the different

campuses would relate to each other. She also suggested continuing discussions about sharing best practices that could lead to adopting pedagogies and curricula that promote student success and improve equity. In addition, Chancellor Larive suggested a discussion of dual enrollment pathways; debt-free UC; the expansion of work-study; a homegrown professoriate that served various segments of higher education; and the financing challenges for graduate education.

Committee Chair Park invited Committee members to continue providing suggestions. She expressed her hope that the Committee be both action- and data-oriented. Committee Chair Park also acknowledged that this was Ms. Gauvain's last full board meeting and thanked her for her service.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff