

The Regents of the University of California

**ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

May 18, 2022

The Academic and Student Affairs Committee met on the above date at the following locations: Luskin Conference Center, Los Angeles campus; 1108 Myrtle Street, Calistoga, California.

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

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

The meeting convened at 1:30 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 March 16, 2022 were approved, Regents Anguiano, Elliott, Hernandez, Park, and Torres voting “aye.”<sup>1</sup>

**2. AMENDMENT OF REGENTS POLICY 3201 – THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA FINANCIAL AID POLICY AND DISCUSSION OF NEW FEDERAL NEED ANALYSIS**

The President of the University recommended that the Regents amend Regents Policy 3201 – The University of California Financial Aid Policy as shown in Attachment 1.

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

Provost Brown stated that this item proposed to amend Regents Policy 3201, The University of California Financial Aid Policy, to make clear that UC’s financial strategy preferred to make a UC education affordable through part-time work opportunities and to minimize student loan borrowing. This aligned with President Drake’s pathway to a debt-free UC education. The success of the financial aid strategy would be assessed using the student experience of paying for college, perceptions of affordability, and rates of housing and food security as benchmarks, which aligned with the Regents’ focus on basic needs.

Executive Director of Student Financial Support Shawn Brick stated that the current financial aid policy did not distinguish between part-time work and borrowing, and the amendment would align with State’s and President Drake’s goal of eliminating or

---

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

drastically reducing student debt. The UC Undergraduate Experience Survey asked students about food and housing security and their perceptions of UC affordability, and these would be folded into the assessment of UC's financial aid strategy. Perceptions of UC affordability have remained fairly stable, but UC would continue to track them.

Mr. Brick provided an update on recent changes to federal financial aid policy. The Expected Family Contribution was transitioning to a Student Aid Index, which could better differentiate the over 50,000 students who originally had a zero dollar Expected Family Contribution by allowing for a negative number. UC could provide students with a negative Student Aid Index number with additional grant dollars, work-study opportunities, or loans. UC planned to use modeling tools to determine how UC students would be affected by this change. The U.S. Department of Education has not released guidance on the change.

Regent Hernandez applauded efforts to minimize student loan debt and suggested setting quantifiable goals, such as specifying the amount and period of time by which average loan debt is to be reduced. Mr. Brick replied that average loan debt at graduation for undergraduate students was about \$21,000, and that UC set concrete goals to achieve a debt-free education in its compact with Governor Newsom. In addition, borrowing rates and average debt were included in annual reports to the Regents. Mr. Brown agreed that it would be valuable to specify UC's ambitions and set them as targets.

Regent-designate Blas Pedral asked about the source and amount of funding that would assist students with a negative Student Aid Index number. Mr. Brick replied that those students would be aided with the UC Grant.

Regent-designate Blas Pedral asked if the UC Grant would be used to achieve President Drake's goal of a debt-free UC education and when he aimed to achieve it. Mr. Brick responded that, in the compact with Governor Newsom, UC would achieve a debt-free pathway by 2029–30, but President Drake wished to achieve it sooner. This would require increases in the Pell Grant, UC Grant, and Middle Class Scholarship. For 2022–23, the State has proposed \$632 million for the Middle Class Scholarship program.

Regent-designate Timmons asked if the Californians for All College Corps stipend was part of the plan for work opportunities. Mr. Brown responded in the affirmative. Mr. Brick noted that the Californians for All College Corps was a volunteer service, which meant it would be available to undocumented students. The State's Learning-Aligned Employment Program was starting this fall and would provide high-quality opportunities.

Committee Chair Park asked if the University's increased return-to-aid would cover all UC students with a negative Student Aid Index number. She asked that this and insights into the modeling be discussed at a future meeting.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the President's recommendation and voted to present it to the Board, Regents Anguiano, Elliott, Hernandez, Park, and Torres voting "aye."

3. **ESTABLISHMENT OF AN EIGHTH UNDERGRADUATE COLLEGE, SAN DIEGO CAMPUS**

The President of the University recommended that Section 7 of the Academic Units and Functions, Affiliated Institutions, and Related Activities of the University, as provided for in Standing Order 110.1, be amended as follows:

**Additions shown by underscoring**

\* \* \*

7. Academic Colleges at San Diego

\* \* \*

(h) There is established at San Diego the Eighth College with undergraduate curricula leading to the degrees of Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Science.

[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 the addition of Eighth College was part of a larger plan to accommodate current and anticipated enrollment growth. The campus had projected 32,000 undergraduate students by 2025, but, due to unprecedented yield, UCSD had 33,000 undergraduate students in fall 2021.

Chancellor Khosla stated that UCSD's colleges were structured around both residential living and themed general education, and they were meant to provide a liberal arts college experience within a large, full-service public university. Based on the original projection of 32,000 students, each college would have 4,000 students. The Theatre District Living and Learning Neighborhood previously approved by the Regents was under construction and would serve as housing for the Eighth College.

UCSD Dean of Undergraduate Education John Moore stated that the campuses seven undergraduate colleges were not discipline-specific and could have students of any major. These colleges combined the general education curriculum, academic advising, student affairs, and residence life. UCSD's colleges were unique in the way they integrated academic and student affairs, and their general education curricula have evolved over time. The campus' Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) aimed to make UCSD a fully residential university, with housing guarantees of four years for first-year students and two years for transfer students. Lower division students would live in their colleges, and upper division students would live in apartment-style housing. The campus undergraduate population was nearing 32,000 students, and there were about 5,000 students in each of the first six colleges. By the time Seventh College and Eighth College reach steady state, the campus aimed to have about 4,000 students per college. The Theatre District Living and Learning Neighborhood would add 2,000 beds, retail and dining space, and underground parking. Like all UCSD colleges, Eighth College would be financed with core funds, which would support the administration, academic program, and student affairs, as well as student housing income. At 4,000 students, tuition revenue was estimated at about \$70 million, and the incremental expense of operating Eighth College would be about \$1 million. Student

housing income would support residential life. The proposed theme of Eighth College was “Engagement & Community,” and the general education curriculum would emphasize community-based experiential and interdisciplinary projects; take an anti-racist approach to critical service learning; and build on breadth courses and major requirements. Mr. Moore presented a list of general education best practices that were developed during the establishment of Seventh College and were considered when planning Eighth College, such as interdisciplinary work, problem-solving capstone projects, experiential learning, and inclusive pedagogical practices. The general education curriculum was comprised of alternatives—breadth requirements in arts, humanities, social sciences, natural sciences, and quantitative reasoning—and required courses offered by the college, known in Eighth College as “engagement courses.” Alternatives could be taken throughout a student’s academic career, and engagement courses would focus on anti-racism in community engagement and include community-based and group projects.

Regent Anguiano asked about the UCSD college experience of commuting students. Mr. Moore replied that the colleges were not only residential in nature, but also included academic units and student affairs, and programming was meant for students regardless of their residential status. Colleges had commuter organizations and lounges, and deans and student affairs staff reached out to commuter students. Many students involved in student government were upper division and did not live at the college. There was outreach to transfer students as well.

Chancellor Khosla asked Mr. Moore if it was the case that fewer lower division students lived outside of the college because UCSD offered complete financial aid packages. Mr. Moore replied in the affirmative. Over 90 percent of students lived at the college in their first year and over 75 percent in their second year. Regent Anguiano noted that, despite financial aid being provided, there were students who might prefer to live at home for cultural reasons. She was heartened to learn about experiences for commuting students.

Regent Anguiano asked how the experience of teaching from a department or a college overlap for faculty. Mr. Moore responded that new faculty members were assigned to a college and could change their affiliation if they so desired. A Senate faculty member served as the director of each college’s academic program and recruited faculty to teach. Department faculty received credit for teaching in the colleges, and Unit 18 lecturers taught some of the courses.

Regent-designate Timmons asked if any departments would be embedded in Eighth College. Chancellor Khosla clarified that departments were not embedded in the colleges, but rather located nearby. Eighth College would be in close proximity to the physical sciences departments.

Regent Hernandez asked whether the colleges offered additional degrees given their associated academic units and about the accreditation process. Chancellor Khosla explained that UCSD was originally envisioned to resemble the Claremont Colleges, which housed various disciplines, but the campus later separated the departments from the colleges; however, the general education function of the colleges remained. The colleges

were residential communities with varied general education themes that provide different experiences. Part of the general education program, such as the writing or community engagement courses, were housed within the college and taught by lecturers and faculty who were affiliated with the college. The colleges certified degrees but did not confer them.

Committee Chair Park asked how transfer students were welcomed and integrated into the colleges. Chancellor Khosla responded that UCSD was building capacity so that transfer students could be welcomed at multiple locations and facilities. Pepper Canyon West would serve as transfer student housing, and the Triton Center would house a transfer student center. Mr. Moore stated that the colleges offered a transfer student-specific orientation, a transfer student experience course, several courses in the general education curriculum, and programming outreach. There was a transfer student representative in the student government within each college. On-campus transfer student housing would be outside of the colleges, but it would be closely connected to the transfer student center.

Committee Chair Park asked why the target population was set at 4,000 students per college. Chancellor Khosla replied that 12 colleges with 2,000 students per college had been originally planned, but this did not seem feasible given UCSD's land mass and rate of growth. Small liberal arts colleges typically had 3,000 to 4,000 students.

Committee Chair Park asked if UCSD surveyed students about the general education and residential experience at their particular college. She distinguished this from the UC Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES). Mr. Moore responded that the campus could disaggregate UCUES data by college and did observe some differences in the colleges. UCSD used these data to improve the student experience. Chancellor Khosla added that the provosts of the colleges were committed to the student experience, and that the colleges engaged in friendly competition to provide unique experiences for students. Regent-designate Timmons shared some college traditions and activities at UCSD when she was a student at Revelle College, noting that college identity was built around them. Chancellor Khosla stated that, unlike at a private institution, all UCSD students were required to take at least one course in mathematics, one in physics, and one in chemistry. Mr. Moore added that, according to guidelines from the UCSD Division of the Academic Senate, the general education curriculum must cover arts, humanities, social sciences, natural sciences, and quantitative reasoning. The Senate also conducted regular program reviews of the colleges and met with students to assess the student experience and general education curriculum. Committee Chair Park suggested that UCSD survey students regarding their experience at their particular college.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the President's recommendation and voted to present it to the Board, Regents Anguiano, Elliott, Hernandez, Park, and Torres voting "aye."

4. **STATUS REPORT ON THE ADVANCING FACULTY DIVERSITY PROGRAM**

[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 began his remarks by underscoring the generational opportunity to diversify the professoriate in light of the University's goal of hiring an additional 1,100 ladder-rank faculty by 2030. Advancing faculty diversity was one of Mr. Brown's goals when he joined the Office of the President in 2017, and he commended the efforts of Vice Provost Susan Carlson. In Mr. Brown's view, the Advancing Faculty Diversity (AFD) program provided the right base of policies, practices, and programs on which to increase faculty hiring and improve faculty diversity. The AFD program started with an infusion of \$2 million from the State. In its first five years, the program has received \$15 million in State and UC funds.

Ms. Carlson stated that campus teams were invited annually to apply for two types of AFD program grants: those that support new practices in faculty recruitment and those that improve academic climate and retain faculty. In the last five years, 146 faculty were hired from 20 pilot recruitment projects, 33.6 percent of whom were members of underrepresented minority (URM) groups and 49.3 percent of whom were women. She compared this with non-AFD searches that resulted in the hiring of 18.7 percent URM and 45.7 percent women faculty during the same period. All AFD hires demonstrated commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) in their teaching, research, and outreach and service, and they were joining departments and schools that were committed to building an inclusive, supportive, and productive academic climate. Success varied among recruitment projects; some projects encountered leadership challenges, had less effective designs, or met resistance. Once the President provided funding in the AFD program's third year, the program added a second focus on retention and improving climate. Since then, there have been 20 pilot retention and climate improvement projects, and hundreds of faculty have committed to new mentoring programs, teaching practices, manuscript workshops, the review of uneven service burdens, the scrutiny of academic leadership, and new assessments of climate. In both types of projects, applicants were asked to draw from practices that were successful in the past or on other campuses, and to partner with other campuses. This year, four projects included more than one campus. To create a strong, multi-campus network, program participants have met five times so far.

UC Merced Associate Vice Provost and Professor Zulema Valdez shared that the Merced campus has been awarded four AFD grants since 2018, three of which were cross-campus collaborations. UC Merced first collaborated with UC Davis on a retention and climate project that focused on developing a cross-campus faculty learning community. UCM then collaborated with UC Santa Cruz on two projects—a recruitment project whereby DEI statements were considered in the first-round review of candidates, and a retention project to institute a faculty equity advocate program at UCSC and expanding such a program at UCM. Through these grants, the campuses have also enhanced first-generation student learning and gathered a list of online resources. Since 2018, UC Merced saw a 50 percent increase in hiring women and a 27 percent increase in hiring people of color. The UCD and UCM faculty learning community sought to accommodate a diverse student population through improved teaching and pedagogy. UC Merced learned much from UC Davis' experience with its own faculty learning community. Early-career faculty could use their faculty learning community projects in merit and promotion materials. According to feedback, the community has improved attitudes toward, knowledge of, and implementation of evidence-based teaching practices, and increased feelings of

collegiality, collaboration, and belonging. Every participant of UCM AFD programs was still at UC Merced. UCM encountered challenges related to the COVID-19 pandemic; the differences presented by the semester system at UC Merced and the quarter system at UC Davis; and limited infrastructure. Following faculty consultation, the goals of the faculty learning community were revised accordingly. UC Merced and UC Davis' collaborations built on their similar traits: both were Hispanic-Serving Institutions, were agriculturally and rurally centered, and both had established teaching commons. Ms. Valdez shared that UCM planned to launch a new faculty learning community next year.

UCLA Dean of Life Sciences Tracy Johnson stated that the Mentor Professor Program was an eight-year strategy in which the six life sciences departments sought scholars who had a history of mentoring students from underrepresented communities in addition to outstanding scholarship. The Program had three components. First, a divisional search committee evaluated candidates' mentorship history and determined whether top candidates aligned with the departments. Then, the departments ranked candidates, interviewed them, and selected finalists. Third, an evaluation was conducted involving retrospective and case study analyses. In 2021, about 850 candidates applied and three faculty were hired for the Department of Molecular, Cell and Developmental Biology, the School of Medicine, and the Department of Psychology. The evaluation examined outcomes in real time, compared this search with previous ones, and interviewed search committees and current mentor professors. Mentoring impact, grant acquisition, and retention determined success. Mentorship work was acknowledged in review, tenure, and evaluation processes, and service loads and perceptions of the Program continued to be monitored. There were now mentor professor searches across different disciplines. The Program rejected the term "diversity hire," as diversity was not achieved at the expense of excellence, and the Program was also focused on retention.

Regent Anguiano asked how best practices were being communicated to other campuses. Ms. Carlson responded that the AFD program has held both in-person and virtual meetings, has shared research that guides decision-making, was compiling a bank of climate-related survey questions, and was developing a website that aggregated best practices. The AFD program was building on and supported by campus chief diversity officers, their staff, and faculty equity advisors and advocates. Ms. Valdez added that best practices were being developed through the review of various campuses' program proposals and assessments. When the UC Santa Cruz DEI working group partnered with UC Merced, UCSC engaged in extensive research to create reference lists and bibliographies, which UCM published online and made widely available. The Merced campus also had a website that answered frequently asked questions about diverse faculty recruitment. With these programs, she observed a shift in how faculty understood the importance of DEI.

Committee Chair Park emphasized Mr. Brown's comments about State investment in these efforts. In her view, the data demonstrated the effectiveness of UC's approaches, and she asked if a bigger unit of change was possible. Chancellor Larive replied that, since UCSC presented its faculty diversity plans at the March meeting, she believed that UC was on the path to a faculty that represented UC students and the state. Best practices did have an effect on who was chosen for interviews and hired.

In response to a question from Committee Chair Park, Chancellor Larive stated that departments were the units of change, and this change occurred at the individual hiring committee level. As a result, the whole campus needed to be in alignment about best practices, what factors to consider during interviews, and recognizing implicit bias.

Chancellor Block added that multi-departmental efforts were possible, citing the divisional search conducted by the Mentor Professor Program. Faculty Representative Horwitz remarked that cluster hires could lead to an esprit de corps among the cohort hired, which could help with retention. Ms. Johnson noted that those hired using the Mentor Professor Program felt connected with each other regardless of department affiliation. The divisional approach has led to departmental collaboration that could drive systemic change.

Committee Chair Park expressed support for a collaborative approach and asked that the University analyze what needed to be funded to ensure success and what could be adopted without funding.

Regent Hernandez asked how the Regents could help accelerate this effort. He suggested reviewing lessons learned from five years of the program. Mr. Brown replied that the Regents have shown a strong commitment to investment toward making substantial change, particularly through their budgetary support of the UC 2030 goals, which included faculty growth. He asked for the Regents' support for the UC 2030 Capacity Plan, which included faculty expansion. The University needed to convince more deans and department chairs, who work with their faculty, to advance this effort.

Chancellor Muñoz noted that scholarship on the lack of diversity in the professoriate has existed for some time. He emphasized the diverse perspectives that these faculty would introduce, and he called attention to the absence of diversity in certain disciplines at the graduate student level. Chancellor Muñoz asked how UC was encouraging undergraduate students to consider graduate education and a career in the professoriate equitably across disciplines. While cluster hires were important, climate affected retention and the success of overall efforts. He suggested looking to past initiatives that were successful. In his view, the University's unique gravitas from its academic excellence and desire to achieve inclusive excellence would attract many diverse faculty. Diversifying the professoriate could be UC's legacy contribution. Mr. Brown stated that he was working with the campus executive vice chancellors to draft a systemwide program that would draw from the diversity of UC and California State University campuses to develop the professoriate.

Chancellor May shared his view that, despite many examples of successful interventions, there was no overarching program that was sustainably resourced. In response to Regent Hernandez's question, campuses needed the Regents' support of faculty growth in order to achieve enrollment growth.

Ms. Carlson underscored the importance of investment, the need to support for those who were new to these efforts, and the difficulty of the work. She wished to ensure that those engaged in this work, many of whom were people of color, were rewarded and able to advance in their careers.

**5. UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA BASIC NEEDS PROGRESS UPDATE**

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

Provost Brown stated that this presentation, a preview of the basic needs annual report, would highlight the University's CalFresh efforts. The full report would be presented at the November meeting.

Director of Student Mental Health and Well-Being Genie Kim stated that the University devised a basic needs logic model to track campuses' progress toward the Regents' 2025 basic needs goals and a project tracker for the Regents' specific recommendations. Progress has been made in increasing the number of students receiving public benefits, advocating for greater investment in financial aid, and evaluation and reporting. UC adjusted the undergraduate food insecurity goal from 22 percent to 24 percent and the housing insecurity goal from eight percent to 3.5 percent to remain consistent with measures used in the UC Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES) and the UC Graduate Student Experience Survey (UCGSES). According to the 2020 UCUES, food insecurity among undergraduate students has decreased. According to the 2021 UCGSES, food and housing insecurity among graduate students has also decreased. CalFresh has made a significant contribution toward these outcomes.

Jesse Rothstein, Faculty Director of the UC Berkeley site of the California Policy Lab (CPL), explained that CPL generated evidence from State and local agency data for better public policy. CPL has partnered with the Office of the President (UCOP), the Student Aid Commission, and the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) to build a database of CalFresh usage rates that could be disaggregated by campus and other student characteristics. These data would later be used to inform outreach strategies and measure the impact of intervention. According to early data, CalFresh usage rates increased sharply in 2016–17 and have at least tripled since then; post-pandemic data had not yet been incorporated. Eligibility would be measured later in the project. The high usage rate at UC Merced could be attributed to large numbers of eligible students, whereas the high usage rates at UC Santa Barbara and UCSF might be attributed more to special outreach efforts. Those receiving student financial aid were more likely to receive CalFresh, and usage rates were higher among African American and Hispanic/Latino(a) students and somewhat lower among white and Asian American students. In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, students with an Expected Family Contribution (EFC) of zero became eligible for the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP). The Student Aid Commission notified some 300,000 students with a zero EFC of this change, and CPL worked with the Student Aid Commission to randomize when those emails were sent so it could measure the likelihood of applying to CalFresh upon receiving the email. CalFresh application rates rose among groups that received a notification email. CPL was currently simulating CalFresh eligibility with financial aid data so that it could identify uptake rates and where there were populations of eligible students not currently receiving benefits.

Committee Chair Park invited Student Observer Kyle Schmidt to make remarks.

Mr. Schmidt began his remarks by thanking the Regents for their commitment to student basic needs. As a transfer student from a low-income background, he accessed food resources through the UCLA Community Programs Office (CPO), food drives, and complimentary food served at campus events. He underscored the multifaceted struggles students faced. Through his participation in a Sustainable Los Angeles Grand Challenge research project, he learned that factors such as physical and mental health, food insecurity, and lack of familial and social capital contributed to housing insecurity. Housing insecurity at UCLA and in Los Angeles County affected academic achievement, heightened stress, and decreased peer engagement. One interviewee, a 44-year-old UCLA transfer student and mother of a developmentally disabled child, relied on UCLA scholarships and housing assistance. She did not qualify for certain grants due her income level, and she struggled academically to keep her scholarships. He stressed that speaking with people in such situations provided context beyond data points and survey responses and called attention to the struggles of nontraditional UC students who also needed assistance.

Regent-designate Timmons asked if the outlier data from UC Santa Barbara had been examined. Ms. Kim responded that UCSB's basic needs office involved its financial aid office in its outreach efforts and had a peer advocacy group that provided education and assisted students with CalFresh enrollment. The campus also sent emails, postcards, and mailings, and hosted in-person workshops. Mr. Rothstein added that, in addition to more effective outreach, the campus' basic needs office had a strong relationship with the County CalFresh office. Regent-designate Timmons suggested documenting UCSB's process and sharing it among the campuses.

Staff Advisor Tseng asked if outreach and enrollment assistance could be expanded to include staff or faculty. For instance, at UCLA, staff were invited to use CPO's CalFresh services. Ms. Kim replied that this could be a best practice that could be applied systemwide. UC Santa Barbara worked with Santa Barbara City College and nonprofit organizations to create a coalition that enrolls students and members of the community.

Committee Chair Park asked that the goal of doubling CalFresh enrollment be further explained. Ms. Kim responded that the benchmark year was 2020–21, when the Special Committee on Basic Needs' report was released. Mr. Rothstein noted the difficulty of benchmarking when less CalFresh usage information was available, but the University was now generating that information. The number of eligible students would be UC's maximum enrollment rate. Committee Chair Park asked that the full report highlight how the Regents could participate in these efforts.

Regent Zaragoza asked why basic needs subject matter experts did not participate in this presentation. Mr. Brown explained that this was a presentation of the CalFresh evaluation conducted by the California Policy Lab.

Regent Zaragoza asked how UC would address the expiration of the SNAP eligibility expansion in July. Ms. Kim replied that State Governmental Relations (SGR) and Federal Governmental Relations (FGR) were working with the Legislature to keep eligibility requirements in place to support pandemic recovery. Director of Student Financial Support

Shawn Brick stated that the expansion did not add many more students; the State law made it clear that anyone minimally eligible for federal work-study could qualify, and this should accommodate many of the same students. Graduate student assistant positions could now count as the employment that would qualify students for CalFresh. Forthcoming changes to CalFresh would address some of Regent Zaragoza's concerns.

Regent Zaragoza stated that the complexity of the renewal process was a barrier. For instance, more flexible CalFresh interview scheduling could be help helpful. She asked that the University advocate for the keeping the expansion and that Regents be kept apprised.

Regent Zaragoza asked what UC has done to advocate for Cal Grant reform. Mr. Brick replied that UC has advocated through SGR and supported the expansion of the Middle Class Scholarship program and the California Community College Entitlement Cal Grant. Regent Zaragoza asked if the Cal Grant reform bill was included in UC advocacy efforts. Mr. Brick replied that UC has not taken a position on Senate Bill 1746 on Cal Grant reform.

Regent-designate Blas Pedral asked that the report presented at the November meeting include 2020–21 food and housing data and information about the basic needs support campuses were providing undocumented students. She also asked that CalFresh user data that UC obtains from CDSS be shared with the Regents.

Committee Chair Park suggested that SGR be present at the November meeting to share the University's basic needs advocacy efforts.

6. **FIRST-GENERATION COLLEGE STUDENTS AND THE HIDDEN CURRICULUM**

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

Provost Brown stated that this presentation would focus on the ways in which first-generation college students navigate the implicit rules of the "hidden curriculum" and find success at UC campuses. Two in five UC undergraduate students were first-generation students. These students were more likely to come from underrepresented groups and receive Pell Grants. Mr. Brown surmised that many UC students from rural areas were first-generation as well. Eighty-two percent of first-generation freshman entrants graduated within six years, and 88 percent of first-generation transfer students graduated within four years. Still, there were opportunities to better support first-generation students.

Frances Contreras, Dean of the UC Irvine School of Education, stated that, in 2021, Latino(a)s represented 30 percent of all UC undergraduate students, and 72 percent of undergraduate Latino(a) students were first-generation students. In her view, the entire UC system could be considered a Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI). Ms. Contreras shared a list of factors influencing how Latino(a) students navigated UC. Family and background have been framed as deficits, but recent research has shown that Latino(a) students valued staying close to their communities and drew support from their families. Campuses should

consider their connection to students' families. Many Latino(a) students were likely to work more than 20 hours per week, which has been shown to be detrimental to academic performance and time-to-degree, and they held non-career-related positions. She suggested that deficit framing of underrepresented minority (URM) students be challenged.

First-generation students did not see themselves represented among faculty, and the disproportionate impact of COVID-19 on the Latino(a) community, in particular, has exacerbated their need for social and emotional support. Aside from deficit framing, gatekeeping courses and climate affected first-generation student success. Interventions included access to the majors of students' choosing, academic support, an extension of the first-year college experience, mentorship, diverse faculty, and internships. Her 2019 study on summer bridge programs found that welcoming spaces and representation were crucial to undergraduate students feeling a sense of belonging, and she suggested that the support provided by summer or transfer bridge should follow students throughout their time at UC. Ms. Contreras also stressed the benefit of summer session by major and the success of educational partnership programs. A large share of mentoring URM students went to faculty of color, and institutional support and merit incentives could increase the number of faculty willing to mentor students. She closed her remarks by noting the University's public mission of serving the California population.

UC Berkeley Assistant Dean of Biological Sciences John Matsui began his remarks by sharing his own experiences as a first-generation, low-income college student. In 1992, he founded the Biology Scholars Program for UC Berkeley undergraduate students who were less academically prepared and had less knowledge of how to navigate their majors or the campus. Participants completed biology degrees with near-equivalent grade point averages (GPAs), and they entered postgraduate programs and advanced to careers related to science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) at equal or higher rates than others in the major. Academic plans were tailored, and students were asked to think differently about managing their success. At UC Berkeley, there was significant pressure to conform, but the concept of a conventional student does not factor differences in life circumstances, which has been disastrous for many low-income and first-generation college students. The Program has worked with over 4,000 students to focus on the quality of their academic strategy, as the "more, harder, faster, better" approach they used as high school students was not working in college. First-generation students were very aware of how they are perceived and prioritized making a good impression over their own interests. Rather than dividing attention between research and coursework, students who came to UC less prepared should focus on coursework instead to improve their "research readiness." Students who were working hard but not seeing success were concluding that they were not smart enough, but there were many factors that might be keeping them from realizing their fullest academic potential. Students also felt pressure to graduate "on time" instead of focusing on the quality of their work. The Program's ability to help students resist the pressure to conform has resulted in its success.

Regent-designate Blas Pedral shared that she attended summer bridge programs at UC Santa Barbara and UC Berkeley. She asked if data for first-generation graduate students were available and if a similar effort was being made to help those students. Ms. Contreras

responded that the UC Chicano/Latino Advisory Council was working to increase Latino(a) graduate enrollment. Over the past 15 years, Latino(a) graduate enrollment has remained between eight to 11.9 percent. Campuses were paying more attention to graduate student leadership and onboarding, but efforts were piecemeal rather than systemic. UC needed a seamless pathway from undergraduate education to the professoriate. Regent-designate Blas Pedral stated that systemic strategies would ensure that the graduate student population is not only more diverse, but also more successful.

Ariana Padilla, a recent graduate of UC Merced, shared her experience as a first-generation student. She attributed her success to her participation in the Fiat Lux Scholars Program, which helped her feel supported and a sense of belonging. First-generation students might be unaware of office hours, letters of recommendation, or how to build study skills, and the Program offered structured services and tools, such as faculty networking receptions, student socials, counseling, workshops, professional development resources, and peer mentorship. It notified students about scholarships, internships, housing and financial aid deadlines, and more. Due to the pandemic, the Program lost staff and programming. Ms. Padilla called for more funding for the Fiat Lux Scholars Program and other programs.

Regent Torres shared that he was the first Latino(a) student at UC Santa Cruz and recalled the challenges of being a transfer student. There were more programs now than when he was a student in the 1960s. He emphasized the legacy that these efforts were building.

Regent Hernandez noted how similar his own experiences as a student were to what was presented. He asked why the University could not seek HSI status as a system.

Regent Anguiano remarked that the “hidden curriculum” gave a name to a phenomenon that she had known about for years. She praised this work, noting the power of UC research to effect change in the state and the nation. She suggested discussions on how to increase funding for Student Academic Preparation and Educational Partnerships. Regent Anguiano asked how UC could embed these services so that they are available to all students.

Staff Advisor Tseng stated that the hidden curriculum affected first-generation staff as well. The resources for first-generation students could also help staff.

President Drake recalled the UCSF Medical Scholars Program collaborating with the UCB Biology Scholars Program in the 1990s. He praised Mr. Matsui’s persistence and the impact he had on so many people. President Drake noted the diversity within UC leadership and credited the sustainable change due to scholarly and programmatic work.

7. **BRIEFING ON THE MITIGATING COVID-19 IMPACTS ON FACULTY WORKING GROUP**

[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 April 2021, President Drake charged Provost Brown to appoint the Joint Academic Senate-Administration Mitigating COVID-19 Impacts on Faculty Working Group in response to the Academic Council's submitted 21 recommendations for addressing such impacts. Faculty Representative Horwitz and UC Davis Executive Vice Chancellor Mary Croughan co-chaired the Working Group.

Ms. Croughan shared a sample of what a UC faculty member's typical day would be like during the pandemic. She described the faculty member's struggle to balance family needs, students' needs, unfamiliarity with remote instruction, isolation, exhaustion, research delays, and fears of not achieving tenure.

Mr. Horwitz stated that the Working Group recently submitted its final report, which included five recommendations to prevent the impacts of the pandemic from eroding the quality of scholarship or faculty's advancement opportunities.

Ms. Croughan stated that impacts such as the increase in professional and personal demands; rapid shift to remote instruction; lack of access to laboratories, field sites, and research materials; and patient care responsibilities resulted in lost time, stalled research and scholarship, sunk costs, and reduced productivity for faculty, postdoctoral researchers, and graduate students. The Working Group found that early to mid-career women faculty, as well as a disproportionate number of underrepresented minority faculty, were affected the most by the pandemic. Of those who participated in the COVID-related Dependent Care Modified Duties Program, 63 percent were women and 19 percent were underrepresented minority (URM) faculty. URM faculty made up 12 percent of total UC faculty. The Working Group recommended advancing faculty diversity goals that could be applied consistently across UC.

Mr. Horwitz underscored the importance of a systematic framework for fairly reviewing academic achievement while considering different situations. The Achievement Relative to Opportunities (ARO) in Academic Advancement framework would place more weight on individual successes given personal and professional circumstances. The ARO would adjust the balance among research, teaching, and service responsibilities based on the impact of the pandemic on faculty members, and they would share their circumstances in an ARO statement that is included in their academic file. The Working Group recommended that each campus encourage faculty to submit their academic files according to the regular review schedule with the expectation that reviewers would incorporate ARO principles. The ARO framework would be operational for five years.

Ms. Croughan stated that funding mechanisms proposed by the Working Group would provide needed resources or increase available research time. Strategic interventions would help the University and individuals recover and advance UC's research mission. The Working Group has asked each campus to devise implementation plans through 2025–26. Plans must be submitted and posted by October 1, 2022. The campus provosts and executive vice chancellors would provide oversight and work with the campus divisions of the Academic Senate on implementation and reporting. A yearly report would be submitted to the systemwide Academic Senate Chair and systemwide Provost for the next five years.

Committee Chair Park thanked the Working Group for adopting this work and wished to ensure that faculty are not taken for granted. Mr. Horwitz stated that demands on faculty have persisted, as teaching methodologies and modalities have continued to be negotiated. Some in the Working Group wished to have a longer horizon than five years, and some wanted to remake the faculty advancement system altogether because they believed that it expected too much of younger faculty under difficult conditions. Ms. Croughan shared that, during the pandemic, emeriti faculty helped junior faculty by taking on teaching responsibilities.

Committee Chair Park noted that UC needed to identify resources to support the campus implementation of the Working Group's recommendations.

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff