

The Regents of the University of California

**ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

September 21, 2022

The Academic and Student Affairs Committee met on the above date at the Price Center, San Diego campus and by teleconference meeting conducted in accordance with California Government Code §§ 11133.

Members present: Regents Blas Pedral, Elliott, Hernandez, Park, and Timmons; Advisory members Steintrager and Tesfai; Chancellors Christ, Larive, Wilcox, and Yang; Staff Advisor Lakireddy

In attendance: Regents Batchlor and Ortiz Oakley, Faculty Representative Cochran, Regents Analyst Sheridan, General Counsel Robinson, Provost Brown, Vice Presidents Brown, Gullatt, and Maldonado, and Recording Secretary Li

The meeting convened at 1:25 p.m. with Committee Chair Park presiding.

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

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the Academic and Student Affairs Committee meeting of July 20, 2022 were approved, Regents Blas Pedral, Elliott, Hernandez, Park, and Timmons voting “aye.”<sup>1</sup>

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the joint Academic and Student Affairs and Finance and Capital Strategies Committee meeting of May 19, 2022 were approved, Regents Blas Pedral, Elliott, Hernandez, Park, and Timmons voting “aye.”

**2. ENHANCING STUDENT TRANSFER: CCC-UC TRANSFER TASK FORCE FINAL REPORT**

The President of the University recommended that the Regents accept the CCC-UC Transfer Task Force Final Report.

[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, in April 2018, the University and the California Community Colleges executed a memorandum of understanding (MOU) to increase access to a four-year UC degree and to ensure that there is academic preparation and support for success and timely graduation. The MOU stipulated that a representative Task Force be assembled to monitor provisions, progress, and outcomes. The Task Force’s final report indicated

---

<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.

progress in six areas for action by both segments, in transfer enrollment during the MOU period, and in the Task Force's eight recommendations. Among the outcomes of the MOU was the creation of Pathways+, which was a set of uniform transfer requirements for 20 of the most sought-after UC majors. Mr. Brown praised UC faculty for this undertaking. In fall 2021, over 3,600 community college students in the first Pathways+ cohort had an average transfer grade point average (GPA) of 3.68. The University also saw a 16.9 percent increase in the number of students applying to UC through the Transfer Admissions Guarantee (TAG) program since fall 2020; 45 percent of TAG students enrolled at UC Berkeley, UCLA, or UC San Diego, which did not offer TAGs.

Completion outcomes for transfer students also showed improvement. Of transfer students who entered UC in fall 2017, 59.4 percent graduated in two years and 90 percent in four years. Despite the COVID-19 pandemic's effect on operations and engagement, UC augmented its partnership with student-serving organizations, such as Umoja which supports the academic success, personal growth, and self-actualization of African American and other students at the California Community Colleges. Under the MOU, six UC campuses had Umoja student ambassadors who supported the transfer of Umoja participants. Some areas needed continued attention, such as developing improved data sharing agreements. While the MOU period has concluded, UC and the community colleges would continue to work toward regionally and socially equitable access to bachelor's degree programs, expand the quality of academic preparation, and support students in their transfer journey. The Task Force's recommendations underscored the importance of data for evidence-based action, measuring outcomes, enacting policies, research, and facilitating intersegmental collaboration.

Vice President Gullatt explained that the report recommendations identified areas of action that were absent from the MOU and would improve the transfer process and respond to changes in the transfer landscape. These changes included new legislation like Assembly Bill (AB) 928, which streamlined general education requirements, and AB 132, which pertained to UC and California State University dual admissions programs. Other changes included the State's new Cradle-to-Career Data System; the intersegmental enhancement of ASSIST, the State's course articulation repository; and State funding to integrate course articulation from private and independent colleges into ASSIST. There were more admissions guarantees that incorporated the Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT), and the new K-16 Educational Collaboratives would create pathways into various industry sectors.

The Task Force asked UC faculty to assist the California Community College system in developing common course numbering per AB 1111, which would create consistency in community college curricula and clarity for students. The Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS) was developing a singular transfer pathway required by AB 928. The Academic Council's Special Committee on Transfer Issues has been tasked with reviewing and reporting on UC transfer programs, practices, and outcomes, and to assist other Academic Senate committees with a review of transfer initiatives and policies. Jointly establishing a baseline and targets would enable both segments to better plan for future transfer demand. Increasing transfer would help UC meet its 2030 goals to produce more degrees and close gaps, but UC needed to advance regional growth in transfer. The

University was identifying community colleges in regions with lower educational attainment but higher population growth. Efforts to improve affordability for transfer students included the development of a debt-free pathway to UC and participation in the Californians for all Program College Corps, a State service program. The report's recommendations also called for an intersegmental MOU between UC, the California State University (CSU), the California Community Colleges, and private and independent institutions in response to the aforementioned changes to the transfer process.

Mr. Brown stated that California could serve as a national model for improving transfer.

Regent Hernandez asked about the biggest challenge to implementation. Ms. Gullatt replied that it would take substantial work to collect data, and that UC was devising data sharing agreements. She also stated that UC should work with the California Community Colleges to help community college students who were not transfer-ready. Mr. Brown noted the challenge of coordination among 116 community college campuses and nine undergraduate UC campuses to achieve greater regional equity in UC transfer enrollment.

Regent Timmons asked if there was a timeline and benchmarks for implementing the recommendations. Ms. Gullatt replied in the affirmative. The UC 2030 goals were a major milestone, and there would be incremental milestones as well. UC would prioritize recommendations with its community college partners.

Regent Ortiz Oakley acknowledged the tremendous amount of work involved in these efforts and called for an accountability framework so that Regents could follow the progress of implementation. He credited Student Regents who were transfer students with helping change UC's transfer culture. Despite the legislation and frameworks in place, many still felt unable to attend UC, partly because of the complicated nature of the transfer process. He asked why many transfer-eligible students were not enrolling at UC. Last year, transfer from community colleges rose about four percent while the number of community college students who earned an ADT increased more than 18 percent. Regent Ortiz Oakley suggested streamlining the ADT, entering into a new MOU with the California Community College system, and holding the University accountable in these efforts. The transfer experience varied widely across different UC campuses.

Regent Blas Pedral asked about affordable housing options for transfer students and suggested that improvements to the financial aid process, which had been discussed in previous meetings, be integrated into these efforts as well. Ms. Gullatt explained that housing was beyond the scope of this report and its recommendations, which pertained to the 2018 MOU. Housing, time to degree, and inclusion were part of the larger transfer framework. UC's work with UAspire would continue to evolve its approach to financial aid.

Regent-designate Tesfai asked to be kept apprised of the coordination and planning regarding the recommendation to conduct a longitudinal study and regional outreach to community college campuses. Ms. Gullatt responded that UC campuses would be receiving

new Student Academic Preparation and Educational Partnerships (SAPEP) funding to work with regional community colleges.

Faculty Representative Steintrager asked how the Task Force approached the issue of transfer culture as this was not explicitly reflected in the recommendations. Ms. Gullatt replied that the University's culture efforts, through programs like the Puente Project and Mathematics, Engineering, Science, Achievement (MESA), predated the 2018 MOU. UC students who participated in the Umoja program returned to the community colleges as ambassadors. She added that Mr. Brown was working with California Community College leadership to identify and address culture issues. While faculty researched transfer culture, students played a key role in demystifying it.

Staff Advisor Lakireddy asked how staff could be empowered to ensure the success of these efforts. Ms. Gullatt recognized the significant impact that the COVID-19 pandemic has had on staff, who needed resources, support, appropriate compensation, and work commensurate with compensation. Campuses have seen much turnover among staff who worked with students. UC must innovate new forms of engagement, both in-person and remotely. It would take much time to restore the staff capacity lost during the pandemic.

Chancellor Wilcox shared that the Riverside campus has struggled with transfer and suggested that UC set transfer goals that are specific to campuses. He acknowledged that such specificity would be difficult quantitatively and politically. The University also needed a systemwide effort to address the geographic diversity of transfer. He did not believe that reaching out to 116 community college campuses individually was efficient.

Regent Timmons asked if transfer admissions were spread evenly among the campuses and how more equity could be encouraged. Mr. Brown replied that the transfer process was becoming more competitive. Many feeder institutions were sending students to UC's urban campuses, which were already in high demand. The University admitted 75 percent of California Community College applicants who apply, compared with about 60 percent of freshman applicants. It was challenging to develop partnership programs that ensure transfer student success. Ms. Gullatt likened transfer admission to graduate admission in that students were applying to a particular UC major program. Students applying to a broader array of majors would help with access issues. Outreach has included informing prospective students about the variety of majors available at UC.

Committee Chair Park asked what the Task Force learned. Ms. Gullatt stated that the pandemic had a significant impact on what UC was able to accomplish. The intricacies of transfer were immense and solutions were incremental. The Task Force did not have an opportunity to examine curriculum. A more holistic approach to transfer than what was articulated in the MOU was needed, and the transfer process should include private institutions. Transfer student successes ought to be explored and replicated.

Committee Chair Park asked Faculty Representative Cochran to expound on progress that the Academic Senate has made. Ms. Cochran echoed Ms. Gullatt's comments about the impact of COVID-19. The Senate created a new committee that would work on extending

transfer pathways and improving processes. Last year, the Academic Senates across the three segments worked together to develop a singular set of general education requirements, which was now undergoing approval processes at the different segments.

Committee Chair Park shared that the Committee would engage in more in-depth discussion of the recommendations at a future meeting. She questioned whether UC was adequately prepared to meet demand, particularly with regard to faculty capacity. She called attention to the University's ability to meet its goal of a two-to-one transfer ratio.

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

### 3. **UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA DUAL ADMISSION PILOT 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 explained that last year's State budget trailer bill, Assembly Bill (AB) 132, requested that the University establish a dual admission program for freshman applicants, particularly underrepresented students experiencing limitations in their high school curriculum, geographical constraints, or financial challenges. Academic Senate Regulation 476 D. allowed applicants who do not meet UC's academic preparation requirements at graduation but were in the top 12.5 percent of their graduating class and had a grade point average (GPA) of at least 3.0 to apply for admission to a California Community College with conditional admission to a UC campus. UC's previous dual admission program was implemented in 2002 and targeted students in the top four to 12.5 percent of their graduating class and who did not meet requirement for statewide eligibility. At the time, the Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) program focused on the top four percent of a graduating class. The current dual admission program did not require ELC qualification. The new dual admission program would create a pathway for freshman applicants who were considered UC-ineligible because they did not meet the A-G course requirement. Of the approximately 10,000 students considered ineligible every application cycle, about 3,700 met Senate criteria for dual admission. Not part of this new program were the UC-eligible first-year applicants who are not admitted to their campus of choice, those who are admitted to UC but choose to attend the California State University, and those who choose to attend a community college.

Executive Director Han Mi Yoon-Wu explained that the new dual admission program applied to California residents or those qualify for AB 540 benefits who are graduating from a California high school and have at least a 3.0 GPA. These are students who are denied freshman admission and do not qualify for an admissions referral due to deficiencies in A-G completion. This was a three-year pilot program for students applying for freshman admission in fall 2023, 2024, and 2025. Eligible students would be invited to enter into an agreement for conditional admission to a UC campus that offers a transfer admission guarantee (TAG). Students would be able to complete lower division requirements at a

California Community College while receiving academic advising and other support from UC. Students would have three years to complete transfer admission requirements and any campus-specific dual admission criteria. As with the TAG and Pathways+, these students could apply to any UC campus and were not obligated to enroll in the dual admission campus; about 45 percent of TAG students enrolled in a non-TAG campus. These students could enroll in any community college of their choosing and would have priority registration there. The launch of the program was recently announced.

Mr. Brown stated that the University would provide a report to the State at the end of the pilot program. UC planned to track the number and characteristics of students who are offered dual admission, opt in, and enroll at UC campuses, as well as their performance while at UC. The University would also track the activities of community colleges with good student outcomes for best practices that could be scaled and sustained.

Regent Timmons asked about the profile of students who apply to UC without fulfilling A–G requirements and why dual admission was the chosen intervention. Mr. Brown replied that students did not always know whether they fulfilled A–G requirements. The new program would guide students who have signaled an intent to attend UC to take the right courses and transfer to UC.

Regent Timmons asked why UC was not committing resources at the high school level so that students better understand A–G requirements. Mr. Brown responded that UC did commit resources at the high school level. In his view, AB 132 recognized that non-completion of A–G requirements is not always a result of student choice but rather course availability. Vice President Gullatt stated that Regents recently voted to expand UC programs related to A–G requirements. Some schools did not offer the full array of A–G courses, and some students' own circumstances could lead to non-completion.

Regent Timmons remarked that this program could address regional issues. Mr. Brown responded in the affirmative, recalling his involvement in creating the “entitled to review” pathway, whereby applications were reviewed regardless of whether students met all the eligibility requirements. Some of those students were admitted. A positive aspect of this program was that, early on, the University establishes a relationship with students who signal an intent to the University. He expressed his wish that this program could have sufficient resources and include students who did meet the eligibility requirements as well.

Regent Blas Pedral asked about the reactions to announcements about the program and any questions the University received. Ms. Yoon-Wu replied that UC received questions similar to those posed by Regent Timmons. Individuals also asked if students who met UC requirements and enrolled in a community college could participate in this dual admission program; those students could pursue a TAG. This dual admission program offered more wraparound services to a population that seemed to need them.

Chancellor Larive remarked that the TAG's existence within the context of UC requirements presented a challenge. Campuses have been trying to work with community colleges to translate TAG requirements into community college courses. This new dual

admission program could help UC build up a set of requirements in the community college context.

Regent Hernandez suggested that those in the dual admission program begin to pay tuition while attending community college, and these funds could be used to offset costs when they transfer to UC. He compared his suggestion to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, or G.I. bill. Ms. Gullatt stated that students could be offered the Californians for All College Corps opportunity, which offered a \$10,000 stipend. Regent Hernandez remarked that it would provide an incentive for students to follow through with transfer.

Regent-designate Tesfai asked how many students qualified for the new dual admission program. He expressed hope that best practices from this program could be applied to students in the conventional transfer pathway. Regent-designate Tesfai asked if there would be one cohort for the three-year period, or if there would be an additional cohort every year. Ms. Yoon-Wu replied that there would be three cohorts who each had up to three years to transfer to UC. She stated that an estimated 3,700 students would qualify, but the participation rate was unknown, with some dropouts anticipated. Ms. Gullatt added that the University could not automatically place students in this program; the opt-in element was a legislative requirement.

Committee Chair Park stated her understanding that students would be notified of this option. Ms. Gullatt added that UC would engage in outreach to encourage participation.

Committee Chair Park asked if all nine undergraduate campuses were participating in the new dual admission program. Ms. Yoon-Wu replied that this was a TAG-based program, so participating campuses were the six that offered the TAG.

Committee Chair Park asked why non-TAG campuses—UC Berkeley, UCLA, and UC San Diego—were not participating. Mr. Brown noted that every admission guarantee displaces students, and the types of students who become displaced could make participation difficult to justify. Many TAG students apply to non-TAG schools and gain admission. Ms. Gullatt added that non-TAG campuses would provide advising and host events.

Regent Timmons asked if UC was addressing the lack of access occurring both at the high school and community college levels in a given region. Ms. Gullatt expressed hope that advising from UC about opportunities such as cross enrollment and UC online courses would help offset those inequities. Mr. Brown added that the program could reveal what is offered at the community colleges, where bottlenecks existed, demand for transfer to UC, and what resource infrastructure was needed to help students transfer.

Regent Timmons expressed concern about the availability of community college courses for high-demand majors like chemistry and engineering. Mr. Brown responded that, through the program, UC would learn what courses were offered at the community colleges and how best to partner with them. For example, UC Merced graduate students were teaching major preparation courses at the community college level.

Regent-designate Tesfai asked if AB 132 precluded UC Berkeley, UCLA, and UC San Diego from joining the pilot program. He stated his understanding that these campuses struggled to attract more underrepresented students. Mr. Brown clarified that these campuses struggled to admit and enroll students given demand. Regent-designate Tesfai urged the participation of these campuses and called attention to majors not offered in the program. Mr. Brown underscored the importance of having data to better identify this population. In his experience, admission guarantees did not always work as intended.

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

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

Provost Brown recalled that, in 2020, the State Auditor recommended that the Office of the President (UCOP) resume annual outreach regarding the Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) program. This practice had been discontinued in 2012 to shift resources to implementation when ELC was expanded to include the top nine percent of high schools. To participate in ELC, high schools must offer at least 15 A–G courses, share student-level data with UCOP, and obtain annual parental consent to share those data. As of fall 2021, 1,867 schools were eligible and 1,600 participated in ELC.

Executive Director Han Mi Yoon-Wu stated that ELC eligibility via the local pathway or the statewide pathway guaranteed University admission but not necessarily to one’s campus of choice. ELC, a tool to broaden the geographical diversity of the undergraduate population, drew from the top nine percent of participating high schools based on the grade point average (GPA) of A–G courses. To increase ELC awareness, UC has identified and engaged nonparticipating schools; reached out to online schools, which were now allowed to participate; and provided webinars to high school counselors and UC admissions staff. In fall 2021, 28 percent of the applicant pool had ELC status, and ELC students made up nearly 40 percent of those admitted. ELC status was one of 13 approved factors in comprehensive review, and the weight placed on ELC depended on campus selectivity, the size and quality of the applicant pool, and campus policy and priorities. At the most selective campuses, ELC students must still compete with other applicants.

Michelle Whittingham, Associate Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Management at UC Santa Cruz, stated that, in the first step of the admissions process at UCSC, each application was fully reviewed by extensively trained, certified readers, and no one factor or person determined an admissions decision. The ELC or percentile ranking was taken into consideration during the holistic review process. ELC designation helped readers understand applicants’ academic achievement within the context of their opportunities and the likelihood that they would take full advantage of opportunities at a major research university. GPA, the number of A–G courses and honors courses taken, and performance in English and mathematics comprised an “academic achievement within context” score. For the second step in the admissions process selection, faculty have articulated three aspects: academic achievement within context; non-cognitive factors such as leadership, special talents and achievement, contributions to diversity; and equity factors, or

indications that a UCSC education would have a positive effect on social mobility, with ELC being one of these factors. This same methodology was used to determine merit scholarship recipients. In fall 2021, the ELC admit rate was 93 percent and the non-ELC admit rate was 44 percent.

Gary Clark, Executive Director of Undergraduate Admission at UCLA, shared that, in fall 2021, over 28,000 or about one in three California resident applications to UCLA were from ELC students, and about 8,400 California residents were admitted. The fall 2021 ELC admit rate was 24 percent compared with an admit rate of three percent for non-ELC California resident applicants. While UCLA gave ELC strong consideration, the campus also did not wish to disadvantage a student attending a non-ELC school. All applications were reviewed at least twice, and ELC was flagged for the application reader. Like UCSC, UCLA also considered factors such as courses, GPA, and leadership opportunities. ELC status did not necessarily reflect the level of accomplishment or the rigor of the high school program. For applications to a competitive major or one that requires an audition or a portfolio, talent would be a critical factor aside from ELC status. Regardless of a student's ELC status, UCLA would calculate a percentile based on a student's academic performance relative to other applicants from the same school.

Committee Chair Park asked that future presentations differentiate between "ELC" and "ELC only" students.

Staff Advisor Lakireddy asked if there was a map of schools not participating in ELC. Ms. Yoon-Wu replied in the negative but offered to provide a list of nonparticipant schools by counties or regions. Some schools with full A–G course lists, which were also used by the California State University, might not have many students applying to UC and therefore did not participate in ELC. Mr. Brown opined that a map could be helpful and informative.

5. **“LIFTED”: THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA’S FIRST IN-PRISON BACHELOR OF ARTS 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 stated that the UC Irvine Leveraging Inspiring Futures Through Educational Degrees (LIFTED) program enabled incarcerated students to earn a bachelor of arts (B.A.) degree in sociology from UC Irvine.

Chancellor Gillman noted that UCI was the first to provide incarcerated students with the opportunity to earn a UC baccalaureate degree. He underscored the difficulty of such an undertaking, as well as the talent and dedication of the faculty and staff involved.

Keramet Reiter, Vice Chair of Criminology, Law and Society at UC Irvine and inaugural Director of UCI LIFTED, stated that the program was launching this week at Richard J. Donovan Correctional Facility. About four years ago, faculty, staff, and stakeholders including formerly incarcerated students brainstormed the possibility of providing

unserved students in State prisons access to a UC baccalaureate degree. The program received support from Chancellor Gillman, the UCI Division of the Academic Senate, and other campus leadership, secured philanthropic support with the help of the campus advancement office, and received additional financial support from the UCI Office of the Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor. In December 2020, UC Irvine and the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) signed a memorandum of understanding (MOU) committing to the program. In June 2022, the State allocated \$1.8 million to UCI LIFTED over a five-year period. Southwestern College, which has enabled students from Richard J. Donovan Correctional Facility to earn associate in arts (A.A.) degrees that meet UC transfer requirements, was chosen as the community college partner. Students in the program would enter UCI as junior-level transfers and work toward a B.A. in sociology. Faculty would teach courses in the prison. Courses would be preset in the first year, but UCI hoped to offer more choices as the program matriculates more students. UCI LIFTED aimed to make the student experience as similar to the campus experience as possible. Of the 30 students who applied, 26 were admitted to UC Irvine; these students met the same requirements as any other transfer student. The program initially cost an estimated \$30,000 per student per year, and tuition was covered by the Blue and Gold Opportunity Plan. As more students join the program, cost per student was expected to decrease. The \$1.8 million in State funding included \$250,000 per year for the program and \$500,000 for replication at other campuses. Ms. Reiter noted two primary challenges. UCI was the first college in the state to request a statement about academic freedom in its agreement with the CDCR, and the campus planned to protect this value. Limited classroom space, faculty travel time, and the lack of internet access in prisons challenged the program and its scalability. In response, UCI LIFTED was working to identify classroom space in prisons throughout the state, raising funds to support faculty travel to institutions, and advocating for computing and internet access in prisons. Guided by the California Master Plan for Higher Education, UCI LIFTED was adding new meaning to UC's commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion and would undergo rigorous systematic evaluation. Ms. Reiter looked forward to working with UC colleagues to expand the program.

Faculty Representative Steintrager asked whether there were restrictions on course content in the MOU. Chancellor Gillman replied that, per the MOU, there would be no restriction on faculty's ability to assign reading or identify issues for conversation. The spirit of the agreement was such that faculty would be able to do in this environment everything that they would do on the Irvine campus. Chancellor Gillman emphasized his commitment to the academic freedom of this program. Ms. Reiter added that, as internet access is expanded in prisons, there would be more opportunities for surveillance.

Regent Hernandez asked how students were selected for UCI LIFTED. Ms. Reiter replied that students had to earn an A.A. in sociology through Southwestern College and meet UC eligibility requirements. These students were still applying through open transfer pools and had to meet transfer requirements. She commended these students for the obstacles they overcame to complete courses during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Regent-designate Tesfai asked if other majors were being considered and about plans to expand the program to other campuses. Ms. Reiter responded that sociology was chosen because it was one of three majors for which community colleges offered courses in State prisons. The program aimed to offer science and other majors in the future. Other departments at UCI have expressed interest. UCI was in active discussion with UC Riverside and other campuses. The program benefited from a triangular relationship between a UC campus, a community college campus, and a prison in proximity.

Committee Chair Park asked if the program would follow the trajectory of graduates in the long term. Ms. Reiter responded in the affirmative. The program was incorporating the campus' internal evaluation process and was considering an external evaluation process as well. Through this program, the University was helping students envision graduate and professional education.

Committee Chair Park suggested that the program offer teaching credentials in the future.

Regent-designate Raznick asked if career services would be provided as part of this program. Ms. Reiter replied that UCI has a counselor who supports formerly and currently incarcerated students. UCI was creating an external community advisory board, and career resources would be an element of that group. She emphasized the challenge of career development for students with criminal records.

## 6. **CLIMATE CHANGE: THE RESEARCH IMPERATIVE**

[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.]

Vice President Maldonado discussed new climate resilience research opportunities in partnership with the State. This month, Governor Newsom announced the California Climate Commitment, which aimed to achieve carbon neutrality by 2045 and 90 percent clean energy by 2035. Wishing to improve its relationship with State government, UC research leadership met with State agencies to discuss climate and other critical issues. In 2021, UC hosted a successful series of Wildfire Symposia that conveyed various aspects of research ranging from modeling to policy, and the State invited UC to submit a proposal on climate resilience. Ms. Maldonado presented a chart of the six priorities in the State's climate adaptation strategy. An example of nature-based solutions, one of the priorities, was the California 30 x 30 initiative, which aimed to conserve 30 percent of the state's land and coastal waters by 2030. UC was also monitoring the California Air Resources Board's 2022 Scoping Plan for achieving carbon neutrality. UC was conducting research at ten campuses, five UC Health locations, three National Laboratories, and UC Agriculture and Natural Resources, and boasted unique facilities and test beds. UC's Natural Reserve System accounted for nearly all of the state's biodiversity, and its 41 sites could help meet the California 30 x 30 initiative's goals.

To administer the \$100 million awarded by the State for climate research, UC was forming a steering committee that would include members from State agencies and UC research

leadership. Projects would be selected based on the State's goals, and the Research Grants Program Office (RGPO) at the Office of the President would be responsible for managing peer reviewed competitions. The University had experience as a long-time steward of tobacco, breast cancer, and HIV/AIDS research programs.

Committee Chair Park asked when the request for proposals (RFP) would be issued and if grants would be awarded over several years. Ms. Maldonado replied that UC would have two years to encumber the funding and would host a systemwide webinar for UC researchers in October. Research leadership teams were deciding how many competitions to hold during the RFP period. Some projects would take longer to show results than others.

Committee Chair Park asked if anyone affiliated with the aforementioned UC locations was eligible. Ms. Maldonado replied in the affirmative.

Committee Chair Park asked if UC could catalog the magnitude of its climate efforts. Ms. Maldonado replied that UC was observing each location's strengths as well as cross-campus and cross-system collaborations. A goal was to establish a singular website to catalog both expertise and laboratory assets.

Committee Chair Park observed that the new climate research funding was a significant addition to the research funding UC was already managing. Tracy Richmond-McKnight, Director of the Tobacco-Related Disease Research Program, replied that the volume of grant money that RGPO awarded was doubled. This new amount was being integrated into RGPO's regular pre-award schedule. With regard to post-award management, these new grant amounts would be larger but also fewer in number.

Regent Hernandez asked if priority would be given to particular types of climate research, noticing differences between carbon neutrality and carbon reduction. Ms. Maldonado responded that this was still under consideration. Focusing on vulnerable communities and health disparities would be a core value of the grant program. The University was partnering with State agencies to determine how UC could fill gaps in climate research. Regent Hernandez offered his help.

Regent Blas Pedral asked if students would have an opportunity to shape guidelines for proposals. Ms. Maldonado replied that she invited members of the UC Student Association (UCSA) and UC Graduate and Professional Council (UCGPC) to speak to research leadership about climate. There was discussion about engaging UCSA and UCGPC in the governance structure of the grants program.

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff