

The Regents of the University of California

**ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

July 19, 2023

The Academic and Student Affairs Committee met on the above date at UCSF-Mission Bay Conference Center, San Francisco campus.

Members present: Regents Anguiano, Ellis, Hernandez, Park, and Tesfai; Ex officio member Leib; Advisory member Steintrager; Chancellors Block, Christ, Wilcox, and Yang; Staff Advisor Mackness

In attendance: Regents Elliott, Lee, and Sarris, Regent-designate Pack, Staff Advisor Mackness, Assistant Secretary Bricker, General Counsel Robinson, Provost Newman, Vice Presidents Brown and Gullatt, and Recording Secretary Li

The meeting convened at 10:20 a.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 17, 2023 were approved, Regents Anguiano, Ellis, Hernandez, Leib, Park, and Tesfai voting “aye.”<sup>1</sup>

**2. ROLE OF UC RESEARCH ENTITIES IN STATE POLICY DEVELOPMENT**

[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 Newman introduced the item. UC researchers were a source of critical analysis and insight that assisted the State by informing public policy. Dozens of organized research groups and institutes, such as UC Center Sacramento (UCCS), conveyed research findings. UCCS managed the California State Policy Evidence Consortium (CalSPEC), in which UC faculty and staff partnered with State legislative committee staff to produce non-partisan reports. In its first year, CalSPEC worked with the Senate Environmental Quality Committee and Assembly Natural Resources Committee to produce a report on microplastics that has resulted in ideas of future legislation. UCCS has created a catalogue of faculty profiles to help State employees connect with researchers.

Jesse Rothstein, UC Berkeley Professor of Public Policy and Economics and Director of the California Policy Lab, stated that the Policy Lab aimed to generate research insights for government impact. Based at UC Berkeley and UCLA, with affiliates throughout the UC system and beyond, the Policy Lab brought UC research expertise to State, County, and local government. The Policy Lab helped government agencies analyze and utilize their own data, provided guidance on data sharing, and linked data across agencies. The

---

<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.

Policy Lab also gave UC researchers the opportunity to work with agencies on impactful issues and access to data needed for social science research. The Policy Lab's legal and computing infrastructure has enabled collaborations to commence within weeks instead of years. The Policy Lab partnered with the City and County of San Francisco and Santa Clara County in their pilot programs to provide individuals with access to public defenders upon arrest instead of at arraignment. This has had a significant impact on the number of convictions, cases dismissed, and days detained, and has resulted in cost savings. Other Counties around the country have expressed interest. The Policy Lab has also worked with UC, the California Community Colleges, the California Student Aid Commission, and the California Department of Social Services to identify how many students were receiving CalFresh benefits and to test CalFresh outreach strategies. This project found that 12 percent of UC undergraduate students were receiving these benefits and that more UC students were participating in CalFresh than community college students. Next, this project would examine the impact of CalFresh on student success. During the COVID-19 pandemic, the Policy Lab provided real-time information about the labor market and used credit information to better understand the "California Exodus," the belief that many were leaving California during the pandemic. Though not working with agencies with the intention of being published, the Policy Lab's projects have begun to be published, and its infrastructure was accessible to other researchers across the University system. The infrastructure, which was built using seed money from UC, has enabled the Policy Lab to successfully raise money. Agencies were not charged to work with the Policy Lab so that they could ask questions regardless of their budgets, and researchers were charged nominal fees for hosted projects. To date, the Policy Lab has raised over \$50 million but was still determining how to cover base operating expenses. Mr. Rothstein shared several initiatives in progress. The Health Data Access Initiative aimed to build a data-sharing program for UC faculty to reduce the cost of accessing government data. The UC Consumer Credit Panel provided the anonymized, privacy-protected credit history of Californians since 2004, as well as a random sample from the rest of the country. The Undergraduate Summer Institute offered undergraduate students a chance to gain data skills and work on policy projects, and fellowships and seed grants were available to graduate students. Mr. Rothstein concluded by explaining that the California Policy Lab worked with the State to convene siloed data to a common, secure computing platform.

Ms. Newman expressed her wish to work with Mr. Rothstein and others to build a similar infrastructure to understand the impact of UC programs on areas such as retention, graduation rates, and gaps in performance based on race.

Laura Podolsky, Assistant Director at the UC Institute of Transportation Studies (UCITS), shared that UCITS was established in 1947 by the State Legislature. One of seven multi-campus research units in the system, UCITS had branches at the Berkeley, Davis, Los Angeles, and Irvine campuses, as well as 225 affiliated faculty and researchers and over 300 graduate students. UCITS' expertise covered over 30 disciplines and all aspects of transportation, including logistics, land use planning, public transit, pavement engineering, and aviation. UCITS distinguished itself with its culture of policy engagement. The State adopted its design for the State's Low Carbon Fuel Standard, first adopted in 2007, with very few changes. UCITS researchers have continued to work with the State to improve

the policy. UCITS has helped design policy in the California Sustainable Freight Action Plan, including the rule that 100 percent car sales would be zero-emission by 2035; implement policy to reduce vehicle miles traveled per the Sustainable Communities and Climate Protection Act; and reform parking policy. At the local and regional levels, UCITS has designed, deployed, and evaluated Míocar, an electric car-sharing service for low-income residents in the San Joaquin Valley. Researchers collaborated with partners in Stockton, Bakersfield, and Los Angeles to examine the impact of providing low-income residents with flexible transportation funding. UCITS has produced State reports like “Carbon Neutrality Study 1: Driving California Transportation Emissions to Zero,” which was cited heavily in the State’s 2022 Scoping Plan for Achieving Carbon Neutrality. UCITS representatives were serving on State commissions, boards, and task forces. Across its four campus branches, UCITS attracted and spent about \$60 million per year but has recently secured State funding. UCITS enhanced the connection between policy and research in several ways. First, UCITS researchers must work with a government agency or community-based partner. Second, all research culminated in a policy brief or other deliverable suitable for a policymaker. Third, staff specialists helped researchers translate and communicate their work. Fourth, UCITS hosted regular briefings with legislative staff.

Sonja Diaz, Executive Director of the Latino Policy and Politics Institute (LPPI) at UCLA, stated that LPPI, through research, community partnership, narrative change, and leadership development, addressed the places, people, and ideas rendered invisible and inconsequential by decision makers. Ms. Diaz stated that, unlike the regressive California policies of her childhood, such as Proposition 187, which denied social services to undocumented immigrants; Proposition 209, the ban on affirmative action; the three strikes law, and the English-only initiative, the Legislature was now promoting inclusive, affirmative policies in higher education, health care, and more. However, the Latino(a) population remained at the periphery of the development and implementation of these policies. State government did not routinely analyze the effect of policy proposals based on racial/ethnic makeup, gender, or geography, and the Latino(a) data gap has eroded this population’s inclusion in policymaking. Representation of Latino(a)s has remained stagnant in academia, philanthropy, media, and the judiciary. LPPI leveraged the University’s research enterprise to ensure that the Latino(a) population has opportunities to thrive. Community partners from East Oakland to East Los Angeles helped develop LPPI’s research portfolio and guided LPPI programs, such as narrative change, research grants, and fellowship training for undergraduate and graduate students. LPPI produced two dozen policy reports and briefs on the pandemic’s impact on public health, small businesses, voting, unemployment, housing, and higher education, and shared them via policy briefings, op-eds, webinars, and testimony before government. Community partners used LPPI research to inform vaccine administration, support minority-owned small businesses, and implement relief programs that did not discriminate based on immigration status. LPPI distinguished itself with its speed, agility, and connections to the community. Currently, LPPI had 15 full-time employees; 25 student employees; and 60 tenure-track affiliated experts from UCLA, UC Merced, UC Irvine, the University of Texas, the University of New Mexico, and Arizona State University. During Hispanic Heritage Month, LPPI planned to launch the Latino Data Hub, which would disaggregate data from ten issue areas and with 80 indicators of well-being. The Latino Data Hub, which would

disaggregate data by state, Latino(a) subgroup, gender, and other categories, would be available in English and Spanish and aimed to serve sectors beyond academia.

Regent Anguiano noted how these institutes aligned with the 2050 goal of applying UC research and thought leadership to the state's biggest challenges. She asked how the UC system or the Regents could help advance the goals of these institutes. Mr. Rothstein replied that easing funding constraints would help, as less time spent fundraising meant more time for substantive work. The California Policy Lab sought systemwide coordination for matters such as signing data agreements with government agencies. Ms. Podolsky replied that UCITS needed core funding to maintain baseline operations. UCITS has relied on an ongoing allocation of \$5 million from the Road Repair and Accountability Act of 2017 to maintain staff, because the research divisions of State and federal agencies preferred to fund research. Ms. Diaz replied that UC could leverage its Hispanic-Serving Institution status to improve retention, matriculation, and support for faculty and postdoctoral researchers, as well as obtain funding for research. UC could also make bolder investments in light of recent U.S. Supreme Court decisions. For instance, through Chancellor Block's effort to strengthen UCLA's Latino(a) infrastructure, LPPI has received funding for two staff members for five years. Ms. Newman emphasized that continuous investment was necessary for the University engage in applied research, as episodic funding tended to be more costly and inefficient.

Regent-designate Pack asked how government agencies connected with these research institutes and if the institutes worked with local agencies as well. Mr. Rothstein replied that, due to the fractal nature of State government, the Policy Lab contacted many agencies directly. The Policy Lab typically engaged with agencies at the staff level and was working more with legislative staff as well. Ms. Podolsky replied that UCITS has worked closely with State agencies for a long period of time. UCITS has connected with local and regional transportation agencies through member associations and conferences. UCITS was trying to better connect with community-based organizations. Ms. Diaz replied that LPPI engaged in outreach via earned media, op-eds, and letters to the editor. Last year, LPPI began to survey community leaders regarding policy issues and needs, and it still sent both traditional mail and electronic newsletters to bridge generational divides. Ms. Newman stated that the new UC Center Sacramento location, which was close to the State Capitol, would be a hub where UC research is presented to the Legislature.

Regent Tesfai asked Mr. Rothstein about the challenges associated with broadening access to data sets. Mr. Rothstein replied that the Policy Lab often worked with sensitive data and had a detailed legal, computing, and operations infrastructure to keep these data secure. The Policy Lab rarely received personalized information. Another challenge has been building trust of agencies, which has improved in the last 15 years.

Regent Hernandez asked if the institutes considered monetizing these data for revenue, citing advertising firms or companies as examples of interested parties. Ms. Podolsky replied that UCITS relied mostly on State funding, but individual campuses had industry consortia, whereby industries pooled funding to support work so that no one industry was directly funding a project. For instance, UC Davis' zero-emission vehicle research has been

supported by a consortium that included General Motors and Ford Motor Company. UC Berkeley's had a similar arrangement for its research on automated vehicle technology. Ms. Diaz replied that, in its statement of funding principles, LPPI aimed to divorce itself from corporate interests and to be transparent to donors. However, UC could model technical assistance and certification programs like those at Harvard University. LPPI would take money for events, an endowment, and students, but not for research.

### 3. **UPDATE ON IMPROVING FINANCIAL AID OFFER LETTERS**

[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 Newman stated that, in 2020, the Special Committee on Basic Needs requested a presentation about financial aid offers and asked the Office of the President (UCOP) to better align communications across the UC system. UCOP then contracted with uAspire to conduct student focus groups that led to campus and systemwide recommendations.

Executive Director Shawn Brick explained that, in response to uAspire's recommendations for the system, UCOP developed two sets of guidelines for the campuses. One was a best practices document that served as a benchmark for campus financial aid offers. For instance, it suggested separating grants and scholarships, work, and loan assumptions. The second was a detailed glossary of standardized terms and labels. uAspire found that the variation in wording among the campuses was confusing. Campuses were also asked to replace outdated language, such as "room and board," with more modern language, such as "housing and meals." Campus financial aid offices have since used these guidelines to make offers more understandable. The next phase was to align UC standards with forthcoming national standards.

Karen McCarthy, Vice President of Public Policy and Federal Relations for the National Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators (NASFAA), stated that, in the last year, NASFAA decided that work related to financial aid offers should involve admissions offices, enrollment management offices, and higher levels within institutions, thus launching the College Cost Transparency Initiative (CCTI). The CCTI Task Force was tasked with developing a set of principles and standards, as well as a glossary that institutions would commit to using for undergraduate financial aid offers. These principles included creating offer letters that provided clear, accurate, and consumer-friendly information and used standardized language. Standards included prominently displaying the following components in all aid offers: cost of attendance separated into what is owed to the institution and to other entities; types and sources of financial aid separated into whether repayment or employment is required; net price; and clear labeling of terms, definitions, programs, and loans. Recognizing that institutions might not be able to display all these components on one page of an offer letter, the CCTI Task Force gave them flexibility to display components in a supplemental document or via an online portal. Institutions could decide which types of financial aid to include in their aid offer, and those referencing Parent PLUS loans should not include loan amounts, but rather refer students and parents to do further research. NASFAA was currently seeking commitment from

institutions to the principles, standards, and the glossary, and these institutions would be announced in December.

Regent Anguiano asked if aid offers from UC campuses had similarities according to the best practices guidance. Mr. Brick shared his view that all nine undergraduate campuses did some things well, such as including the cost of attendance and grouping types of awards. Financial aid offices have changed some wording. Changes that would take longer to implement required programming and staff time, which was limited given all the recent State- and University-level changes to financial aid.

Committee Chair Park asked about the nature of ongoing work after an institution commits to the CCTI Task Force principles, standards, and glossary. Ms. McCarthy responded that NASFAA invited institutions to submit a redacted aid offer for suggestions for clarity and compliance, and planned to ask institutions to reaffirm their commitment every two years. NASFAA would convene a group to make changes. Feedback from and engagement with institutions would inform NASFAA's legislative advocacy.

Committee Chair Park, noting the number of disclaimers in a sample offer letter from UC Santa Cruz, acknowledged the challenge of communicating disclaimers to students and their families without implying that the information in the offer letter was unreliable. She also asked how students were expected to use the lengthy glossary of terms. Committee Chair Park expressed hope that partnerships with national counterparts would help the University continue to make improvements.

Staff Advisor Mackness asked if UCOP had findings regarding the impact that the aid offer changes had on students and changes in financial aid had on financial aid offices. Mr. Brick stated that UCOP had not had an opportunity to reconvene the student focus groups after changes were made to aid offers. Most of the work related to aid offers was done in 2021–22. In 2022–23, financial aid offices faced a number of competing priorities, such as implementing the cohort tuition model, the path to a debt-free education, the Native American Opportunity Plan, and State programs such as the Middle Class Scholarship Program and the Learning-Aligned Employment Program.

In response to previous comments from Committee Chair Park, Mr. Brick clarified that the glossary was not meant for students, but rather was an internal guide for campuses. He did not believe that uAspire had asked the student focus groups about disclaimers, an area that UC could further investigate.

Committee Chair Park invited Student Observer Andy Hu to make remarks.

Mr. Hu shared his personal experience that reflected the challenges and confusion of many students due to unclear or inadequate offer letters. As a first-generation student from a low-income background, Mr. Hu felt bewildered and anxious when he received his offer letter, struggling to determine the cost of attendance and how he would afford housing, meals, and other essentials and feeling uncertain about future funding. Mr. Hu experienced stress and was not able to make informed decisions about his education. In his view, terms lacked

clarity, making the true cost of attendance difficult to understand, and the breakdown of costs was insufficient, leaving out important components like room and board. Vague or missing information about scholarship and grant renewal left students unsure about eligibility from year to year. Mr. Hu proposed the following changes. First, clear and standardized language across all UC campuses would enable students to understand and compare aid offers. Second, offer letters should have a comprehensive breakdown of costs, including housing, meals, and other essential expenses, so that students and their families could budget accordingly. Third, offers should provide detailed information on scholarship and grant renewal so that students could plan for the future. He believed that these changes would empower students and foster trust between the University and students. Mr. Hu urged the Regents to consider his proposal and to allocate resources toward these efforts. He also suggested forming a working group comprised of students, administrators, and financial aid experts to explore best practices and develop recommendations.

4. **STUDENT ACADEMIC PREPARATION AND EDUCATIONAL PARTNERSHIPS (SAPEP) NEW ONGOING FUNDING UPDATE: FOCUS ON TRANSFER**

[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 Gullatt began her remarks by thanking the Regents for their support for the Student Academic Preparation and Educational Partnerships (SAPEP) program. The 2022–23 State Budget Act included an additional \$22.5 million in ongoing SAPEP funding, for a total of \$47 million. With this new funding, the University planned to restore academic enrichment and preparation services to middle-grade and elementary school students that had previously been cut. UC planned to increase the number of courses in UC Scout, a program that offered A–G, honors, and Advanced Placement courses online to help students fill gaps in their curriculum. Funding has been allocated to campuses for the Growing Our Own and Diversifying Ph.D. Pathways initiatives, as well as the goal of 40 percent of graduate students originating from California Community Colleges, California State University (CSU), and other Hispanic-Serving Institutions.

Ms. Gullatt noted that there were fewer students from underrepresented ethnic groups at every point in eligibility and enrollment pathways. SAPEP programs aimed to reduce these gaps and increase the representation of these students on UC campuses. K–12 students and transfer students who participated in SAPEP programs were admitted to UC at higher rates than their non-participant peers. Although the admission rate for SAPEP transfer participants was 18 percent higher than non-participants, the difference in enrollment yield was only four percent higher. To close this gap and boost participation at more community colleges, UC was focusing on 69 community colleges with significant numbers of Pell-eligible, low-income, underrepresented students. According to the value proposition of SAPEP, students' early engagement with UC, combined with partnerships with these community colleges, would result in more students preparing to transfer and enrolling at UC. The University would serve students through transfer preparation programs, the Mathematics, Engineering, Science, Achievement (MESA) program, and the Puente Project. These programs provided student services such as academic advising, summer

programs, early research opportunities, campus visits, internships, and career exploration. New funds would expand the reach of these programs, which had been limited due to the erosion of resources. Services would also be delivered virtually, as students were less likely to visit physical transfer centers as they had done before the COVID-19 pandemic. The University was allocating funds to develop data collection tools and experiment with new interventions that could be studied and potentially expanded to multiple campuses. Sometimes, outreach by UC students was more effective than outreach by staff. The Riverside and Santa Barbara campuses were experimenting with near-peer advising initiatives, and other campuses have designed programs and curricula to address transfer gaps among Southeast Asian students and male students of color. Campuses were using these funds to aid core course completion through early identification of high school students for transfer preparation and the development of online concurrent courses.

The University assessed SAPEP programs with the Program Impact Framework and reported progress toward Framework goals to the Regents every year. Every program submitted an annual performance report to UCOP. There were goals at the both the portfolio and program levels. Each campus and program had five years to achieve their goals. Programs that were not making satisfactory progress would be monitored and required to report quarterly; programs have been defunded in the past for failing to make adequate progress. UC wished to restore funding to research the root causes of educational disparity and the impact of different strategies.

Ms. Gullatt provided an update regarding the University's proposal to the State regarding transfer. In response to Governor Newsom's and the Legislature's commitment to addressing the transfer process, the Academic Senate and the University developed a guarantee of admission to at least one UC campus with the completion of the California Education Transfer Curriculum and of major preparation coursework with a minimum grade point average. The University could implement this admission guarantee by 2025–26 for many in-demand majors. This could include a pilot project to evaluate the impact of adding the Associate Degree for Transfer. UC was still in conversation with the Legislature and the Governor to reach a solution.

Regent Tesfai asked how the gap between the admission and enrollment rates of transfer students could be narrowed. Ms. Gullatt, noting that the gap was about 12 percentage points, stated that students needed to understand the difference between various institutions of higher education, and UC needed to address perceptions of affordability. UC had fewer locations than the other segments, which was also a barrier. Near-peer advisors, mentors, and supporters were an important part of UC's strategy. Emily Engelschall, Associate Vice Chancellor of Enrollment Management at UC Riverside, stated that UCR was investing in the placement of additional UCR students in community colleges. The campus would also allocate some of the new SAPEP funding toward a financial aid literacy counselor who could engage with community college students and their families. Conversations about cost and affordability could include a discussion of return on investment. UC Riverside was partnering with CSU San Bernardino and Growing Inland Achievement, a K–16 collaborative, to conduct a study on perceptions of higher education among community college students in the Inland Empire. This would inform future SAPEP engagement.



Regent Anguiano asked about systemwide coordination of enrollment planning and how SAPEP efforts would affect the UC 2030 goals. Ms. Gullatt responded that a council of chief outreach officers was meeting regularly to share strategies and challenges. Since every UC campus served every community college, UC sought to be consistent in the advising and support it provided. There were opportunities for systemwide collaboration, such as addressing unfinished learning and developing new core courses. Mario Castellanos, Executive Director at the Office of Education Partnerships at UC Santa Barbara, shared that UC partnered with community colleges to give students access to UC campuses and research experience. Ms. Engelschall added that transfer preparation programs have collaborated on “discover your UC” events. UC sought to better identify and support transfer-intending students. With new SAPEP funding, UCR was investing in a counselor dedicated to supporting Early Academic Outreach Program participants who wished to attend a community college.

Regent Anguiano asked how enrollment planning would be coordinated given capacity needs. Vice President Brown replied that SAPEP efforts were critical to achieving UC 2030 goals, such as increasing the number of transfer students, which has been challenging following the pandemic. Increasing transfer also aligned with the UC 2050 goals of improving the University’s representation of the state and its geographic reach goal. Ms. Gullatt added that investing in infrastructure would provide more early indicators of students’ intent to transfer, which would help UC target its recruitment efforts.

Committee Chair Park asked that the next report include more detail, particularly about campus-level efforts, investment, and transfer preparation programs. Ms. Newman stressed that it would be challenging to increase the number of community college transfers to UC if community college enrollment remains flat or declines.

5. **REIMAGINING HOW AND WHERE UC HAPPENS: UC REENGAGEMENT CONSORTIUM**

[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 Newman introduced the item. Partially the result of the COVID-19 pandemic, the number of students nationwide with some college and no degree increased by 40 million, up 1.4 million in the last academic year. Californians made up 6.63 million of the national total, and over 75,000 attended the University between 2000 and 2018. The State has directed \$15 million in one-time funds to address this through UC Extension. With the first phase of funding, UC Merced launched its bachelor’s degree completion program in March 2022. With the second phase of funding, degree completion efforts were expanded to the Riverside, Davis, and Santa Barbara campuses. These four campuses comprised the UC Reengagement Consortium.

Michael Pierick, Director of University Extension and Degree Completion at UC Merced, shared that UCM Extension’s Degree Completion Program was a collaboration with the School of Social Sciences, Humanities and Arts, and it reengaged students who left UC

before completing their bachelor's degree using high-touch re-entry advising. The Program added staff dedicated to degree completion in the campus' financial aid, registrar's, and marketing and communication offices. A "success coach" provided each student with tailored support from re-entry to graduation. Since March 2022, the Program has conducted manual degree audits and sent personalized communications to over 5,200 students and reengaged 333 students. Of these, 31 students have earned degrees or will earn them by fall 2023, 73 students have re-enrolled at UCM, and 229 were receiving advising. This effort helped UCM better understand the barriers that lead to students stopping out. For instance, the campus now had a report of students with completed degree audits but no graduation file. Flexible learning options such as evening, online, and asynchronous courses would help attract the 96 percent of UCM students who have reengaged but have not returned. Mr. Pierick suggested options such as stackable certificates, credit for prior learning, and professional learning. He also suggested institutional aid for those who exhausted their financial aid eligibility or have less than a part-time course load remaining.

The UC Reengagement Consortium aimed to amplify the State's investment by sharing data structures as well as personnel and advising best practices. In the coming months, the Consortium planned to share its recommendations for a more strategic, systemwide approach, such as cross-campus articulation so that students may access coursework from any UC undergraduate campus while completing their degree at their home campus; access to flexible course options; and customized service. As of June 2023, the Consortium has reengaged 937 students, of whom 64 have received their degrees, 46 have filed for graduation, 100 have filed for readmission, and 540 were receiving advising. There were also 187 students who had left UC in poor standing or were academically dismissed. The Consortium was presenting at national conferences and the UC Academic Advising Conference, and recently hosted a systemwide reengagement symposium at UC Merced that led to an action plan. UC stakeholders identified the need for sustainable funding for re-entry and retention initiatives, an opportunity to scale efforts through a Consortium model, and an interest to continue discussion regarding cross-campus collaboration through data sharing, identifying stop-outs, and advocacy for policy changes.

Liliana Barron, UC Merced re-entry student, shared that she was a first-generation college student who had left UC Merced due to mental health issues, getting married, and having children. Ms. Barron had previously attempted re-entry twice. In 2022, she was contacted by the Degree Completion Program and re-enrolled in spring 2023, accompanied by her younger sister and her husband, who had transferred from Merced College. Ms. Barron expected to graduate in fall 2024 with a degree in public health and a minor in psychology, and her husband expected to graduate in spring 2025 with a mechanical engineering degree. It had always been Ms. Barron's goal to complete her degree. She also wanted to complete her degree to obtain a good career and more financial stability, as well as set a good example for her daughters. After graduating, she wished to participate in the reengagement effort. The Program provided her with personalized support and addressed her financial aid quickly. Ms. Barron noted that she had difficulty obtaining childcare and suggested online and evening classes, as well as creating a part-time program for full-time workers.

Regent Leib asked Ms. Barron how she was contacted. Ms. Barron replied that an advisor contacted her in March 2022 as part of the Degree Completion Program's outreach efforts and informed her that she was in good academic standing and could return to school if she wished to. Ms. Barron had assumed that units expired or that policy barred her re-entry.

Regent Leib praised the Program for its ability to identify stop-outs who qualified for re-entry. Ms. Newman noted that some contact information might not be current, but the University was working to locate students. Vice President Brown shared that the Council of Chancellors Capacity Plan survey of stop-outs also asked individuals to provide their contact information, which was shared with UC Merced. The Consortium identified those who were closer to graduating and then broadened their efforts. Ms. Newman added that helping stop-outs would also help current students on the brink of stopping out.

Regent Ellis explained that one only needed to complete two semesters to become a member of the UC Merced Alumni Association. UCM Alumni Relations staff kept good records of alumni.

Committee Chair Park asked who served as success coaches. Mr. Pierick replied that campuses used State funding to hire staff for this role. UC Merced's success coach worked at Extension and was re-entry students' point of contact for accessing resources. Other Consortium campuses had similar arrangements.

Committee Chair Park noted the potential impact of alumni and near-peer engagement on reengagement as this effort grows.

Committee Chair Park asked what types of courses re-entry students could access, citing online courses and courses at other institutions as examples. Mr. Pierick responded that, through advising, the Program ascertained students' academic standing and what they needed to complete their degree. For students with a few requirements to complete, the Program worked with schools or the campus Division of the Academic Senate to waive the graduation residency requirement so that students could complete requirements at another campus, institution, or in another state. If students had more than one semester left, the Program helped them transfer to a UC campus, California State University campus, or community college. UC Merced did not currently have available online evening coursework. Feedback from inactive UCM students indicated that online courses were being offered when they were at work. Ms. Newman remarked that the number of reengaged students who enroll would grow substantially if they were offered asynchronous online courses or an intercampus course exchange.

Regent Tesfai asked what Mr. Pierick envisioned with regard to asynchronous online courses. Mr. Pierick replied that Extension was asked to propose re-entry programs because of its experience with adult learners and could expand its role to include inactive students. He suggested flexible solutions such as cross-campus articulation. There were many possible solutions that required changes in policy.

Regent Tesfai asked how much funding the Degree Completion Program needed. Mr. Pierick replied that UC Merced was given \$5.7 million over five years. However, the State's recent allocation was one-time funding, and students would need resources when they return.

The meeting adjourned at 12:35 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff