

The Regents of the University of California

ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

September 20, 2023

The Academic and Student Affairs Committee met on the above date at the UCLA Luskin Conference Center, Los Angeles campus and by teleconference at 1200 Taraval Street, San Francisco and 106 E. Babcock Street, Bozeman, Montana.

Members present: Regents Anguiano, Batchlor, Ellis, Hernandez, Park, Sarris, and Tesfai; Advisory members Beharry and Pack; Chancellors Block, Christ, Muñoz, Wilcox, and Yang; Staff Advisor Mackness

In attendance: Regent Raznick, Faculty Representative Steintrager, Assistant Secretary Bricker, General Counsel Robinson, Provost Newman, Vice Presidents Brown, Gullatt, and Maldonado, Chancellors Larive and May, and Recording Secretary Li

The meeting convened at 10:35 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 July 19, 2023 were approved, Regents Anguiano, Batchlor, Hernandez, Park, and Tesfai voting “aye.”¹

2. CLIMATE ACTION INITIATIVE

[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. The 2022–23 State budget allocated \$185 million to the University for climate action, \$100 million of which went to the Office of the President (UCOP) to invest in research and innovation. This coincided with President Drake’s climate action goals in his Presidential Priority Plan. In developing the Climate Action Initiative, UC envisioned that collective expertise across the state would generate the most innovative and inclusive proposals and implementable solutions. Through a two-year partnership with Governor Newsom’s office and the State Legislature, UC was able to secure the largest targeted research investment in its history. Values of inclusion and equity were reflected in the way UC awarded over \$83 million in seed and matching grants.

Vice President Maldonado explained that the \$100 million allocation was organized into two competitions: \$83 million for the California Climate Seed and Matching Grants and \$15 million for a UC-only Climate Action Innovation and Entrepreneurship (I&E) program. Fifteen \$1 million I&E grants were awarded to ten campuses, two National

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

Laboratories, Agriculture and Natural Resources, UC Health, and the Natural Reserve System.

A statewide webinar was hosted for the California Climate Seed and Matching Grants in October 2022, and a request for proposals was shared with the Governor's office before it was posted in December 2022. Researchers from any California four-year institution of higher education could apply, and the Office of Research and Innovation (R&I) received over 500 letters of intent requesting over \$1 billion in research funding. R&I invited about half of the teams to submit full proposals and received 216 proposals. R&I then recruited over 120 experts from outside of California to manage conflicts of interest. After a vigorous peer review process, 38 proposals were selected; \$56 million went to 34 seed grants and \$27 million went to four matching grants. Projects involved 12 UC locations, 11 California State University (CSU) campuses, two California private universities, and over 130 community, industry, tribal, and public agency partners. Projects covered 51 of the state's 58 counties, and \$9.2 million went directly to community, non-profit, and tribal partners. The California Strategic Growth Council provided additional funding to supplement ten projects with exceptional community engagement plans. These projects received \$20,000 to develop training on best practices for community participatory research in climate change.

Miriam Greenberg, Professor of Sociology and Interim Faculty Director of the Center for Labor and Community at UC Santa Cruz, introduced Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) Research for Resilience, which received a \$1.6 million seed grant. The wildland urban interface, where human development mixed with wildland vegetation, now accounted for 50 percent of new housing in California, which meant growing commute times and greenhouse gas emissions; impacts on habitat, water, and energy use; and flood and fire risk. WUI growth also contributed to climate-related natural disasters and the climate crisis. Ms. Greenberg discussed the factors driving WUI growth and who is moving to these regions. With the increase in remote work since the COVID-19 pandemic, there has been voluntary migration to these regions by those with means. However, this project hypothesized that affordability migration accounted for an increasing share of WUI growth and generated increasing inequality in WUI areas. Another hypothesis was that, by understanding the social drivers and demographics of WUI growth, one can better understand its social and environmental impacts, such as the types of housing being built, the capacity of residents to protect themselves and their property, the impact on the displacement of rural and indigenous populations, and obstacles to cultural burning and habitat restoration. WUI growth would lead to increased risk of WUI disasters, increased vulnerability of WUI residents, and uneven redevelopment and displacement, which would further exacerbate the urban housing crisis. One project team would develop a demographic analysis of the WUI, interviewing and surveying WUI residents to understand motivations for migration, the housing market, and areas where trends reflect displacement of lower-income individuals from urban areas. The other team, "WUI Fire," would combine ecological analysis and ethnography to understand the impact of WUI growth on the efficacy of prescribed and cultural burning and disaster preparedness. This project would focus on California's central coast, one of the most unaffordable housing markets in the U.S. and would create a "WUI Equity Atlas," an online tool demonstrating the connections

between housing, climate, and conservation issues in order to inform new approaches to policy and planning. Ms. Greenberg presented a slide listing the project's participants and expressed hope that the project would highlight the critical need for affordable housing, and traditional land stewardship within the California climate and resilience movements.

Megan Jennings, Co-Director of the Institute for Ecological Monitoring and Management at San Diego State University (SDSU) introduced the Collaborative of Native Nations for Climate Transformation and Stewardship (CNNCTS), which received a \$7.1 million matching grant and was comprised of CSU, UC, four tribal governments, and four tribal nonprofit organizations. Ms. Jennings noted that, since colonization, there has been a history of suppressing indigenous land stewardship, and current policies and practices were not envisioned with indigenous stewardship in mind and were slow to change. CNNCTS has proposed a community-based approach that would leverage local networks and successes to create a model of indigenous-led land stewardship and would help build capacity and support tribal communities, as well as CSU and UC students and researchers. Five years ago, the Climate Science Alliance's Tribal Working Group identified research priorities and information gaps where academic science could complement tribal knowledge to enhance tribally led climate adaptation and resilience planning and implementation. With funding from the California Strategic Growth Council's Climate Change Research Program in 2021, UC Riverside, SDSU, and the Climate Science Alliance formed the Resilient Restoration Project, which focused on restoration needs for culturally important plants. With this as a foundation, CNNCTS would translate academic and traditional knowledge to practice and build capacity for more indigenous stewardship. SDSU and the Climate Science Alliance would lead this effort under the guidance of the Tribal Working Group. Two of the nonprofit organizations in CNNCTS would serve as geographic hubs for the Los Angeles and Santa Barbara regions, CNNCTS would partner with three federal agencies to create co-stewardship opportunities on public lands. Continuing research from the Resilient Restoration Project would enable ecological and genetic modeling, and greenhouse experiments would complement indigenous ecological knowledge and support both students and indigenous stewards testing restoration strategies such as seed banking, plant propagation, and cultural fire. Training for and demonstrations of these strategies were available through the Stewardship Pathways program. CNNCTS would also help advance State initiatives, such as 30x30 California, the Wildfire and Forest Resilience Action Plan, the Natural and Working Lands Climate Smart Strategy, and would address climate adaptation priorities, such as protecting vulnerable communities, accelerating nature-based climate solutions, improving climate resilience, and collaborating to leverage resources.

Regent Anguiano asked about best practices among award recipients and how those who were not selected could engage in these best practices. Ms. Jennings replied that CNNCTS supported intertribal collaboration and was expanding to external collaboration to ensure access to resources and examples. The Tribal Working Group met monthly to discuss successes, activities, and upcoming efforts. CNNCTS would also be documenting best practices through storytelling and videos, and the geographic hubs offered locations for individuals to connect with the partnership. Ms. Maldonado noted that partnerships were required as a condition of receiving a matching grant. Ms. Greenberg shared that the

California Strategic Growth Council planned to assemble best practices on working with community partners. WUI Research for Resilience had partners from emergency management and labor and included the California Labor Federation and the Trust for Public Land. Partners sought to disseminate the findings to their own networks. UCSC planned to publicize best practices of the projects as well. Ms. Maldonado shared that she was seeking other opportunities for the excellent proposals that were declined. Workshops were planned in which best practices would be shared with project teams.

Staff Advisor Mackness asked how indigenous groups benefitted from sharing their knowledge. Ms. Jennings, acknowledging a history of extractive research and partnerships, replied that CNNCTS sought to approach this work with respect and reciprocity, to value academic science and traditional knowledge equally. Tribal partners could strengthen relationships among multiple tribes and work with academic scientists and federal partners, to ensure that sovereignty and reciprocity are respected. Academic science could help traditional knowledge be more adaptive to an uncertain future. Ms. Greenberg replied that WUI Research for Resilience partnered with UCSC's Amah Mutsun Relearning Program and Native Plants Program, as some tribes were relearning past practices that were lost through colonialism. WUI development was near lands that tribes would like to steward, and changing dynamics have introduced invasive species and complex politics related to prescribed burning, as well as challenges gaining access to tribal ancestral lands.

Regent-designate Beharry asked how the long-term success of these projects would be assessed and whether there would be accountability measures beyond the initial peer review process. He suggested ongoing updates on implementation, policy formation, and benefits to a wider audience. Ms. Newman replied that this information would be provided to the Regents in the future. Accountability measures were planned for both grant holders and the program as a whole.

3. **RESPONDING TO THE STATE'S NEED FOR A HIGHLY PREPARED AND DIVERSE K-12 TEACHER WORKFORCE: UC'S EDUCATOR PREPARATION AND PROFESSIONAL LEARNING PROGRAMS**

[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. UCLA could trace its origins with the establishment of the second California State Normal School, a teaching college, in 1882, and the preparation of K-12 teachers was at the core of the University's mission. Despite training an average of seven to nine percent of the state's annual teacher work force, UC contributed to the field of teacher education in many other ways, including preparing faculty for teacher education programs at UC and across the state and nation. Like the rest of the nation, California confronted a persistent shortage of highly qualified teachers, especially in mathematics and science, bilingual education, and special education. This was exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic. Of the approximately 275,000 teachers in the state, an estimated 27,500 were not fully certified. In 2021-22, 37 percent of some 10,000 vacancies were unfilled, and seven percent of the work force were planning to retire. California would

soon have a shortage of 50,000 qualified teachers. An additional 10,000 to 15,000 lead and 15,000 to 20,000 assistant teachers would be needed for transitional kindergarten by 2025–6. Last year, about 16,500 teachers were certified, about 750 of whom completed a UC program. Ms. Newman remarked that students with highly effective teachers, access to a rigorous curriculum, and exposure to innovative and culturally responsive pedagogy would be better prepared for life after high school. The multi-year funding Compact between UC and the Newsom administration has asked UC to increase by 25 percent by 2026–27 the number of students graduating with academic doctoral degrees and degrees or credentials in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM), education, or early education.

Christina Christie, Wasserman Dean and Professor at the UCLA School of Education and Information Studies, stated that University was a research and development (R&D) innovation hub for educator preparation and had a sound theory of action for how to prepare and retain highly qualified educators. Efforts included the expansion of teacher residency programs, engagement in community schools, and mechanisms to recruit, retain, and sustain a diverse educator work force. However, UC was not charged with training educators for scale, having graduated 750 teachers in 2021 while the California State University (CSU) graduated 7,500. Ms. Christie stated that UC must develop intersegmental initiatives grounded in UC research. For instance, the State Legislature allocated one-time funds to establish the UC-CSU Collaborative for Neuroscience, Diversity, and Learning, which aimed to develop resources that articulate the best curriculum and pedagogy for meeting the needs of neurodiverse students, who comprised 25 percent of students. The work of the Collaborative was grounded in UC research and disseminated through CSU educator programs, and the Collaborative itself was a model for other intersegmental initiatives, such as building the Universal Transitional Kindergarten (UTK) work force with the California Community Colleges. Cross-campus partnerships like the 21st Century California School Leadership Academy (21CSLA), led by UC Berkeley, UCLA, and the California Subject Matter Project, would offer a subsidized UTK leadership certificate course online. UC Merced, UC Berkeley, and UCLA offered the first statewide pathway to a credential for pre-kindergarten through third grade.

The pandemic demonstrated that schools were not only places of education but also centers of well-being. The State has invested significantly in the implementation of the community schooling model, which acknowledged that schools were positioned to leverage local resources and support the social, emotional, and educational needs of families. UC had the tools to determine how best to establish a community school. Although UC has been very successful in developing and testing preparation programs that produced diverse, highly qualified educators who worked in under-resourced schools, Ms. Christie was concerned that UC did not have the faculty capacity to advance innovation while testing the effectiveness of its efforts, and that UC needed incentives to entice highly desirable candidates into the profession. UCLA, UC Irvine, UC Riverside, and UC Berkeley had undergraduate majors in education, and about 25 percent of UC students wished to be public school educators. She suggested exploring UC's ability to guarantee grants like tuition stipends and loan forgiveness to all participants in UC teacher education programs.

Mayya Tokman, UC Merced Professor of Applied Mathematics, School of Natural Sciences and Faculty Director of CalTeach, shared that, according to the Education Trust–West 2020 report, for every single subject STEM credential awarded during the period 2016 to 2020, there were two open STEM-credentialed teaching positions. The teaching shortage was more pronounced where there were large populations of students of color. In 2005, UC received an annual allocation of \$2.25 million to start what is now known as CalTeach, an undergraduate program that recruits STEM majors for teaching careers. In 2021, CalTeach alumni, who earned 30 percent of single subject STEM credentials, were highly qualified STEM teachers who transform how STEM is taught. For example, Marcos Evangelista, who graduated from UC Irvine in 2013, introduced Advanced Placement Physics and doubled physics enrollment at his Title I school. CalTeach tended to be more diverse than general STEM majors. CalTeach was found at the nine UC undergraduate campuses and offered coursework, field work, mentoring, internships, networking, research opportunities, and expedited pathways to earning credentials. Compared with other credentialing candidates, CalTeach students were significantly more prepared in subject matter and pedagogy and tended to have better retention levels. By 2020, 90 percent of UCI alumni who participated in CalTeach from 2012 through 2018 were still teaching and 70 percent were in Title I schools. CalTeach has become one of the largest outreach programs for K–12 students and was innovating new approaches to teacher education by incorporating the program into educational tracks in STEM majors and offering a joint bachelor’s degree and teaching credential. State funding for CalTeach had remained flat for 18 years, while salaries, costs, and need had not. Expanding CalTeach would require resources and commitment from campuses and the UC system.

Regent Raznick asked what Regents could do to help and if UC students could help address the teacher shortage through mentorship. Ms. Newman replied that more collective advocacy is needed to increase State investment, noting that the federal government has invested heavily in the production of teachers in the past. Without a larger cadre of qualified teachers, schoolchildren would falter and there would not be the next generation of professionals. Ms. Christie shared that evidence-based mentoring was embedded in UC educator preparation programs. Ms. Tokman replied that mentoring was embedded in CalTeach, which played a significant role in the program’s success, and reiterated the need for more funding. Vice President Gullatt added that every campus had some form of mentorship. While it was embedded into STEM educator preparation, mentorship could take other forms in other parts of the University.

Regent Ellis shared his view that the Governor’s Compact set goals for UC to exceed and called on the University to be more ambitious. He suggested that UC aim to confer closer to 2,000 credentials by 2030, and UC Merced could be a part of that effort as the campus expands. Regent Ellis also asked how online education could be utilized in K–12 teacher education. Ms. Newman suggested that this topic be discussed at a future meeting.

Regent Anguiano asked how UC planned to increase demand for doctoral education. Ms. Christie replied that UC undergraduate programs in education could help address expectations in the Governor’s Compact by growing the teacher education work force. Numbers in UC’s doctoral training programs have remained steady, but the demand for

producing doctorates in teacher education has risen, and the new United Auto Workers (UAW) contract added a level of complexity to the recruitment of candidates. Systemwide, about half of the instructors in professional programs to prepare educators were Unit 18 lecturers. In order to change this proportion, incentives were needed to encourage ladder-rank faculty to participate in those programs. UC was also competing for all the same students as other universities.

Regent Tesfai stated that he had also had a question about online programs and would reserve it for a future discussion.

Faculty Representative Steintrager recalled that, when he joined the UC Irvine Department of English 1997, there were subject matter programs that were later discontinued. He asked if there were roadblocks to such programs that were keeping educators out of the pipeline or delaying their progress. Ms. Christie and Ms. Tokman responded in the affirmative. CalTeach addressed barriers faced by STEM majors pursuing careers in education, and resources, faculty, and structure were needed support this effort. Mr. Steintrager recalled that faculty were supportive of the programs.

Chancellor Muñoz shared that he graduated from UCLA with a doctorate in education and taught in an education preparation program at CSU. He emphasized the University's impact in producing the doctoral recipients who train teachers and educators at CSU. UC's influence went well beyond the individual preparation of teachers. Furthermore, the master's degree was an important step toward becoming an administrator and informing pedagogy and ideology in classrooms. UC needed to increase engagement and determine ways to incentivize more UC students to pursue the teaching profession.

Committee Chair Park remarked that UC was rich in ambition and talent but scarce in resources relative to impact, and she expressed alarm that funding for CalTeach has not increased in 18 years. She asked what State funding request UC was prepared to make. Ms. Newman replied that UC needed to determine what it needed. This could be the subject of UC-sponsored legislation. Ms. Christie stated that programs needed incremental increases that aligned with increases in salaries, fees, and operating expenses.

4. **UPDATE ON OFF-CAMPUS OPPORTUNITIES**

[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. To achieve the goal of adding over 23,000 students per the 2030 Capacity Plan, UC campuses were considering nontraditional approaches, including off-campus opportunities such as satellite operations. Many communities were competing for UC expansion. UC could learn from its campuses and other higher education institutions that have explored these opportunities, and expansion could help advance UC's 2050 plan for institutional growth.

Chancellor May presented Aggie Square, a 25-acre innovation hub in its first phase of construction at UC Davis' Sacramento location that would serve as a laboratory, classroom, workplace, business incubator, and community gathering place. In May, the campus held a ceremony to commemorate the structural completion of the first two buildings: a life sciences building featuring laboratories and three-dimensional printing capabilities, and a lifelong learning building for undergraduate, professional, and continuing education programs. The buildings were slated to open in 2025 and would include private tenants such as Amazon Web Services (AWS), which was partnering with UCD Health to establish the first Cloud Innovation Center at an academic medical center. Completion of a mixed-use residential building was also expected in 2025; the facility would have about 250 beds to supplement almost 6,500 on-campus beds that were added in the last five years. Aggie Square would house a diverse group including transfer students, medical residents, and possibly UC Center Sacramento students.

Chancellor May remarked on the success of the "Quarter at Aggie Square" program, which integrated classroom learning, research, and community engagement for a cohort of 25 students and faculty on a variety of topical themes. Students earned 12 to 18 units that fulfilled major or general education requirements. This fall, biomedical engineering students would explore the relationship between design and medical devices while observing and interacting with practitioners at UC Davis Medical Center. This winter, students focusing on immigrants, refugees, and human rights would work with Sacramento-based organizations, learn from political science faculty, and make a presentation at a conference hosted by the UC Davis Global Migration Center. All UCD undergraduate colleges and some professional school faculty were participating in the program. Aggie Square would create new possibilities for undergraduate and graduate programs, such as a new master's degree for biomedical device development, and help advance UC Davis' three-part mission of academic excellence, leading-edge research, and public service. Aggie Square would also help meet regional workforce needs. The Community Benefits Partnership Agreement between UC Davis and the City of Sacramento would create workforce pipeline programs while Aggie Square is being built. The Public Pathways Program, a collaboration between UC Davis Continuing and Professional Education, the Sacramento Employment Training Agency, and local organizations would work with employers with existing job openings in high-demand areas.

Chancellor Larive introduced UC Santa Cruz's network locations: its main campus location and coastal science location in Santa Cruz and its Silicon Valley location in Santa Clara. UCSC had three affiliated centers: the Westside Research Park; the Monterey Bay Education, Science and Technology Center (MBEST); and the Scotts Valley Center. The campus was also connected to online, remote, and hybrid instruction through cloud computing. At the Silicon Valley location were graduate students, faculty, and researchers from the Baskin School of Engineering, as well as UCSC Extension, which offered hundreds of professional courses and hosted UC Scout. Last year, about 50,000 California students utilized UC Scout, and this number was growing at 20 percent per year. UCSC Extension's new post-baccalaureate program helped students prepare applications to medical school and emphasized recruitment from underserved populations. In August, the

Silicon Valley location hosted a CHIPS coalition meeting, with representatives from every major microelectronics company in the region, to discuss the future of semiconductor research and workforce development in California. Eight Baskin faculty and nearly 30 Ph.D. students and postdoctoral researchers worked at this location, and faculty taught three professional master's programs: Games and Playable Media, through which students had direct access to industry professionals in Silicon Valley; Human Computer Interaction, with industry sponsors such as Accenture, IBM, Mastercard, and Microsoft; and Natural Language Processing, in close collaboration with Silicon Valley research and development scientists. MBEST was poised for expansion that was envisioned in 1994, when UCSC received the property. A recently completed feasibility study recognized the potential for a mix of commercial, educational, and residential development that aligned with regional needs and the needs of the advanced air mobility (AAM) cluster there. Chancellor Larive explained that AAM aircraft helped reduce carbon emissions while enabling more efficient aerial transport of people and cargo. The Santa Cruz, Monterey, and San Benito tri-county region had the highest concentration of AAM activity in the world, with leading electric vertical take-off and landing (eVTOL) aircraft companies, a hydrogen fuel passenger aircraft company, and a heavy-payload drone manufacturer. The area also potentially had large-scale drone users in marine sciences, defense, agriculture, and infrastructure inspection. UC Santa Cruz recently submitted a proposal to the U.S. Economic Development Administration to be designated a regional technology and innovation hub, with broad support from industry partners, area community colleges, California State University (CSU) Monterey Bay, UC Merced, regional airports, and government representatives.

Regent-designate Beharry asked about student involvement in the development of these off-campus sites and programs. He envisioned an interdisciplinary approach that could serve as a valuable learning experience for students. Chancellor May responded that students were a major factor in the development of Aggie Square. The Quarter at Aggie Square program enabled students to participate in a project before construction of Aggie Square was complete, and faculty and students collaborated on course offerings. Chancellor Larive replied that the Silicon Valley location engaged strongly with UCSC graduate programs and only offered graduate education at present. UCSC was in the early planning stages for MBEST, including physical planning for the site's 470 acres and valuable native species. During program development, there were opportunities to involve students from UCSC, Hartnell College, Monterey Peninsula College, and CSU Monterey Bay.

Regent-designate Beharry asked about the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliance of these programs and facilities. Chancellor May responded that one could more easily ensure ADA compliance of a new construction project than of existing infrastructure. Chancellor Larive echoed Chancellor May's comments.

Regent Raznick asked how campuses were "evangelizing," or conveying the impact of their programs, such as health equity, high-quality job creation, and training physicians from underrepresented communities to the local community and lawmakers. Chancellor May replied that UC Davis' extensive communications effort about Aggie Square, on

topics such as workforce development in the local community, was accentuated by the campus' partnership with the City of Sacramento and the developer. Local newspapers published articles about Aggie Square every few weeks. Chancellor Larive replied that UCSC has been very engaged with the tri-county community and that she served on the board of the Monterey Bay Economic Partnership. UCSC heavily promoted UC Scout, which had a reach throughout the country and was free for California resident students. In addition to physical locations, online and hybrid offerings could extend the University's reach to many communities. Regent Raznick encouraged the University to make its work known in the community. Ms. Newman added that these examples showed that engagement with the business community created opportunities for UC students and researchers.

Regent Anguiano, noting the impact of these programs on the 2030 Capacity Plan and the 2050 plan for institutional growth, urged more campuses to present their expansion efforts.

Staff Advisor Mackness asked what lessons UCD and UCSC have learned that they could share with other campuses. Chancellor Larive shared that UC Santa Cruz instituted a daily shuttle service between the Santa Cruz campus and the Silicon Valley location to mitigate the challenges presented by Highway 17 and would consider something similar for MBEST. These programs, whether they were offered online or in a hybrid format, were helping break down barriers. In the aforementioned post-baccalaureate program, students would shadow physicians in Watsonville while taking courses from UCSC in collaboration with UCLA. There was an opportunity to leverage multiple UC campuses. Chancellor May underscored the criticality of establishing local partnerships for Aggie Square, particularly the partnership with Sacramento Mayor Darrell Steinberg. Ms. Newman added that technology enabled communication and cultural integration at an off-campus operation. Following the COVID-19 pandemic's effect on major cities, State and local officials regarded UC expansion as part of the solution to urban economic problems.

Committee Chair Park noted that projects featured in the written materials had been presented to the Finance and Capital Strategies Committee and encouraged more discussion about expansion before this Committee.

Committee Chair Park asked if the search for space drove programming or vice versa, or if both occurred at the same time. Chancellor Larive noted the intentional development of the Silicon Valley location by then Chancellor Blumenthal. On the other hand, the Santa Cruz campus received the land for MBEST in 1994. At the beginning of her tenure, Chancellor Larive recalled her astonishment at how little had been done in the location and felt obligated to fulfill the commitments that UCSC had made and to use the space for economic development through a combination of housing and partnerships in the region. The distance between MBEST and Santa Cruz created an obstacle. Chancellor May replied that economic development was a driver for developing Aggie Square. He observed that innovation hubs worked better in urban environments, and the City of Sacramento was 20 minutes away from the Davis campus and a willing partner.

Committee Chair Park asked if funding was an impediment to the success of campus expansion, noting an unsuccessful attempt in 1974. Chancellor May responded that Aggie Square was a public-private partnership (P3) in which the developer assumed the risk in funding the construction. Chancellor Larive stated that funding had been the reason why MBEST did not proceed in the past, despite multiple attempts by the campus. Now, UCSC had a more entrepreneurial way of thinking and wished to develop housing and engage with a P3 partner. Workforce development at MBEST might be eligible for federal and State funding. Larry Samuels, UCSC Special Advisor for Economic Development and Partnerships, explained that, until the last five years, the MBEST location had been isolated, blighted, and full of World War II barracks. High demand for housing in this region would help attract P3 partners.

5. **EXPANDING OPPORTUNITIES FOR COLLEGE CREDIT IN HIGH SCHOOL:
THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA IN PARTNERSHIP WITH THE
NATIONAL EDUCATION EQUITY LAB**

[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. Identifying scalable ways to engage historically underrepresented populations could help the University meet its 2030 enrollment goals while working to achieve equity and inclusion.

Rolin Moe, Executive Director of UC Online, stated that UC was the first public research university system to collaborate with the National Education Equity Lab, a nonprofit organization that offered credit-bearing, university-level courses to high school students across the U.S. who were enrolled in Title I schools. Since its initial pilot program in 2019, the National Education Equity Lab has expanded to include over 300 high schools in 29 states, allowing more than 15,000 marginalized high school students to earn 18,000 college credits in partnership with 14 universities. The National Education Equity Lab aimed to reach over one million students by 2030. With its “college in high school” model, university faculty and high school teachers co-facilitated courses and were supported by undergraduate, graduate, and alumni teaching fellows who offer tutorials, grading, and office hours. National Education Equity Lab staff ensured that the pace and rigor of courses were maintained. School districts with Title I schools were invited to participate in the program, and principals chose the high school teachers who would co-facilitate the courses. Each course had an average of 25 students, mostly juniors and seniors. Courses were free for students to attend, and schools paid \$250 per student to cover costs. Unlike courses taken at a university, these courses had cumulative assessments to build knowledge, similar to a high school course. Students in the program were high-achieving and came from high school environments that did not match their abilities. They could take courses in the humanities, science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM), business, and the social sciences. The National Education Equity Lab found that three types of courses were successful: high-impact courses integral to student success, courses focused on prescient topics, and elective courses that help students foster a love of learning. Mr. Moe highlighted several courses offered this year. The University planned to

begin offering courses in 2024; these were courses that already existed in the UC system and were taught by faculty with experience in online education and academic outreach.

Regent Hernandez remarked that community colleges offered the majority of early college programs and asked how the National Education Equity Lab differentiated itself from the competition. Mr. Moe responded that, for instance, a dual enrollment program focused on a traditional curriculum and resulted in credit at a particular institution, while the National Education Equity Lab engaged students who were historically underrepresented in prestigious institutions and focused on fostering a love of learning and demonstrating that they could succeed in college. UC and Arizona State University (ASU) were the only public institutions currently partnering with the National Education Equity Lab. Taking a course from a UC campus could hold a different meaning for a student than taking a course from a community college. Ms. Newman noted that students from a middle-class background were more likely to engage in dual enrollment. She opined that the National Education Equity Lab's connection to four-year universities made it attractive as an educational experience and as a resume builder.

Regent Tesfai asked what UC courses were selected for future terms and how UC planned to grow its participation. Mr. Moe replied that UC would choose existing courses that have been successful so that it could focus on pedagogy. The University was committed to a partnership lasting at least three years, and one-time investment in a course could result in benefits over time as a course is offered multiple times. He expressed hope that this program could expand to cover all ten campuses and multiple departments.

In response to a question from Regent Tesfai, Mr. Moe offered to gather more information about which partner institution offered the most courses.

Regent Tesfai asked Mr. Moe to expound on the teaching fellows. Mr. Moe stated that teaching fellows could be students or alumni who not only had experience with the material but also with being a first-generation student. The program helped teaching fellows build their resumes and consider their subject matter expertise as practitioners rather than scholars. The ratio of fellows to courses depended on the course. Ms. Newman added that this program could potentially be a model for increasing transfer from community colleges. By using a similar collaborative structure that enabled instructors to build courses together, UC campuses could help with course offerings at community colleges with low numbers of UC transfers. A number of students from low-sending community colleges have had to seek courses at multiple locations, slowing their transfer process.

Chancellor Muñoz questioned why National Education Equity Lab courses could not evolve into credit-bearing courses that could be applied toward a UC degree and help accelerate time to degree. He regarded this as a different kind of dual enrollment, with community colleges offering what Ms. Newman described. Chancellor Muñoz asked if this could be considered for the future. Ms. Newman responded in the affirmative, sharing that, in Massachusetts, first-generation, low-income, and ethnic minority high school students could earn up to a year's worth of college credit from courses offered by University of Massachusetts faculty, cutting college costs by one-quarter. The University could do

something similar. Vice President Gullatt clarified that students would receive college credit for taking National Education Equity Lab courses. Chancellor Muñoz reiterated the question posed by Regent Hernandez and asked what distinguished these courses from dual enrollment courses. Mr. Moe replied that, unlike dual enrollment, the National Education Equity Lab was reaching out to Title I schools, and the students invited to participate had been identified as high achievers who had not had similar opportunities before.

Chancellor Muñoz asked why a Title I school with an existing relationship with a community college would choose to participate in the National Education Equity Lab. Mr. Moe responded that there were many students and enough demand for these courses. The Los Angeles Unified School District was second largest provider of students to the National Education Equity Lab and also had significant dual enrollment relationships with area community colleges. Some were concerned that, by expanding online education, offerings might become too standardized. However, the apparatuses used to provide online education needed to ensure that a UC-quality online experience could be scaled. Ms. Gullatt added that a community college course might be a survey course, but National Education Equity Lab courses were more in-depth. Like the courses from the California State Summer School for Mathematics and Science program, these courses were not available in high schools or community colleges and were related to faculty research. These courses went beyond A–G and general education requirements.

Regent-designate Beharry asked if credits transferred only to the UC system. Ms. Gullatt replied that this was a national program and that credits could transfer to many institutions.

Regent-designate Beharry asked if teaching fellows would be able to obtain college credit. Ms. Gullatt replied that the University could explore the idea.

Regent-designate Beharry asked about the program’s outreach strategy for UC and high school students. Ms. Newman noted that the National Education Equity Lab had a significant marketing operation. Ms. Gullatt stated that the National Education Equity Lab selected the schools and provided support services, such as ensuring a later deadline for dropping courses. Faculty selected the graduate students, who were compensated.

Regent-designate Beharry asked how “high achievement” was determined and how accessible the program was within Title I schools. Ms. Gullatt offered to obtain this information from the National Education Equity Lab, as well as how the Lab might mitigate bias in selection. Regent-designate Beharry expressed concern about discourse related to concepts like academic rigor and called for “meeting students where they were.” Being in a Title I environment often meant having limited resources and scarce parental support. In his view, courses should be more than merely rigorous; rather, they should also be immersive, inclusive, and accessible and demonstrate that academia could be an equalizer. That had been his experience as a Title I student. He praised the National Education Equity Lab and looked forward to getting involved. Ms. Newman stated that those involved shared the same values. She underscored the importance of the high schools selecting students best positioned to benefit from this experience and making sure that these students are supported. One did not wish to see students struggle.

The meeting adjourned at 12:45 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff