

# THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

November 19, 2025

The Regents of the University of California met on the above date at the UCLA Luskin Conference Center, Los Angeles campus.

Members present: Regents Anguiano, Batchlor Brooks, Cohen, Komoto, Kounalakis, Leib, Makarechian, Milliken, Park, Reilly, Robinson, Sarris, Sures, and Wang

In attendance: Regents-designate Craven, Melton, and Tokita Faculty Representatives Palazoglu and Scott, Staff Advisor Hanson and former Staff Advisor Emiru, Secretary and Chief of Staff Lyall, General Counsel Robinson, Chief Compliance and Audit Officer Bustamante, Provost Newman, Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer Brostrom, Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer Nava, Executive Vice President Rubin, Senior Vice President Turner, Vice Presidents Brown and Kao, Chancellors Assanis, Frenk, Gillman, Hawgood, Hu, Khosla, Larive, Lyons, May, and Muñoz, and Recording Secretary Li

The meeting convened at 8:40 a.m. with Chair Reilly presiding.

## 1. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Reilly thanked those who signed up for public comment. The Board of Regents valued the exchange of ideas that sustain the University's strength and vitality. She asked that public comment be approached with respect and an open mind.

Chair Reilly explained that the public comment period permitted members of the public an opportunity to address University-related matters. The following persons addressed the Board concerning the items noted.

- A. Daniella Abbott, UCLA student, called attention to the rise in antisemitism at the University. In Ms. Abbott's experience, professors shared their personal views about Israel and Gaza and framed discussion questions that were biased against Israel. She asked the Regents for consistent and transparent enforcement of anti-harassment policies, clear guidance distinguishing protected speech from hate speech, and the promotion of dialogue that recognizes collective humanity.
- B. Amanda Dominguez, representative of the Campaign for College Opportunity, asked for more information about the impact of the Tuition Stability Plan and its proposed changes on affordability and equity gaps. Since a modest increase could destabilize the path to a degree, the Campaign urged UC to ensure that those with the lowest family income do not need to incur additional debt or work more hours.
- C. Vanesa Cruz Granados, UC Irvine student and Student Advocate to the Regents (StAR), called attention to the food and housing insecurity that undocumented students experienced. UC fellowships helped cover the cost of housing and food

but supported only ten percent of undocumented students. Ms. Cruz Granados demanded that the Regents continue funding the Presidential Fellowship for Experiential Learning for the next five years, allocate funding for alternatives to CalFresh for undocumented and international students, implement State Senate Bill 98, or the Sending Alerts to Families in Education (SAFE) Act, and notify the campus community of the presence of immigration enforcement on campus.

- D. Ryan Coryea, UC San Diego student and StAR, called for the adoption of an Open Educational Resources (OER) program similar to that of the California Community Colleges. Ms. Coryea noted the high cost of textbooks and the risks associated with seeking alternative sources for course materials. She asked the University to implement one of the three recommendations made by an OER task force in 2023.
- E. Sherry Zhou, UCLA student and StAR, urged the Regents to reject the proposed changes to the Tuition Stability Plan. In the past week, hundreds of UC students wrote in opposition to an indefinite one percent increase for capital projects and the ability to bank tuition increases, and they asked that return-to-aid remain at 45 percent. Ms. Zhou noted that the proposed UC budget would allocate billions of dollars toward capital projects.
- F. Javier Nuñez-Verdugo, UCLA student, urged the University to continue funding disability services, noting that nearly \$8 million was allocated in the last three years, and to improve oversight and promote transparency. Nuñez-Verdugo asked that UC consider how funding could support the retention of disabled students and Black and indigenous students of color, improve time-to-degree, and prevent students taking out exorbitant loans.
- G. Jared Gaby-Biegal, representative of United Food and Commercial Workers (UFCW), called attention to anti-union campaigns run by Cardenas Markets and Tony's Fresh Markets, both owned by Heritage Markets and part of UC's investment with Apollo Global Management. He stated that Heritage Markets settled two class-action lawsuits for \$4 million and faced multiple outstanding cases alleging sexual harassment, the failure to prevent harassment and retaliation, and the violation of labor law. He asked that Apollo negotiate an agreement that guarantees workers' rights and that the University withhold commitment to Apollo as it raises money for a new fund.
- H. Bryan Shields, member of North Coast States Carpenters Union Local 646, stated that his union joined members from Southern California to call for healthcare provisions within prevailing wage requirements. Healthcare expenditures would provide good work opportunities for union members. Mr. Shields noted that ADCO Drywall and Metal Framing, brought in by W.E. O'Neil Construction for a housing project at UC Santa Cruz, was named in a case before the California Labor Commissioner.
- I. Skye Smith, UCLA student, asked the Regents to direct UCLA to investigate the Center for Accessible Education's (CAE) staffing and funding levels. Ms. Smith

had lost 20 pounds and her studies suffered when CAE failed to transfer her disability accommodations request to another system. CAE has experienced a 70 percent increase in students seeking services in last two years while staffing levels have remained almost the same. Ms. Smith noted the national standard of one staff member to 150 students.

- J. Sylvia Hurtado, UCLA professor and Co-Chair of the UC Chicana/Latina Advisory Council, thanked President Milliken for supporting hiring incentives in order to increase diversity. As a fellow herself in 1990, Ms. Hurtado stated that the President's Postdoctoral Fellowship Program attracted talent to the University and produced nationally competitive scholars.
- K. Michael Andrew, UC Santa Cruz student and StAR, stated that the U.S. Department of Homeland Security proposed that student visas last four years, which would not account for the length of certain graduate and undergraduate programs. He suggested that the Academic and Student Affairs Committee work with the Academic Senate Committee on International Education to make appropriate recommendations in anticipation of this proposed change.
- L. Alexis Atsilvski Zaragoza, Student Regent Emerita, called on UC to address understaffing and correct flaws in the residency and income appeals process before increasing tuition. The months it took to resolve appeals led to students dropping out, some with debt. Regent Emerita Zaragoza urged the Regents to value student perspectives and raised concern about the amount of time students had to make remarks at meetings, students' ability to meet with UC leadership, and the role of the Student Regent position.
- M. Arif Ismail Bin Ruslan, UC San Diego international student, urged the Regents to either reject the proposed one percent step increase in the Tuition Stability Plan or dedicate part of the revenue to basic needs. Mr. Ruslan stated that tuition increases would disproportionately affect international students, who experienced food insecurity, housing insecurity, and work limits. He asked that decisions regarding the Tuition Stability Plan be delayed until fall 2026.
- N. Lily Brawner, UCLA student, stated that she and over 100 students lost their jobs following cuts to UCLA outreach and retention programs. Citing Regents Policy 4401, Policy on Future Admissions, Employment, and Contracting: Resolution Rescinding SP-1 and SP-2, she stated that the University should have student retention programs and should maintain outreach efforts in California public schools and community colleges.
- O. Michelle Markosyan, UCLA student, urged UC to implement the SAFE Act, fund the Presidential Fellowship for Experiential Learning, and fund alternatives to CalFresh. Students rejected the proposed changes to the cohort tuition model and instead asked that the maximum annual tuition increase be five percent, that tuition increases be based on inflation starting 2026, that return-to-aid remain at 45 percent, and that there be no step increases.

- P. Renata De Leon, UCLA student, urged the Regents to reject proposed changes to the cohort tuition model. Although financial aid made attending college possible for Ms. De Leon, she and thousands of other students were exhausted trying to make the most of opportunities at UCLA while facing financial difficulty. First-generation students would be particularly affected by these changes.
- Q. Kelsey Duff, UCLA alumna and UCLA Staff Assembly President-Elect, called attention to chronic understaffing and asked the University to invest in fair compensation for non-represented staff. Ms. Duff asked Chancellor Frenk to appoint a member of the UCLA Staff Assembly Executive Board to the Executive Budget Action Group.
- R. Maya Briston-Ingkom, UCLA student, asked UC to implement the SAFE Act so that students feel less fearful. She called for divestment from Blackstone, Blackrock, and Sequoia Capital, and advocated for fair pay and an end to programming cuts.
- S. Salvador George, member of Carpenters Union Local 6562, urged UC to help contractors provide healthcare coverage to the workers who build UC campuses. Mr. George shared that he helped build the Luskin Conference Center, and that healthcare coverage through his work prevented him from incurring medical debt when his son born was prematurely.
- T. Harvey McKeon, representative of North Coast States Carpenters Union, asked that UC implement healthcare standards in its construction procurement process to ensure that all contractors at UC campuses do the right thing as publicly funded safety nets face severe federal underfunding.
- U. Carl Maier, UCLA student, shared students' vehement opposition to the proposed changes to the cohort tuition model, primarily the reduction in return-to-aid and the one percent step increase. Mr. Maier stated that 43 percent of undergraduate students and 40 percent of graduate students at UC experienced food insecurity. UC could not blame the federal administration for its decision to raise tuition, and current and future students would not accept astronomical debt.
- V. Miriam Shbaita, UCLA student, shared that her family in Palestine faced kidnappings, incarcerations, and bombings. She stated that UC's investments funded and facilitated this violence. She called on Regents to meet with the Divest Coalition, Students for Justice in Palestine, and affected students.
- W. Tai-Ge Min, UCLA student and member of the Divest Coalition, demanded that UC meet with students and reject changes to the Tuition Stability Plan, noting that the University was voting on changes one year early without public input. Min raised concern about the basis of these changes, stating that the additional revenue generated would not benefit teaching assistants, student programs, or workers.

- X. Alexander Li, UCLA student, called on UC to support undocumented students, reconsider tuition increases, and implement the SAFE Act. Students asked that tuition increases be limited to a maximum of five percent annually and be based on inflation starting in 2026, that return-to-aid remain at 45 percent, and that step increases not be included.

## 2. **REMARKS OF THE CHAIR OF THE BOARD**

Chair Reilly began her remarks by noting the Board's responsibility to provide governance through oversight of policy, risk, and strategy. The Regents balanced fiscal prudence with a core commitment to access, excellence, and service to the public good. With regard to the renewal of the Tuition Stability Plan, the Regents recognized that they were making decisions that profoundly affect current and future students and devoted a significant amount of time and effort to evaluating all possible courses of action. The Tuition Stability Plan has provided students and families with predictability and confidence in their financial planning. Since its implementation in 2022, about 54 percent of California undergraduates received enough aid to fully offset tuition increases and cover housing, food, and books. Renewing this plan would preserve affordability, provide financial predictability, and strengthen UC's ability to deliver excellence. The University was committed to ensuring that no student is denied a UC education for financial reasons.

Chair Reilly announced the launch of the annual UC Regents Innovation Awards, a new systemwide initiative that would recognize UC faculty and UC National Laboratories scientists for their groundbreaking research, transformative start-up companies, and community partnerships that exemplify UC's commitment to innovation and to the public benefit. Details on eligibility, nomination procedures, and timelines were available on the Regents' website.

In the current climate of constant change, it was the role of the UC community to remain vigilant, forward-looking, and unified. The Board's governance and oversight strategy was rooted in the daily experience of students, faculty, and staff, with their success as the Board's guide. At the close of 2025, Chair Reilly called for the UC community's collective commitment not merely to adapting to change, but also to leading, strengthening UC's position, expanding UC's positive impact, and preserving UC's public mission. This would require collaboration, thoughtful deliberation, respect for different perspectives, and unwavering focus on the University's impact. With the approach of Thanksgiving, Chair Reilly expressed gratitude to everyone who made this work possible and for the thoughtful oversight and partnership that defined this Board.

## 3. **REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY**

President Milliken noted that November 8 marked 100 days since he joined the University. Upon meeting with many faculty, students, staff, and donors, he observed that the strength of UC was its people. This year, five out of six U.S. Nobel Prize winners were affiliated with UC, and all UC campuses achieved top rankings, including top two public universities in the country. President Milliken congratulated Chancellor Frenk, who received an honorary degree from the University of Mexico, one of his alma maters.

President Milliken was focused on significant challenges facing the University: the federal administration's investigations and enforcement actions, the suspension of research funding, its demand for over \$1 billion, and preserving the balance between the freedom of speech and campus safety. Peer institutions with significant resources were cutting graduate enrollment, shrinking or eliminating academic programs, cutting student services, and enacting widespread layoffs. The University also confronted systemic budget challenges due to rising operating costs and State fiscal constraints. UC had been preparing for this prior to President Milliken's arrival and had taken measures including a systemwide hiring freeze and travel reductions, stretching resources, taking advantage of UC's scale, and focusing on core priorities. Despite these steps, nearly 800 employees were laid off across the system this year as a last resort.

President Milliken was deeply grateful to Governor Newsom and the State Legislature for their support. This year, the State faced its own budget challenges, resulting in nearly \$400 million in deferred State funding for the University. Despite these deferrals, campuses exceeded the Compact's 2024–25 enrollment target by over 4,000 California undergraduate students, absorbing an over \$500 million increase in operating costs. To alleviate this pressure, UC requested a \$130 million interest-free loan from the State. In the next budget cycle, UC aimed to advocate for a fully funded UC budget and the restoration of the base budget and Compact deferrals.

Tuition increases were never welcome, but moderate and predictable increases were necessary to sustain the quality of education that students deserve. The Tuition Stability Plan ensured predictability and affordability, supported UC's strong financial aid program, and was how UC delivered on the promise of being an engine for social and economic mobility. President Milliken emphasized that 54 percent of California undergraduate students paid no tuition, 64 percent graduated with no student loans, and undergraduate debt at UC was significantly lower than the national average. UC financial aid programs helped students cover the rising cost of housing, books, supplies, and other essentials.

Between January 20 and October 28, more than 1,600 grants across the system were halted. Some were reinstated, but the University still faced a potential loss of \$1 billion in federal research funding. More than 400 grants remained suspended or terminated, representing more than \$230 million in research activity. Proposed reductions to facilities and administrative recovery rates would affect each campus, and new limits on grant applications and cuts to research programs created uncertainty for the University's research mission. There was also a lack of understanding of how patent amendments would affect innovation, technology advancements, and medicine in the U.S. The University's enterprise supported thousands of jobs, advanced medical innovation, and produced life-changing and life-saving solutions. Chancellors engaged with their communities on how to respond to budget reductions and increasing challenges, and they needed tools to sustain quality and access, which included extending the Tuition Stability Plan. In the coming months, President Milliken would share ways in which UC could leverage new technologies and resources to drive operational efficiencies and strengthen UC's financial position while continuing to focus on academic excellence, impactful research, high-quality health care, social and economic mobility, student success, and career preparation.

for graduates. As both an optimist and a student of history, history reassured him in difficult moments.

#### 4. **REMARKS OF THE CHAIR OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE**

Faculty Representative Palazoglu expressed his full support for colleagues and friends at UCLA amidst the assault on the campus' mission and values. The demands made by the U.S. Department of Justice threatened the heart and soul of this institution, but a preliminary injunction was recently granted that barred the Trump administration from imposing fines on UC or withholding federal grants. He acknowledged the efforts of a coalition that included the American Association of University Professors, all ten campus Faculty Associations, and unions representing over 100,000 UC employees; 25 student organizations also filed an amicus brief in support.

On October 3, the Academic Council issued a statement opposing any agreement with the federal government that would compromise UC's institutional autonomy and academic freedom. The statement declared that "There can be no clearer attack on academic freedom than an attempt to dictate curricular content, research priorities, hiring decisions, and admissions standards. While the financial penalties threatened by the federal government would in effect radically curtail UC's future, acquiescing in the idea that academic freedom, governance, and mission are negotiable would be equally ruinous." President Milliken's response assured the Academic Council that he shared its objection to any outside interference with the academic freedom, governance, and mission of the University. The Council's statement also underscored the Academic Senate's expectation of meaningful participation in any discussions concerning settlement with the federal government. This unity of purpose and conviction would help UC get through one of the most challenging periods in its history. The Academic Senate appreciated President Milliken's letter concerning the future of the President's Postdoctoral Fellowship Program and hiring incentive and was ready to collaborate.

The Academic Senate Task Force on UC Adaptation to Disruptions (UCAD) issued an interim report in July that offered a draft blueprint for reimagining the future of UC. A successor task force called UCAD Plus would combine the expertise and wisdom of faculty and administrative leaders and initiate a systemwide dialogue to chart a resilient, exceptional, and sustainable course for the University. UC could draw from its strengths, understand its vulnerabilities, and seize the opportunities and possibilities that lie ahead.

The University had always been more than simply the sum of its parts. The campuses, National Laboratories, UC Agricultural and Natural Resources, and UC's health systems comprised both the University's legacy and its future. With more than 70 Nobel Prizes since 1939, the public had witnessed the University's excellence, impact, and the legacy of successful contributions to society and future research inquiry. By winning the Nobel Prize, UC was elevated to a global platform from which to advocate new ideas and show what one could accomplish with creativity, perseverance, and hard work. In this moment, UC celebrated its accomplishments and reaffirmed the very character of this institution.

Chair Reilly invited Regent Makarechian to make remarks.

Regent Makarechian stated that, after falling in his home and becoming paralyzed from the neck down, he participated in Regents meetings via teleconference for the past four years. UCLA Health Chief Executive Officer and Professor of Neurology John Mazziotta and Geoffrey Manley, Professor of Neurological Surgery at UCSF, advised that Regent Makarechian go to Craig Hospital, a neurorehabilitation center in Denver, Colorado. Regent Makarechian was able to walk after 4.5 months. He felt well above the neck but still experienced significant pain in his arms and legs. Two weeks ago, Dr. Manley invited Regent Makarechian to undergo experimental treatment at UCSF. An instrument was attached to his neck, which eliminated the pain in his hands and legs, opened his fingers, and enabled him to perform functions such as zipping his jacket, buttoning and unbuttoning a shirt, picking up items from the floor, and tying his shoelaces.

Regent Makarechian emphasized that this illustrated the value of the research occurring at the University of California, research that sometimes took decades. A large portion of UC's \$60 billion budget came from research funding, benefiting millions of people who were paralyzed or afflicted with other diseases. With regard to the national discussion about the value of international students, he shared his own experience as a UC international student some 60 years ago and his subsequent successes in business and contributions to the country. Chancellors Khosla, Assanis, Hu, Frenk, Hawgood, and former Chancellor Yang, as well as the chief executive officers of major technology companies, all accomplished leaders, came to the University from other countries. Regent Makarechian expressed gratitude to the University for what it has done for California and the world.

Chair Reilly stated that this was a remarkable example of how research dollars affect individual lives in a profound way. The Regents would continue to fight for this University.

Regent Leib asked Regent Makarechian about his future treatment at UCSF. Regent Makarechian shared that he would resume treatment at UCSF in March. He expressed hope that this instrument could become wireless and portable in the future.

Chair Reilly suggested inviting Dr. Manley to speak to the Regents about this technology.

5. **UC INSPIRES: UC NOBEL LAUREATES—A LEGACY OF WORLD-CHANGING ACHIEVEMENT AND IMPACT**

[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.]

Chair Reilly introduced the item. Since the 1930s, University faculty and staff have received 75 Nobel Prizes, more than any other university in the world. Last month, UC faculty and alumni earned five Nobel Prizes in a single year, more than any university system in history. Each of the Nobel Laureates speaking to the Regents today demonstrated their belief in the value of public science for the common good. Their achievements were living proof of what happens if society invests in ideas not just for profit, but for progress.

President Milliken stated that these achievements were possible because of the historic compact in the United States between the federal government and research universities. At

the end of the Second World War, head of the U.S. Office of Scientific Research and Development Vannevar Bush (1890–1974) proposed to U.S. President Harry S. Truman (1884–1972) a compact to support the university research that would help the country succeed in the war and could fuel the peacetime economy. This compact was an unparalleled success, leading to the creation of research universities that attracted talent from around the world. President Milliken expressed concern about the future of this compact and the uncertainty of federal support. While celebrating the great success of UC Nobel laureates, one should also consider importance of advocating for the continuation of this historic collaboration between the government and U.S. research universities.

Chancellor Frenk introduced Andrea Ghez, Distinguished Professor of Physics and Astronomy at UCLA and Lauren B. Leichtman & Arthur E. Levine chair in Astrophysics. A member of UCLA faculty since 1994, Ms. Ghez directed UCLA's Galactic Center Group and in 2020 became the fourth woman ever to receive a Nobel Prize in Physics. Her research confirmed the existence of supermassive black holes and provided the strongest evidence yet of Einstein's theory of gravity. Ms. Ghez's discoveries were made possible by sustained public investment ranging from the National Science Foundation (NSF) to UC's commitment to the W.M. Keck Observatory.

Professor Ghez recalled that 30 years ago, she came to UCLA because of her desire to work with the Keck telescopes, tools that have attracted one in five astronomy and astrophysics researchers to work at UC. Ms. Ghez launched a program to design new methods to find and study black holes using these telescopes. Today, the program has grown, with a core of 12 people at UCLA and a network of 100 people from around the world. She explained that a black hole is an object whose mass is confined to zero volume, or no finite size, noting the challenge of combining quantum mechanics with general relativity to understand black holes. To prove the existence of a black hole, one must show that its mass is confined within its Schwarzschild Radius, the size at which an object's gravity overcomes all other known forces. Current theories suggested that galaxies had supermassive black holes at their center that regulated their future growth, and to prove this, researchers must seek stars at heart of the Milky Way Galaxy orbiting a black hole. Ms. Ghez spent most of her career overcoming distortions in images created by the earth's atmosphere, which led to the discovery of thousands of stars. In 2020, she was one of three individuals who received the Nobel Prize in Physics, but despite winning the Nobel, Ms. Ghez had much more to study, as many predictions about black holes were inconsistent with what was observed. She and her team were also advancing the next generation of instrumentation. Ms. Ghez was deeply proud and grateful to be part of the University.

Chancellor Hawgood introduced David Julius, who received the Nobel Prize in Physiology or Medicine in 2021. His work identified the receptors that detect the heat of a chili pepper, the cool of menthol, and the sting of wasabi, as well as how these sensations are transmitted to the brain. Mr. Julius studied biochemistry at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, earned his doctorate at UC Berkeley, and completed postdoctoral training at Columbia University. He joined UCSF as faculty in 1989, where he served as Professor and Chair in the Department of Physiology and was the Morris Herzstein Chair in Molecular Biology and Medicine.

Professor Julius defined pain as a critical warning system used to initiate protective reflexes when one is about to experience tissue injury. His laboratory sought to understand how chronic pain syndromes differ in order to introduce new strategies to address them, and to understand the pain system in order to identify new targets and new types of analgesic drugs. His laboratory identified molecules on the surface of nerve fibers that initiate pain sensation, sites that were not present in other tissues or other areas in the body. His team found that naturally occurring substances like capsaicin, menthol, isothiocyanates, and thiosulfonates acted on molecules found at the beginning of the pain system and mimicked familiar aspects of pain. Chili peppers act on the molecule that detects heat, and menthol acts on the molecule that detects cold. Onions and shallots activate a receptor for detecting chemical irritants. Co-laureate Ardem Patapoutian identified molecules that sense mechanical pressure. Mr. Julius expressed hope that the molecules that his team and others have identified could be targets for new non-addictive, non-toxic therapeutic drugs to treat chronic pain associated with inflammation, chemotherapy, and chronic cough. His team collaborated with colleagues at UCSF to characterize and identify these molecules for the benefit of drug development. Mr. Julius remained at UC because of its intellectual and collegial atmosphere, and he underscored the importance of UC's relationship with the National Institutes of Health and other federal sources. He expressed pride in this work and called for the perseverance of California, which has given much to scientific advancement in the U.S. and around the world.

Chancellor Assanis introduced John Martinis, Professor of Physics at UC Santa Barbara who received the Nobel Prize in Physics in 2025 alongside UCSB Professor of Physics Michel Devore and UC Berkeley Professor Emeritus John Clarke. Mr. Martinis and his colleagues transformed the understanding of the quantum world by demonstrating its behavior at a scale large enough to observe and measure. His work, based on decades of fundamental research, paved the way for scientific advancements in communication, sensing, and quantum computing. Mr. Martinis was known at UCSB for his collegiality and deep commitment to teaching and mentorship.

Professor Martinis recalled the rigor and challenge of learning physics at UC Berkeley, where he was a first-generation college student. He decided to stay on the Berkeley campus to work with Mr. Clarke and conducted a thesis experiment that later resulted in a Nobel Prize. The culture of instrumentation at UC Berkeley, brought about by Ernest Lawrence (1901–1958) with the cyclotron and particle accelerators, had a positive effect on Mr. Martinis' career. His work asked whether macroscopic variables obey quantum mechanics. Quantum mechanics had two components, wave-like behavior and particulate behavior, which was described in the Schrödinger's cat paradox. Mr. Martinis presented a photo of the microwave device used in his early experiments, which was operated at very low temperatures. In the last 40 years, new tools such as macroscopic electrical circuits made new quantum experiments possible. In 2014, Mr. Martinis moved the project to Google while the laboratory remained at UC Santa Barbara. In 2019, he and his team conducted the Quantum Supremacy experiment and demonstrated that a quantum computer could solve mathematical problems far more quickly. Mr. Martinis's start-up company QoLab was leveraging semiconductor technology to make further advances.

Chancellor Lyons introduced Randy Schekman, Professor of Molecular and Cell Biology at UC Berkeley and Howard Hughes Medical Institute Investigator. In addition to the Nobel Prize in Physiology or Medicine in 2013, Professor Schekman has received numerous honors and awards and was a member of the National Academy of Sciences and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. He was a renowned teacher and mentor to successful scientists such as David Baker, a UCB alumnus who received the Nobel Prize in Chemistry. Mr. Schekman's research led to the development and production of a new vaccine for Hepatitis B, the world's first recombinant vaccine, and lifesaving drugs like insulin and human growth hormone. His current work might lead to a future cure for Parkinson's disease. In addition to these contributions, Chancellor Lyons commended Mr. Schekman's advocacy for the greater good, the needs and interests of his students, and public higher education. Mr. Schekman donated his Nobel Prize award to UC Berkeley.

Professor Schekman recalled his interest in science growing up and how he worked odd jobs to save money for a student microscope that was now on display at the Nobel Prize Museum. His passion for microbiology grew through his time at UCLA and in graduate school. In 1976, his first year as a UC Berkeley faculty member, Mr. Schekman and Peter Novick, now Professor of Cellular and Molecular Medicine of UC San Diego, searched for the genes that controlled protein secretion. Human chromosomes contain about 23,000 genes, which encode proteins that catalyze the chemistry of life. About 30 percent of these proteins, including insulin, were secreted from cells to work elsewhere in the body. Mr. Schekman's laboratory devised genetic and biochemical techniques using baker's yeast that helped a local biotechnology company produce large quantities of human recombinant insulin. Mr. Schekman's education and career benefited from the State's significant investment in public education in the 1960s, increased federal investment in science and science education during the space race, and the California Master Plan for Higher Education, which called for the construction of new campuses to accommodate more California students. At the time, at least 80 percent of the UC budget was provided by the State, compared with ten percent now.

Mr. Schekman warned that the infrastructure supporting science was facing an existential crisis due to increasing antagonism toward science and the scientific method. The NSF was facing eviction from its headquarters, and the U.S. Secretary of Health and Human Services recommended cancelling NIH grants supporting infectious disease research and replaced all members of the Advisory Committee on Immunization Practices with vaccine skeptics. Academic institutions were under attack based on false claims of antisemitism and unbalanced applications of civil rights law, and universities and research institutes were directed to accept grants with unsustainably low levels of indirect cost recovery, a restriction not imposed on the aerospace and defense industries. Mr. Schenkman cautioned that the United States' place in science might be overtaken by countries like China, where there was enormous investment in basic science. He called upon the leaders of academic institutions to speak more forcefully in support of truth and science. The Regents must resist the federal government's attempt to extort funds from UCLA and other campuses. UC had a powerful message to deliver: that an investment in basic science pays enormous dividends in improved health outcomes and technological development. The voices and actions of Regents were needed to show that California could still lead the way.

Regent Makarechian asked when such a new pain medication could be developed. Mr. Julius replied that the transition from basic discovery research to pharmaceutical manufacturing took a long time, but his team would keep pursuing this molecular approach.

Regent Makarechian asked if Mr. Julius was studying how pain signals traveled from the spinal cord to the nerves. Mr. Julius responded in the affirmative; this was relevant to inflammatory pain and has garnered much attention in the last two to three years. His laboratory was studying gastrointestinal dysfunction and pain related to inflammatory bowel syndrome. Researchers sought to harness the actions of neurons to suppress pain.

Staff Advisor Hanson asked whether Ms. Ghez and Mr. Martinis collaborated on research. Mr. Martinis responded in the negative, but colleagues at UCSB were working on optical detectors to observe exoplanets. He was proud of the fact that researchers were looking for applications for quantum devices.

Regent-designate Craven asked what message the presenters would send to students who wished to pursue innovation. Mr. Schekman replied that there were enormous opportunities for discovery for those willing to make bold choices, take risks, and collaborate with others. These opportunities would continue, even in the present circumstance. Mr. Julius agreed but acknowledged that this was a challenging time for trainees. Many graduate programs cut their admission by 50 percent or more, and the faculty job market was very competitive. Institutions must give hope to trainees that science would remain supported in California. Ms. Ghez noted the benefit of requiring undergraduate students to take general education courses outside of their majors. Taking a science course, for instance, demonstrated the scientific method and the importance of basic science and was a gateway to science, technology, engineering, and mathematics disciplines.

Regent Park asked about the role of public sentiment and how UC could inspire the general public and raise awareness about the value of science. Mr. Schekman sounded the alarm about the loss of public faith in science and suggested that the leaders of National Academies promote the value of science to the general public. When Bruce Alberts, Professor Emeritus of Biochemistry and Biophysics at UCSF, was President of the National Academy of Sciences, he traveled around the country, speaking to local and State governments in order to advance science curricula. It was an opportunity to educate the nation and not just speak to politicians.

Chair Reilly asked how many of the laureates present had social media accounts. Mr. Julius acknowledged the role of social media in disseminating news to younger generations. He noted the very poor quality of science education in some areas and called for selecting political leaders who appreciated science and fact-based thinking. Ms. Ghez replied that students from her laboratory were sharing their work on social media and had a significant online following. Mr. Martinis disagreed with the view that the federal administration was anti-science and pointed to the administration's concern about what was happening in other academic departments at universities.

The Board recessed at 11:10 a.m.

.....

The Board reconvened at 1:20 p.m. with Chair Reilly presiding.

Members present: Regents Anguiano, Beharry, Brooks, Cohen, Komoto, Kounalakis, Lee, Leib, Matosantos, Milliken, Park, Reilly, Robinson, Sarris, Sures, and Wang

In attendance: Regents-designate Craven, Melton, and Tokita Faculty Representatives Palazoglu and Scott, Staff Advisor Hanson and former Staff Advisor Emiru, Secretary and Chief of Staff Lyall, General Counsel Robinson, Chief Compliance and Audit Officer Bustamante, Provost Newman, Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer Brostrom, Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer Nava, Executive Vice President Rubin, Senior Vice President Turner, Vice Presidents Brown and Kao, Chancellors Assanis, Frenk, Gillman, Hawgood, Hu, Khosla, Larive, Lyons, May, and Muñoz, and Recording Secretary Li

6. **RENEWAL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA TUITION STABILITY PLAN**

The President of the University recommended that the Regents approve adjustments to student charges and general provisions as described in Attachment 1, Proposed Adjustments to Student Charges.

[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.]

Chair Reilly introduced the item, the renewal of the University of California Tuition Stability Plan, which was first approved in 2021. The Regents were asked to review a proposed modification: maintaining a five percent cap on annual increases, banking excess increases, adjusting the return-to-aid rate, and incorporating a one percent increase to support capital improvements. These refinements reflected UC's dual commitment to safeguarding affordability and access for students and ensuring the financial resilience of the University's academic enterprise.

Assistant Vice President Caín Díaz explained the role of student tuition and fees on the UC systemwide budget, specifically the over \$11 billion core funding that represented about 20 percent of the University's \$56 billion budget. Core funds were made up of State support, mandatory tuition and fees, and UC General Funds. Nonresident Supplemental Tuition (NRST) made up most of UC General Funds, which was 15 percent of core funds revenues, State funding made up 45 percent of core funds revenues, and the remainder was made up of student tuition and fees. Salaries and benefits made up nearly 75 percent of core funds expenditures, and student financial aid made up 14 percent. UC campuses relied on a blended funding model, in which modest growth in core operational costs required growth in all fund sources or extraordinary year-over-year increases of a single fund source. If total costs within core funds increased by five percent, each of the three sources of core funds would also have to increase by five percent. If UC relied on the State to shoulder this increase, State support would need to increase by 11 percent year over year.

Relying on annual double-digit increases in State support was not realistic for a multi-year plan, so tuition was critical to addressing growing cost pressures. In order to address this and to support stability and predictability for students and the University, the Regents approved the Tuition Stability Plan in July 2021, which took effect for students entering fall 2022. Tuition, the Student Services Fee, and NRST did not increase for continuing undergraduate students. Each year, tuition was assessed based on a three-year average of the California Consumer Price Index (CPI), and that rate remained flat for the four to six years a student remained at UC. For graduate students, fees increased according to inflation and were capped at five percent.

Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer Brostrom described the proposed modifications to the Tuition Stability Plan. First, the University would be able to bank any amount above a five percent cap on annual cohort increases, which could be applied in future years. For instance, if the combination of inflation and one percent for capital exceeds a five percent increase, the amount above five percent could be carried forward and applied the following year. This mechanism provided an assurance to future students and a safeguard to the University during periods of higher inflation. During those periods, this amount would go toward the operating budget, not the capital budget. Second, 40 percent in new incremental tuition would be committed to return-to-aid, which was a slightly lower rate than in the original plan. The Tuition Stability Plan has increased UC's overall contribution to return-to-aid from about 27 percent to nearly 30 percent. Under the proposed change, return-to-aid would increase to 31.4 percent in 2030 and reach the target rate of 33 percent within nine years. Third, subject to the five percent cap and return-to-aid, one percent would be added to the inflationary increase for capital improvements. This reflected a growing need for capital, particularly for deferred maintenance and seismic upgrades. UC has not received general obligation bond funding from the State since 2006 nor received lease revenue bond support since 2011. The one-time allocations the University received were primarily for new projects. The \$9 billion shortfall in deferred maintenance was due in part to better reporting and analysis.

Shawn Brick, Associate Vice Provost for Student Financial Support, described the effect of the Tuition Stability Plan on affordability. The UC Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES) asked whether students felt attending UC was manageable and how worried they were about student debt. The 2024 survey, the first administered after the implementation of the Tuition Stability Plan, showed the most positive outcome since UCUES was instituted. Affordability was measured by the self-help expectation, or estimated cost of attendance less grants, scholarships, and parent contribution. It determined how much students had to work part-time or borrow to cover tuition, books and supplies, room and board, transportation, groceries, and personal expenses. Mr. Brick presented a chart indicating that the self-help expectation was lower under the Tuition Stability Plan. He also presented a table of the percentage of California undergraduate students in each income group who received financial aid such as the UC Grant, the Cal Grant, the Native American Opportunity Plan, and the Middle Class Scholarship program.

In response to questions that Regents asked about students with family incomes under \$60,000 who were not covered by financial aid, Mr. Brick presented a table indicating that 98 percent of California undergraduate students with family incomes below \$60,000 who

applied for financial aid received it. The remaining two percent tended to be students whose families had large assets. He then presented charts of the net college cost, defined as the total estimated cost of attendance less financial aid, in 2029–30 for a sample student with a family income of \$45,000 with the Tuition Stability Plan and without the Tuition Stability Plan. The estimated cost of attendance would be lower without the Tuition Stability Plan, but the net cost to the family would be greater. Non-tuition costs rose with inflation regardless of whether there was a Tuition Stability Plan in place, but only with the plan would there be sufficient financial aid to offset those increases. For a student with a family income of 90,000 per year, net costs were different, but the dynamic was the same. As family income rose, the impact of the Tuition Stability Plan was smaller. Some families earning \$120,000 would not receive aid with an increase in tuition and would experience a cost increase under the Tuition Stability Plan. Families earning \$180,000 would pay more under the Tuition Stability Plan, but the Middle Class Scholarship program would offset some of those cost increases.

Regent Lee asked if banking would occur the following year or if the total accrued amount would be used in future years with no expiration date. Mr. Brostrom replied that banking could accrue over a number of years but would be capped at five percent.

Regent Lee noted that the five percent cap would be reached given the number of high-inflation years UC has experienced. Mr. Brostrom stated that he and Mr. Díaz reviewed California CPI data from the last 40 years and found only six years in which UC would have exceeded five percent, even with the additional one percent premium.

Regent Brooks shared her view that the proposed changes to the Tuition Stability Plan would reduce education to workforce output, devalue equity and inclusion, and make affordability a privilege rather than a promise. She asked if UC could provide a campus-level analysis of increases in housing, dining, UC Student Health Insurance Program (UC SHIP), mandatory fees, textbooks, and transportation costs in the last five years and explain how the proposed tuition increase would interact with these higher cost categories and which students would be more affected. She also asked for disaggregated data on student outcomes and how improved outcomes were tied to investments funded by the Tuition Stability Plan. Next, Regent Brooks asked whether there was a rise in borrowing among certain income groups and if the proposed changes would affect borrowing among low- and middle-income families. Noting the rise in demand for student basic needs and mental health services, Regent Brooks requested an assessment of each campus' capacity to support student well-being and of the impact that the proposed changes would have on student retention and educational outcomes. She noted a lack of transparency regarding how the Student Services Fee was being used. Students expressed clear opposition to the banking of tuition increases, the reduction of return-to-aid, and the one percent increase. Students felt that such a structure would disenfranchise students by automating tuition increases without meaningful governance. Regent Brook recalled that the original Tuition Stability Plan was implemented to protect students from unpredictable increases; in her view, students should not bear the burden of the University's capital issues. She asked if UC could ensure that the proposed plan would not require more students or families to take out loans, adding that the questions she raised did not account for the impact that the proposed changes would have on graduate education.

Mr. Brick replied that the last five years of non-tuition costs at each campus could be provided. UC designed its financial aid to take non-tuition costs into account regardless of campus and moved resources according to cost changes at a particular campus so that students from that campus were not disproportionately affected. Non-tuition costs rose regardless of whether the Tuition Stability Plan was in place, but the plan generated revenue to offset those non-tuition costs. Undergraduate student debt has been declining over the last several years. At present, 35 percent of California resident students were graduating with debt, and the average debt at graduation was about \$17,000, lower than the national average. This could be attributed to the Tuition Stability Plan and other factors.

Mr. Brostrom stated that the University was addressing the dramatic increase in the need for mental health support through UC SHIP and student mental health services. The Tuition Stability Plan would include an increase in the Student Services Fee at the same percentage level, which the campuses could use for those services. Mr. Díaz added that the written materials for item B2 of the July meeting, *Overview of the University of California Tuition Stability Plan*, provided information on outcomes in areas such as student retention, number of applications, and affordability after four years under the original plan. Many of these outcomes were drawn from the UC Information Center dashboards, and UC monitored them closely every year. Mr. Brick noted that the affordability dashboard did not include parent loan borrowing. Families of out-of-state students were taking out more Direct PLUS Loans for parents than families of California students. He stated that he would need to gather more data to provide an answer regarding borrowing trends.

Regent Brooks asked what prompted the proposed changes to the current plan. Mr. Brostrom replied that the current plan brought operating revenue to campuses, provided predictability to families that paid tuition, and increased financial aid and improved debt levels. In his view, the proposed changes were minor. Banking could have happened only six times in the last 40 years. By reducing return-to-aid from 45 percent to 40 percent, overall return-to-aid would continue to proceed toward the 33 percent goal but more slowly. The addition of one percent was a recognition of the need to address capital liabilities. UC has nearly exhausted its State Assembly Bill 94 funds, and there was no other fund source.

Regent Brooks asked if the recent \$130 million from the State would have an impact on the Tuition Stability Plan. Mr. Brostrom responded in the negative. UC received less State funding this year than in 2024–25, a year in which UC received \$125 million less than the funding Compact payment. The \$130 million was a zero-interest loan from the State that the University would treat as one-time funding for uses like capital projects or student services.

Regent Anguiano moved that the recommendation be amended such that the Regents review the Tuition Stability Plan in seven years, and that campuses are able to use the additional one percent at their discretion.

Regent Cohen stated that the University heeded the concerns of the Board and students, as the proposed changes improved upon what was presented in July. He recalled the chaos of tuition discussions prior to the cohort tuition model. Without the Tuition Stability Plan,

current students would face ten to 30 percent tuition increases. As costs increased every year, tuition for each cohort has stayed the same. The Tuition Stability Plan also helped UC add 15,000 new undergraduate students. Regent Cohen regarded a 40 percent return-to-aid as acceptable, as the University was much closer to its ultimate goal of one-third return-to-aid, and the pool of financial funds would grow more slowly but not shrink. Approving the proposed changes would help address the cost of housing, books, and other expenses. With regard to setting aside one percent for capital needs, Regent Cohen noted the \$48 billion worth of projects without a funding source in the Capital Financial Plan. UC was not making progress on its deferred maintenance and seismic projects quickly enough. Campus buildings existed for the benefit of students, and buildings in use had more deferred maintenance. UC had an obligation to keep its facilities modern, and this was an opportunity for UC to bolster its commitment to its financial obligations. Regent Cohen expressed support for the proposal as presented.

Regent Robinson asked how the one percent would be distributed among campuses and what the dollar amount would be. He did not wish to see the responsibility for seismic projects and deferred maintenance placed on students. Mr. Brostrom responded that one percent would generate about \$50 million per year, which could become about \$800 million per year by leveraging the central bank. This would be allocated to campuses for deferred maintenance or enrollment growth but not for new buildings. The University was making progress on seismic projects and deferred maintenance for its auxiliary enterprises, housing and dining, and medical centers because they had dedicated revenue streams that the academic enterprise did not have, such as patient care payments, rent, and dining contracts. Students would be paying debt service for their time at UC. For example, they would be contributing to a small portion of a new roof, which would be amortized through a bond issuance.

Regent Robinson asked whether there was an issue with keeping the one percent fungible per the proposed amendment. Mr. Brostrom responded that he would prefer discretion to remain with the President, who could work with the chancellors every year to determine how the one percent should be spent.

Regent Robinson asked why the one percent was indicated separately. Mr. Brostrom replied that this was one tool in the toolbox; UC would still need to advocate for general obligation and lease revenue bonds and other funding mechanisms to address capital needs.

Regent Matosantos emphasized importance of a stable tuition policy and predictability for families. In her view, the University heeded the Regents' concerns about tuition increases exceeding five percent, and banking would enable UC to obtain resources while making progress on access, debt-free pathways, and other priorities in the midst of federal uncertainties and the likelihood of reduced State support. She stated that she did not support fungibility and supported the recommendation as presented. Deferred maintenance did not tend to be a subject of advocacy, and devoting some of the increase to deferred maintenance and capital needs helped reduce future risks.

Referring to Regent Cohen's earlier comments, Regent Matosantos emphasized the need to address the cost curve. Despite stable tuition increases, individual campuses continued

to experience structural budget problems. UC must consider other factors like federal uncertainties. She did not prefer changing return-to-aid and wished to see more money go toward student support, housing, and other initiatives related to debt-free pathways, but she recognized the importance of the Board's role in ensuring public oversight and being responsible fiscal stewards. UC must hold itself accountable.

Regent Park asked for specific information about non-tuition costs. These costs were substantial, and she felt as if the University focused more on tuition than other costs.

Regent Park expressed support for Regent Anguiano's proposed amendment to provide campus flexibility in the use of the funds. In her view, people wished to see the benefit of their expenditures. UC should decide to fund certain things instead of adding them to tuition increases. She agreed that the University's capital issues were much more significant than what the one percent could solve, and UC had other means of prioritizing deferred maintenance.

Regent Park stated that it would be helpful to see the dollar amount associated with return-to-aid. Mr. Díaz replied that, this year, the aggregate amount of return-to-aid generated by the Tuition Stability Plan exceeded \$1 billion. If the proposed changes to the Tuition Stability Plan are approved, \$100 million in new financial aid would be generated.

Regent Leib expressed agreement with Regent Anguiano's proposed amendment. He recalled the challenges UC experienced prior to the implementation of a cohort tuition model and thanked Regent Emeritus Pérez for his advocacy of the model. Regent Leib likened return-to-aid to a progressive tax and found 40 percent return-to-aid acceptable. In response to his question about tuition increases, Mr. Brostrom replied that tuition would be set using a three-year blended average of California CPI plus one percent.

Regent-designate Craven shared that his family benefited from the Tuition Stability Plan. He asked how tuition was collected and distributed. Mr. Díaz responded that tuition generated by a campus stayed there, and return-to-aid was managed in a systemwide pool.

Regent-designate Craven asked if the additional one percent would also go into a systemwide pool. Mr. Brostrom replied that it would go to a campus, or UC could borrow against it and then distribute the bond proceeds. Regent-designate Craven expressed support for more campus flexibility because campuses had varying capital needs.

Regent-designate Craven asked why survey data showed that more Pell Grant recipients found the cost of attendance manageable than non-recipients, but that large numbers of Pell Grant recipients were worried about debt. Mr. Brick responded that Pell Grant recipients might find the cost of attendance more manageable because of the financial aid directed toward the lowest-income students, but these students were also borrowing at higher rates.

Regent-designate Craven asked if non-tuition costs could have contributed to these survey results, sharing that he had been told that financial aid did not cover off-campus living. Mr. Brick stated that the self-help expectation could be used to cover non-tuition costs. He clarified that the University was providing financial aid to students living off campus; two-

thirds of UC Grant dollars went toward housing regardless of location. Regent-designate Craven asked to discuss this matter separately.

Regent-designate Craven suggested that prospective students and their families be presented with the maximum amount to which tuition could increase so that families are prepared in the event of higher inflation. Mr. Brostrom stated that the three-year blended average California CPI being used to determine tuition increases would be backward-looking. The California Department of Finance also provided a forecast on future years, notwithstanding tariffs, which would give families some foresight.

Regent Kounalakis stated she was troubled by the way the proposal was presented and underscored the significance of this decision. Over the last few decades, the concept of access to UC has changed. She compared her tuition as a UC graduate student in the 1990s to graduate tuition in the present day. From 2012 to 2021, UC barely raised tuition as costs were rising. In her view, this signaled that students could receive an extraordinary education without becoming heavily indebted.

Regent Kounalakis expressed deep concern about the pace of tuition increases since the implementation of the Tuition Stability Plan. She stressed that she would vote “no.” When considering a tuition increase, UC must determine whether it has done every possible thing to avoid raising tuition, especially at a time when federal Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) benefits and undocumented students were under threat. She stated that UC should examine whether a tuition increase is necessary on an annual basis.

Regent Wang remarked that, given declining trust in higher education and high economic anxiety, there would be an emotional reaction to any shift from the original plan. She asked whether this was the right time to make such a decision, and what the communication strategy would be. Regent Cohen replied that UC’s core communication strategy was that families would know what tuition would be for the period that students are enrolled.

Regent Cohen moved the recommendation as presented in the item with the addition of review by the Regents in seven years.

President Milliken underscored that no one liked increases in tuition but that the only way to maintain an institution’s quality and affordability was to have regular, moderate, and predictable increases. He praised the University for creating such a plan. He noted the value of attending UC Berkeley, where tuition was \$14,400 this year. Value comprised both cost and quality, and there was an obligation to maintain quality. The University would also continue to address the total cost of attendance. Debt levels at UC were 30 percent below the national average among public universities, and 54 percent of California resident undergraduate students paid zero tuition. In the presentation materials, students at different income levels fared better with the Tuition Stability Plan than without it. President Milliken stated that he and every chancellor with undergraduate students supported the proposed changes, because campuses needed resources to continue to offer high academic quality and student support.

President Milliken expressed support for the additional one percent and asked to vote on it separately. UC Merced did have some deferred maintenance, but other campuses had much more. Adding one percent indicated the Board's understanding that not enough was invested in deferred maintenance and that it had a fiduciary responsibility to the people of California to maintain University assets. This was one way to meet that obligation to preserve those assets. President Milliken supported the goal of debt-free education, but in order to maintain quality, predictability, value, and increases in financial aid amidst financial challenges, he supported Regent Cohen's motion.

General Counsel Robinson clarified that the Board needed to vote on the amendment proposed by Regent Anguiano. Regent Matosantos stated her understanding that the Board would vote on whether campuses could use the additional one percent at their discretion, and that the Board was in agreement regarding Regental review in seven years.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the amendment to the recommendation of the President was approved, Regents Anguiano, Komoto, Leib, Makarechian, Park, Robinson, Sarris, and Sures, voting "aye," Regents Cohen, Lee, Matosantos, Milliken, and Reilly voting "no," and Regents Batchlor, Brooks, Kounalakis, and Wang abstaining.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the recommendation of the President as amended was approved, Regents Anguiano, Cohen, Elliott, Hernandez, Komoto, Lee, Leib, Matosantos, Milliken, Park, Reilly, Robinson, Sarris, Sures, and Wang voting "aye" and Regents Batchlor, Brooks, and Kounalakis voting "no."

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Attest:

The Secretary and Chief of Staff

## Proposed Adjustments to Student Charges

### Undergraduate Students

- For undergraduates in State-supported programs, the applicable levels of Tuition, the Student Services Fee, and Nonresident Supplemental Tuition will be determined according to the following schedule:

Year Student First Enrolls at UC (Entering Cohort)	Increase Over Amount Charged to Students Who Entered in Prior Year
2026-27	Inflation + 1.0%
2027-28 and later	Inflation + 1.0% + Banked Amount*
* Use of any banked amount, if applicable, is subject to the annual cap of five percent.	

- The applicable charge for an undergraduate student in an entering cohort shown above will remain in effect for six years from the time the student first enrolls.
- The President of the University is authorized to develop appropriate policies and guidelines for implementing this schedule of charges, including but not limited to (a) policies and processes for determining a student's cohort; (b) circumstances in which a student may be permitted to remain enrolled beyond six years with no change in charges; and (c) the applicable level of charges for students in special programs or having special circumstances—e.g., students enrolled in off-campus programs (such as the Education Abroad Program) or Summer Session, visiting students, and students who remain enrolled beyond six years who do not qualify for an extension of their cohort rate as described in (b)—provided that the amounts charged do not exceed the amounts charged to the then-current entering cohort of students.

### Graduate Students

- For all graduate students in State-supported programs, adjustments to Tuition and the Student Services Fee will follow the schedule identified below.

Year	Increase
2026-27	Inflation + 1.0%
2027-28 and later	Inflation + 1.0% + Banked Amount*
* Use of any banked amount, if applicable, is subject to the annual cap of five percent.	

### General Provisions

- The Plan will be effective for seven years, beginning in 2026-27 academic year.
- The applicable rate of inflation for calculating adjustments to student charges will be based upon the average annual change in the California Consumer Price Index over a rolling three-year period using upon the latest available forecast published by the California Department of Finance as of July 1 prior to the year indicated (e.g., July 1, 2025 for 2026-27) and adjusted to reflect any differences between actual and forecasted levels in the prior year.
- For any year in which the increase to a student charge would exceed five percent, the increase will be capped at five percent unless the Regents take action to approve a different amount.
- An amount equivalent to 40 percent of the undergraduate Tuition and Student Services Fee increase, 20 percent of the undergraduate Nonresident Supplemental Tuition increase, 50 percent of the Tuition and Student Services Fee increase for graduate academic students, and 40 percent of the Tuition and Student Services Fee increase for graduate professional students will be set aside for financial aid.

- The additional 1% increase above inflation can be used for any purpose as determined by each campus Chancellor.
- The Regents will review the Tuition Stability Plan and reauthorize or approve any changes to the Plan prior to the 2033-34 academic year.
- Notwithstanding the levels of student charges described above, the Board of Regents retains the ability to modify all student charges for any reason and in its sole discretion. The policy described herein does not create any legal right or cause of action.

Pending Approval