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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The University has developed goals and supporting strategies that are aligned with all three components of the multi-year framework presented to the Regents in November 2018: enhancing degree attainment, ensuring that the California dream is for everyone, and investing in the next generation of faculty and research. The specific goals and strategies vary by campus, necessarily reflecting differences in the challenges and opportunities that different UC campuses face in each of these areas. Campus officials and staff at the Office of the President are working to refine those strategies and to develop a multi-year funding strategy to support them, which will be presented to the Regents in March and which will inform discussions with the new Governor, the Legislature, and others as the 2019-20 State budget is developed and enacted.

CONTEXT

In November, the Regents were presented with a proposed multi-year framework that would guide strategic decisions regarding academic planning and the University’s operating budget for the next four years. The framework has three primary goals:

- producing 200,000 more degrees by 2030,
- ensuring the California Dream is for everyone, and
- investing in the next generation of faculty and research.

Since then, the University has taken concrete steps to better define those goals and to develop strategies for meeting them, both at the systemwide and campus levels. This item provides additional information primarily about the first two goals:

- University-wide goals related to each component of the framework,
- campus-specific goals related to improving graduation rates,
- examples of proposed campus strategies related to degree production and closing undergraduate graduation gaps, and
- next steps in developing the framework, including refining goals and strategies related to faculty growth and diversity.

In March, Office of the President and campus officials will bring forward further refined goals and strategies related to the third goal of investing in the next generation of faculty and research, along with the funding strategy to support all three goals of the framework.
GOALS OF THE MULTI-YEAR FRAMEWORK

University-Wide Goals

Based on feedback from the Board of Regents and input from campuses, the University has provided more specific goals on what focused investments and efforts today can yield by 2030 for the first two goals, specifically,

- Producing 200,000 more degrees by 2030 on top of the 1 million undergraduate and graduate degrees projected
- Ensuring the California dream is for everyone with 90 percent overall undergraduate graduation rates by 2030 and closing graduation gaps for students from low-income families, students from underrepresented groups, and first-generation college students

Campus-Specific Goals for Improving Degree Attainment and Eliminating Graduation Gaps

The University’s ability to achieve the goals described above ultimately relies upon the success of campuses in meeting campus-specific goals and on the sustained support received to effect those goals. Some major areas of focus for improvements in undergraduate degree attainment include:

1. Increasing overall graduation rates to or above 90 percent: By 2030, five UC campuses—Berkeley, Davis, UCLA, San Diego and Santa Barbara—will have freshman six-year graduation rates of 90 percent or higher, and all nine undergraduate UC campuses will have transfer four-year graduation rates of 90 percent or higher. Today, only Berkeley and UCLA achieve that goal for freshmen, and only Berkeley, UCLA, and Irvine achieve that goal for transfer students.
2. **Improving timely graduation**: By 2030, eight UC campuses—Berkeley, Davis, Irvine, UCLA, Riverside, San Diego, Santa Barbara and Santa Cruz—will have four-year freshman graduation rates of 70 percent or higher and six campuses—Berkeley, Los Angeles, Riverside, San Diego, Santa Barbara, and Santa Cruz—will have two-year transfer graduation rates of 70 percent or higher. Today, only Berkeley and UCLA achieve that goal for freshmen, and no campus achieves that goal for transfer students.
3. **Closing graduation gaps for low-income students, students from underrepresented groups, and first-generation students:** Eight UC campuses – Berkeley, Davis, Irvine, Los Angeles, Riverside, San Diego, Santa Barbara, and Santa Cruz--will eliminate significant gaps in overall freshman graduation rates and all UC campuses will eliminate significant gaps in overall transfer graduation rates between Pell Grant recipients (who are generally from low-income families),¹ students from underrepresented groups, first-generation college students, and the overall student population. Five UC campuses–Davis, Irvine, Merced, San Diego, and Santa Cruz--will eliminate significant gaps in timely (i.e., four-year) freshman graduation rates, and eight UC campuses – Davis, Irvine, Los Angeles, Merced, Riverside, San Diego, Santa Barbara, and Santa Cruz - will eliminate significant gaps in timely (i.e., two-year) transfer graduation rates.

Table 1 provides detailed data on graduation rate goals for overall six-year freshman and four-year transfer graduation rates and timely four-year freshman and two-year transfer graduation rates for all entrants, Pell Grant recipients, students from underrepresented groups, and first-generation college students. Graduation rates shown in **bold** indicate campuses with comparable graduation rates across subgroups and/or campuses working to eliminate graduation gaps (i.e., where graduation rates for subgroups are within three points to graduation rates for all entrants). **Shaded** graduation rates highlight gains over ten points.

---

¹ Federal Pell Grants are typically awarded only to students from low-income families and are hence a generally reliable indicator of a student’s financial resources. However, the University’s efforts to eliminate graduation gaps for students from low-income families encompasses students from low-income households who may not qualify for Federal Pell Grants – e.g., undocumented students.
Table 1: Freshman and Transfer Graduation Rate Goals – Eliminating Gaps and Areas of Focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Freshman</th>
<th></th>
<th>Transfer</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Four Year Rates</td>
<td>Six Year Rates</td>
<td>Two Year Rates</td>
<td>Four Year Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2030 Gain</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2030 Gain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Entrants</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>82%  6%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%  0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pell</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>72%  5%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%  0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underrepresented</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>72%  17%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>89%  2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>73%  7%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>89%  2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Entrants</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>78%  15%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>91%  5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pell</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>77%  22%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>90%  6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underrepresented</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>75%  24%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>88%  12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>77%  23%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>90%  7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Entrants</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>74%  4%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>89%  4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pell</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>74%  5%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>90%  6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underrepresented</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>74%  14%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>90%  12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>74%  6%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>90%  7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Entrants</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>84%  6%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>92%  1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pell</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>79%  6%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>89%  2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underrepresented</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>79%  12%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>89%  4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>79%  8%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>89%  1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Entrants</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>50%  5%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>75%  8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pell</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>50%  4%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>72%  7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underrepresented</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>49%  5%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>67%  8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>50%  5%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>69%  6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Entrants</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>75%  18%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>85%  8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pell</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>75%  19%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>85%  8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underrepresented</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>70%  18%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>82%  8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>75%  20%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>85%  9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Entrants</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>75%  10%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>91%  6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pell</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>75%  15%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>91%  7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underrepresented</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>75%  22%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>91%  15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>75%  16%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>91%  8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Entrants</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>80%  12%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>91%  9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pell</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>76%  14%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>90%  9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underrepresented</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>76%  17%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>90%  13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>75%  12%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>90%  10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Entrants</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>70%  17%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>85%  5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pell</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>70%  22%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>85%  6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underrepresented</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>70%  24%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>85%  10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Generation</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>70%  23%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>85%  8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graduation rates vary by campus, which partly reflects differences in the academic preparation of the students that they enroll. Similarly, goals related to improving graduation rates vary by campus. Berkeley, UCLA, and Irvine, for example, already have the highest four-year freshman graduation rates in the system; the 2030 goals for these campuses are thus focused on closing the graduation rate gaps for students from low-income families and underrepresented groups. In contrast, goals at other campuses reflected a greater potential to improve graduation rates among all students in addition to narrowing graduation rate gaps between students from different backgrounds.

CAMPUS STRATEGIES TO SUPPORT THE FRAMEWORK

University and campus graduation rates have continued to improve over time, in part due to existing efforts on campuses to support degree attainment, but greater goal attainment will require greater investment. Campuses have proposed additional strategies and necessary investments to achieve 2030 goals. These strategies vary depending on graduation rate goals and areas of improvement, ongoing campus efforts and opportunities, and student demographics and academic preparation. While there are some areas of overlap across campuses, the proposed strategies suggest campus-specific solutions and not a single, one-size-fits-all solution.

Below are examples of existing and proposed efforts to support key aspects of the framework. These examples are not intended to be comprehensive; rather, they illustrate the type and breadth of work that would help increase degree attainment.

Pre-Matriculation, Orientation and First-Year Programming to Jump Start UC Education and Timely Graduation

The first step to increasing degree attainment is ensuring students get off to the right start. The transition from high school or community college to the University presents students with a number of challenges, including living on one’s own and away from home, moving from a smaller school to a large research university, and learning new skills to handle college courses. UC research shows that students who underperform in their first year are much less likely to complete a degree. Student performance can be enhanced by reaching out to students before the first day of classes with pre-matriculation and orientation programs, including summer bridge for freshmen and transfer edge programs that introduce students to university life, increase their awareness of university services, and provide them personal connections to the campus. Merced emphasized these summer bridge programs are critical for first-generation students to dispel myths about college, set expectations, and provide early preparation for courses.

Campuses are continuing to evolve and improve these programs to meet student needs and to encourage timely graduation. Santa Cruz’s “fast-start initiatives”

One of the most meaningful experiences I had…

“ was participating in Summer Bridge. I was able to start school early, gain credits, and live on campus to get accustomed to the college student lifestyle. I really enjoyed my time and gained a lot of insight to the services offered at school. I also was able to network a bit, making some friends in the process. I am very thankful I was able to do this because I came to UCI with nothing and starting early gave me an advantage to other freshmen.”

Spring 2018 UC Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES)
include summer academies for freshmen, transfers, and non-resident/international cohorts to get them a head start on their coursework and learn how to succeed in a research university setting. The campus also offers a transfer success class—College 25—that introduces transfers to university culture, opportunities, and effective academic strategies. Berkeley recently launched its Golden Bear Orientation (https://orientation.berkeley.edu/once-here/orientation), a mandatory, week-long program that introduces students to the campus and the support services and educational opportunities it provides. UCLA has a six-week intensive summer program for newly admitted freshmen and transfers and its “Tassels to the Left” (http://www.ugeducation.ucla.edu/degreepath/) initiative pairs degree-planning messaging (e.g., opportunities for three-year pathways) and strategic advising to support early academic planning. Riverside has launched a “Finish in Four” (https://finishinfour.ucr.edu/) campaign to highlight the benefits of taking a full load (e.g., 15 units a term) and finishing on time.

Research findings from the UC Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES) show that students with a lower sense of belonging (on the campus) have lower graduation rates than their peers (see Figure 4). To address this issue, UC campuses are deploying a wide range of programs and activities to engage students with the campus community in their first year.

Figure 3: Graduation Rates Compared to Survey Responses on Sense of Belonging

Davis and Irvine were early adopters of a First Generation initiative (http://firstgen.ucdavis.edu/ and http://firstgen.due.uci.edu/) to welcome and celebrate first-generation students, introduce them to faculty who were once first-generation students, and provide centralized training and support for faculty committed to first-generation student success. In Fall 2017, the University launched a First-Generation campaign (https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/initiative/student-opportunity/first-generation-students) across all campuses and then hosted a systemwide conference (http://diversity.universityofcalifornia.edu/events/index.html) to share research, innovative solutions and best practices on how to help first-generation students succeed.
Merced emphasizes the importance of cohort-based learning experiences and academic living/learning communities to create peer and community support for underrepresented and first-generation students. Riverside’s strategy to eliminate graduation gaps is also based on proactively helping students engage more deeply in their educational experiences, which requires a variety of different approaches to meet the range of student needs. Examples include gender and ethnic affinity groups, peer mentoring, undergraduate research and internship opportunities, a summer bridge program, student ambassador programs, and learning communities. Berkeley has begun to offer new students a Berkeley Connect experience (http://www.berkeleyconnect.berkeley.edu/) that provides them with a graduate student mentor in a group of other students who share similar academic interests. The program also helps undergraduates build relationships with professors and alumni.

To achieve the 2030 degree attainment goals, a number of UC campuses propose expanding these types of services and support. For example, Merced wants to expand its summer bridge programs and create new and improved cohort-based learning experiences. Davis would expand its freshman and transfer pre-matriculation programs to target 20 percent of the incoming class, along with creating a new week-long orientation program, similar to Berkeley’s Golden Bear Orientation. A number of UC campuses propose expanding these programs for transfer entrants. Irvine would expand its Transfer Edge programs, for example, by providing financial aid to encourage participation. Riverside sees a significant opportunity to create an early entry program for pre-matriculated transfers. San Diego would expand its summer bridge programs for transfers. Berkeley would expand its Berkeley Connect to all new undergraduates, tracking improvements in participation rates for underrepresented and other groups of students targeted for improved graduation rates.

Curricular Innovations Advancing Academic Outcomes and Co-Curricular Support

UC research discoveries extend to understanding academic delivery models better, particularly those that can support an increasingly diverse student population. UC campuses have established teaching and learning centers to research teaching pedagogies and provide instructional enhancement and support for faculty and graduate student instructors. Davis’s Center for Educational Effectiveness has created a Know Your Students (KYS) dashboard (https://cee.ucdavis.edu/tools) to improve inclusive instruction across STEM courses by raising awareness and understanding of key characteristics of a class and providing a centralized network of instructional support materials and expertise to actively improve inclusive instruction.

In addition, campuses are looking at ways to better integrate curricular and co-curricular support to improve student outcomes. For example, Irvine is focused on enrichment of a teaching culture supported by an integrated approach to co-curricular success. It believes the culture and instructional approaches are the most cost-effective investments in student success, and by definition, reach all students. Through its “Fall First-Year Course Project,” Irvine’s Teaching Excellence and Innovation Units have identified 15 fall courses where over 90 percent of students enroll. Enriching the culture of these courses along evidence-based practices is known
to have a significant impact on reducing performance gaps. Irvine works with faculty teaching these courses to be an advocate for student success and helps them provide a campus welcome, key differences with high school, and ways to contact faculty through email and office hours.

San Diego’s Teaching + Learning Commons (https://commons.ucsd.edu/) provides programs and services organized across six related hubs to support faculty and teaching assistants (TA), along with graduate and undergraduate students to advance teaching and learning. The campus reports 500 faculty and 3,600 TAs, along with 19,000 undergraduates, have been served by the Commons with data showing better GPAs in gateway courses than similar students who did not get supplemental instruction provided through the Commons.

Santa Barbara’s Center for Innovative Teaching, Research, and Learning (CITRAL) (http://www.citral.ucsb.edu/) provides workshops, discussions and assessment activities focused in five areas: teaching and learning in large classes, effective communication, information and data literacy, teaching and learning in a minority-serving institution, and engaged assessment.

Where possible, UC campuses are centralizing learning support services in central locations. Merced’s Center for Engaged Teaching and Learning (https://ctl.ucmerced.edu/) and University Writing Center (https://writingcenter.ucmerced.edu/) are both part of the Kolligian Library. Riverside has invested heavily in the Academic Resource Center (https://arc.ucr.edu/) which provides tutoring, writing support, supplemental instruction, peer mentoring and professional development opportunities to students; within it, the Transfer Student Success Zone (https://arc.ucr.edu/cohort/tsp/index.html) offers computer workstations, study areas, meeting spaces reserved for transfer students, and peer mentoring. Irvine recently opened the Anteater Learning Pavilion (http://alp.uci.edu/), its first facility that provides high-tech, collaborative spaces to support active learning.

To achieve 2030 degree attainment goals, a number of UC campuses are looking to add faculty and staff (along with required funding) to build on this work. For example, Berkeley would add staffing to its Center for Teaching and Learning to support faculty creating more inclusive classrooms; Santa Cruz would create a community of teaching professors and graduates students to more effectively bring new teaching techniques to courses; Merced would add course-based supplemental instruction and would improve and expand its Write to Learn initiatives; and Davis would launch a Course Gap project to remove achievement gaps in its largest, high-impact courses. Much of Santa Barbara’s existing work is grant funded which the campus would like to replace with permanent funding.

As another example, Irvine would focus additional resources on engaged learning course redesign supporting faculty in large enrollment courses (greater than 100 students). The campus would create teams of three faculty and one education expert from the department and they would participate in month-long summer intensive series of workshops led by the Division of
Teaching Excellence and Innovation, staff support for one year for ongoing assessment of course enrichment and data support, and support for undergraduate learning assistants to maximize the effectiveness of integrating active learning into large courses.

Expanded and Holistic Approaches to Student Advising and Success

Academic advising is a key component to advancing student success, and, with effective investments, many campuses are looking to expand this support in order to achieve 2030 degree attainment goals. For example, Davis described its overall strategy to enhance and improve academic systems and academic support systems to better support its students, particularly underrepresented and first-generation students. These efforts would build on pre-matriculation and orientation services with enhanced and expanded advising services provided throughout a student’s career. Merced’s Bobcat Advising Center (https://advising.ucmerced.edu/bobcat-advising-center) provides support for first-year, undeclared students and uses students as tutors as part of its teach to learn practices. Riverside’s Assistance, Coaching, and Encouragement (ACE) program provides support to students in academic difficulty (GPA less than 2.0), pairing them with a peer mentor to create a customized plan to develop essential and lifelong academic skills and study habits to achieve academic success.

Increasingly, campuses are leveraging analytical tools and decision support to support student advising and would like to be able to expand and accelerate their capabilities here. Irvine developed a suite of data-analytic tools (part of its COMPASS--Comprehensive Analytics for Student Success—project) targeted at supporting academic advising, but also available in Student Affairs. For high-stakes courses (i.e., prerequisites), Santa Cruz has early alert programs to identify students at risk of failing a course early in the quarter and provide academic advising and support.

There is increasing recognition that to increase degree attainment, campuses are broadening academic advising efforts to address growing concerns about student mental health, wellness and basic needs, including housing and food insecurity. UC campuses aim to expand their advising and support efforts that focus on the whole student and these efforts may become increasingly important as UC takes steps to increase degree attainment and timely graduation.

For example, San Diego reports a significant number of students who drop out after enrolling three years, suggesting issues other than academic performance, and in response, the campus has a goal of strengthening its support for basic needs, cultural programs, psychological services and peer mentoring. The campus has also introduced a case management approach through the Student Success Coaching Program (https://students.ucsd.edu/sponsor/success/) where first-year students are assigned a Success Team composed of a Success Coach and a Peer Coach that help develop a Student Success Plan, which becomes a tool to support goal setting and action planning. Second-, third-, and fourth-year students continue to connect with the Success Coach and participate in a series of group coaching workshops designed to continue to propel them towards their goals. Participating students will meet with their coaches (peer and professional) several times during the academic

One of the most meaningful experiences I had…

“at UCSD was being a part of a program called Student Success Coaching created for first generation students. We all have different backgrounds, but a similar goal of completing a four year university.”
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year, attend a variety of academic and community-based programming, and participate in major- and career-focused activities—all individualized to the student's goals and passions.

Some campuses are looking to consolidate these services into a central location to make it easier for students to get what they need. When UC Santa Barbara became a Hispanic Serving Institution, the campus used the Department of Education Title V grant to create the ONDAS (Opening New Doors to Accelerating Success) student center (http://ondas.ucsb.edu/), which serves as a one-stop-shop for peer and academic mentoring, workshops, and faculty office hours, and partners with Counseling & Psychological Services (CAPS), Career Services, and Financial Aid focusing on entering students, particularly first-generation and low-income students. Irvine has plans to build a Student Success Building, with a focus on bringing together a range of student programming from mental health to career planning to enrichment of the classroom culture.

To achieve the 2030 degree attainment goal, many campuses hope to expand academic advising and student support. As examples, Berkeley would create an advising training manager, increase advisors in Letters & Science and the Student Learning Center, and add a wellness coordinator; Davis would add 20 academic advisors in critical areas and highlighted the need for testing accommodation space; UCLA would invest in student affairs officers and undergraduate advisors; Riverside would add 76 academic advisors to reduce its student-advisor ratio from 411-to-1 to 275-to-1 and expand its ACE program to provide support to students in academic difficulty with GPA less than 2.5 (instead of the current 2.0), growing participants from 250 to 600 per year; and San Diego would expand the student success coaching program for all incoming freshman and transfer students and expand counseling and psychological support.

**Expanded Summer Programming to Support Student Engagement and Timely Graduation**

Summer enrollment is an important tool to supporting timely graduation and essential for any student taking a three-year pathway. Campuses are focusing on ways to expand summer programs to support engagement and timely graduation. Davis has created a “guaranteed to go” list of courses that students know will be offered in the summer. Irvine has invested significantly in increasing summer enrollment through its “Pay for 8” program where students pay up to eight units but can take additional units for free, encouraging students to take a larger load in the summer. The campus believes this program helps increase graduation rates and time to degree. Recent expansion of Pell Grant support will help low-income students who otherwise would be working to consider summer enrollment; and advocacy to expand summer Cal Grant eligibility is also critical to supporting greater summer enrollment across the UC system.

To achieve 2030 degree attainment goals, San Diego will be partnering with Summer Session and Extension to set up a coordinated portfolio of summer offerings to help students shave off a quarter of their time to degree. Riverside want to leverage summer sessions to provide high-demand courses and financial aid to encourage student participation. Santa Cruz would seek
faculty and staff resources to help restructure summer to support three-year and four-year pathways and time to degree goals.

UCLA would expand summer opportunities for high-demand courses and would develop a Sophomore Summer Bridge Program that would be an expansion of its Freshman Summer Program (https://www.summer.ucla.edu/newUCLAstudents) offered through the Academic Advancement Program. The Sophomore Summer Bridge Program would provide diverse, rising sophomore students with summer courses and career and graduate school mentorship. Merced would also look to expand its summer undergraduate research institute.

**Crossing the Stage: Bachelor Degree Completion Programs**

Approximately 10 percent of freshman and transfer entrants begin at UC but never receive a degree. Over the last decade, more than 50,000 students fall into this category. Recent estimates show that UC bachelor degree recipients earn $260,000 more over a ten-year period than UC undergraduates that leave with no degree. These former UC students are less likely to own a home, have health insurance or retirement benefits, and contribute less in state and federal taxes.

Several UC campuses have efforts underway and/or would like to start or expand efforts to help students finish their degrees. Based on early indications of interest from the Governor, UC Extension would be a viable partner in creating or expanding BA degree completion programs. Many campuses would partner with UC Extension to do so or are already doing so.

Some campus efforts are focused on specific populations. For example, Berkeley’s Athletic Study Center has a degree completion program (https://asc.berkeley.edu/dcp) that targets former student athletes to develop a re-entry and specific academic plan towards graduation. The overall population of potential bachelor degree completion program participants is broad, creating challenges on who to target to ensure success for students and the University. Recent UC research comparing students who did not finish with students who graduated shows no significant difference in the proportion of Pell Grant recipients (40 percent vs. 39 percent). However, there is a higher proportion of first-generation students (45 percent vs. 37 percent) and students from underrepresented groups (28 percent vs.18 percent) among those who did not complete their bachelor’s degree compared to undergraduates who graduated.

**Figure 4: Social Demographics and Degree Completion**
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One of the most meaningful experiences I had…

“was taking summer classes for the first time last summer. The different pace and class sizes really helped me better engage in the material”

*Spring 2018 UCUES*
Students who did not finish their bachelor’s degree tend to complete at least one year of units at UC. More than half (61 percent) complete more than 50 units at UC before they leave. In addition, students who do not finish their bachelor’s degree often enroll for multiple years at UC. Less than 20 percent leave within one year, and about half of students leave after completing 1 to 2 years.

Figure 5: Number of Units Completed and Years Enrolled at UC for Students Who Did Not Finish

A number of UC campuses expressed interest in establishing bachelor degree completion programs, with some seeking seed funding to do research and marketing to facilitate developing a plan. Merced is the furthest along with a proposed bachelor degree completion pilot in Interdisciplinary Arts & Sciences (IAS) targeted to non-traditional adult learners, including the thousands of former UC undergraduates who stopped out before getting a degree. With additional resources, Merced’s IAS would leverage existing systemwide online courses developed by ITLI (Innovative Learning and Technology Initiative) for the lower-division core requirements. For upper-division courses, IAS would use Merced’s online courses in public health, service management, history, and philosophy, and course meetings would be done in the evenings. This program would be a partnership between UCM Extension and Merced’s Academic Senate that will be reviewing the proposal.

One potential area of expansion Merced is considering is creating an IAS program with an Education Concentration that would provide the necessary training and credentialing for those interested in a transitional K-12 teaching career while also addressing California’s teacher shortage. (Transitional K-12, or TK-12, refers to a modified kindergarten curriculum that is age and developmentally appropriate for four-year-old kindergarteners.) With some changes to the lower-division curriculum and development of upper-division courses with a Merced department, like Psychology, a program could be developed that could fast-track graduates to become teachers in the classroom.

Other UC campuses considering bachelor degree completion programs are Berkeley, Davis, Irvine, San Diego and Santa Cruz with various partnerships with campus department, Academic Senate and University Extension units. Some unique ideas under consideration include:

- Davis would target incumbent health care workers wanting to complete a degree and potentially provide a pipeline to an array of health-focused graduation professional programs.
Irvine is considering targeting current prisoners to create a bachelor degree program that would help them leave with a degree, decrease recidivism rates and have a significant positive impact on overall costs across the state.

Riverside would initially target Riverside County Office of Education, San Bernardino Superintendent of Schools, and UC Riverside staff who don’t have a degree but want to teach (similar to the Merced proposal); if successful, the campus could consider other programs directed at the 25 percent of Riverside-San Bernardino population who have some college but no degree.

**Online Anytime: Expansion of Course Offerings and Creation of Degree Programs**

UC campuses are integrating online technology into existing courses, expanding the number of courses available online, and developing stand-alone online degree programs (primarily at the graduate level). Newer campuses are relying on ILTI to support online course development, while others have invested in technology services to support this work at the campus level. Below is a brief description of existing efforts, along with potential areas of expansion.

Irvine is leading much of the online development within the UC system, providing 30 online courses over the fall-winter-spring (FWS) term serving 2,000 students and 80 online courses in summer with over 11,000 students. Irvine’s Open Education offers 70 free online courses for 30,000 visitors per month; its YouTube site has over 230,000 visitors each month and includes a full undergraduate chemistry curriculum (17 courses); and UCI Coursera has over 90 offerings with 8.5 million visitors, 3.1 million enrollment, 2 million active learners and 278,000 course completers since 2013. With additional support, Irvine would increase FWS online undergraduate courses and eventually create a full general education curriculum in online format; expand opportunities in open education; and pre-matriculation curriculum.

Berkeley recently reorganized its academic technology, digital learning services, faculty development and research technology into a single, faculty-facing unit. It has also invested in “time and talent” grants for faculty to develop digital tools to improve learnings and created over 20 fully online classes in Summer Sessions and its first undergraduate summer minor in Education. New activities would be piloting online paths toward degree completion, investing in local efforts to utilize digital tools to solve course enrollment issues and to open access to gateway courses, and creating a digital learning strategy to explore creation of two online undergraduate degrees in Letters and Science.

Davis’s current level of online instruction equates to roughly 130 full-time equivalent (FTE) students per quarter. With additional funding, it would plan to develop 36 new courses over the next four years that eventually would support 400 FTE per quarter.

UCLA has a Curricular Innovation with Technology team with instructional designers and online education experts that serve as a central resource that can support the development of new online
programs. With additional investment, UCLA can expand the impact of this team, especially with the offering of online Professional Masters degrees across several of its schools.

Merced is working with ILTI to create and convert up to 50 courses for hybrid and online teaching. New funding would continue expansion of that effort with investments in infrastructure (e.g., trained personnel) and planned online development in a Childhood Development and Care Certificate Program and a Teacher Credential Program.

Riverside has worked with ILTI and now has 50 online courses. The campus also has in-house ITS support in their Center for Teaching and Learning in Undergraduate Education with an assistant director, instructional designers, media producers, and student assistants, along with three recording studios with necessary technology, now including two “learning glass” blackboards. With additional funding, Riverside would expand online courses by 100 in the next four years, particularly in bottleneck areas and select upper-division courses to help transfers.

San Diego has a Strategic Academic Program Development initiative that includes a campus portfolio of non-traditional academic programs to enhance educational experience and outcomes for students; online learning is one component included within that initiative. With additional support, San Diego would expand efforts to produce online courses that would support degree attainment for returning students.

Santa Cruz is increasing the proportion of curriculum available online, including fully online degrees building on courses created through ILTI (24 courses and high demand courses now offered in summer). With additional funding, new efforts could include creating a 4+1 BA/MA program where one year is online and create fully online BA program in area of high demand (e.g., arts and entrepreneurship).

San Francisco’s online curriculum currently uses blended/hybrid courses to deliver content and activities to working professionals through its learning management system. Examples are Doctor of Nursing Programs (DNP), Master of Science in Healthcare Administration and Interprofessional Leadership, Master of Science in Health Policy and Law, Master of Advanced Studies in Clinical Research. San Francisco plans for modest, steady growth in online learning to complement existing curricula. Fully online programs will be limited to certificates, external programs like global health, and new programs like DNP.

**NEXT STEPS**

Over the spring, UC will make further progress in developing a comprehensive set of strategies designed to achieve the primary goals of the framework related to improving degree attainment, ensuring the California Dream is for everyone, and investing in the next generation of faculty and research. Specifically, the University will focus on the following activities:

- **Review campus goals and strategies related to graduate education and faculty development.** In addition to proposals to improve degree attainment and close the
achievement gap between different student populations, campuses also submitted proposals related to graduate education and faculty recruitment, development, and retention. Those proposals reflect a reinvestment in the research component of the University’s mission and acknowledge the challenges and opportunities presented by a projected increase in the number of ladder-rank faculty members who retire in the next few years due to demographic changes in the University’s workforce. As with campus proposals related to degree attainment, campus goals and strategies related to graduate education and the professoriate vary by campus. Staff from the Office of the President will work with campuses over the next few weeks to review and refine those proposals, which will be summarized for the Regents in a subsequent item.

- **Identify funding levels needed to adequately support strategies.** Most of the strategies identified by campuses as part of the framework will require additional resources to implement. Examples include the resources required to:
  - hire additional academic counselors and student success coaches to identify and assist at-risk students earlier in their academic careers;
  - create or expand summer bridge programs for incoming students, as well as expanding summer instructional programs for continuing students; and
  - design, develop, and deliver additional online courses.

The 2019-20 budget plan approved by the Regents in November 2018 included $60 million in new investments for current operations (excluding capital) to support the framework next year. Preliminary estimates suggest that campus proposals for 2019-20 can be accommodated at that budgeted level, but further analysis is needed to ensure that the projected expansion of programs and services can be sustained over the course of the framework.

- **Incorporate these and other components of the University’s operating budget into a balanced, multi-year strategy.** In addition to the new investments described above, the University can expect other required investments over the course of any multi-year framework. For example:
  - *Enrollment growth.* Campuses anticipate enrollment growth at both the undergraduate and graduate levels over the next four years. In order to provide a high-quality education to incoming students without diluting the resources available to educate the University’s existing student body, the estimated cost of enrolling each additional student—referred to as the marginal cost of instruction—needs to be fully covered with new resources. Tuition and fees paid by each additional student cover only a portion of this cost; the remainder represents the State’s share of the marginal cost. Funding from the State to fully cover its share of the marginal cost is critical to ensuring that enrollment growth does not draw resources away from current UC students, which would erode the quality of their instruction and the student services that they rely upon.
  - *Capital needs.* The University has substantial needs related to capital investment, both to address its sizeable backlog of deferred maintenance and seismic projects.
and to upgrade and expand space for classrooms, teaching laboratories, faculty offices, and other needs. Without new funding from a general obligation bond or State lease-revenue bonds, the University must set aside an ever-increasing portion of its operating budget to address these needs itself.

– *Faculty, staff, and retiree-related costs.* Costs related to faculty, staff, and retirees comprise more than half of the University’s total operating budget from core funds, just as they do at other research universities. Any multi-year framework needs to incorporate reasonable estimates for projected costs associated with both represented and non-represented University employees, along with the resources needed to fulfill its commitments to current and future UC retirees.

- **Continue consultation with UC stakeholders.** UC will continue to consult with key stakeholders including the incoming Governor and members of his administration, legislators and legislative staff, faculty, and students about the framework’s goals, components, and funding plan.

A more comprehensive iteration of the multi-year framework accompanied by a proposed funding plan will be presented to the Board in March.