

The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

July 17, 1997

The Committee on Educational Policy met on the above date at UCSF-Laurel Heights, San Francisco.

Members present: Regents Atkinson, Connerly, del Junco, Eastin, Gonzales, Khachigian, Lee, Levin, McClymond, Montoya, and Soderquist; Regents-designate Miura and Willmon

In attendance: Regents Bagley, Brophy, Davies, Johnson, Leach, Nakashima, and Parsky, Faculty Representatives Mellichamp and Weiss, Secretary Trivette, General Counsel Holst, Treasurer Small, Provost King, Senior Vice President Kennedy, Vice Presidents Darling, Gomes, Gurtner, and Hopper, Chancellors Berdahl, Carnesale, Debas, Dynes, Greenwood, Orbach, Vanderhoef, Wilkening, and Yang, and Recording Secretary Nietfeld

The meeting convened at 8:55 a.m. with Committee Chair Gonzales presiding.

Committee Chair Gonzales informed the Committee that the items would be taken out of order so that the discussion of the Outreach Task Force report would be the final matter on the Committee's agenda.

1. APPROVAL OF JOINT POWERS AGREEMENT AND REPORT ON CAMPUS INITIATIVE, INSTITUTE FOR DESERT AGRICULTURE COUNTY SERVICE AREA, RIVERSIDE CAMPUS

The President recommended that, subject to the concurrence of the Committee on Finance, The Regents authorize the execution by the Secretary of The Regents of a Joint Powers Agreement between The Regents of the University of California and the Institute for Desert Agriculture County Service Area, the purpose of which is to delineate the respective responsibilities of the Institute for Desert Agriculture County Service Area and the University pertaining to the funding and implementation of the Institute for Desert Agriculture.

Vice President Gomes, in presenting background to the recommendation, observed that California agriculture is an extensive, intensive, and diverse industry. Recent data indicate that agriculture remains the number-one industry in California and that California has expanded its lead as the number-one agricultural state in the nation. The long-standing relationship between the University of California and the California agricultural industry has been an important component of producing the most advanced agriculture in the world. The University's agricultural and natural resources outreach is expressed at more than one hundred sites on campuses, in Cooperative Extension offices, at research and extension sites, and in the Natural Reserve System. The priorities of the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources (DANR) for research and extension programs in agriculture emerge from new

opportunities at the leading edge of science, such as genetic engineering, and from the continuing need in California's agricultural systems to improve on already advanced performance. Within DANR there is a commitment to pursue multidisciplinary opportunities and to build the infrastructure to support collaborative relationships beyond the borders of the University. In order to be an issue-driven organization, there is a need to develop meaningful teams and associations that take advantage of multiple skills and generate support.

The University is a leader in bringing together research and Extension expertise from different scientific disciplines to address complex problems of natural systems. Decreases in funding have made the need for such coordination and synergy greater than ever.

Vice President Gomes recalled that several years ago the Agricultural Research Service of the United States Department of Agriculture determined that it was not possible to keep its Shafter Field Center and Cotton Research Unit open. This is a 120-acre site 15 miles northwest of Bakersfield. The growers approached the University, and a plan was developed to re-open the station. Researchers from UC Davis and the Department of Agriculture study cotton genetics, plant growth regulators, and pest control alternatives. The partnership with the private sector has allowed the University of California to focus on funding the human resources necessary to conduct appropriate research at the Center and has restored participation by the Agriculture Research Service in Shafter. The continuum between basic research on campus, applied research at facilities like the Shafter Center, and the county-based Cooperative Extension programs has been enhanced by private-sector participation. This public-private partnership has benefited the public with results that have reduced industry dependence on pesticides, improved air quality with changes in defoliation practices, and increased efficiencies in water used to produce cotton.

Vice President Gomes continued that another example of the value of public-private partnerships is the development of a state-of-the-art post-harvest facility for fruit handling at the Lindcove Research and Extension Center in Tulare County. Research on post-harvest management of citrus fruit is conducted in the site's 5,000-square-foot Fruit Quality Evaluation Center, which was built for the University's use by the California citrus industry. Research by both campus-based faculty and County-based advisors is contributing to the success of the partnership. Early benefits include new fruit-handling processes that can be used to allow growers to reduce dependence upon field-applied insecticides. Consumers benefit from an increased supply of high-quality fruit and lower levels of pesticide use.

These examples illustrate how partnerships have developed between the University and industry to meet the needs of specific commodities. In some parts of the state, however, the needs are not defined by a commodity but by regional and environmental conditions. A prime example is the desert region of California, with its distinctive circumstances. Mr. Gomes then called upon Chancellor Orbach to describe the proposal spearheaded by the Riverside campus to establish a research institute that accommodates a multi-commodity geographic area.

Chancellor Orbach reported that the Riverside campus, in cooperation with the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources, the Davis campus, and a grower advisory committee, has

initiated the establishment of the Institute for Desert Agriculture. The Institute is an innovative public-private partnership between the University of California and the agricultural community of Imperial and Palo Verde Valleys. Since 1990, growers in the valleys have been battling clouds of whiteflies which have caused losses of \$700 million in the region. Last spring the region's wheat was quarantined due to a suspected fungus.

The goal of the Institute is to stimulate the economic growth and contribute to the long-term viability of desert agriculture through research on new crops and varieties, pest and disease management, livestock, and environmental issues related to soil and water. By matching grower needs and resources with University expertise and resources, the Institute will create a synergistic relationship for growers, the University, and consumers. The University's contribution to the Institute includes \$2.2 million for construction of a state-of-the-art research facility at DANR's Desert Research and Extension Center. The University will continue to pay the day-to-day operating costs of the Center, approximately \$680,000 annually. In addition, the Riverside campus will commit four new faculty positions to be located at the Institute's new facilities. A fifth faculty position, funded by the Davis campus, is already in place.

Chancellor Orbach reported that the agricultural community will provide funds to support the research activities of the Institute. After exploring a number of options, the Institute's grower advisory committee recommended an annual land-based assessment of \$1.25 per acre. The Board of Supervisors for the County of Imperial has formed a county service area (CSA) as a mechanism for collection of the assessment. The County will collect the assessment, totaling approximately \$581,000 annually, deduct costs associated with administering the CSA, and provide the balance to The Regents to support the research and extension activities of the Institute.

Due to the passage of Proposition 218 in November 1996, a vote of the affected property owners is required before the assessment can be levied. Ballots will be mailed to agricultural landowners in fall 1997. Votes may be cast for a 45-day period, after which a public hearing will be held to count the ballots. Votes will be weighted in proportion to financial obligation. A simple majority of the weighted votes will prevail. The Board of Supervisors must set the assessment annually. At the request of property owners, the level of assessment can be reduced by the Board, but it cannot be increased without another vote of the affected landowners.

Chancellor Orbach reported that a Joint Powers Agreement (JPA) has been developed between The Regents and the Institute for Desert Agriculture CSA (IDACSA) to articulate the respective responsibilities of the University and the IDACSA. The JPA covers issues related to the administration of the CSA; the collection, expenditure, and accountability of funds; and the services to be provided through the Institute.

If the vote is favorable, the first assessment will be collected in December 1998, which allows time for facilities to be constructed and faculty to be hired in the interim. The Institute will become fully operational in January 1999. Funds collected through the CSA will be used to support the five on-site researchers, as well as to establish a pool for competitive grants open to any UC researcher. Research priorities will be established jointly by UC researchers and representatives of the agricultural community, through a formal advisory committee. This opportunity to have a voice in identifying research priorities is one of the major benefits the Institute offers to growers. Local growers and agricultural landowners will be using local dollars to support research on local issues. The funds they contribute will be leveraged many times over by UC and other resources. The Institute's on-site researchers will also seek grants from federal, State, and private sources, thus bringing to the desert valleys research funds which otherwise would not be there. Further, because researchers from throughout the UC system can compete for Institute funding, the Institute will provide local growers with a window into the entire University.

For the University, the partnership ensures that the Institute's research will be funded in part and that it will be relevant and applicable. The Institute offers a new approach to fulfillment of the University's land grant mission. Most importantly, UC scientists will benefit from the intellectual stimulation offered by the unique problems facing desert agriculture. In effect, the Institute for Desert Agriculture formalizes the involvement of the local agricultural community as part of the traditional research-Extension continuum.

Initiatives such as the Institute for Desert Agriculture suggest an option for the future of agricultural research and Extension. Together the entities which fund, conduct, and take advantage of agricultural research must seek new ways of revitalizing the agricultural research enterprise. Mission orientation, creative funding strategies, and a strengthened partnership between the University and the agricultural industry are all essential ingredients to assure that agricultural research remains relevant and responsive and that the agricultural industry remains progressive and economically strong.

Regent Leach commented that the Institute is of particular importance to the future of California because this desert represents one of the largest irrigated agricultural production areas in the world. This area has been experiencing such difficult economic times recently that there is a chance that the metropolitan areas of San Diego and Los Angeles might buy water from the valleys to supplement their water supplies. He believed that the Institute for Desert Agriculture could make a significant contribution to improving the economic condition of the area.

Regent Connerly asked for a definition of Government Code §6503.5, which is referenced in the Joint Powers Agreement. Vice President Gomes explained that the Desert Agricultural County Service Area is organized under Government Code §25210 et seq. In response to a further question, he noted that no open meeting implications are involved in the Section

referred to by Regent Connerly. General Counsel Holst stated that he would obtain an answer to Regent Connerly's question prior to action being taken by the Board.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the President's recommendation and voted to present it to the Board.

2. **QUARTERLY REPORT ON PRIVATE SUPPORT**

In accordance with the Schedule of Reports, the Quarterly Report on Private Support for the period of January 1 through March 31, 1997 was submitted for information.

Vice President Darling reported that the University is anticipating the second-best year for private support in its history, with five campuses indicating substantial increases.

[The report was mailed to all Regents in advance of the meeting, and a copy is on file in the Office of the Secretary.]

3. **REPORT ON PROGRAMS AND FACILITIES FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA CENTER IN WASHINGTON, D.C.**

Vice Provost Tomlinson-Keasey provided an update on the academic, federal governmental relations, and public service programs at the UC Center in Washington, D.C. The planned move of these programs to a single building will take the University closer to realizing the Center's original vision. The primary mission of the UC Center is to use the unique resources and opportunities of the nation's capital to expand and enrich programs for UC undergraduates, graduate and professional school students, and faculty, and to enhance the federal relations and public service activities. As proposed by President Gardner in 1988, the UC Center in Washington, D.C. would establish the University of California as a visible and active academic presence in the nation's capital. The Center was to house under one roof a variety of teaching, research, and public service programs, as well as the Federal Governmental Relations office. While these activities are now well established, they are geographically separated, and the residential component of the program has yet to be incorporated. The inclusion of residential space for students and faculty was central to the original vision of the Center. The move now being proposed into a UC facility will enhance all of the current programs and provide a more focused UC signature in Washington, D.C. A site located at 1616 Rhode Island Avenue has been selected for development, subject to Regental approval, of the approximately 140,000-square-foot UC Center, and negotiations to acquire this site and obtain the necessary development entitlements are under way. The property is just off Scott Circle and two blocks east of Connecticut Avenue.

Ms. Tomlinson-Keasey recalled that the Regents have had several opportunities in the past to hear about the UC Center program. The initial item, *Planning for a University of California Center in Washington, D.C.*, was discussed by the Committee on Educational

Policy in June 1989. The item presented the concept of the Center and described the academic programs that would be housed there. In November 1990, President Gardner reported to the Committee on Finance on the progress of the Center. He noted that the development of the Center would help address two criticisms aimed at American research universities: a concern that such universities pay insufficient attention to the educational needs of undergraduate students, and a concern that research universities should do more to encourage students to consider careers in public service. The President explained that three campuses--Davis, Los Angeles, and Santa Barbara--were launching programs in an office building at the corner of 19th and N Streets (later relocated to 23rd and M Streets) in Washington, D.C. Students were housed in rented apartments in a building outside the District of Columbia, and the Federal Governmental Relations office was at a third location. It was becoming increasingly apparent that a new physical site was needed to address adequately both the academic and residential needs of students. Other campuses had shown interest in participating in the program, and a research component was still envisioned as part of the Center.

Following the report, The Regents approved a Delegation of Authority for Purchase of Property and Financing for Construction of a Washington, D.C. Center in order to facilitate the purchase of one of two real properties then available in Washington, D.C. to house the Center. The item also authorized the Treasurer to seek funding for this purchase. However, plans for the purchase of a building and further development of the Center were deferred because of the State's fiscal crisis. In November 1991, the Regents heard a further update on the Center as part of a presentation on Undergraduate Education in the University of California: Off-Campus Learning Programs. The item also noted that the living-learning concept which undergirded the Center concept had not yet been fully realized.

Five campuses participate in the UC Center programs: Berkeley, Davis, Los Angeles, Santa Barbara, and Santa Cruz. Programs are open to students from other campuses. The San Diego campus will become a full participant in Fall 1997, and the Irvine campus is actively preparing to develop programs at the Center. It is hoped that ultimately all campuses will be represented at the Center. The academic program has four principal components, and the external relations activities have two, as described below.

ACADEMIC PROGRAM

Undergraduate Programs

The essential components of the undergraduate program during the academic year include internships in a governmental agency or other organization with a public policy orientation; preparation of an independent research project; seminar courses offered at the Center; and a variety of educational, cultural, historical, and social activities and events. Internships generally demand from 24 to 32 hours a week, and the academic programs include a research class and various electives. Summer programs generally consist of internships only. While these elements are common to the programs offered by each of the campuses, there is substantial variation, reflecting the concerns, interests, and culture of each individual campus. Although the campus programs differ in their emphases and requirements, there is a considerable amount of exchange and interaction designed to create a multi-campus learning community. The directors of the campus programs have developed intercampus registration procedures, and students consequently may take seminars and courses from among those offered by the different campus programs. Also, faculty from the various campuses work together to plan ancillary programs, including forums to which government officials and other Washington notables are invited.

The three founding campuses began their programs in Washington in the 1990-91 academic year. Davis now sends 45 to 50 students in the fall and spring quarters, and UCLA sends 25 to 30 students, also in the fall and spring quarters. The UCLA program is under the auspices of the Center for American Political and Public Policy. UCLA's summer internship program, EXPO, is also based at the Center. Santa Barbara sends 25 to 30 students each quarter. The Berkeley campus began a program in 1996, sending 15 to 20 students in the fall and spring semesters. Berkeley also sends students to Washington, D.C. for summer internships through the CAL in the Capital program. Santa Cruz will send 20 students in fall 1997, and the San Diego campus is planning to send 12 students. Students from the Riverside campus who are involved in Washington, D.C. internships participate in the Center programs; Irvine currently sends about 24 students a year to internships in Washington.

Since its beginning in academic year 1990-91, some 1,600 students have participated in the program. While many of the students major in political science, international relations, or law, virtually all majors are represented. Internships are also wide ranging, and each campus has developed an impressive list of possible placements for its students. Some students are required to find their own internships from the list of options provided by their campus' program at the Center. For others, the home campus or the Center program may provide assistance with placement. A sampling of internship placement opportunities includes the White House; Congressional Committees; the offices of various Senators and Representatives from both political parties; the U.S. Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Education, Health and Human Services, and State; the Federal Reserve Bank; the Securities and Exchange Commission; the National Park Service; the Smithsonian Institution; and the

National Science Foundation. The list is extensive and covers all areas of political, civic, and cultural life. Many students, both undergraduates and graduates, go on to further study and careers in public service as a result of their Washington experiences. Some have ultimately found employment in related fields in federal, State, and local government, and others in research or public interest agencies.

The academic programs have been highly successful by any number of measures, including student enthusiasm and satisfaction. Students' reports of their experiences are uniformly positive; they speak of their experiences at the UC Center as life-transforming. Many students report that their stay in Washington provided the inspiration and motivation to continue on to graduate school or law school or pointed them in an unanticipated career direction. They have high praise for the quality of the academic program and the personal attention that is its hallmark.

Graduate Programs

The current graduate programs, which are primarily designed for pre-doctoral research, combine teaching assistantships with research fellowships funded by the campuses. Approximately 140 graduate students have participated in these programs so far. Graduate internships and professional school internships also are offered in a wide variety of disciplines, including art, political science, law, human development, medicine, physics, and international agricultural development.

Faculty Research

UC faculty from many disciplines pursue their research activities in Washington, D.C. throughout the year, and the number has grown steadily from 13 in 1990-91 to 31 in 1996-97. A total of 149 faculty have been in residence or made significant use of the Center since it began. Faculty who teach in the undergraduate program work closely with small groups of students and have an opportunity to develop innovative curricula that take advantage of the resources of Washington.

From its inception, the UC Center was planned to include a universitywide research element that would complement and enrich the teaching programs and offer faculty and graduate students the opportunity to carry out individual and joint research projects. This element of the Center has been the slowest to develop. Last year a highly competitive grant program was sponsored by the Office of the President, and the Institute on Global Conflict and Cooperation (IGCC) was selected to establish a research and program office at the Center. The program, which began in March of this year, aims to promote closer links with the policy community and to advance new research and educational opportunities for faculty and students in international affairs. IGCC is a multi-campus research unit, based at the San Diego campus. Working closely with the Center staff, IGCC hopes to help build UC's presence in the capital by communicating research results, sponsoring conferences, briefings,

and the like, and enhancing intercampus cooperation through foreign-policy related programs at the Center. It is hoped that this is just a beginning and that other similar research activities will be located at the Center.

Technology-Based Distance Learning

The Center has also taken advantage of distance learning technologies to send courses and other activities at the Center back to the home campuses. Satellite interactive technology, video conferencing, and Web-based instruction allow the Center to connect Washington to California in ways that enhance the education of a larger number of students than can enroll in the Washington program. As part of regular classroom activities on each campus, a live interview may be conducted in the Center in which students on campus may participate. In recent years, students have been able to question such notable figures as Speaker Newt Gingrich, Elaine Kamark (senior policy advisor to Vice President Gore), Princeton Lyman (Ambassador to South Africa), Winston Lord (Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs), and David Broder (*Washington Post* editor).

EXTERNAL RELATIONS PROGRAM

Federal Governmental Relations

The Federal Governmental Relations office represents the University and its interests before the federal government. It seeks and maintains relationships with the executive and legislative branches of government through a program of information and communication about the University, identifies federal resources to support the University's missions, and monitors and responds to legislation and executive actions that potentially affect the University. The Federal Governmental Relations office consults closely with the campuses, Department of Energy laboratories, and Office of the President to carry out the University's goals and objectives and often hosts meetings when chancellors, faculty, and staff visit Washington. The Director of the Federal Governmental Relations office also arranges for faculty members and administrators to testify on behalf of the University as expert witnesses before Congressional committees.

The University's active and visible presence in Washington is crucial to the success of the Federal Governmental Relations program. At present, the UC Office of Federal Governmental Relations is located several blocks from the existing academic Center. Its activities are not integrated into the teaching and research programs, and it does not benefit from the Center's activities.

Public Service

The campus programs and the Federal Governmental Relations office try to reach out to the sizeable UC communities in the Washington area. One such community is the 11,000 UC alumni who live and work in the Washington area. Maintaining and developing relationships with these friends of UC is a continuing focus of the work of the Federal Governmental Relations office. In addition, a broad range of public service activities are being developed and will become an integral part of the Center. An expansion of the Federal Governmental Relations role to facilitate the University's public service mission provides the opportunity to recognize the nexus between the nation's public policy needs and the University's intellectual resources. New partnerships may be forged, and the University's academic capability to assist public policy development will be an important component of Federal Governmental Relations and the entire Center's efforts.

Future of the Program

The opportunity to combine the instructional, research, and public service missions of the University in one Washington, D.C. location will have beneficial effects for all members of the University community, and most particularly for those at the Center itself. For students, it will realize the goal of providing a live-learn situation, enhancing the academic program with residential experiences. They will be able to take full advantage of ancillary academic activities that occur at the Center, such as colloquia and public lectures. Consolidating all operations under one roof will increase opportunities for collaboration with the Federal Governmental Relations office and will make its operations more accessible to policy makers, faculty, administrators, students, alumni, and others. Housing all students in a single, University-administered facility will greatly facilitate the provision of needed student support services. Furthermore, the building will provide residences for students and faculty, at competitive prices, which are safe and do not require a commute to the Center.

Academic scholarship and research will be enhanced by the integration of undergraduate, graduate, and research programs. Bringing faculty and graduate students into a common facility has the potential to stimulate the development of new and more ambitious research projects, both within and across disciplines and across campuses. The residential complex would be available to faculty who are in Washington for short-term individual projects and those faculty, in turn, could serve as lecturers and resource persons to the Center programs during their stay. UC's more visible presence is expected also to enhance the ability to recruit faculty with policy-oriented fields of interest.

On the research front, the UC Center will continue to develop links with existing Multicampus Research Units, as well as other research institutes, for extramural grant development, research conferences, and other purposes. Individual and collaborative faculty research will continue to be supported, and a proposed Washington Fellows research program will bring

together leading scholars from the UC system whose research would benefit from a term or academic year in residence.

The move of the Federal Governmental Relations office to the Center will make it an integral part of the University's overall institutional presence. This will facilitate the work of the office in a number of ways, including the provision of increased opportunities for faculty-administrative collaboration in public service and public affairs related activities. In addition, a unified facility will create new opportunities for this office and the campuses to work together effectively to strengthen ties with alumni in the region.

Ms. Tomlinson-Keasey informed the Committee that two students who had recently participated in the Center would report on their experiences, and she introduced Ms. Melissa Schoeplein and Ms. Trisha Tran. Ms. Schoeplein, a senior at the Berkeley campus, recently completed an internship in the Office of the Vice President of the United States. Ms. Tran is a recent graduate of the Davis campus who spent spring quarter 1996 as an intern at the Southeast Asia Resource Center. She won the Davis campus' outstanding research award for her project "Vietnamese Women: Forgotten Promises."

Ms. Schoeplein explained that she was one of sixteen students from the Berkeley campus studying with Professor Elizabeth Bowles, the director of the program. While serving as an intern in the Office of the Vice President, she worked with the finance and travel manager to pay the Vice President's bills. Her supervisor became her professional mentor and in so doing included her in the decision-making process. Ms. Schoeplein discussed the academic program, which provided an intimate classroom setting. One advantage of the program was its multi-disciplinary nature. Her research program led to an internship for the summer of 1997 and encouraged her to pursue an honors thesis at Berkeley.

Ms. Tran recalled that when she applied to the Washington, D.C. program she wanted to apply the theoretical knowledge that she had gained from her international courses to the problems of third-world women and children. The Washington Center Program introduced her to public policy and prepared her for the rigorous demands of graduate school through her research project, her internship, and her coursework. Her intern work at the Southeast Asia Resource Action Center introduced her to the Southeast Asian community in the United States and abroad. Her research project combined her theoretical and applied knowledge to create a paper which analysed the microfinance system for Vietnamese women. Her research was subsequently used by the Southeast Asia Resource Action Center to establish the first American nonprofit organization microfinance system. Her coursework in the area of health policy and her professor inspired her to apply to graduate schools in the area of public policy.

Regent Montoya noted that she particularly appreciated the hands-on approach of the faculty members who take part in the programs and wondered whether or not that approach could be maintained as the program expands. Ms. Tomlinson-Keasey responded that one of the

issues that will be addressed in the Regents' Item in September will be the occupancy rate of the building. Students now participate in the program in the fall and spring quarters, with no program during the winter quarter. It is anticipated that occupancy could be improved by the establishment of a full winter program. Additional faculty will be brought in to accommodate the increase in the student body.

Regent Montoya recalled that she had expressed written concerns that the project had advanced so far without Regental input. She urged the President to involve the Regents more closely in the process.

Regent Johnson noted that concerns had been raised by some Regents regarding the safety of the location that is being proposed for construction of the Center. She felt these concerns should be fully addressed before any action is taken by the Board. Regent Bagley agreed with Regent Montoya's assessment that the area being proposed is a bad neighborhood.

President Atkinson believed that the University had a sound financial plan to move forward with the Center project. He stated his intention to review the question of the location before making a recommendation to the Regents.

Regent Leach urged that Regent Montoya be involved in the project before it comes to the Board for approval, noting that the Regents are concerned about the safety of the students.

4. **REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT CONCERNING OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA STUDENT ASSOCIATION TO ADDRESS THE REGENTS**

President Atkinson reported that at today's meeting he would reintroduce a practice in which representatives of the University of California Student Association (UCSA) will have an opportunity to address a Committee of The Regents during the consideration of open session agenda items. The reintroduction of this process stems from the recommendation of the Student Regent Selection Review Committee that the Board hear about student concerns directly from student leadership rather than through the student Regent or during the public comment period. The committee believes that this approach will reinforce the role of the student Regent as a trustee for the people of the state rather than as a spokesperson for student concerns. This will help to define the relationship of the student Regent to the Board. UCSA will submit requests for appearances in writing; following approval, they will be asked to speak before the appropriate Committee immediately preceding discussion of the item.

5. APPROVAL OF OUTREACH TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

The President recommended that the report “New Directions for Outreach: Report of the University of California Outreach Task Force” be accepted and that the recommendations contained in the report be adopted.

President Atkinson recalled that the Board of Regents established the Outreach Task Force in conjunction with the adoption in July 1995 of SP-1, Policy Ensuring Equal Treatment--Admissions. As a part of its action at that meeting, the Board reaffirmed that the University seeks to enroll a student body that reflects the diversity of the State of California. The Task Force specifically was charged to “...develop proposals for new directions and increased funding for the Board of Regents to increase the eligibility rates of those [who are] disadvantaged economically or in terms of their social environment...” In appointing the task force, the Board sought to identify new approaches to assure that the University remains accessible to students of diverse backgrounds.

The President then introduced Provost Judson King and Mr. Richard Clarke to present the Outreach Task Force’s final report. Provost King and Mr. Clarke have served as co-chairs of the task force. Mr. Clarke is the former CEO and Chairman of the Board of the Pacific Gas & Electric Company. He was asked to co-chair the task force because of his strong ties with the business community and his deep commitment to education.

Mr. Clarke explained that in January 1996 representatives from the University and the business community embarked on a mission to develop new and expanded outreach programs, with increased funding, to help students overcome the economic, social, and educational disadvantages which prevent them from qualifying for admission to the University of California. The objective of the task force, as stated in SP-1, was to seek methods to further the goal of enrolling a student population that encompasses the diversity of the state without the use of special preferences in the admissions process. The task force consisted of 35 members representing UC faculty, staff, and students, Regents, K-12, the California community colleges, the California State University, the California Postsecondary Education Commission, and business and industry. Those members of the task force representing business and industry recognize the importance of higher education in providing their companies with well-educated and skilled employees. Education is more important than ever due to the new technologies and the knowledge basis upon which many companies depend for their competitiveness, as well as the globalization of the State’s economy. As the population becomes more diverse, it is essential to have a diverse workforce that can relate to the markets that these companies serve.

In order to carry out its charge, the task force heard testimony from practitioners and other experts in the field of outreach and education. It commissioned studies on the various outreach programs and met with students and parents to gain their insight into the meaning of outreach. The task force established the following five subcommittees: Pre-K-16

Outreach, Community College Outreach, Graduate/Professional School Programs, Assessment and Evaluation of Outreach Programs, and Communication and Technology in Outreach. The task force was informed by a conference on outreach issues at the Santa Cruz campus which was designed to help frame the work of the task force by consulting with two hundred outreach practitioners from throughout the state.

The task force found wide differences in the percentage of high school graduates from different racial and ethnic backgrounds who qualify for admission. There are distinct patterns of educational advantage that impede the educational achievement of various groups of students in the state. A school-by-school analysis of various indicators shows that the educational exposure predicts the differing outcomes for various racial and ethnic groups. The students who are least represented at University campuses are most concentrated in the lowest-performing schools in California. For example, almost 80 percent of the students in the 150 lowest-performing schools are from underrepresented minorities, while at the best-performing schools that percentage is slim. Elements outside of the classroom also have an important influence on educational achievement, including the location of the community, limited English proficiency, and dependence upon Aid to Families with Dependent Children. The task force believes that the elements of outreach must address all of these factors in order to be successful. The task force proposes a four-point outreach strategy that includes various efforts to assist students in overcoming educational disadvantages while also attracting to the University a student body broadly representative of the state:

- ***School-centered Partnerships***: Each campus should work with a select number of regional partner schools to help improve opportunities for college preparation and to foster a school culture that promotes academic success and high educational standards.
- ***Academic Development Programs***: The task force proposed expansion of existing effective academic development programs such as the Early Academic Outreach Program, the Puente Project, and MESA.
- ***Informational Outreach***: As a short-term strategy, the task force recommends an aggressive program of informational outreach to provide better and more timely information to students, families, teachers, and counselors to improve planning and preparation for college. This program should address the perception in many communities that the University has lessened its commitment to diversity. Students and families must hear that commitment reaffirmed.
- ***University Research and Evaluation***: The research expertise of the University of California should be brought to bear in a much more coordinated and focused way on the educational needs identified by the task force in order to determine the root causes of educational disparity and to evaluate the effectiveness of the University's outreach programs and suggest modifications of these programs to the administration.

Mr. Clarke observed that it will be necessary for the University to focus its limited resources in those areas where the diversity objective can be achieved. The task force also recognizes that its work is only one element in the broader context of national and state educational reform. In view of the many different K-12 efforts now beginning or under way, the task force recommends a convocation of the state's educational, governmental, and business leadership. The leadership should survey the full range of ongoing educational innovation and reform and move to coordinate these efforts in a collaborative way. The Outreach Task Force believes that the comprehensive plan proposed will best enable the University to achieve its goal of a diverse student body. He assured the Committee that there is a strong commitment on the part of the members of the task force to accomplish this mission.

Provost King commented on the procedural aspects of the work of the Outreach Task Force, emphasizing the breadth of consultation that went into the report. Various drafts were posted on the World Wide Web, and many responses were received. The report was widely distributed for comment, including to every high school principal and superintendent in the State of California. Drafts were circulated at various times to Regents, chancellors, and the Academic Senate.

Provost King observed that, as the State's land-grant institution, the University serves as the main avenue for upward mobility. A major function of the task force has been to devise the ways in which this can best be achieved. People should be limited by their abilities and desires rather than by social, educational, economic, or environmental factors. The task force concluded that the University would need to address head-on the disparities that occur in educational achievement and attainment. Historically, the University has worked through student development programs to improve the diversity of the student body. There are currently 850 such programs, representing a large degree of individual initiative and creativity.

Provost King reviewed the four major components of the task force's recommendations, as described by Mr. Clarke above, addressing in more detail the proposal for the creation of school-centered partnerships. For these partnerships, the University would seek schools with consistently low college-going rates. A second qualification would require these schools to have a clear interest in forming a partnership with the University as well as the potential for positive change. The University will work not only with high schools but also with the associated feeder elementary and middle schools. The task force report outlines in great detail the methodology proposed to bring about improvements in these schools. In forming partnerships, the University will need the participation of families, community organizations, the business community, and the other sectors of higher education. It is anticipated that each campus will partner with five local schools, thereby reaching about ten percent of the schools in the state. The University also has the goal of forming partnerships with schools in the central valley.

With respect to the community colleges, Provost King reported that the task force saw them as a major untapped source for a diverse student population. As a result, the task force

recommends the expansion of successful academic development programs such as Puente and MESA, as well as the possible extension of the Early Academic Outreach Program to the community colleges. The University should take a more forceful role to enhance articulation and to facilitate the transfer process. Provost King noted that attention also needs to be given to diversity at the graduate and professional level. The task force calls for expanded informational outreach and recruitment by graduate and professional schools. Undergraduate research should be used to motivate students on to graduate school. There are programs which work toward expanded graduate school participation, such as the California Alliance for Minority Participation program at the Irvine campus; this concept could also be expanded.

The task force recognizes the fact that the University’s outreach efforts will require support from the highest levels of State government in order to succeed. Nonetheless, the task force found it desirable to state five-year goals, as follows:

School-Centered Programs

- Increase UC-eligible graduates from partner schools by 100 percent, or increase the UC eligibility rate by 4 percentage points, whichever is greater.
- Increase competitively eligible graduates from partner schools by 50 percent, or increase competitive eligibility rates by 2 percentage points, whichever is greater.

Academic Development (Student-Centered) Programs

- Increase the number of UC-eligible program graduates by 100 percent.
- Increase the number of competitively eligible graduates by 50 percent.

Information Outreach

- Increase the number of outreach contacts with elementary school, middle school, high school, and community college students and families by 200 percent.

Provost King observed that the President, the chancellors, and the leadership of the divisional academic senates are responsible for the attainment of the recommended outcomes, in partnership with regional K-12 and postsecondary institutions. The task force has estimated the annual costs required to implement its recommendations to be as follows:

| | |
|------------------------------------|------------------|
| School-Centered Outreach | \$27,200,000 |
| Academic Development Outreach | 17,900,000 |
| Informational Outreach | 7,900,000 |
| University Research and Evaluation | 1,550,000 |
| Infrastructure Needs | <u>6,000,000</u> |

| | |
|-------|--------------|
| Total | \$60,550,000 |
|-------|--------------|

The total of \$60.5 million is roughly twice what is currently spent by the University on its outreach efforts. The task force envisions five sources for this additional funding: the State of California, resources from the partners, private foundations, the business community, and the federal government.

In concluding his presentation, Provost King expressed his appreciation to Mr. Clarke for his service as co-chair of the task force, and he acknowledged the effort made by the staff in putting the report together.

President Atkinson then introduced Professor Cecil Lytle, a member of the task force who would present the "Minority Report of the University of California Outreach Task Force," which was written by former Regent Russell. Professor Lytle stated that while he endorsed the findings of the minority report, he endorsed the report of the Outreach Task Force as well. The minority report supports the enlargement of the current academic development programs as described in the Outreach Task Force report, but it also calls for additional thinking about the University's involvement with K-14 education. The minority report suggests that the University should position itself to assist colleagues in K-14 to develop meaningful educational reform. The \$60.5 million which has been requested will fund programs which are basically outside of the classroom. These programs, while useful in the past, may not be effective enough to create competitively eligible students from populations that typically do not attend University of California campuses. Professor Lytle suggested that the industry-University partnership described by Chancellor Orbach points the way to the kind of partnerships that can have a meaningful impact on the State's economy. The task force report does not represent the invasive intervention that the University of California can bring to bear on pressing social and economic issues. He urged the Regents to continue to ask for input from the communities that outreach is intended to serve, because it is not clear that there is unanimity on the part of underrepresented communities as to how the University should address these issues.

Regent Khachigian, a member of the Outreach Task Force, implored the University community to tackle the daunting task of increased outreach as quickly as possible. The four-pronged plan outlined by Mr. Clarke is basically simple, but its implementation is extremely complicated, requiring collaboration between many diverse constituencies. She issued a challenge to her fellow Regents to become involved in the University's outreach programs by participating in meetings and representing the Board to students, parents, and school administrators. She envisioned individual Regents speaking to small groups in order to help with the outreach effort. Regent Khachigian reported that she served on the Assessment Subcommittee of the Outreach Task Force, which was charged with evaluating current outreach programs. The subcommittee was frustrated by the lack of available data. She noted that approximately \$1.5 million will be devoted to assessing what does and what does not work.

Regent Eastin observed that the Outreach Task Force had made some powerful recommendations, adding that it was her belief that the University of California should greatly expand its outreach role. Regent Eastin reported that she had visited school districts in 52 of the state's 56 counties and found that rural schools suffer from problems as much as some inner-city schools do. Students in these rural areas often lack the vision to attend any college or university. She commended to the Regents an article in *Wired Magazine* which refers to the beginnings of a "global economic boom on a scale never experienced before." Regent Eastin stipulated that the people who will take part in that boom will be well-educated. In the 1950s, sixty percent of the jobs that were created were for unskilled workers, while the present rate is less than ten percent. Students must be aware of the need for training in order to succeed. Regent Eastin noted the importance of the segments of higher education working together throughout the state to reach those students who have not been reached before. She described a program initiated by a middle school in Modesto where students were grouped together in "families" that corresponded to campuses of the California State University as well as one UC campus. The students visited these campuses in order to familiarize themselves with them, an important issue for children whose parents may never have participated in higher education. Regent Eastin observed that last year the top twenty percent of engineering and computer sciences graduates in India came to the United States to work because the demands of the Silicon Valley and the entertainment industry cannot be met by California's college graduates. In order to improve the quality of education in California, graduation standards must be raised. She asked that the Regents support AB 418, a bill which calls for regional collaborations to improve academic outreach. In addition to the partnerships proposed by the Outreach Task Force, there must be ways to involve CSU, private universities, and the community colleges in building stronger partnerships throughout the state. Regent Eastin also urged that the Schools of Education be strengthened through more contact with the classrooms of California in order to instruct new teachers in ways that reflect the diversity of the student body.

Ms. Debbie Davis, Chair of the University of California Student Association, expressed her appreciation for the new procedure which allows students the opportunity to present their comments to the Regents in a more effective manner than during the public comment period. She then introduced Mr. Daniel Santillano, a student member of the Outreach Task Force. Mr. Santillano noted that the Outreach Task Force addressed the question of how the University of California can maintain diversity in the future in light of SP-1. The task force developed a plan of expansion and new directions for UC outreach. He believed that the University can expect students of all racial and ethnic backgrounds to perform equally if given the opportunity to do so. However, the task force report did not elucidate clearly enough the factors which produce uneven eligibility rates for different groups. Mr. Santillano suggested that the University must recognize how race and ethnicity play a role and charged that the task force report does not address this issue sufficiently. Outreach plays only a small role in what is required to reform the State's educational system overall and to ensure diversity at the University of California. While outreach will accomplish much, it will not replace affirmative action. Mr. Santillano stated that he supports the minority report, as do

Outreach Task Force members Eugene Garcia and Del Anderson, who agree that a minority voice needs to be heard. As the premiere public institution for higher education in California, it is UC's responsibility to educate the diverse population of the state.

Regent Connerly stated his overall support of the Outreach Task Force report, although he did believe that certain issues either were not raised or were not adequately addressed. He expressed regret that the report was issued only a few days short of the second anniversary of the passage of SP-1. Regent Connerly stated that, if The Regents adopt the report, history will say that it was worth the wait. He noted that he supported the report as a method for greatly enhanced academic preparation and because it holds out the promise of significantly increasing the number of disadvantaged students who will be able to obtain a college education. In the course of pursuing that intent, one of the beneficial results should be an increase in the competitive admissibility of those students who are not now competitive. By charting new territory, the task force has rendered an important service not only to the University but also to the entire nation. If these outreach efforts are successful, more Black and Latino students will be competitively admissible starting in five years than was the case during the past twenty years. Once the educational infrastructure that the report envisions has been built, the annual educational dividends will be a source of pride. The report lays the foundation for the kind of policy structure that must exist in a multi-ethnic, pluralistic society such as California, one based on competition with no guarantee of outcome, but a competition administered by a caring society that has no reservation about using affirmative action to ensure that every student has a fair chance to become adequately prepared for that competition. The report candidly assesses the inadequacies of the State's K-12 system, but it does not conclude that the problem is someone else's. Regent Connerly observed that there are many talented and dedicated teachers in underperforming schools who have the same goals as the University. He suggested that the report put inadequate emphasis on the need to instill the importance of education within those groups which are identified as underrepresented. Children must be informed that not getting an education is not an option. Regent Connerly recalled that throughout the debate over affirmative action it has been charged that the University of California has created an unwelcome environment. The decision that preferences will not be given on the basis of race and ethnicity should not be translated into a message that some people are not welcome. Regent Connerly pointed out that the use of affirmative action is no longer open to debate due to the passage of Proposition 209 in November 1996. Because it will not be possible rapidly to achieve a color-blind society without inflicting grief on the University, it will be necessary to seek ways of smoothing that transition. One of the benefits of coming to terms with the issue of competitive admissibility involves the role of standardized tests. The University must confront the question of whether such tests are biased against Black and Latino students. If so, either their use should be discontinued or the bias should be eliminated. If they are not, which is his opinion, then the problem lies elsewhere, and that problem should be pursued until its true source is uncovered. Regent Connerly explained that, while he would support the report, he strongly objected to any suggestion that there should be any emphasis or priority given to outreach to students of any particular race or ethnic background. To do so

would be in direct violation of Proposition 209. The same objective can be achieved by targeting non-race based outreach programs, which would shelter the University from the threat of litigation. Mr. Connerly noted that the University's affirmative action programs could not have been sustained indefinitely, because either the courts or popular opinion eventually would have ended them. Preferences based on race and ethnic background cannot be resumed once their elimination has begun. Regent Connerly believed that the most haunting finding of the task force report was the fact that the average SAT score for African-Americans in the highest income category is below that of white and Asian Americans with the lowest incomes. He stated his faith that when his term as a Regent ends in 2005 there will be a large supply of students of every color and ethnic background on the University's campuses, all of whom earned the right academically to be there.

Regent Levin observed that if the recommendations of the Outreach Task Force result in a body of young people who are competitively eligible for the University, it will have done this and future generations a great service. She found the recommendation that community college outreach be expanded to be immediately encouraging because it will affect students who are already in the pipeline for a four-year institution. She was in favor of increased involvement by families and the community to encourage students to pursue higher education. Regent Levin pointed out that the current outreach programs have not produced the desired results. She hoped that the report of the Outreach Task Force would help to energize these programs. She noted that there was no incentive program for faculty and staff who may be involved in increased outreach efforts, and she believed that an assessment and evaluation process would need to be defined. Regent Levin also pointed out that the report recommends partnering with only 50 schools in the state, while there are 150 in the lowest quintile, and she wondered whether the report went far enough, fast enough, particularly when the report states that efforts need to be made at the third and fourth grade levels to achieve the greatest success in the long term. She hoped that regular reports would be made to the Committee about the implementation of the task force recommendations and that the Committee would be continually involved in assessment of the progress.

In response to a question from Regent Bagley, President Atkinson recalled that he had reported previously that approximately \$100 million are spent annually on outreach to K-12. Provost King explained that the Outreach Task Force had analyzed all of the programs that are so funded to determine which were outreach and which were not. The task force estimated that at present outreach programs are funded at approximately \$60 million, and it has proposed that an additional \$60.5 million be allocated. President Atkinson added that outreach should be a high-priority item in the 1998-99 Regents' Budget.

Regent Bagley observed that in the presentation task force co-chairs Clarke and King did not discuss the role of the California State University in these outreach efforts. Provost King noted that there were two active members of the task force from CSU and that CSU campuses are mentioned prominently in the report as desirable partners in the regional coalitions. Regent Bagley pointed out that CSU will face similar problems as those which

confront the University of California if the injunction against Proposition 209 is lifted. Provost King assured Regent Bagley that the University intends to work closely with the CSU campuses in these efforts.

Regent Bagley asked how outreach would affect access to graduate school. He pointed out that some accounts had suggested that Dean Kay at Boalt Hall might be discouraging Black students from accepting admission. President Atkinson responded that he had talked at some length with Dean Kay and that there was no question about her commitment and her loyalty to the institution. He believed that she operates at the highest standards and with the best interests of the University at heart.

Regent Davies hoped that the time had come to put the debate over SP-1 to rest. He supported increased funding in the budget for the University's outreach efforts.

Faculty Representative Weiss commented that facilitating access to educational opportunities and enhancing diversity are of paramount importance to the faculty. There is a sense among the faculty that the research component of the Outreach Task Force report may have the greatest impact in the long term because this research will help to identify the factors which bring about educational disparity and test interventions to address those factors. In addition, the faculty are eager to participate in the regional partnerships and want to be involved in identifying the schools that are chosen as partners.

Regent Brophy was hopeful that the University would be able to concentrate its outreach efforts in areas with diverse populations in the schools.

Regent McClymond referred to Regent Bagley's comment about access to graduate school, noting that there are many factors which affect a student's decision to attend graduate school, including fees, and suggested that this fact would need to be taken into account. She was concerned about the five-year goals which had been set by the Outreach Task Force, because an entire generation of UC undergraduates will be skipped during these five years. She believed that measurements should be taken at much shorter intervals. With respect to outreach, Regent McClymond stated that she would be more interested in learning about take rates rather than the University's output, because the outreach materials which are produced could be ineffective. She also suggested that the University needs to do more than reach out to students from diverse backgrounds; it needs to recruit them.

Regent Nakashima suggested that greater emphasis should be placed on the community college system because students there are interested in pursuing higher education. The University should take advantage of the fact that the community colleges represent a source of students who have two years of college. In particular he mentioned the MESA and Puente programs as ones which have accomplished much with the community colleges to encourage students to attend the University of California.

Regent Montoya reiterated Regent McClymond's concern about the lack of attention to the take rate for minority students, and she acknowledged that campuses at the University of California have already begun to increase their take rate at the undergraduate level. In particular, it has been reported that at the Riverside campus administrators doubled their contacts with individual students, doubled their recruiting trips, and pushed their guaranteed admission program. Rather than waiting for the task force report, these administrators sought ways to increase the take rate in order to increase the number of qualified minority students who enroll at the Riverside campus.

Regent Parsky referred to the section of the report which addresses accountability, noting that the President, the chancellors, and the Academic Senate are all deemed to be accountable. He believed that the Regents should also be held accountable for the results. Regent Parsky suggested the need for a discussion by the Committee of how the resources to be allocated to outreach will be aimed at producing the desired results. He believed that the presentations to date on how resources would be spent had been too general in nature. In addition, he suggested that the efforts recommended by the task force represent one prong in the University's efforts to achieve and maintain a diverse student body. Admissions officers need to be held accountable for reviewing a number of different factors within the restrictions of Proposition 209. He stressed that the task force report should not be taken as the University's answer to diversity.

President Atkinson pointed out that there is no public educational institution that has devoted itself so wholeheartedly over the past thirty to forty years to issues of diversity. The task force report has refocused attention on what steps need to be taken. The President resonated with Regent McClymond's comments regarding the loss of several generations of students before the effect of increased outreach is felt.

At the request of the President, the following statement was entered into the record on behalf of Regent Davis:

"I support the task force's recommendation for a concerted multi-faceted outreach proposal with the goal of increasing UC eligibility rates among underrepresented minority groups. Let's not kid ourselves, however, this is simply not enough. I believe we must also adopt a proposal guaranteeing admission to the top two students of every public high school in California.

This is a truly merit-based approach which ensures a first-rate UC student body with a wide diversity of experience (the experiences of students at Lowell High School in San Francisco may vary considerably from those of students at Edison High School in Fresno). Guaranteed admission for the top students at every school sends our kinds the message that they have a shot at a UC education no matter where they live. A

truly merit-based system should reward those students who have made the most of their situation, and whose excellence is based on personal effort.

California State University at Long Beach and UC Berkeley, through the “Berkeley Pledge,” are already experimenting with variations on this theme. More time and research are needed, however, to develop a detailed proposal to which we could credibly affix the UC seal. Consequently, I call on you to set up a task force to examine and further develop this proposal; a task force on which I would be happy to serve or chair.”

(For speaker’s comments see the minutes of the July 17, 1997 meeting of the Committee of the Whole.)

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the President’s recommendation and voted to present it to the Board.

The meeting adjourned at 11:55 a.m.

Attest:

Secretary