

The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

July 16, 1998

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

Members present: Regents Atkinson, Bagley, Chandler, Connerly, Davies, Espinoza, Khachigian, Miura, Montoya, Nakashima, Villaraigosa, and Willmon

In attendance: Regents Davis, Gould, Hotchkis, Johnson, Kozberg, Lee, Ochoa, Parsky, Preuss, and Sayles, Regents-designate Taylor and Vining, Faculty Representatives Dorr and Weiss, Secretary Trivette, General Counsel Holst, Provost King, Senior Vice President Kennedy, Vice Presidents Broome, Darling, Gurtner, Hershman, and Hopper, Chancellors Berdahl, Carnesale, Cicerone, Dynes, Greenwood, Orbach, Vanderhoef, and Yang, Vice Chancellor Bainton representing Chancellor Bishop, and Recording Secretary Nietfeld

The meeting convened at 1:55 p.m. with Committee Chair Connerly presiding.

1. **REMARKS OF COMMITTEE CHAIR CONNERLY**

Regent Connerly recalled recent discussions concerning the ethnicity check-off boxes on the University's application form. The attempt has been made to engineer a compromise that would achieve the objective of Regents who object to the boxes while at the same time preserving the ability of the University administration to gather necessary data. The conclusion was that the boxes will remain on the application forms that are collected by the College Board, but the information will not be transmitted electronically to the campuses. When the campuses review applications, they will not have explicit information on an applicant's race, sex, or ethnicity.

Provost King noted that the administration had also agreed that the information would be made available once the admissions decision has been made.

In response to a question from Regent Bagley regarding access to this information, President Atkinson stated that the information will be available as in the past, except that it will not be considered by admissions committees.

Regent Connerly believed that the compromise achieves the aims of Proposition 209 while allowing the University to maintain data and to monitor outreach efforts.

In response to a question from Regent Sayles, President Atkinson explained that students would not be proscribed from identifying their race or ethnicity in their personal statements.

2. **PROPOSED CHANGES IN ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS FOR UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS**

Provost King recalled that at the May 1998 meeting Professor Widaman, Chair of the Academic Senate's Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS), presented several ideas that BOARS is exploring regarding UC eligibility for freshman admissions. These ideas included two paths to eligibility. One path would base eligibility on performance within the local context of the high school that a student attends. The second path to eligibility would be based on performance within a statewide context and would take the form of satisfying a sliding-scale index of high school grade point average (GPA) and SAT scores. At the May 1998 meeting, Professor Widaman indicated that BOARS would continue its deliberations and provide a firmer proposal to the Regents at the July 1998 meeting. However, several critical issues were raised by Regents that require further attention by BOARS. In addition, BOARS sent a questionnaire to all public high school principals and district superintendents in the state regarding the merits of the planned changes in eligibility requirements. Only about 15 percent of these 858 high schools have responded to date. BOARS feels that the quality and quantity of feedback on these issues was not satisfactory and that more consultation is needed. In the months to come, BOARS plans to oversee visits with a sample of high schools, particularly schools that presently send few students to the University. At these visits, the different aspects of proposed changes in eligibility standards will be discussed, specifically with regard to how these changes would affect both schools and their students. In addition, a review of student records will be made to determine the preparation of the top-ranked students from these high schools.

Provost King noted that BOARS has also been addressing concerns raised as a result of the latest eligibility study conducted by the California Postsecondary Education Commission. This study found that the eligibility rate for graduating high school seniors for the University was 11.1 percent, well below the 12.5 percent recommended by the California Master Plan for Higher Education. The CPEC study also found that an additional 9.4 percent of high school graduates were "potentially eligible," meaning that they had completed all the required course work with the required grade point average but were lacking one or more of the standardized tests required for eligibility for the University. These findings have caused concern for BOARS and also for many others within and outside the University. It has been suggested that it appears inappropriate for the University to require students to take a complete battery of tests if some of these tests are not included significantly in the determination of UC eligibility, even though these additional tests are used in selection decisions by individual UC campuses.

To address both the 11.1 percent eligibility rate problem and eliminate the "potentially eligible" category of students, BOARS intends to establish an academic index that would determine combined high school GPA and SAT test score thresholds for all categories of students in the UC eligibility pool. Presently, such thresholds are established only for students with GPAs in the range from 2.82 to 3.29; students with GPAs of 3.30 or above are not

required to satisfy any specific test score cut-offs. In devising this new academic index to eliminate the "potentially eligible" category, BOARS will calibrate the index in such a way as to yield an eligibility rate of 12.5 percent.

BOARS expects that a final proposal on revised guidelines for UC eligibility will be presented to The Regents no later than the January 1999 meeting. The first class to be affected by any changes will be the entering class of fall 2000.

In response to a question from Regent Miura, Provost King stated that the eligibility rate for private high school seniors is approximately 30 percent. Associate Vice President Galligani continued that the Master Plan calls for 12.5 percent of public high school graduates to be eligible to attend the University of California. In 1990 CPEC attempted to get eligibility data for private institutions, but this information was difficult to obtain. Regent Atkinson pointed out that Regent Miura's question went to the issue of what percent of high school students in the state graduate from a private high school. Assistant Vice President Smith stated that this figure is not known because private schools are not required to disclose how many students they graduate.

Regent Chandler noted that the Academic Senate would have the opportunity to review BOARS' recommendations regarding admissions before they are presented to the Regents. Faculty Representative Weiss explained that faculty had had the opportunity, through the Assembly and the Academic Council, to analyze the initial proposals. The Senate divisions on the campuses, however, have not discussed the proposals. BOARS will consult with high schools in the coming months and will hold discussion sessions at the workshops held for high school counselors in the fall to determine how the schools feel about the four percent proposal. Regent Khachigian asked that the results of these consultations be shared with the Outreach Advisory Group.

Regent Ochoa reiterated the question raised by Regent Miura regarding the role of private high schools in determining the eligibility pool. Provost King noted that, because only 18 percent of the University's entering students come from private high schools, their numerical effect is not large. President Atkinson added that, if the pool of eligible public high school and private high school students were to exceed 12.5 percent, the University would still honor its commitment to offering a seat to every student who is eligible for admission.

3. **EXPANDING THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA'S EDUCATIONAL SERVICES TO CALIFORNIA'S ADULT PROFESSIONALS: MASTER OF ADVANCED STUDY**

Vice Provost Tomlinson-Keasey announced a new degree initiative that will expand the University of California's advanced degree programming for working adult professionals. The President has proposed a new degree title, the Master of Advanced Study, to signal to

California's working adult professionals the availability of courses of study designed to contribute to professional and educational advancement and to accommodate working adults' schedules. Master of Advanced Study programs would be offered independently by academic departments or through a partnership with University Extension in which the academic department would be responsible for academic aspects of the program and the degree, while University Extension would lend its expertise in marketing and program delivery to working adult professionals.

College graduates are now entering an adult workforce that must anticipate dramatic changes in career experiences and career patterns. Within a chosen career, the information provided by an individual's degree program may become dated quickly. Changes resulting from restructuring in the American workplace and the rapid transition to an information-based economy will mean that, to keep pace, individuals must renew their skills, acquire new ones, and integrate their existing skills with new knowledge.

A continuum of programs beyond the baccalaureate needs to be available to working adults on a part-time basis. These include:

- Certificate programs which are comprised of a series of courses in a specific subject area. Such programs are the province of University Extension and have been attracting large numbers of professionals in recent years.
- Professional masters degrees which indicate expertise beyond the baccalaureate level in areas including business administration, public health, public policy, fine arts, engineering, and in a variety of other disciplines. The University of California already offers these degrees to full-time students and is actively working to expand and tailor the programs to serve the needs of working professionals.
- Masters degrees involving courses of study designed to contribute to the professional and educational advancement of working adults. Several top private universities have offered such programs for a number of years, including Stanford, Chicago, Harvard, and Johns Hopkins. Currently, this aspect of postbaccalaureate professional education is not available at the University of California, where typically a masters degree leads to the Ph.D. This masters degree, which will stand on its own, will not require students to be involved in research.

The Academic Senate has endorsed creation of the Master of Advanced Study campus pilot program. Such degree programs would be developed, reviewed, and approved by faculty; the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs is considering a variety of review processes that are appropriate to this degree. Several campuses have expressed an interest in developing Master of Advanced Study programs geared to professional communities with which they have close relationships and in fields in which they offer or would plan unique programs. Planning grants will be available shortly for groups of faculty interested in creating

pilot Master of Advanced Study programs, and it is expected that several campuses will develop pilot proposals.

Faculty Representative Weiss reported that the proposed degree has been the subject of intensive dialogue among the President, the Academic Senate, and the campuses over the past year and a half. The faculty initially expressed concern that the programs be of the highest quality. Having been assured by the President that this will be the case, the faculty are highly supportive of the proposal.

In response to a question from Regent Willmon, Vice Provost Tomlinson-Keasey explained that all of the campuses have been invited to submit pilot programs. The administration anticipates receiving proposals from the Davis, Santa Barbara, and Santa Cruz campuses and hopes that the other campuses will follow suit.

Regent Preuss observed that the University has an obligation to the State to play an active role in adult professional training. He suggested that the administration would need to explore how the University could play an even wider role in this increasing market.

Regent Khachigian asked for an explanation of how the Master of Advanced Study would differ from the professional degrees which the University presently offers. Vice Provost Tomlinson-Keasey explained that they will be offered in subject areas such as psychology where masters degrees typically are not offered. In addition, it is anticipated that the degree will be offered in interdisciplinary fields. Provost King added that the University's professional degrees are accredited degrees designed for the student who will enter the profession. The Master of Advanced Study, on the other hand, will be a continuing education degree designed for students with different needs.

At the request of Regent-designate Taylor that he differentiate between the proposed degree and the role of University Extension in adult education, President Atkinson noted that Extension provides many certificate programs. Many students, however, are interested in obtaining an advanced degree without attending college on a full-time basis. University Extension does not offer advanced degree programs.

Faculty Representative Dorr reported that the proposal signals an interest on the part of the faculty in offering a terminal masters degree for an adult professional who wishes additional professional development. What the programs eventually look like will not be known until the proposals are developed by the campuses and reviewed at the campus level and systemwide.

4. **QUARTERLY REPORT ON PRIVATE SUPPORT**

In accordance with the Schedule of Reports, the **Quarterly Report on Private Support** for the period January 1 through March 31, 1998 was submitted for information.

Vice President Darling called the Committee's attention to the fact that the University received \$154 million during the quarter; cumulative gifts during the first three quarters totaled \$490 million, as compared with \$476 million for the first three quarters of the previous year.

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

5. **PROPOSED ADOPTION OF REGENTS' POLICY BARRING DEVELOPMENT CONSIDERATIONS FROM INFLUENCING ADMISSIONS DECISIONS**

Regent Connerly recalled that in July 1995 the Board of Regents ended the use of race, gender, or ethnicity as factors to be considered by the University in its admissions process. In 1996 he and Regent Bravin introduced the following resolution, which was intended to eliminate preferences that disproportionately benefit applicants who are not underrepresented minorities:

The Board of Regents hereby directs that no gift, contribution, gratuity, or other consideration either made or contemplated to the University or any of its operations, functions, or programs shall play any part in any admissions decision and that no University officer, employee, or agent shall operate any process or seek to influence any admissions decision in regard to any such consideration; and further, that any process of appeal of admissions decisions shall be administered on a fair and equal basis to all applicants, within the rules, procedures, and criteria published and provided to all applicants.

The resolution was not adopted by The Regents.

Subsequently, the issue of development considerations in admissions was assigned to the Academic Council for review. In a letter to President Atkinson from Faculty Representative Weiss, she clearly stated that matters relating to anything other than academic achievement, special talents, or life experiences had no place in the admissions process. Regent Connerly reported that, based upon that communication, he had reintroduced the 1996 resolution in order to eliminate political, financial, and other considerations as part of the admissions process. He stated that he had been persuaded that the language contained in the resolution was too restrictive and, as a result, he would offer the following motion:

The Board of Regents affirms the statement of the Academic Senate's Board on Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) approved by the Academic Council on January 14, 1998 which provides in part that "admissions motivated by concern for financial, political or other such benefit to the University do not have a place in the admissions process." The full text of the BOARS statement follows:

BOARS reaffirms the established admissions criteria. These criteria include an applicant's academic achievement, special talents, and life experience. Admissions motivated by concern for financial, political or other such benefit to the University do not have a place in the admissions process. If Chancellors elect to admit students outside of the established criteria, the Academic Senate should be consulted.

The Board of Regents further requires that any Chancellor so electing shall inform the President of the University and the Chairman of the Board.

Regent Connerly explained that, by adopting this policy, all admissions decisions at the University of California would be based upon merit, as befits a public university. He recognized, however, that there may be rare instances when factors may come to the attention of the chancellor that should be taken into consideration. He agreed that some flexibility should be retained in order to allow for the chancellor to be able to make such a decision, subject to consultation with the Academic Senate.

Regent Bagley observed that over the years State support for the University has declined dramatically. Because the State has abdicated its responsibility to provide adequate funding to the University of California, there is a need for the University to raise private funds. He recalled that in July 1995 The Regents had chosen not to follow the advice of the University's administration with respect to affirmative action. He stated his concern that, if the policy being recommended by Regent Connerly went much further, it might encourage the impression that the Regents question the well-honed discretion of the people whom they employ to run the University.

Regent Connerly submitted that the role of the Regents is to set policy. As long as the University receives public funding, it is the responsibility of the Regents to ensure that factors such as political influence are not taken into consideration when admissions decisions are made.

Regent Montoya pointed out that the resolution did not seem to cover admissions to model schools and the like. President Atkinson assured her that the provisions of SP-1 would be applied across the board.

Regent Montoya expressed concern that students might be admitted who do not meet the University's basic admissions criteria. Faculty Representative Weiss reported that the purpose of consultation with the Academic Senate was specifically to ensure that any individual being considered for admission was prepared to succeed academically at the University.

Regent Villaraigosa asked what type of reporting mechanism would be put into place to inform the Regents of how many students had been admitted outside of the established

criteria. President Atkinson assured the Committee that these admissions would be very rare exceptions, perhaps one or two every five to six years. It was his hope that the Regents would be satisfied with the discretion of the President and the Chairman of the Board to monitor this activity. Following a remark of Regent Villaraigosa, General Counsel Holst stated that any such admissions would be matters of public record which could not be considered in closed session.

Regent Villaraigosa observed that there is a perception on the part of the public that development considerations influence admissions decisions on a regular basis. He suggested that it would be appropriate for the Regents to know how many of these exceptions actually occur.

President Atkinson gave an example of an exception that was not related to development considerations: the situation of a handicapped student who required a companion who was not accepted at the campus that the handicapped student wished to attend. The chancellor should have the discretion to admit the companion student without this decision being announced to the public.

Regent Davis supported Regent Villaraigosa's suggestion that the University be accountable to the public with respect to its admissions decisions by implementing a mechanism for reporting to the Regents, and he urged Regent Connerly at a future date to put forward such a proposal.

Regent Espinoza stated his support for the proposal because he believed that financial and political considerations had no place in admissions decisions at a public university. He expressed his confidence that the administration would be vigilant in monitoring the situation, but he also agreed that a reporting mechanism should be put into place.

Chancellor Carnesale referred to Regent Montoya's comment about admissions to entities not covered by the resolution. He explained that the University Elementary School, because it is a research facility, is permitted to have admissions that take students' ethnicity into account. This was determined through a lawsuit to be an appropriate procedure.

In response to a comment by Regent Parsky, Regent Connerly confirmed that the resolution was not intended to alter any present admissions processes. Regent Parsky pointed out that, through adoption of the resolution, The Regents would send the message that the chancellors would be held accountable to the restrictive nature of the resolution. Regent Connerly added that the attempt is also being made to provide the chancellors with some degree of flexibility in admissions while closing the door on political and financial considerations.

Regent Davies pointed out that the chancellor will have to consult with the Academic Senate and advise the President and the Chairman of any admissions decisions that he or she makes. If a concern is raised, the Regents will be so informed.

In response to a question from Regent Connerly regarding legacy admissions, President Atkinson explained that the application form asks whether the applicant's father or mother is a graduate of the University of California. For those out-of-state applicants with a parent who graduated from UC, the requirements for admission are the same as for California residents, while the requirements are more difficult for other applicants from out of state.

Regent Connerly believed that it should be the sense of the resolution that this practice be discontinued.

Regent Bagley pointed out that this suggestion went beyond the resolution as written. General Counsel Holst agreed that the matter would have to be noticed for a future meeting.

(For speaker's comments, see the minutes of the July 16, 1998 meeting of the Committee of the Whole.)

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the resolution and voted to present it to the Board.

The meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary