

The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

May 17, 2001

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

Members present: Regents Atkinson, Bagley, Connerly, Fong, O. Johnson, S. Johnson, Lansing, Montoya, Preuss, and Sayles; Advisory members T. Davis, Morrison, and Seymour

In attendance: Regents Hopkinson, Kohn, Kozberg, Marcus, and Miura, Faculty Representatives Cowan and Viswanathan, Secretary Trivette, General Counsel Holst, Provost King, Senior Vice Presidents Darling and Mullinix, Vice Presidents Broome, Gomes, and Gurtner, Interim Vice President Gómez, Chancellors Berdahl, Bishop, Carnesale, Cicerone, Dynes, Greenwood, Orbach, Tomlinson-Keasey, Vanderhoef, and Yang, and Recording Secretary Nietfeld

The meeting convened at 10:45 a.m. with Committee Chair Montoya presiding.

1. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of March 15, 2001 were approved.

2. **THE NEW STUDENT SERVICES ARCHITECTURE FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

Provost King informed the Committee that he had commissioned a task force to develop a framework for the delivery of student services in the future. This plan would allow campus student service units, administrative operations, and the Office of the President to support the student growth of the University over the next decade. Mr. Winston Doby, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs at the Los Angeles campus, chaired the task force, which was composed of senior managers from several campuses and the Office of the President. The planning team consulted with students, University leaders, student service practitioners, and a number of private sector companies during the course of its discussions.

The task force's report, "Future Vision: Student Services at the University of California," presents a new framework for redesigning and enhancing student services. The report also describes eleven urgent needs and proposes strategies for action on those needs incorporating the new framework as a guide.

Provost King introduced Vice Chancellor Doby, who has served in his position for the past twenty years, and invited him to present his report. President Atkinson commented that Vice Chancellor Doby has a national reputation as a leader in the area of student affairs.

Vice Chancellor Doby prefaced his remarks with a brief excerpt from several hours of a videotape of three focus groups composed of freshmen, upper division, and graduate students who shared their perspectives at a task force retreat. These students described some of the problems and challenges they face and made suggestions as to how student services could be improved.

The task force report is designed to be useful for policy makers and student service providers throughout the system. The report does the following:

- Defines student services and why they are so important in the University.
- Presents a systemwide vision and framework to guide the future delivery of student services.
- Identifies and assesses the key challenges and opportunities facing student service providers.
- Provides examples of best practices and urgent needs.
- Recommends a series of initial steps toward achieving the new vision.

Vice Chancellor Doby focused his remarks on the following three points: the definition of student services and why they are important; the future vision and framework; and the urgent needs.

Definition and Importance of Student Services

Over the course of completing its work, the task force's view of student services expanded considerably to encompass the full range of services offered to students. The task force report defines student services as "any activities, functions, or programs that enable student matriculation and/or support student academic success or personal development, and/or enhance the quality of student life." This definition recognizes the ubiquitous nature of student services, which are wholly independent of campus organizational structure. The definition reflects the broad mission of these services: strengthening student academic growth, promoting civic and social responsibility, ensuring the personal health and well being of students, and fostering a sense of community. The students with whom the task force spoke made it clear that they do not care about who is responsible for a service or how the campus is organized, but they do care about quality, convenience, timely access, low cost, and effectiveness.

Mr. Doby stressed that student services are vital to ensuring student academic success and personal well-being. Student service providers work in close partnership with faculty to facilitate the total development of students and to link their classroom learning to their campus and civic engagements. The commitment to this aspect of student learning and development distinguishes the University of California from other institutions, public or private, and contributes much to its success in producing future leaders. The task force believes that the University's definition of quality should embrace the totality of a student's academic and co-curricular experiences.

A Shared Vision and Framework

In the University of California, student service delivery models have been shaped primarily by the leadership, philosophy, culture, values, and beliefs of individual campuses within the context of systemwide policy guidelines. The task force vision statement and framework are intended as guides to the future delivery of services throughout the system, undergirded by a common set of values that embraces the judicious use of technology to increase efficiency and share best practices.

The key words of the vision statement are seamless, coordinated, efficient, excellent, and continuous improvement. The framework of the student services architecture has the following five dimensions:

- Student centered: focused on the needs of students
- Comprehensive: embracing the full range of services and student needs
- Compatible with the mission and values of a public research university
- Adaptable to changing student needs and to local campus priorities
- Excellent in all dimensions.

The vision statement and framework are intentionally non-prescriptive. Campuses are free to adopt numerous strategies. Some may choose to implement one-stop centers, while others might opt for cross-functional workgroups, cross-training of staff, or shifting to generalist professionals. The goal is a paradigm shift from an organization-focused model to a total student services model.

All campuses have embraced the eight value statements in the report. In providing services to students, organizations must:

- Reaffirm that meaningful human interactions are core to supporting student development;
- Value and promote the diversity of people, ideas, beliefs and perspectives;

- Be responsive and adaptive to the diverse and changing needs of both individual students and groups of students;
- Actively collaborate with students, staff, and faculty to develop, design, deliver, and evaluate student services;
- Assure that staff have appropriate training and skills to provide high-quality student services;
- Base service policies and procedures on sound educational practices and on principles of service excellence;
- Employ and adapt new technologies to deliver services; and
- Promote a seamless network of services across campus through the appropriate blend of human resources and technology.

Vice Chancellor Doby observed that technology is a tool that affects all aspects of student life. In many student services, technology has reduced both the personnel and student time spent on routine administrative tasks, while simultaneously increasing the time for personal interactions with professionals focused on academic and personal development. Throughout the report there are featured examples of “best practices” from each campus, most of which use some form of information technology to facilitate communication with students or to streamline routine transactions. These practices need to be shared more broadly throughout the University, however, as current best efforts are not sufficient to meet future needs.

Urgent Needs

A message from campus service providers was the importance of connecting future planning with present reality. Some services are barely able to keep up with the workload and do not know how they are going to accommodate enrollment increases. By identifying urgent needs, it was the hope of the task force to stimulate appropriate action on the campuses and in the Office of the President to establish priorities and adopt plans for addressing them even as campuses are transforming their service delivery systems. Mr. Doby noted that concrete plans had been established in three areas: admissions application processing, affordable housing, and affordable childcare. Further discussions at a student services planning retreat suggest that three of the remaining eight needs – rebuilding information technology infrastructures, services to students with disabilities, and funding and delivery of financial aid – lend themselves to systemwide planning approaches. The remaining five are more campus specific:

- Bridging the digital divide
- Career planning and placement services for graduates
- Cost-effective delivery of student services during the summer session
- Strengthening health and psychological counseling services
- Student parking.

One need which did not appear on the urgent list but which represents a high priority for students is increased support for academic development and retention.

Vice Chancellor Doby concluded that, in order to achieve the vision outlined in the task force report, campus administrations must be prepared to provide the necessary leadership for change, to support intra- and inter-campus collaborations, to share best practices broadly, to monitor the process using appropriate assessment measures, and to respond to urgent needs. An immediate measure of progress toward achieving the vision will be the extent to which the consensus on concepts reflected in the report emerges in the language of campus and systemwide strategic plans. The task force believes that the use of this framework, coupled with appropriate support, will enable the University to meet the needs of all future students.

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

Regent Montoya asked how the report's findings would affect students enrolled in University programs in Washington, D.C. and abroad. Vice Chancellor Doby stressed that the report was not directed toward any specific programs at any individual campus.

Regent O. Johnson raised the issue of funding, particularly in light of anticipated increases in enrollment, and asked how priorities would be set. Provost King reported that the State budget under consideration by the legislature contains a line item pertaining to the enhancement of student services. This will serve as a model for future funding. Vice Chancellor Doby emphasized the fact that the report is not a budget document. The goal of the task force was to define a future vision for service delivery.

President Atkinson pointed out that the report serves as a framework for the development of student services; funding for specific programs will need to be identified.

Regent Connerly drew attention to the plight of women students at the Berkeley campus who would not be able to secure affordable childcare during the summer. Vice Chancellor Padilla

explained that during the summer the campus is able to keep open only two childcare centers, both of which are connected to research projects. These centers are available primarily to faculty and staff. Student registration fees are used to fund childcare centers for the children of students, and this fee revenue is not available during the summer. Regent Connerly noted the necessity to focus on the twelve-month service needs of students.

President Atkinson reported that the Office of the President had made a major commitment to fund childcare facilities once the University has undergone the transition to year-round operations. The budget before the legislature includes funding for year-round operations at three of the campuses. The President offered to send to the Regents the report of the childcare task force and a letter describing programs that are under way.

Chancellor Berdahl pointed out that the issue depends on the demand for childcare on the part of students. He described the funding situation in some detail and suggested that the issue be raised again at the July meeting.

In response to a question by Regent Marcus, Associate Vice President Galligani reported that each campus guarantees housing for all freshmen who apply. Regent Marcus asked whether the requirement that students live on campus had ever been considered. Mr. Galligani pointed out that the demand for student housing is so high that there would be no need for such a requirement. Regent Marcus stressed the role that on-campus housing plays in enriching a student's college experience.

Provost King was not aware of any public university that requires a student to live on campus, noting that many private universities do have such a requirement.

Vice Chancellor Doby added that a more daunting problem the campuses face is that of providing guaranteed housing to transfer students. The provision of such housing would encourage transfer students to attend a campus away from home.

President Atkinson noted that the University's efforts to expand student access to the Internet will result in improved interaction for students, regardless of location.

In response to Regent O. Johnson's comments regarding funding, Chancellor Orbach pointed out that many student services are funded by students themselves through special fees that they must approve.

Regent Hopkinson observed that University-run childcare facilities provide a more rich educational experience than typical childcare centers do. Chancellor Berdahl agreed, noting that these programs have a favorable ratio of teachers to students. President Atkinson added that the programs vary somewhat, even within a campus, from one facility to another. He stressed that the

quality of the programs leads to their high cost. Regent Hopkinson suggested that, in light of the fact that the University is able to meet only one-half of the childcare needs, consideration might be given to subsidizing payment for off-campus childcare used by students.

Chancellor Carnesale emphasized that the campuses do subsidize the on-campus childcare programs that are provided. Childcare is expensive, in part due to State and federal requirements. The Los Angeles campus is attempting to identify private sources of funding to meet the demands of its faculty, staff, and students. The Office of the President has established a matching program to encourage donors to provide capital funding.

Faculty Representative Cowan commented that the faculty understand that a student's education takes place both inside and outside of the classroom. The well being of a student has a profound effect on what the student is able to accomplish. He pointed out that there was no faculty representation on the student services task force. This fact appears to be symptomatic of the way in which student services tend to operate. He suggested that, as campuses move to implement the proposals contained in the task force report, attention be given to how faculty can be involved. In particular, the faculty will be able to assess if the student services are effective. He observed that civility is an important part of academic life which is not being taught as well as it could be. The faculty should be encouraged to play a role in the discourse on services provided to students.

Regent Fong pointed out that many student services are performed by students themselves on a voluntary basis. He suggested that these services could provide some interesting models for the administration to consider.

Regent Connerly presented his observations about the Board's action to rescind SP-1, policy ensuring equal treatment in admissions, which The Regents adopted in 1995. He believed that SP-1 had had positive results for the University. The achievement gap among students will not disappear through the rescission of this policy. Regent Connerly suggested that the elimination of affirmative action had provided a sense of urgency which could be lost, even though the educational disparities will continue to exist. He reported a sense of pride among some underrepresented students who appreciate the fact that they were selected based solely upon merit. This should be the model to encourage other Black and Hispanic students to succeed. There should be no impression that underrepresented students who are admitted in the future are admitted due to their race.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

Attest:

Secretary

