

The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

July 18, 2001

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

Members present: Regents Atkinson, Bagley, Connerly, Davies, T. Davis, O. Johnson, S. Johnson, Lansing, Marcus, Montoya, and Sayles; Advisory member Sainick

In attendance: Regents Hopkinson, Kozberg, Lee, Moores, Morrison, Parsky, Preuss, and Seymour, Faculty Representatives Cowan and Viswanathan, Secretary Trivette, General Counsel Holst, Treasurer Russ, Provost King, Senior Vice Presidents Darling and Mullinix, Vice Presidents Broome, Drake, Gómez, Gurtner, and Hershman, Chancellors Berdahl, Carnesale, Cicerone, Dynes, Greenwood, Orbach, Tomlinson-Keasey, Vanderhoef, and Yang, Vice Chancellor Bainton representing Chancellor Bishop, Laboratory Director Browne, and Recording Secretary Nietfeld

The meeting convened at 9:07 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 May 17, 2001 were approved.

2. **TRANSFER PATH FROM THE CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES-BACKGROUND, STATUS, CHALLENGES, AND ENHANCEMENTS**

Provost King recalled that transfer from the California Community Colleges to the University of California at the junior level is a fundamental tenet of the Master Plan for Higher Education, which sets as a goal a ratio of 60:40 for upper division to lower division enrollment at the University of California. Under the Master Plan as enacted in 1960, the top 12.5 percent of California high school graduates would be eligible to enroll at the University of California through direct freshman admission, while the top one-third would be eligible to attend a state college. Transfer from a community college to the University of California required a 2.4 grade point average (GPA), and transfer to a state college required a 2.0 GPA.

The transfer path to UC affords a route to access for students for whom financial need and limited mobility make it desirable to complete lower division work closer to home. It also affords a valuable second-chance route for students whose educational circumstances did not enable them to be UC-eligible at the time of completing high school.

Provost King presented the requirements that are necessary for eligibility as a transfer student, noting that when these requirements are met, the student is guaranteed a place somewhere in the UC system. The course requirements include English composition, mathematical concepts, and physical and biological sciences; a minimum GPA of 2.4 must be attained in 60 transferable units. Provost King noted that in the 1970s the University experimented with reducing the GPA requirement to 2.0, but this was judged by the faculty to be too low. He explained that not all campuses are able to accommodate all eligible transfer students who apply. In that case, students go through an admissions process similar to that for freshman admissions. At least one campus is kept open for all eligible transfer students.

In order to hold the 60:40 proportionality, transfer admissions should increase in rough proportion to freshman admissions. Recognizing this goal, in 1997 President Atkinson and Community Colleges Chancellor Nussbaum signed a memorandum of understanding that was further modified by the University's budgetary partnership agreement with Governor Davis in July 2000. Through these agreements, the University has pledged to increase by 50 percent the number of community college students that transfer to UC, from 10,150 in 1998-99 to 15,300 by academic year 2005-06. Transfer enrollments remained relatively flat from 1992 to 1999 but increased by 6.6 percent for fall 2000 and are projected to grow by another 11.5 percent for 2001.

Provost King presented a series of slides giving various data pertaining to transfer students. He traced the growth rate of transfer enrollment since 1980 and the projected growth through 2004. The gap between the ten-year projected growth and the growth required by the partnership should be filled by the dual admissions program, which is expected to attract between 2,000 and 3,500 students per year. He presented data on transfer students by age, parental income, parental education, parental occupation, and ethnicity. A further slide illustrated the fact that the academic majors at UC graduation of transfers and students entering as freshmen are fairly parallel, particularly for engineering and physical and life sciences. The mean GPA for students transferring from a community college was 3.27 in 1999-2000. Provost King noted that up to six percent of transfer students can be admitted with a GPA of less than 2.4. Transfer students tend to have a slightly lower GPA upon graduation from a UC campus. With respect to graduation rates, Provost King reported that 76 percent of entering freshmen graduate within six years; the same percentage of entering transfer students graduate within four years after transfer. Eighty-nine percent of freshmen who reach the junior level graduate within four years after reaching junior status. Students who enter as transfers tend to require on average an additional quarter to graduate.

Provost King turned to the issues and challenges facing the transfer path in 2001, the first being to meet the partnership goal and to ensure a ratio of at least 60:40 of upper division to lower division enrollment. A second issue is the articulation of courses and majors. The community colleges will need to offer courses which will meet the University's transfer requirements. A third challenge is clarity of communication with potential transfer students. There is a need to develop communication mechanisms to reach out to community college

students. A final issue is the uneven transfer performance among the community colleges. Provost King reported transfer data for fall 1998 which showed that only seven colleges produce transfer students in the 200 to 500 range. Each of these seven colleges is located in a community close to a UC campus. At the bottom of the scale, some 30 colleges yielded between zero to 20 students.

Provost King outlined the following five-point strategic plan for addressing the issues he had raised:

Counselor Initiatives: The University intends to have at least one counselor for three community colleges. Originally in the University's budget for 2001-02, funding for these positions is now included in separate legislation. The University will enhance its counselor conferences designed for community-college based counselors. The primary goal of the counselor initiatives will be to enable the community college counselors to provide consistent and correct advice to potential transfer students.

Joint Strategy and Infrastructure with the Community Colleges: An MOU Implementation Committee has been working on ways to implement the memorandum of understanding signed by President Atkinson and Chancellor Nussbaum. Northern and southern task forces are addressing the topic of "reinventing transfer." In addition, curricular interactions between UC and community college faculty will be enhanced. Finally, ASSIST (*Articulation System Stimulating Interinstitutional Student Transfer*) is a web-based program that provides information on articulation agreements between the community colleges, UC, and the California State University system.

Clear Path of Financial Aid: The primary goal is to provide a coordinated, four-year financing program so that a student entering a community college will have a financial aid package in place.

Enhance Articulation: There are a number of efforts in place to address the issue of improved articulation, including a program designed to coordinate approved courses for particular majors.

Dual Admissions Program: The proposed dual admissions program will provide a new path by guaranteeing UC admission to high school graduates who complete their lower-division course work at a community college.

Committee Chair Montoya raised the issues of financial aid for entering UC freshmen and existing articulation agreements between UC campuses and the community colleges. Provost King recalled that the University has a goal of providing four years of financial aid to all eligible students. The intention is to link the first two years at a community college into the financial aid program. With regard to campus transfer agreements, he noted that each is specific to the campus and the community college. Each campus specifies a level of academic performance for admission to a particular major.

In response to a question from Regent Hopkinson, Provost King reported that approximately one-third of the students who graduate from the University of California had entered as transfer students.

Regent Lee observed that the size of California's community colleges varies greatly from campus to campus. He asked that the administration provide data on the percentage of students from each community college who transfer to the University of California.

Regent Davies asked for more information on the graduation rates of students who enter the University as freshmen and as transfers. Provost King reported that 36 percent of freshmen graduate in four years, with the average length to degree being four years plus one quarter. Twenty-eight percent of transfer students graduate within two years of entering the University. Forty-four percent of the juniors who entered as freshmen graduate two years after achieving junior status, while the figure is 29 percent for transfer students. By the end of six years, the graduation rate is basically equivalent for students who entered as freshmen and as transfers.

Regent Lansing observed that many transfer students have jobs and thus are not able to enroll in a full course load. Provost King added that the University of California is a challenging institution that often results in a period of adjustment for students. For entering freshmen, this adjustment occurs in the lower division, while transfer students face it as upper division students. This factor also contributes to the length of time to degree.

Regent Davies asked whether or not the Board on Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) had considered reviewing the 2.4 GPA threshold for transfer, noting that this grade point average represents something different than it did when the Master Plan was adopted. Professor Dorothy Perry, the chair of BOARS, reported that several years ago BOARS had reviewed data pertaining to the performance of transfer students and felt comfortable with retaining the 2.4 GPA requirement.

Regent Davies asked for more information on why the faculty had determined that a 2.0 GPA requirement was too low. Associate Vice President Galligani agreed to provide that information.

Regent Connerly recalled that in 1998 the Office of the President had prepared a simulation model in response to a proposed constitutional amendment by Senator Hughes that would have required the University to admit the top 12.5 percent of students from every California public high school. The model found that "...redefining the eligibility pool to include the top 12.5 percent of each school would, in short, produce a bifurcated eligibility pool with severe academic disparities along racial and ethnic lines." The model showed a strong relationship between academic index scores and UC graduation rates. Regent Connerly continued that the model discussed another problem with the Hughes proposal, its negative impact on high feeder schools. Regent Connerly asked for an explanation of the administration's current position as compared with the opinions expressed in response to the Hughes proposal.

President Atkinson stated that he would be prepared to address the issues raised by Regent Connerly in the context of the proposed dual admissions program.

Regent S. Johnson recalled that the Master Plan had created the transfer path to the University as a safety net for students who did not perform well in high school. She observed, however, that the transfer function had proved to be less than successful. She was encouraged by articulation agreements that would provide improved ways to transfer to UC and to CSU from the community colleges.

In response to Regent Johnson's comments, Faculty Representative Cowan noted that a variety of programs are leading to greater articulation, the first being Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC), in which UC and CSU campuses specify the general education requirements that must be met at the community college level. The Intersegmental Major Articulation Project (IMPAC) is in process. The intention of IMPAC is to ensure that a student's lower division course work will meet the lower division prerequisite requirements of a particular major at a particular campus. IMPAC involves bringing together faculty in a discipline from UC campuses, CSU, and the community college departments that offer the curricula in order to help the community colleges develop the curricula which will meet these requirements.

Regent Morrison asked for information on the freshmen who meet the University's eligibility criteria but choose to begin their education in a community college setting. Provost King reported that while such data were not available, the best guess is that they represent between 15 and 20 percent of eligible students. President Atkinson observed that the State should have a database that would permit such questions to be answered accurately.

Regent Lansing shared Regent Davies' concern about the 2.4 GPA requirement, which she also believed was too low. Provost King noted that BOARS models the performance of entering freshmen and transfer students to ensure that they perform at a similar level. Professor Perry continued that eight years ago BOARS determined that the 2.4 GPA requirement was appropriate. Most transfer students enter the University with a higher GPA. She stated her willingness to have BOARS revisit the issue. Regent Lansing stressed that the transfer path to the University should be competitive.

President Atkinson observed that 80 percent of transfer students have a grade point average of 2.9 or better. He agreed with the necessity for transfer students to be well prepared for University work.

Regent T. Davis pointed out that one should not compare a high school GPA with a college GPA. She also observed that the data presented to the Regents had been averaged for all campuses, while some are more competitive than others in their transfer admissions.

Regent O. Johnson continued that the general education requirements at a California community college are equivalent to those at the University of California. Students enrolled in these courses have demonstrated their ability to compete in an academic environment.

President Atkinson believed it was important to recognize that the concept of the community college was invented by the University of California. At the turn of the century, President Wheeler understood that the University could not serve the entire state. As a result, legislation was enacted to establish the community colleges. The President recalled that numerous Nobel Laureates had begun their education at a community college.

3. **DUAL ADMISSIONS PROGRAM**

The President recommended the approval of the Dual Admissions Proposal, as approved by the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools and adopted by the Assembly of the Academic Senate on May 23, 2001, as follows:

Effective for students applying to the University for Fall 2003, the Dual Admissions Program (DAP) would become an additional path to the University of California, over and above the means that currently exist, which would guarantee UC admission to specified high school graduates following completion of lower-division requirements at a California Community College. DAP would identify high school graduates within the top 12.5 percent in each school who are not UC-eligible for freshman admission (i.e., students who are not UC-eligible using Statewide criteria and who are not in the top four percent of their high school class), but who wish to attend a UC campus following completion of lower-division work at a California Community College.

It was recalled that the Standing Orders of The Regents provide that the Academic Senate establishes the conditions for admission, subject to the approval of the Board of Regents. The Academic Senate's Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools, after consultation with California high schools and community colleges and UC campuses, has proposed a new path for admission to the University. The new path has been extensively scrutinized and is supported by the faculty.

Professor Dorothy Perry, chair of BOARS, presented the proposed dual admissions program. She reported that, in addition to faculty review, the proposal had been endorsed by 80 percent of the high schools and community colleges in the state. DAP is primarily a support structure and motivational program that is necessary for UC to live up to its commitment under California's Master Plan for Higher Education. Providing a clear path, encouraging earlier entry to a strong academic program, and providing consistent counseling should result in a flow of capable and well-prepared transfer students. These students would be selected from the top 12.5 percent of their high school class using academic criteria approved by the faculty. They will have taken a higher proportion of UC's college preparatory courses in high school than traditional transfer students and will receive

guidance in selecting a UC-approved set of courses at a community college. Through increased collaboration between the University and the community colleges, these students will receive academic counseling from UC counselors at the community college to enhance the probability that they will meet the requirements necessary to transfer to a UC campus in their junior year. While in the community college, these students will be required to meet the course and scholarship requirements for their intended major at a UC campus.

To qualify for admission to the University through DAP, students would be identified through an analysis of transcripts from the state's high schools. Students determined to be in the top 4 percent to 12.5 percent of their high school class, and otherwise qualified for DAP, would be notified at the beginning of their senior year. In order to qualify for the pool from which DAP students will be selected, individuals are required to have completed at least nine of the fifteen academic units that the University requires for freshman admission. Students chosen for DAP would be encouraged to complete as many of the (a)-(g) subjects as is feasible during their senior year. These students could then apply for admission to UC and receive a dual admission offer guaranteeing acceptance to a UC campus, contingent upon their satisfactory completion at a community college of UC campus- and major-specific course requirements and achievement of a prescribed level of academic performance.

Professor Perry observed that, when the dual admissions program is implemented, students will have four paths from high school to the University. Students who attain statewide eligibility are guaranteed freshman admission within the UC system. The second path, Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC), identifies those students who are in the top four percent of their high school class. They too are guaranteed admission within the system. The ELC program has received strong support from the public and from the high schools. Early evidence demonstrates that this program has enabled the University to reach out to high schools around the state that have not traditionally sent their graduates to the University in the past. The third path, through the traditional transfer process, attracts more than 10,000 students per year. The intention of the dual admissions program is to open the door of the University more widely to California students.

DAP is designed to help the University meet its historic obligations to the Master Plan by defining more explicitly a sequenced transfer path with appropriate student supports, thereby enhancing access to the University for all qualified students who enroll at a California community college. DAP will improve preparation of potential transfers to the University through early identification and systematic advising and monitoring of qualified students.

The policy tenets of the dual admissions program are as follows:

- Every UC campus would participate in DAP, and every campus would admit DAP students. DAP students will be guaranteed admission to a specific UC campus. Those applicants not selected by any campus would be placed in a referral pool, which would guarantee them a place at a campus. This referral pool process would

be similar to the one provided for eligible California freshmen and transfer applicants.

- DAP students would not displace current transfer or freshman admitted students. They would represent an increase in transfer enrollment consistent with UC's long-range enrollment plan and established transfer goals.
- Because DAP is intended to supplement existing eligibility paths, only students who graduate in the top 4 percent to 12.5 percent of their high school class and who are ineligible for admission via existing freshman eligibility criteria would qualify for the program.
- The DAP path would not afford transfer eligibility to students who could not have achieved it otherwise; that is, they must meet the same course requirements and community college performance standards that have been in place with only minor modifications since 1961.
- DAP would not supplant transfer partnership programs that UC campuses currently have with community college campuses.

Estimated Characteristics of the Dual Admissions Pool

Professor Perry reported that BOARS believes that 1,500 to 3,500 additional transfer students will be accommodated by the academic year 2005-06. Data indicate that over half of the students in the DAP pool will report parental income of \$35,000 per year or less. By comparison, 36 percent of current UC transfers and 29 percent of current UC freshmen report annual family incomes below \$35,000. If the success of the ELC program is an indication, the dual admissions program will increase rural student representation. It is estimated that 22 percent of students in the DAP pool will come from rural schools, 39 percent from urban schools, and 39 percent from suburban schools. By comparison, only 12 percent of students in UC's existing freshman eligibility pool are from rural schools, while 41 percent are from urban schools, and 47 percent from suburban schools. The community colleges in general enroll a higher percentage of underrepresented minority students than either the freshman population or the transfer student population. It is estimated that about 40 percent of the pool eligible for DAP will be white, 29 percent Chicano/Latino, 18 percent Asian American, 6 percent African American, and 1 percent American Indian, with other or unknown race/ethnicity accounting for 6 percent.

Professor Perry reported that the Academic Senate is concerned that students admitted through the dual admissions program have the academic tools they will need to succeed when they transfer to the University of California. Each student will have a contract or agreement with the UC campus to which the student has been admitted, along with course and grade point expectations. It will be necessary for the University to collaborate with the

community colleges to prepare students for UC majors. One idea under consideration is the implementation of web-based courses for community college students.

Professor Perry reported that BOARS had consulted extensively with community college faculty on the proposal in order to address their concerns as well as gain their support. In April, the Academic Senate of the community college system endorsed the concept of the dual admissions program by an overwhelming majority. The faculty anticipate that the program will provide an opportunity to further their collaborations with UC faculty. In order to prepare DAP students to perform competitively at UC, BOARS has proposed to the administration a network of student support services to create a dynamic relationship between the students and the University of California. As the program matures, these services should become available to all students interested in transferring to UC. Eligible DAP students will receive a four-year financial aid package, and University faculty will track their academic progress in order to help them achieve their goals at the University.

Regent T. Davis questioned why there was a need for an additional transfer path. She observed that certain campuses already meet their transfer goals. She asked how campuses such as UCLA would be able to accommodate DAP students who wish to attend.

Provost King noted that the present transfer program will not provide sufficient students to meet the University's goals under the partnership. The issue should be taken in the context of Tidal Wave II, which will produce a significant increase in undergraduate enrollments over the coming decade. The faculty believe that the transfer function must be strengthened in order to accommodate these additional students.

Regent T. Davis noted that the campuses that are projected to have the most growth may not be the most popular campuses for transfer students due to these students' geographic immobility. President Atkinson urged the Regents to see the DAP admissions process as similar to that for freshmen admissions. No eligible student is guaranteed a space at the campus of his or her first choice. Each campus will accept a certain number of dual admissions students.

Regent Bagley asked why a flagship campus would admit a student through this program whom they would not otherwise admit. Professor Perry stressed that all campuses accept transfer students. Each of the campuses will be required to select dual admissions participants from students who meet certain academic criteria in order for the University to meet its goal of increasing the transfer function.

Regent Lansing asked whether a student who is accepted at the Berkeley campus would be able to enroll at another campus as a result of programmatic considerations. President Atkinson confirmed that this student would be free to apply to another campus as a transfer student. Professor Perry continued that BOARS had recognized that students change their majors. The student support structures that are put into place will assist in more effective communication between students and the campus to which they have been accepted.

Regent Preuss observed that the University's goal of educating all eligible students assumes the ability to accommodate the growing demand. He acknowledged that the proposal would facilitate a new path to UC eligibility, particularly from underserved areas of the state, but he wondered whether or not the University would truly have the capacity to serve these students. Tidal Wave II anticipates a growth of 43 percent in the undergraduate student body over the next ten years. The ELC program has produced spectacular results. Regent Preuss pointed out that the University is behind schedule in its efforts to hire new faculty and to attract sufficient numbers of graduate students. He stated his personal lack of confidence that the University will have sufficient resources for the students who have already been admitted. The Regents are appointed to 12-year terms in order to enable them to serve as the guardians of the long-term future of the University. Regent Preuss feared that the Regents would either be forced to deny access to eligible students or would need to increase the student-to-faculty ratio. The DAP proposal could result in an additional 5,000 students by the year 2010, which translates into the capacity for the Merced campus at that time. He believed that a much stronger commitment from the legislature was required in light of Tidal Wave II before he would be willing to support an increase in the University's applicant pool.

Regent Hopkinson noted that at present one-third of students graduating from the University of California have transferred from a community college. She believed that the proposed dual admissions program would provide a way to meet the objective of the Master Plan to admit the top 12.5 percent of graduating high school seniors. DAP will provide an additional support structure to enable qualified students to be successful at the University, which she believed to be an important obligation. Regent Hopkinson asked how many students BOARS anticipated would participate in the first year. Professor Perry estimated that the program could attract 1,000 students in the first year.

Regent Hopkinson then raised the issue of the students in the top four percent of their graduating class who would not be eligible to participate in DAP. She believed the students in this group who choose to attend a community college could also benefit from the student services and financial aid that will be afforded to students who participate in the dual admissions program. She suggested that some students may consciously choose not to be in the top four percent in order to obtain these benefits, which include admission to a UC campus.

Professor Perry acknowledged that students in the top four percent who attend a community college should have support services available to them. She believed that BOARS should consider how to adjust the program in order to take account of these students. The faculty did not include them in the dual admissions program because they felt that the opportunity to attend UC as a freshman was the preferred option.

Regent Hopkinson shared the concerns raised by Regent Preuss about the University's ability to accommodate the demands of Tidal Wave II. She did not believe that DAP students would represent a financial burden as they are part of the group of students the

University has already included in its long-range plans. She stressed the need for the Regents to focus on how the University will respond to Tidal Wave II on both a financial and physical basis. She spoke of the need for a cooperative spirit of expectations with the legislature.

Regent Connerly observed that, while he was a strong proponent of the transfer path to the University, he was not able to support the President's recommendation as presented. He suggested that it would be prudent, before adopting any new proposals, to take account of the changes that have already been made in the University's admissions policies and to determine what effects they have had on the quality of the student body. In addition to adoption of the ELC program, the Regents have acquiesced to the change in the weighting of the SAT II examinations in the academic index. He suggested the need to revisit this policy. The Regents also rescinded its policy on equal opportunity in admissions. Regent Connerly believed that many of the University's admissions officers were confused and demoralized by the many changes that had been implemented in recent years. He shared Regent Preuss' concerns about the availability of adequate resources, particularly in light of the fact that the University is being asked to share a greater responsibility for correcting the defects of K-12 education. Regent Connerly stated that he would be prepared to support the proposal if it were demonstrated that adequate funding would be provided.

Regent Lee agreed with the view of Regent Connerly that financial support for the program should be demonstrated before The Regents vote to approve it. He expressed concern about the ongoing quality of the University.

In response to a question from Regent Davies regarding the academic requirements of the dual admissions program, Professor Perry explained that each student would enter into an agreement with the department of the major to which he or she wishes to transfer. The faculty in the department determine the qualifications for all transfer students, which would have to be met by the DAP students. Some majors require a grade point average as high as 3.8. Students must achieve a minimum grade of 2.0 in each transfer course.

Regent Davies saw the dual admissions program as an excellent way to meet the University's transfer commitment in the Master Plan, but he remained concerned about the minimum GPA required for the transfer of dual admissions students. The University will commit to admit these students before they have had a chance to perform at a community college. Regent Davies believed that, if the University is willing to offer special services to these students, it should demand a higher level of performance. He stated that he would be unable to support the proposal as it stands.

President Atkinson expressed agreement with Regent Davies' remarks, acknowledging the need for BOARS to study the issue further. He did not believe, however, that implementation of the program should be deferred.

Regent Davies did not see any reason to exclude students in the top four percent of their high school class from eligibility for the dual admissions program. Professor Perry reported that the issue had been debated extensively by BOARS. The dual admissions program was viewed by the faculty as an opportunity to provide an eligibility path separate from eligibility in the local context. She observed that there would be an opportunity over the coming years to modify the program as necessary.

Regent Hopkinson asked that BOARS look at the students in the top four percent who choose not to attend UC, in addition to evaluating the progress of students who are admitted as eligible in the local context. Professor Perry stated BOARS' commitment to carrying out these evaluations. She noted that any changes in the program would require consultation with the campuses following BOARS' evaluation of pertinent data. All faculty would need to be engaged.

Regent Kozberg noted that the dual admissions program will put a human infrastructure into the community colleges in the form of University counselors. She was concerned that funding for these counselor positions was part of the legislative process rather than the University's budget. Regent Kozberg agreed that important issues had been raised by the Regents, and she requested numeric modeling on the impact of the four percent program and the individual contracts with the community colleges in connection with planning for Tidal Wave II.

Regent O. Johnson stated that, while she supported the proposal, she concurred with Regent Davies' concerns about the minimum grade point average requirement. She believed that an important element of the dual admissions program would be the support services that the University will provide to community college students, which should motivate them to attend UC. In addition, poor advising has often led to students' failure to take the courses required for transfer. The University-paid counselors should lead to better advising and improve the visibility of the University through an ongoing relationship with the community colleges. Many talented community college students had chosen to attend a California State University campus due to CSU's closer relationship with community college campuses. Regent O. Johnson referred to the fact that the community college system does not have a common numbering system for its courses and asked how the University would determine which of these courses satisfied the requirements for the major.

Faculty Representative Cowan responded that the goal of IMPAC is to conform courses to the Course Articulation Number (CAN) system. The faculty from the three segments of higher education must first agree on what competencies are required before a course can be accepted. He reported that approximately 6,000 courses had been accepted into CAN.

Regent Marcus spoke in favor of the proposal as another path for students to the University of California. He believed that the grade point average issue should not be deliberated in the context of dual admissions but rather the transfer program as a whole. He urged the

Regents to support DAP to demonstrate their commitment to providing certainty and goal setting for qualified students.

Regent Morrison noted that the purpose of the dual admissions program will be to allow a student who is not adequately prepared upon graduation to attend the University to transfer to a specific UC campus. On the other hand, students who are eligible at the time of graduation and who decide to attend a community college for personal and financial reasons must go through an application process, with no such commitment of acceptance. Professor Perry pointed out that such eligible students could be included in a campus-specific transfer agreement program. She expressed concern that the support structure would not immediately be of assistance to these students. Regent Morrison believed that more support should be devoted to these higher-achieving students. Provost King reported that the University's counselors at the community colleges would be available to all potential transfer students.

Regent S. Johnson suggested that the dual admissions proposal raises the issue of access versus excellence. She believed that the Regents had moved forward rapidly with respect to access, citing the three, and potentially four paths to eligibility. Regent Johnson noted her support for the transfer program, but she was worried that the dual admissions program would duplicate that program. She recalled her strong support for the ELC proposal, which has attracted a large number of students, including underrepresented minority students. She believed that the dual admissions program, by focusing on students who are not in the top four percent, would violate the Master Plan by recruiting students who are in the CSU cohort. She suggested that, for the reasons articulated by Regent Preuss, the University would face a significant challenge in trying to accommodate these additional students, particularly in uncertain fiscal times. Regent Johnson agreed with Regent Connerly's assessment that the Regents should be given the opportunity to evaluate the new policies that are in place.

Regent Bagley believed that an important function of the dual admissions program was to provide motivation to students who need support in order to matriculate at the University of California. He believed that the Regents should be willing to take a risk, in light of uncertain financial times, in order to implement the program. Regent Bagley moved approval of the President's recommendation, conditioned upon reconsideration of the minimum grade point average and other issues which had been raised by the Regents. The motion was duly seconded.

Regent Lansing believed that the Regents shared the goal of increasing the transfer function. At present the University is not meeting its transfer commitment as defined in the Master Plan. She outlined the three issues of concern: the minimum grade point average, the students who are in the top four percent of their high school class and therefore not eligible for DAP, and uncertain funding sources. She was concerned that failure to approve the President's recommendation would send the wrong message to the community colleges

regarding its commitment to transfer students. Regent Lansing supported the recommendation as amended by Regent Bagley.

President Atkinson noted that BOARS had examined the matter of the top four percent of students at great length before making its proposal; however, he endorsed the idea of asking the faculty to reexamine this issue. The President was in accord with the concerns raised by Regent Preuss; adequate funding will be critical to maintain the quality of the institution. He asked the Regents to adopt the recommendation, with the condition that the faculty would examine the issues that had been raised and report back within the coming year.

At the request of Regent Sayles, Professor Perry described the dual admissions process for a student who wished to transfer to the Berkeley campus. The student would apply to the campus and be selected, at which time the student would enter into a contract to meet the transfer requirements for the major, including courses and grade point average. She confirmed for Regent Sayles that the student could be required to maintain a grade point average that was significantly higher than 2.4. Regent Sayles observed that DAP students would be highly motivated to retain their eligibility.

In response to a comment by Regent Connerly, President Atkinson estimated that the program would need \$2.5 million in funding. He pointed out that the program could not be implemented without this funding.

Regent Moores pointed out that the University accepts the top transfer students and yet they tend to graduate at a lower rate. He suggested that students who enter through DAP may be less qualified. Professor Perry explained that the faculty believe that the dual admissions program will offer an opportunity for high-achieving students in the local context to demonstrate that they can meet the transfer requirements outlined in their contract with a University campus. If they do not meet these requirements, they will be free to compete within the regular transfer program.

President Atkinson observed that the administration would carefully examine the program as it is implemented over the coming years.

Regent Moores believed it would be a significant issue if DAP students take longer to graduate than regular transfer students. Provost King stressed that the entrance requirements for these students are unchanged from those for the current transfer program. DAP will provide structure and motivation.

President Atkinson recalled that he had been stunned by the letters he had received when the University implemented the eligibility in the local context program from students who otherwise would have not been qualified to attend UC. He believed that the dual admissions program was a natural expansion to the students at each high school who are in the top 12.5 percent of their class.

Regent Moores asked why the Master Plan did not contemplate a transfer path from the California State University to the University of California, as CSU students should be more highly qualified than their community college counterparts. Provost King explained that the Master Plan specifies that the transfer route should be from a two-year to a four-year institution. The University does not discourage transfer from a CSU campus, and a few hundred students do transfer each year.

In response to Regent Moores' comments, Regent Hopkinson pointed out that students who enter through the dual admissions program should be better prepared than regular transfer students and thus should graduate in a timely fashion.

Regent Marcus expressed concern that President Atkinson would not implement the program without the proper resources. He believed that clarity and motivation, even without counselors, would represent a step forward. The President did not believe that the program would be successful if counselors were not available to the DAP students. The faculty do not believe that the program should be implemented without support from the legislature.

Chancellor Orbach pointed out that the dual admissions program is an integral part of the campuses' ability to meet their planned enrollment growth to 2010. On the issue of quality, he noted that current transfer students, who are drawn from the entire student body, have a high rate of success. The dual admissions program will focus on students who are in the top 12.5 percent and thereby improve the quality of transfer students to the University. He stressed that many majors require a much higher grade point average than 2.4 for admission.

Regent Sayles recalled that, according to the data presented by Provost King, at present only 15 percent of entering transfer students have a GPA of 2.4-2.9.

Regent Connerly referred to the issue he had raised during the discussion of the transfer program. According to simulation modeling done by the Office of the President in 1998, some students in the top 12.5 percent of their high schools have tremendous academic shortcomings. He believed that it would cost more than \$2.5 million to prepare these students to succeed. Regent Connerly suggested that more data should be provided before the Regents adopt the proposal.

Provost King noted that between 9,000 and 10,000 students are in the top 4 to 12.5 percent of California's high schools. The selection process will narrow this pool to approximately 3,000 students who are willing to take the required courses in high school and to meet the course and GPA requirements for the major. Motivated students will have the opportunity to correct their academic deficiencies at a community college prior to transfer to the University. He confirmed for Regent Connerly that it was possible for a student with a 2.4 GPA to transfer. Regent Connerly agreed with the need to be responsive to grade inflation.

Regent Lee continued to be concerned about the educational quality of the students who are admitted through DAP. Professor Perry stressed that the program should be seen as an opportunity for students to perform well at a community college while receiving support and encouragement from the University. Regent Lee noted that the costs associated with additional students include money to hire new faculty and provide them with office space.

In response to a question from Regent Seymour, Chancellor Orbach explained that each campus has an enrollment plan that makes certain assumptions about the transfer program. It is hoped that the plan will help to meet these enrollment goals. Vice President Hershman added that the enrollment plan is based upon the partnership agreement with the Governor, which assumes that there will be growth through 2010.

Chancellor Carnesale pointed out that there is no major at either the Berkeley or Los Angeles campus that would accept a transfer student with a 2.4 grade point average. In addition, several campuses will have no difficulty in meeting the enrollment targets which will be necessitated by Tidal Wave II. He believed that the dual admissions program would result in the enrollment of some students who otherwise would not have been eligible, some of whom will displace other qualified applicants from the community colleges. While he supported the proposal, the Chancellor noted that the UC system is not homogeneous; the situation will vary from campus to campus. UCLA, for example, only accepts 39 percent of the transfer students who apply. DAP should have more benefits for those campuses with room to grow.

Regent Seymour spoke to the contract which a DAP student will be asked to sign. This contract will specify the student's major, the course requirements, and the required GPA. Regent Davies continued to question why the minimum GPA should be 2.4. Regent Seymour stressed that the 2.4 minimum GPA was not relevant to the dual admissions program because DAP will be highly selective. Provost King confirmed that the 2.4 GPA, as specified by the Master Plan, assures a transfer student of eligibility somewhere in the UC system.

In response to a further question from Regent Seymour, Provost King reported that the estimated \$2.5 million cost for the program will primarily fund one University counselor per three community college campuses.

Regent Seymour stressed that the details of the program would have to be made clear to prospective transfer students.

Regent-designate Sainick saw the dual admissions program as a new path of opportunity for students who were the most likely not to attend UC. He reiterated that these students must perform according to an agreement with a specific campus.

Regent T. Davis believed that the program would create hope and motivation for high-quality students who otherwise might not succeed.

Faculty Representative Cowan reported that each issue raised by the Regents had also been raised by the faculty. After considerable deliberation, the vast majority of the faculty has decided to support the proposal. The top priority for the faculty is to maintain the quality of the University of California. The selection process is designed to improve its reliability in order to attract the students whom the faculty want. The concern about the minimum GPA is shared by many faculty members and will need to be readdressed as part of the larger consideration of the transfer program. Professor Cowan suggested that approval of the dual admissions program would be seen as endorsement by the Regents of the faculty's careful deliberations. The program should be adopted with the understanding that it will require ongoing monitoring and refinement in order to improve it. He observed that the focus had been on the important role that the counselors play at the community college. Equal attention should be given to the faculty who teach academic courses at these campuses. They support the program because it will support them in preparing a larger proportion of students capable of going on to a four-year institution. The dual admissions program will provide these faculty members with a support structure that will help to make them more effective. Professor Cowan suggested the need to set out a list of priorities if the full \$2.5 million is not appropriated.

Regent S. Johnson believed that the program should not be implemented until full funding is in place. Professor Cowan felt that a phasing of the funding might be strategically useful as the administration moves toward putting a structure into place. The faculty are comfortable with the President's commitment not to implement the program until there is sufficient funding to ensure that the program will work. Regent S. Johnson saw the need for a minimum of \$2.5 million.

Regent Parsky was of the opinion that the dual admissions program would have no negative impact on the quality of the student body. He believed that an important question to be considered was what expectations the University would create by the adoption of the program in terms of increasing the transfer rate. A second question is whether or not the University will have sufficient resources to meet those expectations. He supported implementation of the program as long as resources are provided that have not been withheld from other programs.

Regent Bagley moved the previous question, and his motion was duly seconded. Secretary Trivette stated the amendment as follows:

This recommendation is adopted with the understanding that, in implementing the proposal, the administration ask that the faculty carefully examine the issues of minimum grade point average requirement, implications for those 4 percent of students eligible in the local context, and resources available for the program's support, and that the President recommend to The Regents any appropriate adjustments as needed.

The Committee approved the President's recommendation, as amended, and voted to present it to the Board, Regents Atkinson, Bagley, Connerly, Davies, T. Davis, O. Johnson, Lansing, Marcus, Montoya, and Sayles voting "aye" (10), and Regent S. Johnson voting "no"(1).

4. **AUTHORIZATION FOR FORMATION UNDER MEXICAN LAW OF CASA DE CALIFORNIA EN MEXICO AS CENTER FOR UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACTIVITIES IN MEXICO**

The President recommended that:

- A. The President, after consultation with the General Counsel, be authorized to establish in Mexico an affiliate of The Regents of the University of California (University of California) for the purpose of facilitating the University of California's missions of education, research, and public service, with such affiliate (Association) to be controlled by the University of California, and be subject to the general overall responsibility of the Provost and Senior Vice President–Academic Affairs.
- B. The Secretary be authorized to execute, after approval of the President and in consultation with the General Counsel, all documents and agreements required by Mexican law to be executed by the Secretary in connection with the organization and operation of the Association, as well as any modifications, addenda, or amendments to such documents as, under Mexican law, are required to be executed by the Secretary.
- C. The President be authorized to approve and, as appropriate, then to either execute or to delegate for execution by the Director of the Association, after consultation with the General Counsel, all documents and agreements necessary in connection with the operation of the Association, as well as any modifications, addenda, or amendments to the documents (collectively "amendments"), so long as such amendments do not substantially alter the basic terms of this authorization or significantly increase the University of California's risk.
- D. The President be authorized to approve, after consultation with the General Counsel, and as appropriate, then to cast the vote, or delegate the casting of the vote, of the University of California as a Founding Partner of the Association in matters requiring the vote of the Founding Partners.
- E. In no event shall the general credit of the University of California be pledged by the Association.

The Committee was informed that in October 1997 Assembly Speaker Bustamante and members of the legislature led trade missions to Mexico. The State's determination to recognize the importance of improved ties with Mexico was demonstrated further by Governor Davis' state visit to Mexico shortly after his inauguration and reciprocated by

President Zedillo's state visit to California in May 1999. At these exchanges, there was unanimous agreement that all efforts leading to the establishment of new connections between California and Mexico needed to include education and science as key components

Approximately one year later, the University's administration brought before The Regents the concept of a University of California Hub in Mexico. At the November 1998 meeting, Professor John Marcum, the Director of the Education Abroad Program, and Professor Juan-Vicente Palerm, the Director of UC's Institute for Mexico and the United States (UC MEXUS), discussed the concept with the Regents. They explained that the hub concept and its application to Mexico were part of a larger plan to extend the international reach of the University of California beyond student exchange and to respond to the growing recognition that Mexico should be a primary target for such an undertaking.

The University of California prepared a comprehensive plan which, among other components, included the establishment of a high-level commission on education, science, and technology, identified resources needed to fund collaborative research and to expand faculty and student exchanges, and provided the design for the establishment of the California House in Mexico. This plan was presented to the Office of the Governor and introduced as expert testimony on April 7, 1999 at a joint hearing of the legislature's Select Committee on California-Mexico Affairs and the Committee on International Trade and Development.

In recognition of the importance of California's relationship with Mexico, on June 29, 1999 the Office of the President instructed the Director of the Education Abroad Program and the Director of UC MEXUS to recommend for inclusion in the University's 2000-01 Regents' Budget a request for the resources required to realize the objectives previously identified in the comprehensive plan. The result was the inclusion of the item "California-Mexico Collaborative Research on Issues of Mutual Interest (\$5 Million)" in the budget. Governor Davis included The Regents' request for the \$5 million annual appropriation in the 2000-01 State Budget, which was approved by the legislature and signed by the Governor.

In September 2000 the Vice Provost for Research awarded UC MEXUS \$4.5 million from the appropriated \$5 million in annual funding in support of the California-Mexico Collaborative Research on Issues of Mutual Interest initiative. This award included \$500,000 annually for the establishment of a University of California presence in Mexico.

On March 22, 2001, President Atkinson and Mr. Parada Consejo, the Director General of Consejo Nacional de Ciencia y Tecnología (CONACYT), the University of California's principal academic partner in Mexico, ratified the UC-CONACYT Agreement of Collaboration in Higher Education and Research. President Fox of Mexico and Governor Davis witnessed the signing. Governor Davis took the opportunity of this event to announce publicly the establishment the California House in Mexico, and President Fox applauded the decision.

The Proposed Civil Association

The Committee was informed that the Office of the General Counsel has engaged legal counsel in Mexico for the purpose of providing legal advice on the appropriate form of organization. After analysis and discussion between Mexican counsel and the Office of the General Counsel, it has been recommended that the most appropriate form of organization of this affiliate in Mexico would be as a civil association. This form of organization would enable the affiliate to qualify as a tax exempt non-profit organization, and it would also be eligible to receive contributions which are deductible by the donors for Mexican income tax purposes. Under Mexican law, other available forms of organization would not entitle the affiliate to enjoy these attributes.

Governance of the Civil Association

Under Mexican law, an Association is required to have at least two Founding Partners. It is proposed that in addition to the University of California, the other Founding Partner initially be a designated member of the law firm engaged by the Office of the General Counsel. It is proposed that the University of California's control of the Association be assured by the University of California entering into a voting agreement with the other nominal Founding Partner. The University has been advised by counsel in Mexico that this mechanism is authorized.

The Founding Partners will designate a Board of Directors. Although it is anticipated that the Founding Partners will appoint to the Board of Directors not only University of California representatives but also non-University of California representatives, at all times the voting control of the Board will be with the University of California representatives.

Decisions on all major issues will be reserved to the Founding Partners or to the Association's Board of Directors, as appropriate under Mexican law. Because the University of California would be the "controlling" Founding Partner by virtue of the voting agreement, the University of California will be in control of those decisions required by law to be made by the Founding Partners. Because the representatives of the University of California would have voting control of the Board of the Association, the University of California would be in control of those decisions required by law to be made by the Board of the Association.

The Association will come into existence only after authorization by The Regents, approval of the Association's organizing documents, after consultation with General Counsel, and following the execution of required documents as appropriate for the registration of the Association under Mexican law. The Association shall continue in existence until terminated. The Association may be terminated by agreement of the Founding Partners.

The overall day-to-day responsibility for the operation of the Association will be reposed in a Director of the California House in Mexico. The Director shall be a University of

California employee on loan to the Association. The Director's authority will be circumscribed by the terms of the agreement of the loan of the Director by the University of California to the Association.

The facilities to be used by the Association are expected to be owned by the University of California and not by the Association. Based on the legal analysis of the General Counsel, in consultation with retained Mexican counsel, this arrangement is preferable to the Association owning real property because in the event of the dissolution of the Association, under Mexican law all assets of the Association would have to be distributed to a distributee in Mexico, to be used for similar educational and other public purposes as those of the Association. If University of California is the owner of the real property, the University of California would have the authority to sell the property and to repatriate the proceeds. It is anticipated that the Association would lease the facility from the University of California.

Financial Considerations

The cost of operating the Casa de California en Mexico will include staff compensation, maintenance, utilities, conference costs, and the cost of space in an appropriate facility. Based on the estimated budget for the operation of the California House, which budget assumes that the California House elects to rent a facility to house its operations rather than to purchase a facility, the appropriation of \$500,000 which has been allocated for the University of California presence in Mexico is an adequate budget to cover these costs. If the Office of the President recommends that a facility be purchased, additional funding would have to be identified for that purpose.

The protocol for the funding of the Casa de California en Mexico is that operating funds are allocated annually on a permanent basis by the Office of the President for this purpose. The Casa de California en Mexico is accountable to the Office of the President for the administration and expenditure of these funds. The Director of the Casa de California en Mexico will provide a quarterly and annual written expenditure report to the Office of the President.

Because of the operational and financial controls which have been established for the California House, the risk to the University has been controlled. The State of California has made the financial commitment to support the University of California's presence in Mexico.

The expenditure controls are in place through the administration of the funds by the Office of the President. The Office of the President will release funds to the Casa de California en Mexico only pursuant to a request by the Director, and then only consistent with the Casa de California en Mexico annual budget, which has been previously approved by the Office of the President. By establishing the California House as a civil association under the law of Mexico, the University will be establishing a separate legal entity, and as such, the University will also be insulated from legal risk for the activities of the Casa de California en Mexico.

In response to a question from Regent Hopkinson, President Atkinson explained that the facility will be similar to the University's headquarters in London. It will house an Education Abroad Center for students and space for UC MEXUS. Provost King added that the center will facilitate interaction with Mexican alumni.

The Committee approved the President's recommendation and voted to recommend it to the Board.

5. **QUARTERLY REPORT OF PRIVATE SUPPORT**

In accordance with the Schedule of Reports, the **Quarterly Report on Private Support** for the period January 1 through March 31, 2001 was submitted for information.

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

The meeting adjourned at 12:25 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary