

The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

September 18, 2003

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

Members present: Regents Atkinson, Bodine, Davies, Hopkinson, Huerta, Johnson, Kozberg, Lozano, Marcus, Moores, Murray, and Sayles; Advisory members Novack, Ornellas, and Blumenthal

In attendance: Regents Blum, Connerly, Montoya, Parsky, Pattiz, Preuss, and Seigler, Regent-designate Anderson, Faculty Representative Pitts, Secretary Trivette, Associate Secretary Shaw, General Counsel Holst, Treasurer Russ, Provost King, Senior Vice Presidents Darling and Mullinix, Vice Presidents Doby, Drake, Gomes, and Hershman, Chancellors Berdahl, Bishop, Cicerone, Córdoba, Dynes, Greenwood, Tomlinson-Keasey, and Vanderhoef, and Recording Secretary Nietfeld

The meeting convened at 10:50 a.m. with Committee Chair Kozberg presiding.

1. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meetings of July 16 and 17, 2003 were approved.

2. **ANNUAL REPORT ON COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW IN UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS**

Professor Barbara Sawrey, the chair of the Board on Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS), recalled that the comprehensive review admissions process had been adopted by The Regents upon recommendation of the Academic Senate in November 2001 and implemented for the freshman class applying to enter the University of California in fall 2002. She noted that the annual report by BOARS entitled **Comprehensive Review in Freshman Admissions – Fall 2003** had been distributed to the Regents in advance of the meeting. She stressed that BOARS views comprehensive review as a work in progress and invited the Regents to suggest ways in which it could be improved.

Professor Sawrey began her presentation with an overview of the guiding principles of comprehensive review, as follows:

- Priority is given to students of high academic accomplishment.
- Merit is assessed in terms of academic and personal achievements, viewed in the context of opportunities and challenges.

- Campuses use a broad variety of factors to select students.
- No fixed percentage of students is admitted on a narrow set of criteria.
- There is a commitment to academic excellence and access for high-achieving students from all backgrounds.
- The campuses have flexibility in their use of comprehensive review, within the guidelines established by BOARS.
- Students should be selected who demonstrate a strong likelihood to persist to graduation.
- No applicant will be denied admission without a comprehensive review of the file.

Professor Sawrey continued that the first report by BOARS, issued in 2002, had responded to fundamental questions about comprehensive review. BOARS asked whether implementation had been consistent with faculty principles, whether the campuses had been successful in maintaining academic excellence, and whether campus processes had been designed and carried out with integrity. BOARS found positive answers to all three of these questions. It looked at the campus process designs in detail, monitored outcomes, and reviewed the way in which the readers were trained.

In the second year of the implementation of comprehensive review, the goal has been to ensure that these accomplishments are sustained. BOARS' monitoring of the processes and outcomes shows that they have been, as described in detail in the committee's annual report. For 2003, comprehensive review was assessed more deeply in several areas identified by Regents. BOARS addressed the following four questions:

- Is the faculty satisfied that decisions are reasonable, consistent, and defensible?
- Is the information provided by students accurate?
- Is comprehensive review driving strong students out of the system?
- Can the transparency of the comprehensive review process be improved?

Professor Sawrey reported that faculty at all six selective campuses had read a minimum of 60 files, half from the borderline of admit or deny, to determine if decisions were consistent, reasoned, and defensible. The results indicated that the policies were being implemented in accordance with the faculty guidelines and that the readers had scored appropriately. There were no differences in the admit/deny decisions as a result of the file-reading project. The campuses found the process helpful in their ongoing enhancement of comprehensive review.

Turning to the accuracy of the information provided by students, Professor Sawrey reported that for 2003 verification was expanded beyond the academic record. While all of the academic information supplied by a student is verified, a random sample of applications was selected for verification of a variety of factors, including honors, awards, extracurricular activities, and personal statement information. To BOARS' knowledge, UC is the only University that performs this verification. Students are alerted to the fact that their application is subject to verification. Professor Sawrey continued that no evidence of falsification had been found among the random sample of applications and that 83 percent of those selected had completed the verification process by the deadline. Most of the students who failed to return their verification documents by the deadline were found to be ineligible for admission, while a small number had already opted to enroll elsewhere.

Professor Sawrey recalled that there had been concerns that top performing high school students might be leaving the system since the implementation of comprehensive review. Based on remarks by Regents at the November 2002 meeting, BOARS requested a study of matriculation patterns. The study covers the period 1997 to 2002 and uses National Clearinghouse data to track students who did not enroll at the University of California. Looking at the whole system, the matriculation study found that admitted students who are within the top one-third of UC applications have stable enrollment rates of 63 to 64 percent. The enrollment of underrepresented minority students in the top one-third fell from 52.6 percent to 50.1 percent over this five-year period. Enrollment at the middle and lower one-third of the admitted pool has also shown a slight decline over the five years. The overall proportion of top applicants denied admission at Berkeley and UCLA, but who attend another UC, remained constant, but the underrepresented minority students in this top category decreasingly chose to attend UC and increasingly chose to attend private schools.

Professor Sawrey noted that the final issue addressed by the BOARS study had been ways to improve the transparency of the comprehensive review process. The University of California has long required a personal statement as a part of the application for admission, but the quality and usefulness of this statement has varied widely. The open-ended, two-page statement has been replaced by three shorter, more specific prompts. Areas addressed by the new prompts are academic preparation, potential to contribute to the campus community, and any other information students wish to convey. Beginning with fall 2005 admissions, all applications will be electronic. Nearly 70 percent of the applications for fall 2003 were submitted electronically. The California State University will also begin its all-electronic application process in 2005. The faculty have plans to accommodate any student for whom an electronic application is not an option. Finally, BOARS believes that the campuses need to establish better communications with the public about the comprehensive review process. Campus and systemwide websites and publications have been reviewed to ensure a common format.

Turning to next steps, Professor Sawrey observed that, after two years of comprehensive review, it is now time to look more closely at the progress of students on the campuses. BOARS will be studying those students admitted since comprehensive review began,

looking at majors, persistence, and graduation rates. The faculty have worked hard to ensure the quality and reliability of the selection processes, but the number of applications is growing faster than the growth in freshman spaces, and the number of selective campuses is growing as well. BOARS must be diligent in reviewing campus practices and monitoring their implementation.

Regent Connerly asked for further comment on how the campuses weigh non-academic factors in the selection process. Professor Sawrey explained that, while each campus had implemented comprehensive review somewhat differently, the traditional academic factors continue to account for about 75 percent of the weight that goes into the decision. Regent Connerly asked for assistance in addressing the concerns of those who persist in believing that comprehensive review gives undue influence to factors that are not based on academic achievement. Ms. Sawrey recalled that the matriculation study had found that the students in the top one-third continue to enroll at the same rate as they did prior to the implementation of comprehensive review. Regent Connerly asked about the role played by the campuses that accept students who are referred to them by another campus at which they were denied admission. He expressed the concern that, through this referral process, the University may be creating a three-tiered system of campuses, with a campus such as Riverside being considered by some to be a campus of last resort. Provost King noted that the referral pool was not equivalent to the least-qualified students; in many cases it consists of students who applied to only one selective campus or program. Regent Connerly contended that a correlation existed between the referral pool and academic achievement. He believed it would be in the system's best interest to distribute the referral pool more evenly among the campuses in order to convey the message that all campuses are desirable institutions to attend. Professor Sawrey felt that students were getting that message.

In response to a question from Regent Davies, Professor Sawrey explained that the changes that had resulted from the file-reading project were procedural in nature. For example, some faculty members suggested that it might be helpful to re-order the steps in the reading process. She assured Regent Davies that the admissions process had found no evidence of falsification in the applications that had been subject to verification. In order to state categorically that there was no falsification, it would be necessary to verify each application.

Regent-designate Novack observed that the report had illustrated how the University contributes to the well being of the state by admitting first-generation and low-income students in large numbers. He cautioned that the state's fiscal crisis could impinge upon the University's ability to continue to do so.

Regent Marcus requested more information on why an eligible student might be accepted by one campus and rejected by another. Professor Sawrey noted that all of the eight general campuses use the same 14 guidelines in reviewing applications but may be using them in different ways. For example, the San Diego campus has a fixed-weight system that it uses in evaluating applications, while some other campuses do not. She stressed that the Berkeley campus is able to accept only 24 percent of the students who apply.

In response to a question from Regent Sayles, Ms. Sawrey confirmed that the data indicate that the University is losing slightly more than half of the underrepresented minority students who are not accepted at Berkeley or UCLA to other institutions. President Atkinson stressed that these students are heavily recruited by private universities. Professor Sawrey continued that those underrepresented minority students who gain admission to the University have an enrollment rate of 54 percent. Committee Chair Kozberg asked that next year's report focus further attention on these issues in order to determine the reasons these students do not enroll at a higher rate.

Regent Murray suggested the fact that the campuses had implemented different versions of comprehensive review was confusing to the public and asked how this was being addressed systemwide. Professor Sawrey explained that the intention was to disclose as much information as possible in publications and on campus websites.

Regent Kozberg asked how the faculty intended to communicate the changes in the application. Ms. Sawrey commented that one opportunity had been through the counselor conferences that are held annually throughout the state.

Regent Moores commented on remarks that had been made earlier by President Atkinson concerning the concept of attracting more out-of-state students to the University, similar to the University of Michigan and the University of Virginia. He believed that such students would choose to remain in California, thus adding to the state's economy. Regent Moores suggested, however, that the complicated nature of the University's application presents a barrier for these students. He asked whether or not consideration would be given to simplifying the process and also why each campus is permitted to use its own version of comprehensive review.

Provost King acknowledged that the application process was complicated; a strong effort has been made to find ways to improve the application form. He agreed that the present form would not serve as a good marketing device to attract students from other states.

Speaking to the issue of a unified application system, Professor Sawrey observed that the campuses have very different selection rates and each has a unique culture. She agreed with Regent Moores' observations concerning the need for more transparency in the application process.

Regent Moores invited the faculty to reflect on whether there is a compelling academic reason for each campus having its own admissions processes and to report back to the Regents.

Regent-designate Ornellas asked for further comment on the process used to verify non-academic information. Professor Sawrey explained that BOARS' intention was to send the message to students that what they submit could be subject to verification. Counselors have confirmed that the message is being received.

3. **STATUS REPORT ON PROPOSED PARTNERSHIP TO ESTABLISH UNIVERSITY AFFILIATED RESEARCH CENTER AT THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AMES RESEARCH CENTER**

Chancellor Greenwood reported that the Santa Cruz campus had been successful in competing for a ten-year contract with the National Aeronautics & Space Administration (NASA) valued at \$320 million, which is the largest contract ever competed for by the University of California. She recalled that background information provided to the Regents in advance of the meeting had described the process by which the campus had applied for funding for the establishment of a University Affiliated Research Center (UARC) at NASA Ames Research Center at Moffett Field. The Santa Cruz campus will be delegated the authority to administer the UARC for the entire UC system. San Jose State University and the Foothill-De Anza Community College District will participate as partners supporting the research and educational goals of the UARC.

NASA Ames is one of four NASA research centers with responsibilities in fundamental science and technology development. Its roles within NASA are based on its core competencies in information technology, biotechnology, and nanotechnology and aerospace operations; its scientific core competencies in space science, astrobiology, fundamental biology, and computer science; and its unique engineering and specific research expertise in rotorcraft/powered lift vehicles and spacecraft thermal protection systems. Many of these core competencies align directly with the strategic interests of the science and engineering departments of UCSC.

The relationship between a UARC and a Department of Defense sponsoring agency is long-term and strategic, with UARCs being required to operate in the public interest, free from real or perceived conflicts of interest. The Ames UARC is unique in that it will be based in facilities provided by NASA. This arrangement will enable it to form a collaborative bridge spanning ongoing programs at NASA Ames, UCSC's planned research and education center within the NASA Research Park, the UCSC campus, and the University.

Chancellor Greenwood explained that the contract would benefit the Santa Cruz campus in the following ways:

- Support the expansion of UCSC's research capability and presence in the Silicon Valley.
- Provide educational opportunities for graduate students in both practicums and research.
- Over the five-year base period, significantly augment the resources available for campus-based research.

- Open the door for larger-scale collaborations and other potential roles in the \$700 million annual research program of NASA Ames.
- Provide discretionary funds for new research initiatives and other investments.
- Support the training and development of faculty and administrators in the management of large-scale research projects.
- Provide opportunities for inter-segmental collaborative activities in education, degree programs, and research.
- Strengthens UC's position with respect to the NASA Research Park and future development of the Silicon Valley Center.

The UARC will provide NASA Ames access to the research capabilities of the campuses and the national laboratories. The UC system, through the UARC, will provide NASA Ames with an unparalleled scope of available research and management expertise and unsurpassed excellence across all areas of scientific and engineering research for developing its future missions.

The Santa Cruz campus has completed an Initial Study of the potential environmental impacts associated with UC activities under the UARC contract and has adopted a Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the project. The MND public comment period closed August 6, 2003; no significant comments were received. The MND is predicated on two basic assumptions. The first assumption is that UC employees will occupy existing NASA facilities and that NASA will be responsible for any building modifications required to conduct task order work. The second assumption is that there will be no net increase in personnel at NASA Ames as a result of this contract because UARC activities are being funded through a shift in resources away from existing contracts, with personnel located at NASA Ames. This assumption will be reviewed annually in the UARC Executive Management Report. If population projections indicate a potential for a net increase to the population of NASA Ames resulting from UARC activities, UCSC will prepare a focused Environmental Impact Report to address the potential impacts due to population increases. If this level of California Environmental Quality Act analysis becomes necessary, UCSC will refrain, with concurrence by NASA Ames under the excusable delays clause, from initiating further task order activities until the CEQA analysis is complete.

The Chancellor recognized the important work of the UARC contract award teams both at Santa Cruz and in the Office of the President and in particular Mr. William Berry, who will serve as the director of the UARC.

Regent Hopkinson acknowledged the great honor that has been bestowed upon the University in general and the Santa Cruz campus in particular in having been chosen as the recipient of this award.

EDUCATIONAL POLICY

-8-

September 18, 2003

The meeting adjourned at 11:55 a.m.

Attest:

Secretary