

The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

July 20, 2005

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

Members present: Regents Dynes, Johnson, Kozberg, Lansing, Marcus, Moores, Núñez, O'Connell, Parsky, Rosenthal and Sayles; Advisory member Blumenthal, Staff Advisor Bell

In attendance: Regents Blum, Hopkinson, Island, Juline, Lee, Pattiz, Preuss, Rominger, and Wachter, Regents-designate Coombs, Ledesma, and Schreiner, Faculty Representative Brunk, Secretary Trivette, General Counsel Holst, Provost Greenwood, Senior Vice Presidents Darling and Mullinix, Vice Presidents Broome, Doby, Gomes, and Hershman, Interim Vice President Nation, Chancellors Birgeneau, Bishop, Carnesale, Córdoba, Denton, Drake, Fox, Vanderhoef, and Yang, Executive Vice Chancellor Ashley representing Chancellor Tomlinson-Keasey, and Recording Secretary Nietfeld

The meeting convened at 11:10 a.m. with Committee Chair Kozberg presiding.

Committee Chair Kozberg welcomed Staff Advisor Bell to his first meeting of the Committee.

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

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of May 25, 2005 were approved.

2. **THE UC SCIENCE AND MATH INITIATIVE, "ONE THOUSAND TEACHERS, ONE MILLION MINDS"**

Provost Greenwood recalled that at the Committee's November 2004 meeting, Vice President Doby had presented some alarming information about the shortage of qualified mathematics teachers in the state's K-12 schools. These data indicated that it would be difficult for California to remain competitive if the teaching of science and mathematics were not improved. In the May 2004 compact between higher education and the Governor, the University of California agreed to take a leadership role in working with other segments of higher education to increase significantly the number of science and mathematics teachers for California and to provide programs that will improve the quality of these teachers. Professor Greenwood introduced Professor Lynda Goff, who has been working at the Office of the President over the past year to develop the science and math initiative, and invited her to present her remarks.

Professor Goff expressed her appreciation to the Governor for his support of the Science and Math Initiative, to Speaker Núñez and the Legislature, and to Superintendent O'Connell, who strongly encouraged this project as a way to improve California's high schools. She also acknowledged the support of President Dynes and Provost Greenwood and the contributions of faculty throughout the system. Professor Goff observed that the crisis that California faces in K-12 science and mathematics education is an issue of utmost importance. The state is not preparing the scientifically and technologically competent workforce that will be needed to keep California competitive in a global, knowledge-based economy. This fact was summarized by Bill Gates in a speech to the annual Governors' Conference, where he stated "[W]hen I compare our high schools to what I see when I am traveling abroad, I am terrified for the workforce of tomorrow. In math and science, our fourth graders are among the best in the world. By eighth grade, they are in the middle of the pack; by twelfth grade, U.S. students are scoring near the bottom of industrialized nations."

By almost every measure, California is failing to provide the science and mathematics knowledge and skills that its children require. The national assessment of educational progress data of 1996 and 2000 have shown that California's eighth-grade students place last in science and near the bottom in mathematics. Another measure is the finding that the chances that a ninth grader in California will graduate from high school and earn a college degree in science or engineering are less than 2.2 percent. California is producing approximately 22,000 science, mathematics, and engineering students per year, with half earning their degrees at the University of California. The state must import talented workers, and an economic analysis of California's workforce has shown that the state's educational system during the last thirty years has met only 53 percent of the workforce needs in science and engineering.

Professor Goff addressed the question of why California's children are failing in science and mathematics. One factor is that science is not emphasized in some of the lower grades. The major reason, however, is the lack of qualified teachers. Recent California Board of Education data show that the state faces a shortage next year of more than 4,000 teachers in science and mathematics. The situation will worsen in the coming years as more teachers become eligible to retire. Because of these shortages, a significant number of students are being taught science and mathematics by teachers who are judged by the No Child Left Behind Act as unqualified because they did not major in the subject they teach. The problem is worse in low-performing schools, where as many as 80 percent of students are being taught by teachers who are not qualified in these subject areas.

Professor Goff recalled that the Science and Math Initiative was included in the new compact with the State. Because of the University's highly regarded programs in these fields, Governor Schwarzenegger asked UC to take a leadership role in increasing both the quantity and quality of science and mathematics K-12 teachers. UC has worked throughout the past year to develop "One Thousand Teachers, One Million Minds," which is a campaign that will provide California with a thousand or more highly qualified science and

mathematics teachers annually. The new program, "California Teach," will offer every UC undergraduate majoring in science, mathematics, or engineering the opportunity to complete the course work for the major as well as become prepared as a secondary or middle-school teacher within four years. Currently, a student must complete the bachelor's degree prior to enrolling in a teacher credentialing program and pay graduate tuition and fees before becoming qualified to teach. The new program is expected to quadruple the number of teachers that UC creates, and because of the increase in the number of UC students who will enter the K-12 schools as teachers, the quality of science and mathematics education should be expected to improve. The program should encourage the participation of students from diverse social, ethnic, and racial backgrounds. "California Teach" is expected to become a national concept, providing a road map for other states to reform their science and mathematics teacher education programs. It will also be a major research project, as faculty study best practices. "California Teach" will be the largest program of its kind in the country and the first major systemwide initiative. Cohorts of students will be developed who will progress together through the program, thereby increasing retention. The intention will be for UC faculty to become engaged in the preparation of California's teachers for the future. California's businesses and industries will also become involved as they provide ideas for curricula development. Nearly 1,000 faculty were involved in the development of "California Teach," from engineering, education, and the sciences on all ten campuses. California teachers were also involved, and the University worked with foundations such as the Carnegie Foundation, the National Science Foundation, and many others.

Professor Goff observed that students will need to be recruited into the new program, which begins in the fall; the chancellors and deans will play an active role in this process. Each campus will have a center to provide assistance to the students who enroll in the program. The program will also have a number of built-in financial incentives. The students will be placed in the classroom during their freshman and sophomore years, where they will help teach science and mathematics. They will also enroll in seminars taught by master teachers from the K-12 system and by UC faculty. They will engage in systemwide summer institutes and, prior to graduation, they will receive a placement as a teacher. The University will provide additional supervision during the first year following graduation. Professional development programs will be more structured and more reflective of what students need to experience as they become life-long learners in the field. The goal for these programs will be national board certification of UC-trained teachers.

Turning to the issue of funding, Professor Goff pointed out that "California Teach" is a three-way partnership between UC, the State, and industry. The Governor has committed half of the funding for the campus advising centers and has authorized 300 loan assumption warrants. UC has provided the other 50 percent for the centers as well as funding for all instruction. More than 20 companies have contributed over \$4 million; their support will help to fund named classrooms, mentors, and the summer institutes.

Professor Goff explained that, during her discussions throughout the state, she was often asked why the University of California was given the leadership role in improving science

and math education. The answer is that providing the necessary training in these fields requires what UC has to offer, including first-rate students and faculty and nationally ranked science and mathematics programs. “California Teach” will require state-of-the-art facilities, laboratories, buildings, and equipment, as well as partnerships with K-12, with foundations, and with industry. Another frequent question is whether UC students will be interested in participating in the program and becoming teachers. She referred to an article in **U.S. News and World Report** about the success of the “Teach for America” program, which saw 17,000 seniors apply for 2,100 positions. UC accounted for nearly 1,000 applicants in that pool.

Professor Goff concluded her presentation with a quotation from the 2000 Glenn Commission Report: “As our children move toward the day when their decisions will be the ones shaping a new America, will they be equipped with the mathematical and scientific tools needed to meet those challenges and capitalize on those opportunities? These are our children, and the choice is ours. We know what we have to do, the time is now – before it’s too late.”

Regent Johnson raised the issue of cultivating interest in teaching among high school students. She pointed out that in addition to high schools, the community colleges also need highly qualified teachers in science and mathematics. She saw the need for the University to cooperate with the State Department of Education, because she believed that, as the program gets under way, the Department should no longer certify unqualified teachers.

Professor Goff observed that getting “California Teach” students into California’s schools should encourage their students to pursue a career in these fields. She agreed that the need for more qualified teachers in the community colleges was an issue that needed to be addressed. Congressman Miller currently has a bill known as the Teach Act, which would require that teachers at a master teacher level have a master’s degree in their field of disciplinary study. If the bill is authorized, it could result in more teachers for the community colleges.

In response to a question from Regent Pattiz regarding the challenges to implementing the program, Professor Goff observed that two years ago she would have thought that the biggest challenge would have been UC’s culture. She believed that the students and faculty were now ready to engage in this program. The biggest hurdle will be to obtain the sustainable funding that will be required to educate these teachers. It is estimated that it will cost \$20,000 to \$25,000 to produce a highly qualified science and mathematics teacher.

Regent Rosenthal saw “California Teach” as an historic moment for the University of California. He urged the Regents to make the program a top priority for the University.

In response to a question from Regent Moores about the ability of out-of-state teachers to obtain a teaching credential in California, State Superintendent O’Connell explained that California requires that all prospective teachers take the CBEST test. The No Child Left

Behind Act has brought some uniformity as to which states have reciprocity agreements. He expressed the appreciation of the K-12 community to the University for undertaking "California Teach."

Following a comment by Regent Lee, Professor Goff explained that the \$20,000 to \$25,000 would be in addition to the normal cost of obtaining a bachelor's degree.

3. **ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COLLEGE OF BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES, DAVIS CAMPUS**

The President recommended that, effective immediately, Section 6 of The Regents' provisions as covered under Standing Order 110.1-Academic Units and Functions, Affiliated Institutions, and Related Activities of the University, be amended as follows:

additions shown by underscoring

* * *

6. Academic Colleges at UC Davis:

- (a) There is established at Davis the following academic college with curricula based on two or more years of undergraduate work:

College of Biological Sciences, with curricula leading to the degrees of Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science, Master of Arts, Master of Science, and Doctor of Philosophy.

The Davis campus proposes to reconstitute the Division of Biological Sciences (DBS) as the College of Biological Sciences. Formed in 1970, DBS was created to coordinate undergraduate instruction in biology programs in the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences and the College of Letters and Science. The Division was reorganized in the early 1990s and has grown into a large academic unit that offers hundreds of courses and nine undergraduate majors with about 5,000 students. With annual expenditures of \$68 million, the Division houses several multi-million dollar research facilities, as well as several interdisciplinary research centers, including the Center for Neuroscience, the Genome Center, the Center for Genetics and Development, the Center for Population Biology, the Center for Animal Behavior, the W.M. Keck Center for Structural Biology, and the Mouse Biology Program. The Division is organized into five sections reflecting the major themes of modern biology: Evolution and Ecology, Microbiology, Molecular and Cellular Biology, Neurobiology, Physiology and Behavior, and Plant

Biology. This section structure would continue within the proposed College of Biological Sciences.

Academic and Long Range Development Plan

Establishment of the College of Biological Sciences at UC Davis is consistent with the academic plan for campus and the long-range development of its educational programs. The Division of Biological Sciences sits at the academic and administrative nucleus of basic biology research and education at UC Davis. Over the past decade, the pace of change in the biological science disciplines has equaled or exceeded that of most other academic disciplines. The Division is widely regarded for its quality of education and research but must be increasingly responsive and efficient in incorporating new knowledge into its curriculum and in recruiting faculty with expertise in these new areas of biology. Advancing the division to college status will eliminate administrative inefficiencies associated with the intercollege divisional model and enable programs in the biological sciences at UC Davis to flourish and reach their full potential. College designation will achieve the following objectives:

- **Underscore UC Davis' strength in life sciences education and research.** The Davis campus has a breadth of programs in the life sciences that is rarely matched by other universities. According to the National Science Foundation, UC Davis graduates more students in the biological sciences than any other university in the country. Naming a college in biological sciences will help spotlight campus strengths in the life sciences more broadly.
- **Streamline and reassign control over processes of review, change, and approval of courses and curriculum.** Current curriculum review processes include redundant layers of review through the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences and the College of Letters and Science. These redundant layers of review will be eliminated.
- **Reassign responsibility for creating degree requirements** based on the best features of those now used by the parent colleges. New undergraduate regulations will be developed in full consultation with the UC Davis Academic Senate Undergraduate Council. These regulations will feature state-of-the-art biology and ensure that writing, communication, and breadth coursework are prominently featured.
- **Develop full faculty participation in governance.** Faculty in the College of Biological Sciences will develop bylaws and will form, lead, and participate in an executive committee to regulate policies and practices related to students and faculty. In addition, the College will have representation on the Academic Senate executive council. Currently, DBS faculty participate in the Academic Senate as

representatives of the College of Letters and Science or the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences.

- **Clarify the academic structure for potential students, their parents, alumni, prospective faculty members, and potential donors.** The term “division” means many different things across campus and throughout the UC system. College status would clarify relationships between this unit and others on campus, further enhancing the overall image of UC Davis.
- **Grant undergraduate degrees that directly reflect biological sciences.** The Division of Biological Sciences develops programs, manages the curriculum, and advises the students in Biological Sciences, but degrees have been conferred by the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences or the College of Letters and Science. The College of Biological Sciences would confer degrees in its own name, giving clear and public recognition of the significance of basic biology education and research on the UC Davis campus.
- **Support recruitment of high-quality students.** DBS prepares the qualification standards for incoming students and participates as a partner in the recruitment and admissions process, but the students must be accepted by the College of Letters and Science or the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences. College status will enable direct recruitment of qualified students into the biological sciences program.

Relationship To Existing Campus Programs, Units, And Mission

The new College of Biological Sciences will maintain its working relationship with the Colleges of Letters and Science and Agriculture and Environmental Sciences and the Schools of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine. Additionally, the new college will continue to maintain strong relationships with organized research units, such as the Bodega Marine Laboratory and the Agricultural Experiment Station (AES). Faculty in the proposed College of Biological Sciences will retain their seats on the AES Administrative Advisory Committee and fully expect to remain active participants working toward fulfilling the mission of AES for the people of California.

Reviews and Approvals

The proposal to reconstitute the Division of Biological Sciences as the College of Biological Sciences has been endorsed by the Davis Division of the Academic Senate and the University of California Academic Council. The California Postsecondary Education Commission has reviewed the proposal and concurs with the recommendation.

Resources

Changing the designation from a Division to a College will not require any new funding.

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

4. **UNDERGRADUATE ELIGIBILITY AND ADMISSIONS**

Provost Greenwood explained that the goal of the presentation would be to update the Committee on the work of the 2004-05 Eligibility and Admissions Study Group, present new analyses of admissions outcomes for students from different racial and ethnic groups, and preview fall 2005 freshman admissions and enrollment. The Provost recalled that, based upon a recommendation of the 2003-04 Study Group, President Dynes had chartered a follow-on Study Group which met in December 2004 and May 2005. The group focused its work on the implementation of the 2003-04 Study Group recommendations, and it will issue a brief written report. The study group has proposed a "recess," with the ability to remain available to meet if new issues arise.

Provost Greenwood recalled that the 2003-04 report had contained 15 recommendations, most of which are either fully implemented or on track for timely completion. A few are more long term, but work is well under way. In some cases, the 2004-05 Study Group has clarified or expanded a recommendation. The following recommendations have been fully implemented:

- New eligibility requirements were adopted by The Regents in 2004.
- The Board on Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) and the Academic Council have endorsed the recommendation on "admitting from the full range of the pool."
- BOARS has reaffirmed that the SAT writing scores and grades in English courses are the best tools for evaluating applicants' writing ability.
- The analyses of racial and ethnic differences are complete.

The Provost observed that one of the most controversial issues dealt with the University's compliance with Proposition 209 and with federal law, and she invited University Counsel Patti to describe the issues involved. Mr. Patti explained that the difficulty lies in reconciling State law as reflected in Article I, Section 31 of the California Constitution (Proposition 209) with the federal "disparate impact" standard for compliance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Although the requirements of these two laws are not in direct conflict, in practice compliance with one can limit the University's options to obtain compliance with the other. Mr. Patti recalled that Proposition 209 states that the University "...shall not discriminate against, or grant preferential treatment to, any individual or group on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin." Courts interpreting Proposition 209 have

held that it prevents any use of race or ethnicity as a factor in selection. Federal law, on the other hand, allows some limited use of race to achieve diversity. Proposition 209 includes an exception for any action "...which must be taken to establish or maintain eligibility" for federal funding. In 2004, the courts interpreted this exception in a fairly narrow context. The federal government's disparate impact policy is applicable to recipients of federal funds. Federal regulations provide that program criteria may not "...have the effect of subjecting individuals to discrimination" on the basis of race or ethnicity. The courts have applied a complicated, three-part, burden-shifting test to determine whether a challenged practice has the effect of subjecting individuals to discrimination. First, there must be a substantial disparity in selection rates among racial or ethnic groups. The selection rate of any group is determined by a ratio of the number of selected members of the group to the number of qualified applicants from that group. While there is no rule about what constitutes a substantial disparity, some federal agencies have adopted an 80 percent rule. Under that rule, there is a substantial disparity if any group is less than 80 percent than that of any other group. The existence of a substantial disparity by itself does not mean that there is an unlawful disparate impact but triggers further analysis to show that there is an educational justification for using the challenged selection criteria. For example, if the use of high school grades led to disparities, the University could justify them on the grounds that the use of grades is important in selecting academically qualified applicants or encouraging achievement in high school. Even an educationally justifiable criterion may be stricken if it is shown that there is another criterion that will achieve the same educational goal without creating a disparate impact.

Mr. Patti provided a summary of the findings of the 2003-04 Study Group pertaining to the University's compliance with State law. Since the passage of Proposition 209, campus policies and practices make no explicit use of race or ethnicity in the admissions process. Nevertheless, statistical analysis was used to determine whether there appeared to be any evidence of systematic bias in favor of any group. The Study Group compared actual admission rates to those predicted by a statistical model that included all available quantitative admissions criteria. The Study Group found that the substantial differences between actual and predicted admissions rates that had existed prior to Proposition 209 had largely been eliminated. These results indicated that the University had come into substantial compliance with State law. There were two areas in need of further study: some remaining differences for African Americans on some campuses, and a small but consistent pattern of slightly lower-than-predicted admissions rate for Asian Americans. Given the small size of the difference, it was unclear whether this was a coincidence or if it represented a flaw in the model.

Provost Greenwood reported that new analyses completed in May 2005 had applied the recursive partitioning methodology to 2003 and 2004 data. This methodology may be a better model for the University's admissions processes because it accounts for interactions among variables and does not assign fixed weights. These analyses found that the differences between the predicted and actual admit rates for African Americans and Chicano/Latinos was reduced to less than three percentage points on all campuses. Provost

Greenwood presented slides which depicted the predicted and actual admits by racial and ethnic groups for the Berkeley and Davis campuses in 1997 and 2004, using both the logistic model and the recursive partitioning methodology. The analyses also found that the previously observed pattern of small but consistent differences in admit rates for Asian Americans had been eliminated. Provost Greenwood reported that the Study Group had concluded that there is no large, unexplained difference in any admit rates that would lead to concern that the University is not in compliance with Proposition 209.

Provost Greenwood returned to the issue of disparate impact as defined by federal law. She presented data on the percent of public high school graduates eligible for the University of California in 2003 by race and ethnicity which showed that Asian American students are eligible at a rate of 31.4 percent, white students at 16.2 percent, Chicano-Latinos at 6.5 percent, and African Americans at 6.2 percent. Every group except Asian Americans shows a disparate impact because the admit rate is below 80 percent of the Asian American rate. The University must demonstrate educational justification for using test scores and grades in its admissions process. The Provost then presented admit rates by ethnic group for all campuses in 2005. The group that is admitted at the highest rate is not the same on every campus. For example, at Berkeley, Irvine, Riverside, and Santa Cruz, white students were admitted at the highest rate, ranging from 39 percent of applicants at Berkeley to 89 percent at Santa Cruz. Asian students were admitted at the highest rate at Davis, Los Angeles, and San Diego, and Chicano/Latinos were admitted at the highest rate at Santa Barbara. Provost Greenwood explained that disparate impact is calculated against the group that was admitted at the highest rate; at Berkeley, for example, the ratio of the lowest to highest admit rate is 81 percent. At two campuses, Irvine and Los Angeles, the ratio is below 80 percent. The University's data indicate some issues with disparate impact, but its admissions policies are educationally justified by the verification that eligibility and admissions criteria are consistent with educational outcomes.

Turning to freshman admissions for fall 2005, Provost Greenwood reported that all UC-eligible applicants had been admitted, with 60,838 California residents offered admission, which is the highest number ever. The Merced campus admitted 6,000 applicants. Preliminary enrollment data for 2005 show increases in the key academic factors of grade point average, SAT scores, and the number of (a)-(g) courses completed. The incoming class continues to expand opportunity to students from underserved groups, including low-income families, students from low-performing schools, and from families where neither parent has a college degree. The mean number of (a)-(g) courses rose from 45.4 in 2003 to 46.2 in 2005, while the average GPA has moved up to 3.78, and the average score on the SAT I is now 1205. Preliminary freshman data are less encouraging with respect to race and ethnicity, although there was an increase in the percentage of underrepresented minority students who have expressed an intent to register.

Provost Greenwood presented enrollment data for the UC Merced fall 2005 entering class, which will enroll 854 freshmen, 167 transfer students, and 38 graduate students. Of the 854 freshmen, 47 percent are first-generation college, 31 percent are low income, 33 percent are

from rural areas, 25 percent are Chicano/Latino, and 6 percent are African American. She stressed that the University of California is a national leader in providing access to underserved communities. Among research universities, UC leads the nation in the proportion of students who are eligible for federal financial aid. More than half of the entering students come from immigrant families, while nearly 50 percent come from homes where English is not the primary language. Seventy-eight percent of UC freshmen graduate within six years, and the gaps between the different groups are narrowing. Despite this success in increasing access, the University continues to be seriously constrained in its ability to enroll underrepresented minority students. UC eligibility rates for Chicano/Latinos and African Americans have increased substantially but still lag well behind those of Asian Americans and whites. The percentage of underrepresented students among incoming students continues to rise, but it is not keeping pace with growth in the high school graduating class.

Provost Greenwood outlined some of the steps being taken by the University to enroll more underrepresented students. She pointed out that UC Merced will send an important signal to underserved communities that the University is willing to expand to accommodate their enrollment. Academic preparation programs are designed to address the fundamental educational gaps among students from different groups. The Science and Math Initiative should result in bringing qualified teachers to more communities. There will be continued attention on the part of the faculty to eligibility and admissions policies. The University will continue to produce and monitor admissions data annually, but the Study Group will be in recess until it needs to be reconvened.

In response to a question from Regent Lansing, Provost Greenwood recalled that students are required to have a 2.80 GPA in order to achieve eligibility. For fall 2007 admission, the minimum required GPA will be 3.0. Regent Lansing expressed concern about the writing component of the new SAT because she believed that it is difficult to judge. She suggested that it be reevaluated in two years. Provost Greenwood assured her that BOARS would be undertaking that responsibility. The data on the new SAT will not be available until next year, at which time it will be possible to evaluate how the new mathematics and writing components are functioning. Faculty Representative Blumenthal pointed out that the writing component is not new to the University's admissions policy; previously, students were required to take the SAT II writing exam. BOARS will be studying the predictability of the writing exam with respect to entering students.

Regent Sayles raised the issue of the disparate impact at UCLA, where the ratio of lowest to highest admit rates is 67 percent. Provost Greenwood noted that the group applying to one campus may be different from that applying to another one. She reported that admissions officers and others are actively engaged in examining the admissions process in order to ensure that there is not a problem that could be fixed. In response to a further question from Regent Sayles regarding any legal exposure as a result of this disparate impact, Mr. Patti explained that the University believes that there are educational justifications based on the criteria used by the campuses.

Regent Núñez commented on the value of academic preparation programs as they facilitate the process of applying to college and encourage students to become interested in attending the University of California. He commented that, prior to the passage of Proposition 209, enrollment of underrepresented minority students was growing. He believed that, absent affirmative action, this was no longer the case. Regent Núñez saw a need to ensure that underrepresented students who are admitted chose to attend UC and asked for further analysis of this issue. Provost Greenwood reported that such a study would be undertaken for the class admitted for fall 2005. She stated her intention to present the results of this study in spring 2006.

Regent Moores pointed out that a C grade in an advanced placement course would count as a B for purposes of admission. According to the eligibility index, a comparable minimum average SAT score would be 480, which is lower than the average score of California students. Provost Greenwood displayed a chart which showed that approximately 12 percent of admitted students have an SAT I score below 1000. About 3 percent of students who are admitted have a GPA that is below 3.0. She pointed out that in some cases a student's GPA for the senior year was not included in the database, which could skew the results.

Regent Moores commented that he did not understand how a student with a 2.8 GPA could be in the top 12.5 percent of the state's graduating high school class. Provost Greenwood responded that there will always be some students in this category with the potential for success. University Counsel Patti added that the students who enroll in (a)-(g) courses and take the SAT I and II are already a select group. The 12.5 percent relates to the senior class as a whole. Chancellor Carnesale reported that 37 percent of high school students take the SAT.

Regent Moores recalled that he had repeatedly asked for more transparency in the University's admission process. He observed that the *Los Angeles Times* had been able to obtain information about admissions at UCLA that is not available to the Regents. He reiterated his request that such information be provided to the Regents, particularly in light of the fact that BOARS has indicated the intention to keep as much diversity as possible in the system. Provost Greenwood reported that the administration had contacted several vendors about the possibility of creating a database that would be available on the internet, while protecting students' privacy.

In response to a question from Regent Marcus, Provost Greenwood noted that all eligible applicants to the University of California are admitted under the same criteria. All campuses, with the exception of UC Merced, turn away qualified applicants.

5. **CAMPUS UPDATES ON FUND RAISING, SANTA BARBARA AND SAN DIEGO CAMPUSES**

Senior Vice President Darling recalled that over the past ten years, the University's fastest-growing source of revenue had been private giving, largely from individuals and private-

sector organizations. Private support has become a critical complement to State and federal funding in ensuring the University's ability to remain competitive with the best universities in the country. In the current fiscal year, State funding for the University's operating budget is \$2.7 billion, with another \$250 million provided for the capital budget. Private giving is expected to reach \$1.2 billion.

A. *The Campaign for UCSD: Imagine What's Next*

Chancellor Fox reported that the San Diego campus had embarked on a new phase of rapid growth and evolution. To help put its vision into place, the campus is conducting The Campaign for UCSD: Imagine What's Next. This comprehensive campaign will provide much-needed funding for students, faculty, alumni programs, health care, and innovations. The Chancellor noted that the campaign seeks to fund the following five categories:

- *Stellar Students*: ensure educational opportunity and enrich student life.
- *Extraordinary Faculty*: support outstanding faculty.
- *Academic Excellence*: advance academic excellence and launch inventive programs.
- *Improving Lives*: improve lives through research and health care.
- *Innovation Funds*: strengthen innovation funds to respond to emerging opportunities.

The objective of the category "stellar students" is to increase funds for scholarships, fellowships, and student-life initiatives. UCSD's scholarship funds are about one-fourth of those available at UCLA and about one-eighth of Berkeley's. The San Diego campus must compete for outstanding students who have the potential but not the financial means to succeed at UCSD. A new group of alumni are supporting a variety of new student initiatives. An annual 5K run, the Chancellor's Challenge, has raised more than \$250,000 since 1996.

Support for faculty is the second major focus of the campaign. The campus recently celebrated its 100th endowed chair; 26 chairs have been created over the course of the campaign. One of the campus' greatest challenges will be to replace its first generation of faculty, many of whom will retire within the next ten years. The campus will need significant funding to recruit senior faculty replacements, and it must support junior faculty as a high priority.

The third aspect of the campaign is expanding academic programs, which includes enhancing the capital infrastructure. Two schools have been created, the Rady

School of Management and the Skaggs School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences. The campus has launched the California Institute for Telecommunication and Information Technology and is planning a new cardiovascular center and a major expansion of Thornton Hospital. The dedication of the Rebecca and John Moores UCSD Cancer Center was a major event for the campus in 2005.

The fourth goal is to fund research endeavors in the health sciences. To this end, the campus has established the Kavli Institute for Brain and Mind. It has expanded the Shiley Eye Center and secured funding for research initiatives across the campus. The final focus of the campaign is innovation funds and unrestricted support. Innovation funds have been established for all six colleges. The campus has used these funds to create three faculty chairs and has recognized interdisciplinary opportunities being explored by the faculty.

The campaign began in July 2000 and is scheduled to end on June 30, 2007. To date, 72 percent of the campaign goal of \$1 billion has been raised. Chancellor Fox displayed the sources of funds donated to the campaign, which was led by friends of the campus at 37 percent. Another 31 percent comes from foundations, and nearly 30 percent from corporations and other sources. While alumni contributions are low, there has been a marked increase in their participation and interest. Chancellor Fox commented that while typically in a fundraising campaign ten percent of the donors give about 90 percent of the dollars, at UCSD it is less than one percent. This highlights the campus' greatest challenge, which is to expand the donor base.

In response to a question from Committee Chair Kozberg, Chancellor Fox explained that 260 businesses in San Diego had resulted from intellectual property generated on the UCSD campus. Typically the graduate student or faculty member who established the firm will continue to have a relationship with the campus. These firms represent part of the response from the community to the fundraising campaign.

Chairman Parsky emphasized the willingness of donors who are not alumni to support a campus that has helped to generate significant economic activity in the San Diego area. Senior Vice President Darling observed that this holds true for all the campuses.

B. *The Campaign for UC Santa Barbara*

Chancellor Yang outlined the following five priorities of the Campaign for UC Santa Barbara:

- Develop new academic programs and enhance existing ones.
- Encourage interdisciplinary innovation, which has become a magnet for fund raising.
- Increase support for faculty and students, primarily through endowed chairs, fellowships, and scholarships.
- Raise private funds for naming portions of or entire buildings or facilities.
- Build the campus' endowment.

Chancellor Yang reported that Mr. Michael Douglas, a 1968 alumnus, had agreed to serve as the honorary campaign chair. Mr. Douglas has donated \$1 million to the Center for Film, Television and New Media, and he filmed a video message for the campaign. The campus is also grateful to its five Nobel Laureates, who serve as ambassadors for the campaign. The original goal of the Campaign for UC Santa Barbara, which began in July 2000, was \$350 million, but it has since been raised to \$500 million. To date, \$300 million has been raised. The Chancellor commented briefly on the series of campaign receptions which had taken place both around the state and in New York and Washington, D.C. Since the campaign began, the campus has raised 29 new endowed chairs, more than doubling the total, and increased the endowment by 60 percent to a total of \$120 million. Chancellor Yang displayed a chart showing funds raised by purpose, with 44 percent going to endowed chairs, academic programs, and equipment, and 31 percent to research, and a chart showing funds raised by region, with 27 percent coming from the Santa Barbara area and 22 percent from the San Francisco Bay Area. Forty-one percent of the funds raised come from foundations, while corporate donations make up 29 percent. The Chancellor profiled the campus' alumni by age, noting that 72 percent are below age 50 and 93 percent are below age 60.

Chancellor Yang displayed photographs of new buildings which are partially donor supported, including Bren Hall, which is the greenest laboratory building in the country, with a LEED platinum award. With the assistance of Senator Feinstein and Congresswoman Capps, the campus has received a federal grant of \$4 million for the Ocean Science Education Center, with another \$3 million currently in a Senate appropriations bill. The Mosher Alumni House, which will be funded entirely by donors, is scheduled for completion in fall 2006. To help bring the campus' appearance to the same level as its rising academic image, a new entrance gate will be constructed. Chancellor Yang recognized Regent Hopkinson for her suggestion of this idea and for her major leading gift.

Senior Vice President Darling recalled that both Chancellor Fox and Chancellor Yang had emphasized the importance of funding for student scholarships. Each year, the University provides \$100 million in support for students from private sources.

6. **QUARTERLY REPORT ON PRIVATE SUPPORT**

In accordance with the schedule of reports, the **Quarterly Report on Private Support** for the period January 1 - March 31, 2005 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.]

Regent Hopkinson suggested that it would be helpful if the report could indicate which gifts were for endowments and which were for capital campaigns.

The meeting adjourned at 1:20 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary