The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
September 17, 2008

The Committee on Educational Policy met on the above date at the Student Center, Irvine Campus.

Members present: Regents Blum, Cole, Garamendi, Island, Johnson, Lansing, Lozano, O’Connell, Reiss, Scorza, Varner, and Yudof; Advisory members Stovitz and Powell, Staff Advisors Abeyta and Johansen

In attendance: Regents De La Peña, Hopkinson, Kozberg, Pattiz, Ruiz, Schilling, Shewmake, and Wachter, Regents-designate Bernal and Nunn Gorman, Faculty Representative Croughan, Secretary and Chief of Staff Griffiths, Associate Secretary Shaw, General Counsel Robinson, Chief Investment Officer Berggren, Chief Compliance and Audit Officer Vacca, Interim Provost Grey, Executive Vice President Lapp, Senior Vice President Hoffman, Vice Presidents Beckwith, Broome, Dooley, Foley, Lenz, and Sakaki, Chancellors Bishop, Block, Blumenthal, Drake, Fox, Kang, Vanderhoef, White, and Yang, and Recording Secretary Lopes

The meeting convened at 9:35 a.m. with Committee Chair Island presiding.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of July 16-17, 2008 were approved.

2. REPORT OF THE CAMPUS CLIMATE WORK TEAM OF THE STUDY GROUP ON UNIVERSITY DIVERSITY

[Background material was mailed to Regents in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Committee Chair Island stated that this report constitutes the last of four reports presented to the Committee from the Study Group on University Diversity. Interim Provost Grey stated that the Office of the President is reviewing and prioritizing the recommendations of all the reports toward producing an action plan by January 2009. He introduced Chair of the Campus Climate Work Team and former student Regent Maria Ledesma to present the findings of report, and thanked her for her work in chairing the Work Team.

Ms. Ledesma spoke of her gratitude to the Regents and President Yudof for their concern and commitment to university diversity and the anticipated implementation of recommendations. Campus climate, she underscored, focuses on the experience of all
individuals and groups on a campus. Campus climate is a reflection and manifestation of diversity. The term campus climate, she explained, is used by many to mean different things. In the context of the study on campus climate, it is defined as the dimensions which contribute to creating the tone of a campus; the perceptions, real or perceived, of a campus as welcoming and healthy, or unwelcoming and hostile. The term “healthy climate,” she explained, was adapted from the University’s 2006 final report of the Student Mental Health Committee. Healthy climate means the students feel welcomed, respected, and valued by the University. Ms. Ledesma advised that though situations may be tense, uncomfortable, or challenging, if handled appropriately these situations can lead to awareness, understanding and appreciation. It is essential to create an environment of free and open exchange allowing for the exploration and celebration of differences.

Campus climate, she pointed out, is influenced by all community members, including chancellors, students, deans and service workers. Though providing access is the first critical step to diversity, campus climate determines whether students stay and flourish. Research shows a direct connection between campus climate and academic adjustment and outcome. Campus climate is informed by and reflected in five primary dimensions of a University: institutional action, research and teaching, structural diversity, intergroup interaction, and the campus’ socio-historical context.

Ms. Ledesma emphasized that comprehensive data on campus climate for the University of California does not exist. The University Undergraduate Experience Survey has data related to climate, but is limited in scope to undergraduates. Without data and comprehensive sustained assessment, there is no way to understand the source or depth of crucial issues. Assessments must include data and commentary from faculty, staff, undergraduate, graduate and professional students across all disciplines and classifications.

Ms. Ledesma emphasized that an implementation and accountability plan is critical. Assessment data, used appropriately, will create healthier campus climates. She set forth recommendations for implementation. First, the University should regularly assess campus climate by using an inclusive and representative body on the systemwide level. Second, the University should enhance and create programs to support success, including academic and professional support, with sufficient leadership support for the programs. Third, the University should address unhealthy climate factors by exploring avenues to detect, prevent, and correct overt and subtle harassment, racism, and discrimination. Fourth, the University should apply funding and support to enhance campus climate. In conclusion, Ms. Ledesma stressed that leadership is needed in all sectors and levels of the University in order to realize positive change in the campus climate, and that campus climate offers a palpable measure of how the University walks its diversity talk.

Regent Ruiz thanked Ms. Ledesma for her initiative and work on the Study Group on University Diversity and for chairing this work group.

Regent Lansing praised the report as new and significant, and emphasized the importance of achieving a campus environment that motivates the students to stay and flourish.
Regent Lozano asked if there are factors that can be used to measure whether a campus is improving. Ms. Ledesma responded that assessing campus’ micro-climates can lead to a better understanding of campus climate overall.

Regent Varner observed that not overlooking the University’s campus service workers is important to the campus climate as well. He also asked the President and Interim Provost Grey to return to the Committee with specific steps to begin implementation of the recommendations.

Regent Island asked President Yudof to study the recommendations contained in all four of the reports of the Study Group on University Diversity and return to the Committee with a response and proposals deriving from his review.

Chair Island introduced Ms. Chris Strudwick-Turner, Vice President of the Los Angeles Urban League. Ms. Strudwick-Turner stated that she was representing both the League and the Alliance for Equal Opportunity in Education. The Alliance was created in June 2006 to address the disparity in representation of African American students at UCLA and continues to meet weekly on the issue of diversity at UCLA and in the UC system. The Alliance sought a strong statement from the Board, as the voice of the UC system, to deny the implications of the allegation made by Professor Groseclose before resigning his seat on the Admissions Committee at UCLA. Mr. Groseclose claimed that the large numbers of African Americans accepted to UCLA in recent years was due to illegal practices by admissions officers to admit students based on race. Ms. Strudwick-Turner stressed that such an allegation implies that African-American students do not have the qualifications to be accepted at UCLA on their own. She felt that the response by the UCLA campus leadership was not strong enough. Faculty Representative Croughan noted that faculty at UCLA had been quick to respond to the resignation from the committee, which had already completed its work by the time of the resignation.

3. **ESTABLISHMENT OF A SCHOOL OF PUBLIC POLICY, RIVERSIDE CAMPUS**

The President recommended that, effective immediately, Section 15 (a) of The Regents’ provisions as covered under the Standing Order 110.1 – Academic Units and Functions, Affiliated Institutions, and Related Activities of the University, be amended as follows:

**Additions shown by underscoring**

15. Professional Schools

   (a) There are established the following schools, with curricula based on two or more years of undergraduate work:

   ***
School of Public Policy, at Riverside, with curricula leading to the degrees of Master of Public Policy and Doctor of Philosophy.

[Background material was mailed to Regents in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Chancellor White described the grassroots efforts which have culminated in the recommendation for a School of Public Policy at the Riverside campus. Both faculty and policy makers from southern California have been involved in designing the program. There is a compelling need for a school of public policy, the fastest growing degree program field in the nation, with more than 10,000 applicants nationwide and only space for 58 percent of those applicants. He informed the Regents that there is no other institution in the Inland Empire offering a graduate degree program in public policy. The program would offer both a masters degree and doctoral programs in four areas of specialization: health, higher education, immigration, and the environment. He stated that because public policy issues facing the Inland Empire are similar to those faced by many rapidly growing regions worldwide, the campus anticipates a strong national and international demand for the program.

Chancellor White stated that the mission of the school encompasses three broad and interrelated mandates: one, to train a cadre of students in rigorous policy analysis and prepare them for careers in a broad range of sectors; two, to facilitate research by multi-disciplinary teams on substantive public policy problems facing the region, state, nation, and world; and three, to initiate and maintain a dialogue with policy makers at the local, state, and federal levels. He conveyed that currently existing programs at UC Riverside provide a strong foundation for the school, and that 34 of the existing faculty at UC Riverside will hold joint appointments in the new school.

Chancellor White stated that the school is consistent with the campus’ strategic goals, which includes an expansion of graduate and professional education, especially in areas that are responsive to the needs of the state and region. Development of the school is also consistent with the campus’ enrollment plan, which calls for increasing the ratio of graduate and professional students to undergraduate students. At maturity, the school will have 30 doctoral and 150 master’s students. The campus’ Long Range Development Plan provides for the establishment of professional schools on the west campus, where the facilities for the school will ultimately be located.

Chancellor White advised that the resources to establish and run the school have been identified; operating costs for the school will be self-sustaining at full build-out. Initially the program will be housed in the CHASS Interdisciplinary Building, with eventual housing in a new facility in the west campus that will also accommodate the Graduate School of Education, taking advantage of the synergies that will exist between the two professional schools. The campus seeks to welcome students to the program in the fall of 2010.
Regents Varner and Kozberg lauded the program and agreed there was a marked need for the school.

In response to Regent Kozberg’s question regarding the inclusion of an executive program in the school, Chancellor White stressed that the field of public policy is rapidly changing, and expressed the importance of providing continuing education for professionals that will allow them to maintain their roles in policy making and analysis. In addition, an executive program would be a revenue source for the campus. Mr. Anil Deolalikar, Associate Dean of the College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences and director of the initiative that launched preparations for the School of Public Policy, stated that conversations with city, local, and regional officials revealed that there was a tremendous regional need for an analytically oriented program that would help policy makers and practitioners better understand local issues, such as how population growth and migration impact the environment. Analyses conducted by the campus indicate that there would be tremendous demand for these programs.

Regent Johnson expressed satisfaction at the degree of collaboration with the UC Riverside extension program to provide short-term courses. She emphasized that this model, which allows professionals to achieve additional training on a part-time basis, should serve as an example for other programs at the University.

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

4. PLANNING FOR A UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SCHOOL OF GLOBAL HEALTH

[Background material was mailed to Regents in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Interim Provost Grey briefly discussed the proposed School of Global Health, the University’s first multi-campus school. The planners of the school have identified over 700 faculty at all ten campuses, with publication and grant activity in global health, and have evidence of considerable interest in the student population. He introduced former Dean and former UCSF Chancellor Haile Debas, who is leading the effort to develop the school. Mr. Grey noted that neither approval nor funding was being requested at this time.

Dr. Debas described the progress on the planning of the systemwide School of Global Health. This concept has garnered national attention, representing an unprecedented paradigm shift in design and vision which would harness the unexcelled expertise of faculty from the ten UC campuses. Dr. Debas spoke of the contagious enthusiasm of the faculty and students. He introduced Professor Sir Richard Feachem, professor of global health at both UC Berkeley and UC San Francisco, who provided a context for understanding global health and its importance in the 21st century.
Mr. Feachem defined global health as the health of all humankind, and the global and local factors and trends which improve or worsen it. It is a multi-disciplinary concept. Climate change, food and water security, poverty, population and migration are the organizing principles around which the proposed school will be structured. He advised that the challenges and opportunities in global health are great and include disparities, pandemics and health systems: While the life expectancy of a person born in a poor country is 40 years or less, it is 80 years for a person born in a wealthy country. The largest pandemic in recorded history, HIV-AIDS, represents the largest failure in public health of the past century. Drug-resistant tuberculosis is an emerging pandemic threatening many countries around the world, including California. An avian flu pandemic may occur in the future.

Health, Mr. Feachem advised, is the biggest industry worldwide, comprising 10 percent of global gross domestic product. He noted that while health systems are in disarray all around the world, opportunities abound, including a $48 million appropriation with bipartisan support in Congress for AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria research, and the energy and passion among students and faculty for global health.

Mr. Feachem described several examples of current critical issues in the area of global health, including the extent of malaria cases found worldwide and in the United States, the spread of avian flu throughout Asia, and the risks to Mexican immigrants to the United States. He also pointed out that the number of foreign born and trained nurses and physicians in the United States is growing rapidly, particularly in California.

Dr. Debas then spoke of the commitment and unprecedented unity of the planning team membership, chaired by Mr. Harvey Fineberg, President of the Institute of Medicine at the National Academy of Sciences, and which includes a balance of leaders from the private sector, academia, and foundations.

Dr. Debas summarized the key findings of Phase I. He stated that the school represents a paradigm shift from the traditional schools; it will be problem-based rather than discipline-based and will address major global health challenges of the 21st century by joining the health and non-health sciences to solve complex problems. The school is unprecedented in the history of the University as a true multi-campus school. It will be action-oriented, extending the University’s traditional mission of education, research, service, and dissemination to include implementation of projects and policy. The school will be value-adding in that it will collaborate with existing schools, house its centers within those schools and programs when appropriate, and will not replicate the work being done by established schools within the University.

Dr. Debas showed a slide to graphically depict the proposed structure of the school. The multi-campus school will include an administrative center on one campus, where the dean will be located, and five or six centers of expertise located on different campuses, each of which will be lead by a director who reports to the dean as well as to the center’s campus chancellor. Most of the school’s research and educational activity will occur at
the centers. In addition, the school will collaborate with state and federal agencies, international partners, multi-national organizations, foundations, and the private sector.

Initially the school will offer only graduate programs: one and two-year Master’s and Ph.D. degrees. All degrees will be granted jointly by the UC School of Global Health and the campus housing the center.

Dr. Debas noted that an unprecedented amount of unity and collaboration has taken place during the planning of the school among faculty on all ten UC campuses. A wide array of workshops are being held between September and December 2008; at least one workshop will be held at each of the campuses, and each workshop involves multiple disciplines. The topics of the workshops address a variety of major global health challenges, including agriculture, pandemics, emerging infections, climate change and health, water and vector-born diseases, ecology, migration and human mobility, information technology, drug discovery, women’s health disparities, and disasters.

Phase II planning, beginning soon and extending through 2010, will involve finalizing the details of governance, planning fully the educational process, completing the global health workshops, and initiating a competitive selection process for the location of the centers. Dr. Debas emphasized that key to the success of the school is successful fundraising, the strategy of which will be developed and will involve private-public partnerships. A detailed resource plan will be developed. Regental approval for the school will be sought in 2010.

Dr. Debas concluded that the field of global health is very competitive; Harvard, Johns Hopkins, Duke, Emory, Washington, and Stanford universities all have made major investments in global health. He recognized that while the fiscal climate is not favorable to an endeavor of this type, he emphasized that the window of opportunity for the University of California to join the ranks of these universities and lead in this field is narrow.

Chairman Blum stressed the importance of addressing global health issues, noting that many diseases which were thought to be extinct are on the rise. He expressed concern about the coordination of the school with the medical centers, schools of public health, and other related programs. He encouraged the presenters to adequately convey the issues of cost and administration of the school. Dr. Debas agreed that the project is complex, which is the reason for the planning process spanning two years. He assured Chairman Blum that the planners will seek the input of appropriate consulting firms to assist them with planning.

Regent Lansing voiced her strong support for the school. She stated that it presents an opportunity to collaborate and bring the campuses together as an example of harnessing the “power and promise of ten” to achieve a greater good. She emphasized that the research done at the school should not duplicate that being done elsewhere at the University. Regent Lansing applauded the idea of each campus having its own center, but requested that the consideration of where to situate the administrative building should be
a fair, open, and bold process. The campus that houses the administrative building may attain a new identity due to its presence.

Regent De La Peña asked that the chancellors’ offices ensure that no duplicative research is being conducted at the centers, and pointed out the importance of focusing on the structure of the multi-campus school.

President Yudof emphasized the importance of involving the medical schools and schools of public health. He also asked the planners to consider what the footprint of the school will be in the developing world, including relationships with non-governmental organizations and research that is linked programmatically to nations with heath crises.

5. **PROPOSED PUBLIC PHASE OF COMPREHENSIVE FUNDRAISING CAMPAIGN, BERKELEY CAMPUS**

The President recommended that the proposal of the Berkeley campus, jointly with the University of California, Berkeley Foundation, to conduct a campus-wide, comprehensive fundraising campaign, with a goal of $3 billion to support Berkeley’s students, faculty and programs with strengthened endowment, capital, and current-use funding, be approved, subject to the condition that each capital project has been or would be approved at the appropriate time in accordance with Regental policy.

[Background material was mailed to Regents in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Chancellor Birgeneau outlined the fundraising campaign with a goal of $3 billion, the largest goal ever for a university without a medical school. The campaign theme is “Thanks to Berkeley.” He noted that funds will strengthen and advance access to and excellence of UC Berkeley, with $40 million earmarked for equity and inclusion. He reported that the Hewlett Foundation has donated $110 million to be matched, and the campus is halfway toward achieving this. As of the launch date of September 19, the campus will have raised $1.3 billion toward the goal, allowing the remaining five years for raising the balance of $1.7 billion.

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

6. **PROPOSED PUBLIC PHASE OF FUNDRAISING CAMPAIGN, SCHOOL OF LAW, LOS ANGELES CAMPUS**

The President recommended that the proposal of the Los Angeles campus School of Law, jointly with the UCLA Foundation, to conduct a fundraising campaign with a goal of $100 million to support UCLA’s students, faculty and programs with strengthened endowment, as well as current-use funding, be approved.
Chancellor Block indicated that the law school is seeking approval of the public phase of its campaign, having already raised $56 million. He advised that the funds will be primarily allocated as endowment for students, faculty and support programs. He commented that a robust campaign is anticipated.

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

7. PROPOSED PUBLIC PHASE OF FUNDRAISING CAMPAIGN, SCHOOL OF MANAGEMENT, LOS ANGELES CAMPUS

The President recommended that the proposal of the Los Angeles campus Anderson School of Management, jointly with the UCLA Foundation, to conduct a comprehensive fundraising campaign, with a goal of $100 million to support UCLA's students, faculty and programs with strengthened endowment, capital and current-use funding, be approved, subject to the condition that each capital project has been or would be approved at the appropriate time in accordance with Regental policy. The goal of $100 million is an increase from the original $75 million, which reflects the increased number of donors who are prospects for single gifts of $5 million or more, as well as a recent gift of $10 million.

UCLA Chancellor Block described this fundraising campaign for the Anderson School of Management. He noted that this campaign is flourishing, $41 million having been raised in the silent phase. The funding will be divided between faculty and endowment programs.

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

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff