

The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

March 18, 2009

The Committee on Educational Policy met on the above date at the Commons, Riverside Campus.

Members present: Regents Bass, Cole, Garamendi, Johnson, Lansing, Lozano, Reiss, and Scorza; Ex officio members Blum, Varner, and Yudof; Advisory members Powell and Stovitz; Staff Advisors Abeyta and Johansen

In attendance: Regents De La Peña, Gould, Kozberg, Makarechian, Pattiz, Ruiz, Schilling, and Shewmake, 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 Pitts, Executive Vice Presidents Darling and Lapp, Senior Vice President Stobo, Vice Presidents Dooley and Sakaki, Chancellors Birgeneau, Bishop, Block, Blumenthal, Drake, Fox, Kang, Vanderhoef, White, and Yang, and Recording Secretary Johns

The meeting convened at 10:20 a.m. with Vice Chair Lansing presiding.

1. STRATEGIC PLAN PRESENTATION, BERKELEY CAMPUS

[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 Vice Chair Lansing recalled that President Yudof had suggested that the individual campuses present strategic plans to the Regents. She invited Chancellor Birgeneau to make the presentation for UC Berkeley.

Chancellor Birgeneau opened his remarks with the theme of the campus' new campaign, "Thanks to Berkeley." The Chancellor then showed a brief video presentation which was the result of one campaign-related activity, the Photo Booth Project. For the Photo Booth Project, members of the campus community were invited to be videotaped and to provide a short statement about what UC Berkeley means to them.

Berkeley's strategic plan is divided into three segments; the first is Access and Excellence. As a testament to excellence, the Chancellor informed the Regents that China's prestigious Shanghai Jiao Tong University recently ranked the campus as the number three university in the world and number one among public institutions. In 2009, *U.S. News and World Report* also ranked Berkeley as the top public university. The same report listed UC campuses as 6 of the country's top 12, a remarkable accomplishment for the system.

The Berkeley faculty are extraordinarily distinguished, a characteristic that is manifested through their frequent inclusion in honorary societies. They are uniquely well-represented in organizations such as the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the American Philosophical Society, the National Academy of Sciences, and the National Academy of Engineering. In addition, they boast a high number of Nobel laureates and National Medal of Science winners among their ranks. The performance of Berkeley faculty is rivaled only by that of faculty from a small contingent of elite, private institutions. The Chancellor called attention to the number of faculty that Washington is drawing from the UC system – and from the Berkeley campus in particular – to shape the policies of the new administration. Although the list of those selected is long, it is notably crowned with the appointment of Steven Chu as Secretary of Energy, Christina Romer as Chair of the Council of Economic Advisors, and Laura D’Andrea Tyson as a member of the Economic Recovery Advisory Board.

While most of these awardees are senior faculty, the Chancellor stressed the importance of young faculty as critical to the future of Berkeley. The single best quantitative measure of their quality (in science, social science, and engineering) is the large number of Sloan Fellowship awards granted to them. Because the Sloan Fellowships are bestowed upon only the best young faculty in the country, this single piece of data demonstrates the strength of Berkeley’s newer teaching staff.

Echoing the tremendous accomplishments of the faculty is the performance of the students. Ninety-eight percent of the campus’ undergraduate students ranked in the top ten percent of their high school classes, exceeding their peers in private universities across the country. The UCB graduate program attracts students of the highest caliber; the campus recently tied for first place in the *U.S. News and World Report* ranking of Ph.D. programs. Last year Berkeley – by a large margin – received the largest number of National Science Foundation (NSF) fellowships in the country. One out of nine NSF winners said they wanted to come to the Berkeley campus to pursue their Ph.D.s. This compares to one out of 13 who chose the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and one out of 15 who chose Stanford.

Although it does not have a medical school, UCB is research-intensive; in spite of cutbacks in federal funding, the campus’ research budget has been increasing annually. Last year, it reached its all-time peak of \$626 million, including \$48 million for the Energy Biosciences Institute. Not included in those figures is the research funding that goes to Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL). Researchers, students, and postdoctoral fellows from many UC campuses connect with LBNL, but it is particularly important to the Berkeley campus. Research funding at LBNL was more than \$600 million last year, and a significant portion of that went through the campus. There are 250 UC Berkeley faculty (including the Chancellor) whose research funding comes through the Laboratory and who are staff members at the Laboratory as well as faculty members on campus. Over 300 graduate students and 150 Berkeley postdoctoral fellows conduct their research at LBNL.

Chancellor Birgeneau highlighted UCB's research initiative in the area of biofuels. In partnership with LBNL, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, and British Petroleum, Berkeley has formed the Energy Biosciences Institute, a \$500 million project in alternative energy. The Chancellor noted that much of the future of the campus will depend on public-private partnerships such as this one. These collaborations also benefit the community by ensuring that the knowledge developed at the campus is delivered to the marketplace efficiently.

The Chancellor showed a slide featuring two new buildings – the Center for Information Technology Research in the Interest of Science (CITRIS) and Stanley Hall – and one structure currently in progress – the Li Ka Shing Center. Chancellor Birgeneau commented that the Li Ka Shing Center needs significant new resources, and that the construction of Campbell Hall has been put on hold because of the shortfall in State funding. He emphasized that the State budget crisis has had as profound an impact on the campus' capital projects as it has had on its operating budget.

Chancellor Birgeneau touched briefly on Berkeley's arts and humanities departments, noting that many of the campus' humanities programs are recognized for their excellence. Sixty-three different languages are taught at UC Berkeley, including five different Indian languages – more than are taught in many universities in India itself.

Berkeley has an undergraduate student body of 25,151 students. Like the other UC campuses, UCB's six-year graduation rates are extraordinarily high – close to 90 percent. In comparison, 60 to 70 percent of students graduate at a Midwest public institution. Compared to the Big 10 and the great Midwest universities, the University of California does a much better job of seeing its students through from the beginning of their academic careers to graduation. In addition, student satisfaction with Berkeley is generally very high, in the 80- to 90-percent range. Chancellor Birgeneau indicated that this statistic is a particularly pleasant surprise, given the campus' history of oppositional politics and activism.

The intercollegiate athletics program is a source of great pride for the campus, which typically ranks in the top ten in the country in the Director's Cup, an overall assessment of intercollegiate athletic programs. Last year, UCB was ranked seventh. The Chancellor called attention to a common myth that intercollegiate athletics at Division I schools like Berkeley and UCLA are very expensive; he asserted that this belief could not be further from the truth. The overwhelming success of Berkeley's football and basketball teams enables them to generate enough revenue to pay for all of the campus' other sports. He further emphasized that the small amount of money the campus does spend on its athletics program goes to support and scholarships for students.

The Berkeley campus places great emphasis on faculty teaching. Chancellor Birgeneau shared his dream to ultimately create a collegium of great teachers consisting of chairs (equivalent to research chairs) which would be awarded to faculty exclusively because of their preeminence in teaching. Thus far, the campus has created two of these chairs, and

the Chancellor hopes to raise funds for at least ten to foster the development of new ideas in the teaching program.

Berkeley maintains a strong commitment to public service, and emphasizes the importance of volunteering in local communities. It has graduated more Peace Corps volunteers than any other university in the country. It has more than 4,000 student participants in its Cal Corps program, and approximately 6,000 involved in other programs. Overall, UC Berkeley is ranked sixth in the country in numbers of volunteers for the Teach for America program.

The second component of Berkeley's strategic plan is Challenges and Opportunities. Chancellor Birgeneau stressed at the outset that the campus does not have answers for all of its challenges, especially its financial hurdles. However, he was pleased to show the Regents some data developed at Stanford that assess the relative cost-effectiveness of different universities. The Chancellor cited the campus' consistently high rankings for its faculty, in spite of diminishing resources over time. UC Berkeley, among the flagship universities in the country, is the single most cost-effective university by a substantial margin.

The Chancellor referenced an earlier comment by Faculty Representative Croughan regarding Berkeley's worrisome salary gap, particularly for mid-career faculty. The gap with respect to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) is 16 percent, and with respect to Harvard it is 23 percent. Chancellor Birgeneau emphatically stated that Berkeley will not be able to sustain its excellence indefinitely with such a large disparity. He further clarified that this situation is true for every UC campus, not just UCB. Systemwide, UC has incredible compensation challenges, from the highest level to the lowest.

Fundamental to the integrity of the undergraduate program is Berkeley's ability to ensure access and affordability. The campus is also strongly committed to maintaining a robust undergraduate curriculum, with an appropriate cadre of teachers in the classrooms. Chancellor Birgeneau maintained that UCB cannot meet its undergraduate challenges by hiring adjunct lecturers at very low salaries. In addition, student access to courses, laboratories, technology, and enrichment opportunities is critical and must be ensured. The Berkeley campus currently spends \$2 million a year on maintaining state-of-the-art laboratories for its undergraduates. It is not clear that the campus can sustain that \$2 million annually in the current funding environment, a concern that would probably hold true at all of the UC campuses.

The Chancellor reflected that one of UCB's real weaknesses is its lack of a coherent international strategy. Accordingly, Berkeley is currently in the process of changing its administrative structure in international relations. The Institute for International Studies and International Area Studies have been consolidated, and the program has eliminated a deanship as part of its downsizing.

The Chancellor reminded the Regents of the remarkable representation of Pell Grant students at Berkeley. Conversely, UCB's private competitors have very few students from financially-challenged backgrounds, at least among their graduate students. Currently, the "self-help level" at Berkeley, the amount of money a family with an income \$20,000 a year or less has to pay out of pocket, is \$8,200. It is projected to go above \$16,000 in ten years. Chancellor Birgeneau raised the question of how the campus can ask a student whose family income is \$20,000 a year or less to pay \$16,000 a year to attend Berkeley. In his opinion, this issue is one of the great difficulties facing the campus.

Middle-income families, with household incomes between \$20,000 and \$100,000, are required to pay the entire cost (which is about \$26,000) out of pocket. In contrast, Harvard – which costs about \$48,000 a year – offers a generous financial aid package to families in the same income bracket. It would cost more for students whose family income is \$100,000 to attend UC than it would for them to attend Harvard because of Harvard's substantial financial aid programs for the middle class. Chancellor Birgeneau expressed his strong belief that UC Berkeley must not only maintain its financial aid programs for students on Pell Grants, but also must find a way to extend this type of aid to middle class families. His goal is to double the amount of need-based financial aid available, and to find new resources to address the middle class conundrum. At the graduate level, the Chancellor would like to offer competitive fellowship packages to match those of the campus' private peers.

Undergraduate diversity at Berkeley is a source of both pride and concern. While the campus has made significant progress, it still has some quite striking challenges. In 1978, the undergraduate student body was 65 percent Caucasian. Today, the Caucasian population is down, reflecting overall state demographics. Asian and Pacific Islander students have been very successful at Berkeley, growing from 19 percent to 42 percent, and although the Hispanic population is up from 1978 (3 percent then to 12 percent now), it is still lower than the campus prefers. Since 1978, the African American student population has remained constant at three percent. Despite this seeming inactivity, Chancellor Birgeneau presented data which show the statistics in a different light. When normalized, the representation of African American females is up dramatically, exceeding even that of white males. In terms of admissions, African American women are outperforming white men. The Chancellor was exultant at the triumph of these students and said that they were to be commended for overcoming barriers and being so successful.

Regent Garamendi asked for clarification regarding the statistics on female African American students. The Chancellor explained that if the statistics for each group are "normalized," with their representation viewed relative to population, then black women are significantly more successful than white men. Regent Bass then followed up with a request for approximate numbers of Caucasian men and African American women on campus. Chancellor Birgeneau responded that there were approximately 3,000 white males and about 500 African American females.

Like every university in the country, UC Berkeley has experienced an evolution in the gender split of its student body. In 1983, males were in the majority, and today females are in the majority. Similarly, it has made significant progress in gender diversity amongst its faculty. In 1978, faculty was 81 percent white male; currently this figure is 59 percent. The number of women on the faculty has increased dramatically, and the campus has seen a significant uptick this year in the number of African American and Hispanic faculty. The Chancellor expressed some concern at the composition of staff at Berkeley across ranks from support to executive levels. In support staff, Caucasians are in the minority, while their representation at the executive level is almost 94 percent. Chancellor Birgeneau described this disparity as one of UCB's great challenges and recalled the appointment in July, 2007 of a new Vice Chancellor for Equity and Inclusion, Gibor Basri, who leads improvement efforts in this arena. The Chancellor noted that Vice Chancellor Basri has already had a tremendous impact on campus: he has led a variety of programs for faculty and has ensured a strong basis for the student multicultural center. In addition, UC Berkeley has created a program for staff called the Berkeley Initiative for Leadership Diversity, which is having a significant effect both on ethnic diversity and also on the success of staff with diverse sexual orientations. UC Berkeley has developed a ten-year strategic plan for equity and inclusion which Vice Chancellor Basri is just completing. Once it is finished, the University will send it to a major foundation; the Chancellor anticipates it will garner significant funding to support the programs that comprise the plan.

Like all UC campuses, Berkeley does significant work with K-12 schools. Previously, it did little to train high school teachers in the regular science and engineering programs. Recently, however, the campus has been working in partnership with Math for America to create an elite cadre of high school math teachers in the Bay Area. The Chancellor noted that programs like this one are expensive. Citing this, and the limitations presented by Proposition 209, he expressed gratitude to the 501(c)(3) partners who have been helpful in the campus' effort to maintain diversity.

UC Berkeley's revenue situation is similar to that of many of the other campuses. In 1978-79, State funds represented 53 percent of its budget; in 2007-08, they represented 30 percent. The Chancellor remarked that he believes State funding will fall below 25 percent for 2009-10. In essence, the University is evolving from a State-supported public university to a state-located public university. It is critical that this trend be reversed; if the UC campuses are not supported appropriately by the State, inevitably there will be some negative evolution.

UC Berkeley competes primarily with the elite private universities (Harvard, Yale, Stanford, Princeton, MIT) for faculty; these schools enjoy remarkable success in fundraising and, until recently, had sound investment policies, resulting in a rapid escalation in their resources. Since 1995, there has been a shift in American education, in which private institutions are favored. If the campus' State funding is seen as an endowment, Princeton, Stanford, and Yale have all surpassed UCB in terms of dollars available. Furthermore, UC Berkeley has six times as many students as Princeton; in calculating dollars per student, the contrast becomes even more extreme.

Chancellor Birgeneau announced that the projected budget gap for UC Berkeley – before possible fee increases and other strategies are implemented next year – is an astounding \$67.2 million. That includes the \$15 million imposed by the State this year, which the campus absorbed in lieu of cancelling classes and releasing lecturers at very short notice. Chancellor Birgeneau indicated that in his four decades of experience, he has never encountered this type of situation. Calling the budget shortfall “Armageddon,” he stressed the dire nature of this crisis and the profoundly unfair impact it will have on the young people of California. Capital projects will also pose a massive challenge. On the Berkeley campus alone, \$2 billion of seismic work remains to be done, and there is no State funding available for it. This is in addition to the \$67 million shortfall for 2009-10.

Regent Bass asked the Chancellor if the campus would be able to access federal stimulus money for construction and retrofit work on campus. Chancellor Birgeneau responded that he is optimistic about obtaining federal funds for the research buildings – like the Li Ka Shing Center, which is short about \$60 million – but does not see any relief for seismic work. He added that many of UCB’s projects, like the Student Athlete High Performance Center and the UC Berkeley Art Museum, must be funded completely by philanthropy. Fortunately, those projects are proceeding well.

The Chancellor moved on to the third segment of his presentation – Today and Tomorrow – which focused largely on fundraising. In the fall of 2008, shortly before the economic crisis, Berkeley announced a fundraising campaign for \$3 billion. Chancellor Birgeneau explained that among universities without a medical school, \$3 billion is the most ambitious fundraising campaign of any university in the history of the United States. Berkeley is currently half a year into the public part of the fundraising campaign, and has raised \$1.45 billion, nearly half the targeted amount. He expressed great appreciation for alumni and friends who have made extremely generous contributions to the fund. The Chancellor stipulated that he is trying to move the fundraising model for the University away from funds that are spent immediately and towards maintaining the endowment to guarantee long-term financial stability. Of the money currently raised, 38 percent has gone into endowment, and 62 percent has gone toward non-endowment; the Chancellor’s goal is to even the distribution to 50 percent and 50 percent.

Chancellor Birgeneau presented a slide depicting annual private giving totals since fiscal year 2002. In the early part of this decade, Berkeley raised approximately \$100 million annually. Private giving has increased gradually to over \$200 million so far this year. The Chancellor expressed deep gratitude for the continued support of donors, despite the uncertain economic climate. He noted that support at the \$500,000 donor-level remains strong; however, the University was anticipating several gifts at the \$10 million or greater level, and every one of those is on hold. The campus’ attempts to raise a large amount of money for student financial aid have been affected significantly by the economic crisis.

Chancellor Birgeneau illustrated the importance of endowment through a pair of specific examples. In 1872, the first gift to the University was an endowed chair for \$50,000 from Regent Edward Tompkins. That donation was put into endowment which now funds four chairs at the cumulative value of over \$8 million. In the 1940s, Adolph C. and

Mary Sprague Miller gave \$5 million to support basic research in the sciences. That endowment is now up to \$90 million and supports 30 postdoctoral fellows, 10 visiting faculty, and 10 faculty on sabbatical. In all, there are 50 scholars who are supported by the initial gift of \$5 million. The Chancellor underscored that if these funds had been spent long ago, rather than put in endowment, Berkeley would not have many of the extraordinary programs that bring such talented people to the campus.

Regent Johnson expressed an interest in hearing more about the new Vice Chancellor for Equity and Inclusion. She suggested that the work of Vice Chancellor Basri be included the next report on diversity. She congratulated the Chancellor on the position and remarked that it is probably one of a very few such positions. Chancellor Birgeneau responded with information about the Berkeley Diversity Research Initiative through which UCB has hired several outstanding faculty who are experts on topics such as disparities in healthcare. Vice Chancellor Basri suggested this idea to the Chancellor even before he officially assumed the office. Regent Ruiz followed up on Regent Johnson's praise for the new vice chancellorship.

Regent Pattiz asked the Chancellor how Berkeley was able to absorb this year's round of budget cuts. The Chancellor explained that every university has what is called "the float," which is money not yet spent, but committed. At Berkeley, it is about \$600 million – comparable to that at other campuses. UCB borrowed from that pool, and intends to pay it back next year. However, Chancellor Birgeneau pointed out that the continued budget crisis will make that timeline difficult to meet.

Regent Scorza wondered if the campus would be able to incorporate any financial aid ideas from the Obama administration – for instance, the payment of \$4,000 for 100 hours of community service – into programs such as Cal Corps. Chancellor Birgeneau replied in the affirmative and added that he believes the Obama administration's Pell Grant initiative will have a more positive effect on UC than on any other university system in the country. Regent Scorza followed up with a question regarding the impact of the campus' new international strategy on the International Studies programs and departments. The Chancellor clarified that the intent is to bring more coherence to the programs so they will be more effective and provide students with opportunities to spend up to two years abroad.

Regent Bass invited Chancellor Birgeneau to share with the Regents his work with foster children at Berkeley. The Chancellor recalled that in 2005, UC Berkeley was closing down one of the residences over the Thanksgiving holiday to save money and electricity. Campus staff discovered that there were some students in that residence who were former foster children and who would be living on the street if the residence halls were closed. These two staff members started a program, now called the Berkeley Independent Student Network, which currently has approximately 50 undergraduate participants. The first donor, Fred Salinger, provided funds to buy basic essentials, such as bed sheets, for all of the former foster children on campus. Significant donations since that time have enabled the program to fund a half-time coordinator. The Chancellor related a brief biography of one UCB student who had been in 16 different foster homes during her

childhood. Since coming to campus, this woman has won a major scholarship and qualified for the Berkeley track and field team. Citing this student as an example of the challenges and potential these students have, Chancellor Birgeneau affirmed his belief that assistance for foster children should be extended from age 18 to 21.

Regent-designate Stovitz voiced a concern about the relationship between the campus and the surrounding community. He referred to a portion of Chancellor Birgeneau's vision for the Berkeley campus as outlined in the "Access to Excellence" document released in fall 2008. It states that UCB's partnerships with the K-12 community are occasionally "hindered by community distrust of the University." He acknowledged that any disharmony between the two entities long pre-dated the Chancellor's arrival and, in any case, could not be attributed solely to UC Berkeley. However, he pointed out that the campus has superior resources, wonderfully committed students, and a nationally-acknowledged Goldman School of Public Policy. Regent-designate Stovitz expressed a wish to have the campus enhance the community relationship so that it could become partnership based on trust. Chancellor Birgeneau observed that UC Berkeley is not alone in experiencing occasional tension with its surrounding cities; however, he also remarked that the media may tend to emphasize negative occurrences over the many positive interactions. The Chancellor noted that the campus has been working very positively with the City on a downtown development plan and that the City government was supportive of virtually all of the campus' efforts. That said, he reminded the Regents that the people of Berkeley have a history of oppositional politics and that individual politicians may win local support by occasionally expressing public views which are different from their private beliefs. Ultimately, Chancellor Birgeneau emphasized that his responsibility is to provide UCB students with the programs and facilities they need; he does not intend to allow local political agendas to interfere with his service to students.

Regent Makarechian questioned an item in Chancellor Birgeneau's vision for the campus which suggests that some of the UC campuses should be allowed to deviate from the Regents' set student fees by approximately 25 percent. Regent Makarechian asked the Chancellor if he had raised this consideration to the Regents previously. The Chancellor explained that he had discussed the possibility of variable fees with many of the other UC chancellors. Based on his previous experience at the University of Toronto, Chancellor Birgeneau felt that a small discretionary variance would allow individual campuses to address concerns particular to their specific sites. He further reasoned that some campuses with lower enrollment might choose to reduce their fees in order to attract more students. He then clarified for the Regents that he is not currently pursuing this option in light of the likely increase in student fees.

Regent Gould asked the Chancellor to posit the probable changes and losses in the coming years if the campus is not able to marshal the financial resources necessary to function at its current level. Chancellor Birgeneau reported that the initial step in Berkeley's preparation is to increase efficiencies in troubled areas in order to improve quality and reduce costs. The campus has already eliminated a deanship, and some programs will experience significant cuts. Another potential strategy would be the employment of furloughs, a tactic that has been largely approved by UCB's faculty and

non-represented employees. The campus has already changed the financial model for its endowed chairs; half of the chair income now goes into the faculty salary pool. The fundraising campaign will play an instrumental role, and the Chancellor observed that increased student fees would also be a source of needed external funds. Chancellor Birgeneau informed the Regents that UCB has dramatically decreased the rate of faculty hires, from over 100 searches last year, to 25 for this year, and 25 for the year following. This restriction not only saves funding from salaries, but also the cost of start-up packages, which amounted to \$30 million in 2007-08. The Chancellor then stressed that these measures can be sustained only for a few years without seriously affecting the quality of education that students receive.

Regent Lozano commended the Chancellor for his leadership in the arena of diversity and inclusion, and expressed a desire to see similar practices modeled at the other UC campuses. She noted that while the other campuses have also made great strides, the Berkeley campus seems to have been uniquely successful in blending academic excellence with diversity and inclusion. She further urged the Chancellor to have these programs firmly embedded in the culture of the campus to ensure they would be sustained. Chancellor Birgeneau credited much of UCB's success to strategies learned from other campuses. He indicated that Berkeley had tested a few new approaches, such as the vice chancellorship and the Berkeley Diversity Research Initiative, which could be replicated at the other UC sites. The Chancellor added that the campus has recently partnered with the Posse Foundation as an adjunct to its freshman admissions program. The Foundation assists financially-disadvantaged students from the Los Angeles area in applying to Berkeley. The successful applicants come to campus as a cohort, and provide support to each other in their new environment. This concept has worked well at private universities, but until now has not been tried at any public university in California. Chancellor Birgeneau commented that this type of partnership could also be applied to other campuses, but, like all of these efforts, it is expensive, costing more than \$100,000 to maintain.

Regent Kozberg wondered if the Chancellor plans to use the Hewlett model as a pattern for the resource distribution of other, already-endowed chairs. Chancellor Birgeneau responded that the campus is changing the distribution in instances where it is allowed legally, which is in more than 90 percent of the cases. Chairs that are being renewed have the option of contributing; chairs that are being reassigned have no option and will be changed. More than two-thirds of the renewed chairs have agreed to the new model, but the Chancellor indicated that some discussions on the topic had been remarkably complicated.

Chancellor Birgeneau then returned to Regent Lozano's question. He acknowledged that future chancellors may not see diversity and inclusion as a priority, and that it is possible that some of the new programs would not always be supported. However, he informed the Regents that their financial partners, such as the Posse Foundation, are very concerned about the projects' longevity and that UC Berkeley is required to provide a means to ensure – as much as possible – the endurance of the work. Accordingly, the

campus will need to develop ways to institutionalize these programs if it hopes to receive the funding with which to start them.

2. ESTABLISHMENT OF A SCHOOL OF NURSING, DAVIS 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 Nursing, at Davis, with curricula leading to the degrees of Bachelor of Science (B.S.), Master of Science (M.S.), and Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.).

[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 Pitts noted that the proposal for the establishment of a School of Nursing at Davis was being brought before the Board following careful and rigorous review by the campus, by the systemwide Academic Senate, by the Office of the President, and by the California Postsecondary Education Commission. He elaborated that the reviews had examined academic, financial, and organizational issues, and had considered how the School could help meet critical state and national needs. Dr. Pitts acknowledged that, in terms of the State budget, the timing for the project was somewhat problematic. However, he added that a generous donation from the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation would alleviate some of the initial financial strain. Should the School be approved, it would subsequently be named the Betty Irene Moore School of Nursing in recognition of the tremendous gift the Foundation contributed to its creation.

Chancellor Vanderhoef built upon the Interim Provost's introduction by explaining that the Davis campus had first seriously considered the development of a school of nursing in 2003-04. The campus then developed a unique proposal that caught the attention of the Moore Foundation. The Foundation granted UC Davis a major gift to initiate progress on the School, and has been instrumental in its development thus far. The Chancellor closed by asserting that, while the fiscal situation is currently stressed, the University has an obligation to attend to the problems of society. In that light, he held that the proposed

Betty Irene Moore School of Nursing would play a very important role in the much-needed education of nurses in this state.

Ms. Heather Young, Associate Vice Chancellor for Nursing at UC Davis, began her presentation by sharing her enthusiasm for the School and its potential to build upon existing interdisciplinary strengths and investments in areas such as rural medical education and telemedicine. She pointed out that the School had an exceptional opportunity to transform healthcare through nursing education. In approving and building the School of Nursing, the University could lead the way to a healthcare system that is more accessible, of higher quality, more affordable, and that promotes the health and dignity of its patients. Ms. Young observed that the healthcare system is currently in crisis, with escalating costs, inconsistent quality, and unequal treatment based on race and ethnicity. Furthermore, the population of the nation is changing, becoming more diverse and living longer with chronic health conditions and disabilities. Compounding these issues is the nationwide shortage of nurses. Ms. Young explained that by 2020, California will be short 100,000 nurses, about a third of the current nursing workforce, primarily due to retirements. The scarcity is exacerbated by the lack of faculty currently teaching nursing. In 2008, California's nursing programs turned away 20,000 qualified student applicants because of the shortage of teachers. Ms. Young commented that nurses will play an essential part in the solution of many of the state's healthcare problems, and that the School of Nursing will fulfill a central role by supplying faculty and nurse leaders who will re-design health systems ranging from community-based settings to hospitals. These nurses will build a healthcare network that is more accessible, more responsive, more efficient, and more effective.

Ms. Young related to the Regents her vision for the Betty Irene Moore School of Nursing. While the School will offer programs at all levels, the intent is to begin with graduate studies in order to establish research programs and address the need for nursing faculty. Initially, the research programs will focus on two main areas of scholarship: healthy people and healthy systems. The "healthy people" aspect will address populations who have not traditionally been well served by the healthcare system: ethnic minority communities, rural dwellers, and older adults. The "healthy systems" focus will promote systems that adopt and sustain best practices by confronting issues surrounding leadership, management, system change, policy, and technology. Ms. Young noted that the Davis campus is collaborating very closely with UCSF, UCLA, and UCI to identify areas of synergy and to specify areas in which they would differentiate their programs. The Doctor of Philosophy will be the School's first degree and will generate graduates who can be faculty, researchers, and leaders in healthcare. The Master of Science degree will generate faculty for community colleges and will prepare nurses for advanced clinical roles by providing them with critical management and informatic skills. The Bachelor of Science program will prime nurses for clinical practice and leadership and will be a pipeline for the graduate program. She anticipated that full enrollment would reach 456 students: 56 at the Ph.D. level, and 200 each in the Master and undergraduate programs.

Ms. Young outlined the five core elements that will advance the mission of the Betty Irene Moore School of Nursing:

1. Interprofessional and interdisciplinary education will teach health professionals to work, practice, and conduct research as teams.
2. Scholarship and academic excellence will bring together the science of nursing with the art of caring.
3. Cultural awareness and sensitivity will be ensured by preparing graduates to deliver culturally-appropriate care and by recruiting faculty and students from diverse communities.
4. Innovations in technology will be routinely incorporated as part of the School's active and vibrant learning environment.
5. Leadership to advance better care, both at the bedside and in the boardroom, will be advanced through transformative nursing education.

Ms. Young recounted that for nearly two years, UCD leaders have been working closely with leaders in the Office of the President to plan for the School of Nursing. She extended her appreciation to UC Davis Vice Chancellor Pomeroy and to Executive Associate Dean Bonham for their visionary leadership and work in securing the grant from the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation. The grant is unique in that it provides the campus with a 10-to-12-year launch period while State funding and additional resources are secured. The grant will be used to pay for operational costs such as faculty and staff salaries and student stipends. Ms. Young clarified that Davis is buttressing the start-up plans with contingency thinking that balances community need, Foundation expectations, and economic realities to ensure the integrity of the School's vision and the quality of its programs. With more than a decade to test assumptions and make budgetary adjustments, the campus should be able to implement programs at a pace that matches available resources. The campus has identified several options for mid-course corrections, should they be needed.

Ms. Young concluded her remarks by asserting that the University of California is in a position to place itself at the forefront of nursing education and research. UC Davis is building its programs and faculty so that it is strategically positioned to expand as the economy improves. In partnership with the Foundation, the University can respond to a societal need by providing academic excellence, innovations in nursing education and research, improved quality and access to care, and powerful contributions to healthcare reform in California and in the nation.

Senior Vice President Stobo informed the Regents that a recent University of California report concluded that the system needed to increase the number of graduates with nursing degrees at least twofold by 2020, and that it needed to increase by at least fourfold the number of nursing graduates with doctoral degrees in that same period. The Betty Irene

Moore School of Nursing would be an innovative approach to address that need, and it would remedy a major constriction in the nursing pipeline, the dearth of faculty. Dr. Stobo thanked the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation for its vision and leadership in establishing the third school of nursing in the UC system, the first being created 70 years ago at UCSF, and the second 60 years ago at UCLA.

President Yudof expressed his deep gratitude and appreciation to the Foundation for its extremely generous pledge of \$100 million; he highlighted that it is the largest ever received by UC Davis, and is among the largest ever received by any campus in the history of the University of California. The President extended his appreciation to Chancellor Vanderhoef, Vice Chancellor Pomeroy, Associate Vice Chancellor Young, and others who made this public-private partnership possible. He informed the Regents that he has asked Vice President Lenz and his colleagues to work with Dr. Stobo and the campus on this effort and its relationship to the regular budget process. President Yudof emphasized that the University's work in the health sciences benefits immensely from the support of philanthropic donors and that UC is greatly indebted to the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation for this awe-inspiring generosity and confidence in the University. He expressed his belief that the approval of this item would make the Moore family proud.

Regent Johnson asked where the new program would be housed and where the classes would be held. Ms. Young explained that the program is currently in the Health Education Building on the UC Davis Medical Center Sacramento campus and that she is working closely with the facilities department to plan for the upcoming years. She stated that the campus will ultimately raise funds for a new building that will be part of the Health Education Complex; however, that building will not be exclusively for Nursing, but will serve interprofessional purposes and complement the existing Health Education Complex.

Regent Kozberg inquired as to the degree of California's need for nurses compared to that of the rest of the nation. She also sought clarification regarding the interim steps the campus will take to fulfill the donor's intent if the State is not able to provide adequate funding for the program. Ms. Young affirmed that California leads the nation in the nursing shortage and in the anticipated shortfall due to the size of its population and the minimum staffing ratios imposed by the State. She emphasized that the campus would carefully consider the timing of program launches and the size of its classes for the best fiscal effect. Ms. Young also pointed out that a substantial part of program funds are currently dedicated to generous student stipends. Many nurses who attend graduate school hold clinical jobs, and have to take a cut in pay to go to graduate school; the intent of the stipends is to attract these students into the program. The budget also incorporates ample recruitment and start-up packages to entice high-quality faculty to join the School. Ms. Young noted that she would prefer not to eliminate these line items, but that they are available, if necessary, to facilitate cost reduction.

Faculty Representative Croughan praised the proposal and expressed gratitude to the Moore Foundation for their substantial donation and for expanding the Ph.D. nursing program from UCSF to UC Davis. She noted that the Academic Council, in previous

reviews of the proposal, had voiced several concerns about it, particularly about its viability in the current economic climate. She was very pleased with the contingency plans that were developed and expressed her expectation that the Council would be likewise pleased. Ms. Young thanked Ms. Croughan for her input and assistance with the proposal.

Regent De La Peña expressed his support for the program and suggested that UCD develop a means to retain nurses who exit the program, perhaps by creating a policy whereby students who receive scholarships would commit to stay with the campus three or five years after completion. Ms. Young stated that UC Davis as a health system has a very strong record in retaining nurses, and that current surveys indicate that practicing nurses are seeking graduate study in the Sacramento area. She indicated that the School of Nursing would hold definite appeal for public and practicing nurses and would help retention efforts at the campus.

Regent De La Peña then asked if UCD planned on including nurse practitioners in the new school. Ms. Young explained that the campus currently has a very successful Family Nurse Practitioner and Physician Assistant program that has been in existence for 30 years. That program has a very strong record of working with underserved communities and recruiting its students from those communities. Ms. Young commented that she has already been collaborating with the Nurse Practitioner program, which is housed in the Department of Family and Community Medicine; she intends to continue working with the program once the School of Nursing is completed.

Regent Lozano applauded the generosity of the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation and expressed her strong belief in the vision and intent of the program. However, she cautioned that the background materials clearly state that the project rests on State funding and student fees. She added that the Academic Council would not recommend moving forward if the Regents did not have confidence in the ongoing funding stream. Regent Lozano agreed to support the recommendation, but requested that the contingency plan for the item be augmented to facilitate action in the event of future fiscal constraints. In addition, she advised that the campus should furnish the contingency plan with very specific strategies regarding the stability of the program over the long term relative to funding concerns.

Chancellor Vanderhoef acknowledged the validity of Regent Lozano's comments and stressed that the State must recognize the need for the program and must underscore that recognition with funding for its ongoing costs. He informed the Regents that UCD would continue to work for the State's political and fiscal support of the program.

Regent Reiss concurred with Regent Lozano and advised that she did not want the program to result in yet another increase in student tuition and fees. For this reason, she also favored the contingency plan.

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

3. **UPDATE ON IMPLEMENTATION OF STUDENT MENTAL HEALTH REPORT**

Interim Provost Pitts introduced the Student Mental Health Oversight Committee co-chairs, UCSD professor of psychiatry Joel Dimsdale, and UCSB Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs Michael Young, to report on the progress of the implementation plan, present data on student mental health needs, share new initiatives the campuses are employing, and highlight ongoing and emerging challenges.

Dr. Dimsdale informed the Regents that the Student Mental Health Oversight Committee has focused on developing an information infrastructure to track important indicators of student mental health as well as markers of progress in addressing those needs. He noted that all of the accountability efforts have taken place in the context of a changing landscape of student mental health needs.

Dr. Dimsdale showed the Regents data that the oversight committee had collected on UC students. The 2006 UC Undergraduate Experience Survey found that 45 percent of UC undergraduate students reported high levels of stress, and 17 percent reported depression that interfered with their academic success frequently or all of the time. In addition, 10 percent of UC students had seriously considered suicide, and 1.4 percent of them had attempted suicide in the previous year. These numbers are consistent with national data. Dr. Dimsdale explained that the committee sought confirmation of these self-reports by assessing more objective markers of student mental health. The rate of student psychiatric hospitalizations has increased 79 percent across UC in the last year alone. Similarly, there has been a 70 percent increase in students receiving counseling services since 2000, and in 2008, the University saw an 18 percent increase in use of mental health services.

Dr. Dimsdale called attention to this decade's fivefold increase in students registering at UC with documented psychiatric disabilities. The numbers grew from an average of 37 students per campus to an average of 193 students per campus in 2007. Among graduate students, the statistics are more pronounced. Forty-four percent of UC Berkeley graduate students indicated that they had an emotional or stress-related problem, and a recent UC Irvine study found that 17 percent of graduate students had a psychiatric disorder, 15 percent were struggling with substance abuse, and 8 percent had attempted suicide at some point in their lives. In addition, 43 percent believed they needed mental health services, but only 25 percent sought help. Dr. Dimsdale further pointed out that the University has been enrolling increasing numbers of veterans since the 2006 presentation to the Regents. Approximately 31 percent of returning veterans suffer from traumatic brain injury, Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), or major depression. According to Dr. Dimsdale, international epidemiological data reveal that PTSD patients have 15 times the rate of suicide attempts, and 4 times the rate of suicide completions. The number of veterans at UC is expected to increase over time, and the campuses are working to develop services to respond to their needs.

Mr. Young recalled that in the 2006 presentation, efforts were focused on three areas: Tier One, direct delivery of services; Tier Two, interventions for vulnerable populations; and Tier Three, prevention efforts. Resources to support most of these activities had

lagged for many years at UC. Accordingly, student Registration Fees were increased with the stipulation that they be used to support student mental health activities; the increases in 2007-08 and 2008-09 combined for a total of \$12 million. These funds were used on the campuses primarily to cover Tier One, critical mental health and crisis response services. In 2007-08, the campuses hired 41 FTE mental health providers such as psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers, disability specialists, case managers, and after-hours responders. Nine campuses implemented 24-hour telephone crisis counseling services. Additional funds were spent on programs that targeted vulnerable groups such as veterans, graduate students, underrepresented students, LGBT students, and international students. These programs included expanded outreach, mental health internships for students, staff and faculty training, and interventions for students at high risk for alcohol and drug abuse. The campuses have made significant progress in reducing wait time for counseling services, even as the demand for them has increased. They have also made progress in reducing the student-to-counselor staff ratio. However, with one counselor per 1,700 students, it is still outside the range recommended by the International Association of Counseling Services, which – at minimum – calls for one counselor per 1,500 students, and ideally calls for one counselor per 1,000 students. In the face of increasing mental health problems, all of the campuses have been implementing important new initiatives such as 24-hour telephone crisis counseling, placing psychologists in residence halls, colleges, and key student affairs departments, creating mental health coordinators and case managers, and supporting an array of student-led initiatives aimed at reducing the stigma surrounding mental health issues and promoting mental wellness.

Mr. Young reminded the Regents that Registration Fees are the primary source of funding for student services at UC, including student mental health services. Because there has been long-term erosion in the purchasing power of these funds over the past two decades, the University has been suffering from deferred human capital maintenance in these areas. The recent increases have allowed campuses to begin to rebuild their human capital, but much progress still needs to be made in order to bring the University's crisis services and prevention programs up to acceptable standards. The Registration Fee has not kept up with inflation, even in the face of increasing need. Mr. Young informed the Regents that the type of serious mental health issues students are presenting throughout the University represent a major and permanent shift in the reality of student life, and that this shift is the "new normal."

Mr. Young closed his comments with the observation that the Student Mental Health Oversight Committee is focused on accountability, compliance, and reducing risk, and that it is cognizant of the costs involved in the interventions, services, and staffing models that deliver the most responsive care.

Regent Scorza questioned whether or not the University is meeting the mental health needs of its students in spite of the lack of funding. Mr. Young responded that the University would require \$41 million to fully implement the Mental Health Report. Dr. Dimsdale added that the committee has tried to emphasize formal interventions in clinics and health centers, but that effort will not be adequate without the preventive

efforts outlined in Tiers Two and Three. Interim Provost Pitts pointed out that the amount of money going to mental health services has roughly doubled while the committee has been working. Regent Scorza asked for data showing how much funding is currently being received by UC mental health services. Dr. Pitts said he would research the figure and provide this information.

Regent Scorza speculated as to whether the University could wait to increase funding for the program, given the budget crisis. Mr. Young agreed that it might be necessary for the program to pace itself, but the University should make reasonable, thoughtful progress as economic realities allow it to do so. Dr. Dimsdale added that he believes that student mental health is historically one of the least-maintained areas of the University, and that the changes in the past four to five years have been enormously helpful. He related that the committee is trying to examine best practices and determine what some of the campuses are doing well, and what needs improvement. For example, at one large UC campus psychiatric hospitalizations tripled, they increased tenfold at another, and they did not change at all at a third. Regent Scorza expressed his view that student mental health is a life and death issue and not a matter of funding priorities. He advocated that the funding needs of the Student Mental Health Oversight Committee be met.

Regent Garamendi reminded the Regents that in 2006 he had asked the University to investigate gaining access to Proposition 63 funds, which are principally allocated at the county level. He asked what had resulted of his suggestion. Dr. Dimsdale answered that the committee has worked assiduously to meet the requirements for the Proposition 63 funding, but no Requests for Applications or Requests for Proposals have been released thus far. Regent Garamendi acknowledged that serious administrative problems exist in the State Department of Mental Health, and that those problems would complicate the distribution of funds. However, he affirmed that the University and each campus should be held accountable to reach out to the counties and the State for money for these services. Dr. Pitts responded that he would research the degree to which the individual campuses have tried to access the funds and their related stumbling-blocks and successes.

Regent De La Peña observed that most of the \$8 million budgeted seemed to have been used for hiring professionals; he felt that this was a more reactive – as opposed to preventative – policy. He asked what broad-based preventative actions are being applied, and if the students are well-informed about the services and how to access them. Mr. Young agreed that in the first year, much of the funding was allocated to the reactive, Tier One activities to meet critical needs for psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers, and coordinators. However, he countered, as time progressed, more funding was devoted to Tier Two and Three efforts which respond to vulnerable populations such as underrepresented students, LGBT students, graduate students, and international students. Focus was placed on programs that minimize the stress that students experience in their academic careers, and that provide foundational, preventative effort. Regent De La Peña requested information on the preventative measures being taken, noting that he did not see much evidence that the students are aware of the services. He pointed out that UCSB and UCSD had several interesting initiatives, and that widespread campus activities related to them should be employed if they work well. Dr. Dimsdale observed that the

committee has endeavored to promote communication among counseling centers and student health centers, and that the cross-pollination of information and best practices will be a focus for the coming year.

Mr. Young highlighted student-led efforts; for example, a Santa Barbara campus student group called Active Minds is working to destigmatize mental illness and encourage students to be open and forthcoming about issues they may have. Mental health interns work with campus crisis counselors to help respond to the issues of student mental health.

Regent De La Peña queried if the student medical insurance is adequate for psychiatric needs. Dr. Dimsdale responded that many of the UC campuses had different business practices in terms of billing insurance. Some sites do not bill because they have concluded it is not productive; others are billing to help cover costs. Mr. Young added that student health insurance is currently being reviewed by a group within the University. Regent De La Peña observed that student insurance would seem to be a source for considerably more revenue for mental health services.

Regent-designate Bernal asked if there were specific data collected on the needs of particularly vulnerable populations, such as students of color, LGBT students, and foster care youth, and if there were plans for targeted outreach to them. Mr. Young explained that they had identified groups with the highest risk and are planning to work with extant programs, such as the campuses' women's centers, gay and lesbian centers, and educational opportunity programs, to make sure they respond properly to the needs of the various student communities. Regent-designate Bernal followed up with a question regarding statistics on students who may have left the University due to mental health issues. Dr. Dimsdale agreed that information of that type would be helpful, but that the University realistically could collect data only on students who are registered and enrolled.

Regent Varner commented that student mental health is a matter of vital importance and that he would like the committee to continue its efforts. He requested that they report back regarding their successful prevention strategies and their identification of ways to access resources through State and local channels as well as through reimbursement from insurance agencies. He noted that increased societal and financial pressures will likely result in an increased need for treatment and prevention and that this need should be shared in discussions with State and federal elected officials.

Faculty Representative Croughan asked if the committee had seen any actual reductions in morbidity and mortality as a result of its efforts. Dr. Dimsdale commented that the committee had originally been struck by the campuses' lack of data tracking for mental health-related events. Consequently, the committee has been working with the campuses to agree what items they will record and to ensure that they do so consistently and accurately. The new data are showing an uptick in recorded events, but is difficult to determine if that is due to decreased stigma on the part of students, that students now recognize that the system has more capacity to respond to their needs, or that students are having more difficulties.

Staff Advisor Johansen wondered if the general campus community was being educated as to how to identify potential at-risk students and ensure they receive services. Mr. Young affirmed that virtually all the campuses have very extensive training efforts both for staff and faculty to help them identify students who may be in distress and – more importantly – what to do when they find students who are in need of assistance.

Regent Pattiz asked if the committee believed that some treatments, such as certain medications, might be responsible for increased suicide risk. Dr. Dimsdale clarified that the UC suicide rate had not increased. He did, however, point out the increase in psychiatric hospitalizations, which he felt was significant. He mentioned that getting into a psychiatric hospital is very difficult, and that a student has to be severely disturbed to be admitted.

Dr. Pitts closed by stating that the Student Mental Health Oversight Committee will continue to determine the most effective and economical methods to address the mental wellness of the UC student body.

The meeting adjourned at 12:45 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff