

The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

July 14-15, 2010

The Committee on Educational Policy met on the above dates at UCSF–Mission Bay Community Center, San Francisco.

Members present: Regents Cheng, Island, Johnson, Kieffer, Lansing, Lozano, Marcus, and Reiss; Ex officio members Gould, Yudof, and Zettel; Advisory member Powell, Staff Advisors Herbert and Martinez

In attendance: Regents Blum, DeFreece, De La Peña, Hime, Makarechian, Maldonado, Ruiz, Schilling, Varner, and Wachter, Regents-designate Hallett, Mireles, and Pelliccioni, Faculty Representative Simmons, Secretary and Chief of Staff Griffiths, Associate Secretary Shaw, General Counsel Robinson, Chief Investment Officer Berggren, Chief Compliance and Audit Officer Vacca, Provost Pitts, Executive Vice Presidents Brostrom and Taylor, Senior Vice Presidents Dooley and Stobo, Vice Presidents Beckwith, Duckett, Lenz, and Sakaki, Chancellors Birgeneau, Block, Blumenthal, Desmond-Hellmann, Drake, Fox, Kang, Katehi, White, and Yang, and Recording Secretary Johns

The meeting convened at 9:55 a.m. with Committee Chair Island presiding. Committee Chair Island noted that the items to be discussed at this meeting were important to the future of the University.

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

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of May 19, 2010 were approved.

2. **STRATEGIC PLAN PRESENTATION, SANTA BARBARA CAMPUS**

Chancellor Yang recalled that UC Santa Barbara is 66 years old. The campus has about 20,000 undergraduate students, a little over 1,000 faculty members, 3,652 staff members, and 160,000 alumni. In 1995 the campus was elected to the Association of American Universities (AAU). More than 90 local companies have been established by UCSB faculty and alumni. Almost half of UCSB's undergraduate students provide volunteer community service every year. Over half of all graduating seniors have collaborated with faculty members on original research or creative projects. The campus' arts and lectures program provides a bridge between town and gown. Another form of community outreach is the campus' new partnership with a local school, the Harding Elementary School, whose students are 95 percent Hispanic. In December 2010, UCSB will host the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) College Cup for men's soccer; in 2006 it won the NCAA title in men's soccer.

Chancellor Yang stated that UC Santa Barbara is a campus of choice. The number of freshman applications has almost tripled over a period of 16 years, while the number of transfer applications has more than doubled. Since 1994, the grade point average of incoming freshmen has increased from 3.47 to 3.9. Chancellor Yang discussed a chart showing the percentage of Chicano, Latino, African American, and American Indian students at UCSB from 1994 to 2010. The percentage of these students remained at a steady 16 percent in 1996, even after passage of Proposition 209. It has now increased to 25 percent. Among AAU institutions, UCSB has the highest percentage of Hispanic students enrolled, based on 2008 data. The campus has achieved these enrollments through its communications program. UCSB has held 75 regional receptions since 1995, meeting with over 47,000 prospective students and parents. Campus delegations have visited Bakersfield, inner city Los Angeles, Orange County, San Diego, San Francisco, and Concord.

Chancellor Yang next discussed UCSB's research strengths and its outstanding faculty members. Since 1998, five UC Santa Barbara professors have won Nobel Prizes. Alumna Carol Greider, a 1983 graduate in biology, won the Nobel Prize in 2009 in physiology or medicine. Her success reaffirms the value of undergraduate education at UCSB. Professor Shuji Nakamura, the inventor of the blue laser and of blue, green, and white light-emitting diodes (LEDs), won the 2006 Millennium Technology Prize. The campus is mourning the recent passing of Professor Luis Leal (1907-2010), a pioneer in Chicana and Chicano studies who received the National Humanities Medal in 1997. As an indicator of the strength of UCSB's junior faculty, Chancellor Yang informed the Regents that from 2005 to 2010, UCSB ranked third in the nation for receipt of distinguished awards for junior faculty in science and engineering on a per capita basis. This year, seven faculty members won National Science Foundation (NSF) Faculty Early Career Development (CAREER) awards. Over the past 16 years, total research award funding at UCSB has almost tripled. The current-year total is \$222 million. On average, each ladder-rank faculty member brings in \$300,000 annually in research funding. Presenting himself as an example, Chancellor Yang noted that two of his grants funded by NSF this year totaled \$1 million, and that he teaches one undergraduate course every year.

In order to develop its own unique strengths and complement other UC campuses, UCSB has cultivated highly interdisciplinary and collaborative research clusters. The Kavli Institute for Theoretical Physics was ranked as the most influential national research facility for science impact on non-biomedical research in the *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. Its director is Nobel laureate David Gross. Fields Medalist Michael Freedman heads a research group focused on quantum computing funded by Microsoft and known as "Microsoft's Station Q." Professor Michael Gazzaniga, known as the "father of cognitive neuroscience," directs the SAGE Center for the Study of the Mind and the Law and Neuroscience Project. Professor Shuji Nakamura co-directs the campus' Solid State Lighting and Energy Center. Professor José Cabezón, in the Department of Religious Studies, is director of the Sera Monastery Project, an interactive multimedia database of a renowned Tibetan Buddhist monastery. UCSB and UCLA are partners in the California Nanosystems Institute (CNSI). One of CNSI's facilities, located at UCSB,

is the AlloSphere, a three-story visualization sphere with a 30-foot diameter and a 360-degree projection dome which links science with the arts and humanities. Two centers, the Center for Nanotechnology in Society and the Center for Information Technology and Society, are focused on the social impact of these new technologies. The Institute for Collaborative Biotechnologies is led by UCSB, with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the California Institute of Technology as secondary partners. It has received \$100 million in funding for ten years. The Department of Energy has recently funded an Energy Frontier Research Center in which UCSB participates, the Center for Energy Efficient Materials. The campus houses the Carsey-Wolf Center for Film, Television, and New Media. Since 1994, the campus has focused on emerging research in digital humanities. Three examples are Transcriptions, a research initiative on the cultures of information, the English Broadside Ballad Archive, which has received a third grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities, and Voice of the Shuttle, an influential web resource for the humanities. The American Presidency Project, begun in 1999, has become the definitive online source for U.S. presidential documents; its website has received almost five million visitors in the past three-and-a-half years.

Chancellor Yang then outlined some of the campus' sustainability efforts. Bren Hall, which houses the Bren School of Environmental Science and Management, is the first building in the nation to receive two Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Platinum certifications. The San Clemente graduate student housing facility has received LEED Gold certification. It is the largest LEED-certified housing facility on any campus in the U.S. The previous month, UCSB received three Best Practice awards at the annual California Higher Education Sustainability Conference. The campus has a Sustainability Plan and a Sustainability Committee to help it achieve its long-term vision in this area.

Chancellor Yang discussed the budget challenges now facing the Santa Barbara campus. Over the past seven years, State funding for the campus has been reduced by \$102 million, equivalent to 30 percent of the current-year State funding for UCSB. The campus has 547 fewer staff employees than it had two years previously and 32 fewer professors than a year previously. Faculty retention has become difficult. This year, the campus had 900 students enrolled for whom it received no State funding. Chancellor Yang emphasized that the campus must continue to deliver the education students deserve in spite of numerous challenges, including larger and fewer classes; a smaller number of teaching assistants, readers, and tutors; limited resources in critical areas, such as information technology; delayed implementation of the systemwide Graduate Student Health Insurance Plan; lagging instructional technology; and deferred maintenance on an aging campus infrastructure.

Chancellor Yang presented a slide with an artist's rendering of the campus as envisioned in 2025. There are challenges involved in achieving this vision. All campus construction projects must be approved by the California Coastal Commission. Over 70 percent of UCSB instruction and research space is at least 35 years old. Available funding for capital projects is scarce. The median housing cost in the Santa Barbara area is close to \$1 million.

UC Santa Barbara's strategic academic plan is built on a foundation of excellence and diversity and seeks new opportunities in an interdisciplinary and collaborative environment. It includes a long-term enrollment goal to raise the campus' enrollment limit from 20,000 to 25,000 students. The challenges to this plan include economic uncertainties affecting enrollment, providing housing for faculty, staff, and students, recruitment and retention of outstanding faculty, and providing competitive graduate student support.

Chancellor Yang stated that the campus would request approval of its Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) at the September meeting. The LRDP review process has been extensive, with more than 60 community presentations. The campus has engaged in mitigation talks with local government representatives on issues such as transportation, housing, police, and fire. One example of how UCSB has been meeting its housing challenges is the North Campus Faculty Housing, a 12-year project. The California Coastal Commission granted unanimous approval for 161 homes. The first phase of the project, 22 units, is now under construction. The campus recently reached a conservation agreement to preserve 650 acres on a 2.25-mile stretch of coastline. This is a collaborative project with the City of Goleta, Santa Barbara County, and local nonprofit conservation organizations.

Chancellor Yang concluded with remarks on private fundraising. He presented a chart showing the results of UCSB's first capital campaign, which has raised \$590 million. He reported that he has held four retreat meetings with deans, directors, and the leadership of the UC Santa Barbara Foundation to plan for the next capital campaign. He stated that the campus would seek approval in the fall for a revised campaign with a goal of \$1 billion in the next four years.

Regent Lansing congratulated Chancellor Yang on the growth of the campus under his leadership and thanked him for his work.

Regent Varner recalled that he graduated from UC Santa Barbara in 1954. He echoed Regent Lansing's sentiment and congratulated Chancellor Yang on the extraordinary accomplishments of the campus.

Regent Marcus concurred with Regents Lansing and Varner and emphasized the tremendous improvement in quality brought about by Chancellor Yang. The instability preceding Chancellor Yang's tenure only further magnifies this achievement.

Regent Lozano thanked Chancellor Yang for his direct involvement with external constituents, which has led to success in the campus' long range planning.

Regent De La Peña asked about the distinction between Chicano and Latino students made on one of the presentation charts. Chancellor Yang responded that the two groups are sometimes distinguished and sometimes considered together.

Regent Ruiz stated that he was impressed with diversity at UCSB, and with how the campus achieved both quality and diversity. Chancellor Yang responded that quality and diversity complement each other.

President Yudof praised the tenacious work of Chancellor Yang, who is now the longest serving UC chancellor, as well as head of the Association of American Universities.

Regent Reiss stated that the presentation was inspirational and thanked President Yudof for having the campuses present their strategic plans to the Regents.

Regent Makarechian commended Chancellor Yang for his dedication to UC and for his public service. He recalled how the campus offered its help to the local community during recent wildfires.

Committee Chair Island hailed Chancellor Yang's efforts to achieve the University's diversity goals. His success indicated a path forward for all UC campuses.

3. **FALL 2010 UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSION OUTCOMES**

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

Provost Pitts observed that 2010 is the second year in which the University recognizes that it is not receiving funding from the State for a large number of its students. Although the University admitted slightly fewer California freshmen this year than the previous year, there was a substantial increase in the number of transfer students. This reflects the high quality of preparation in lower division coursework that students receive at the community colleges. The lack of State funding for a large number of enrolled students will continue to be a challenge for the University in the coming years.

Vice President Sakaki informed the Regents that the University had its largest freshman applicant pool ever this year, with over 100,000 applicants. Transfer applicants also increased by more than 17 percent. From this pool, UC campuses admitted about 70,000 California resident freshmen and almost 21,000 California resident community college transfer students. The University has received slightly over 34,000 Statements of Intent to Register (SIRs) from California resident high school graduates. This represents a smaller decline from the previous year than expected. For example, UC Riverside admitted approximately 6,000 fewer applicants than the previous year, but the number of SIRs increased.

Because not all students who submit SIRs in fact enroll, it is still too soon to determine if the University will achieve its freshman target of just under 33,000 students. By contrast, the University is almost certain to exceed its target for transfer students. UC campuses have received 15,718 SIRs from California resident community college transfer students. This is an increase of almost 2,000 students over the previous year. Increasing transfer enrollment has been a goal of the University for many years. This effort is now producing

results beyond expectations, which Ms. Sakaki described as a mixed blessing at a time when UC is attempting to reduce overall enrollment. Campuses have tried to smooth the transfer path with expanded transfer admissions guarantee programs and efforts to streamline preparation for UC major programs. These initiatives have helped fuel large increases in transfer applications. Both the number of applications UC receives and the number of admitted students who accept UC's offer are affected by enrollment reductions at the California State University (CSU).

UC continues to attract students with strong academic backgrounds. Grade point averages have increased for both freshmen and transfer students. UC's diversity also continues to increase. In 2010, over 42 percent of UC's projected new freshmen come from families where neither parent has a four-year college degree. More than 42 percent are from low-income families, and almost 28 percent are from underrepresented minority groups (URMs). More than half of the community college transfer students are first-generation college students. More than 41 percent are from low-income families, and 24 percent are URMs. The overall increase in URM students reflects proportional increases from each URM group in the new freshman class. The largest increase was for Chicano/Latino students, who now represent 23.1 percent of UC's new freshmen, up from 20.9 percent in the previous year. The representation of American Indian students increased from 0.6 percent to 0.8 percent. There was a slight proportional increase in African American students, from 3.8 percent to 3.9 percent. Ms. Sakaki noted that there has been specific interest in admissions outcomes for the San Diego campus. UCSD received 68 SIRs from African American freshmen, an increase of nearly a third over the previous year's 51. These numbers are smaller than the University would like, but they reflect progress in achieving the goal of enrolling a freshman class that is broadly reflective of the diversity of California.

Ms. Sakaki concluded by remarking that UC remains attractive and accessible to a large number of well-prepared, diverse students. For freshman students, UC has increased the quality of its incoming class, maintained access for disadvantaged students, and made slight gains in the proportion of URM students. At the same time, the University has reduced new enrollments closer to budgeted targets. For transfer students, the University has continued to experience enrollment growth, maintain quality, and increase diversity across all groups.

Regent Ruiz expressed concern about the levels of African American enrollment. He stated that work needs to be done in this area and hoped the University could establish a special initiative or program to address it. Ms. Sakaki responded that Committee Chair Island has communicated with the Board on Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) about this issue. Discussion is taking place at all levels.

Dr. Pitts added that the Office of the President makes use of a transcription evaluation service technology which can gather transcript information from high school students early in their high school careers. The Fresno Unified School District has an agreement with the University through which UC provides information to students and their counselors on their standing in the process of achieving UC and CSU eligibility. The

University can now identify students earlier in the process who are approaching eligibility, provide encouragement, and communicate with their counselors. The University will attempt to apply this approach to certain schools in the Los Angeles Unified School District. While the number of African American students the University can admit to its campuses is far lower than it would like, the performance of those students who are eligible is good. The challenge for the University is to increase the number of eligible students and to create a larger pool from which to admit. Progress in this area is slower than desirable. It involves school districts, teachers, counselors, and parents, individuals to whom the University does not always have access, but UC is making inroads. Chancellor Blumenthal observed that the University is pleased about the increased yield at all the campuses, particularly for transfer students. The unexpected increase in yield will also require UC to secure the resources necessary to offer the necessary classes to these students.

Regent Cheng asked about the reasons for the increase in African American student enrollment at UCSD. He also asked about the expected impact on the University of the increase in transfer students and if the University is taking any additional measures to ensure that transfer students receive adequate support. Chancellor Fox responded that the San Diego campus worked very hard on this issue, making personal telephone calls to students and arranging an overnight visit to the campus. While the number of African American students is still low, it is increasing. With these interventions, the campus has avoided having a reduced freshman and transfer class.

Regent Cheng asked if these activities included participation by African American students. Chancellor Fox responded in the affirmative. African American fraternities also became involved and helped raise money for scholarships. She added that the campus is constructing transfer student housing, not previously available at UCSD.

Ms. Sakaki referred to Regent Cheng's earlier question about support for transfer students. There has been interest on all the campuses in increasing the transfer function, including issues of preparation as well as concern about the increased numbers. The vice chancellors for student affairs are very much aware of the need for orientation programs and additional services and are working on this matter. Dr. Pitts added that this is an area where budget issues pose continuing challenges. Student services are under significant strain due to reduced budgets and the disproportionate reduction of administrative services at UC compared to educational costs. He expressed confidence that the campuses were doing as well as possible given the existing constraints. Chancellor Fox reported that her campus is providing opportunities for students to volunteer to assist with recruiting activities. One such activity, "An Evening with UC San Diego," takes place on weekday evenings. The Chancellor, vice chancellors, deans, and students meet and speak with applicants and admitted applicants individually.

Regent DeFreece asked about the effect these diversity efforts might have on other student groups on campus. For example, UC has received criticism regarding the possible impact on Asian American student enrollment. Dr. Pitts responded that the number of SIRs from Asian American students has increased again this year. There has been no

decline to date. There is a concern among some Asian American advocacy groups about the effect of the “entitled to review” admissions policy. The University continues to have routine meetings with a number of interested constituency groups, mainly to inform them about the new policy and how it opens the door for a greater number of applicants, including Asian Americans. The number of Asian American applicants who will be entitled to review under the new policy will exceed the number now eligible for review.

Regent Zettel acknowledged that this is a challenging time for the admissions process. She congratulated Chancellor Fox on her special outreach efforts and emphasized the effect on a prospective student of receiving a personal telephone call from a senior administrator. Chancellor Fox thanked Regent Zettel for her participation in UCSD student recruitment efforts.

Chancellor Birgeneau suggested that data on economic diversity could be provided in future presentations. Economic diversity can be measured effectively by the number of students who are Pell Grant recipients and consequently low-income students. In the last three years, the number of Pell Grant recipients at UC Berkeley has increased from 7,400 to 9,300, the largest number the campus has ever had. This development is directly related to the fee increase, which also increased the amount of financial aid available.

Faculty Representative Simmons noted that some members of the Legislature have expressed concern about the University’s transfer function. In that context, it might be useful to highlight some relevant statistics. Applications from transfer students have increased by 17.5 percent and UC has received SIRs from about 2,000 transfer students, while the University had considered increasing transfer student enrollment by only 500. The University is probably accommodating many transfer students for whom it does not have capacity. Well over half of these transfers are first-generation college students. Mr. Simmons hailed this as a sign that the community college system and the transfer system are working well and providing educational opportunity as envisioned by the California Master Plan for Higher Education. The process can be improved, but its effectiveness should be recognized.

Regent Johnson emphasized the importance of economic diversity and UC’s competition for top-notch students, who may choose a college based on how much aid they receive. The Blue and Gold Opportunity Plan and other financial aid programs must be kept available.

Committee Chair Island referred to the chart displaying the diversity of 2010 freshmen by ethnic/racial categories. He asked about how diversity might be defined in the future, given the trajectory indicated on this chart. He recalled that 40 years previously, white students represented about 71 percent of UC’s student body. Based on 2010 SIRs, this figure is now 26.3 percent, while the white population in California is about 46 to 47 percent of the state total. The Chicano/Latino population is about 36 to 37 percent of the total state population. Dr. Pitts responded that the University is attempting to achieve the first step on the path, which is to accept a student body which is broadly reflective of the population of California. UC is unlikely to achieve a student body close to the

population of high school graduates. The University has no influence on many aspects of this situation, such as what proportion of high school graduates chooses to become eligible and what other opportunities may be offered to these students. This leads to the conclusion that holistic review is among UC's best practices. Rather than requiring students to achieve a certain set of numbers, the University is seeking to admit the best possible student body. Dr. Pitts stated his belief that this would result in a diverse student body in terms of all the criteria considered, and his view that matching the number of white student SIRs with the number of white high school graduates would not be an appropriate metric.

Committee Chair Island expressed agreement that the University should not match the student population with numbers of state residents. The University, however, should be concerned about whether its admissions process will in fact allow it to meet its mandate to educate a broad cross-section of the state's population. He suggested that the current trajectory indicates that UC will not achieve this. It is not achieving this goal with regard to African American students. The figures for white undergraduates suggest that they may not be represented in sufficient numbers in the future. Dr. Pitts responded that the University would continue to examine admissions year by year and to consider its admissions strategies. UC would remain mindful of Committee Chair Island's concern.

Regent Makarechian asked about the reasons for the decrease in white student SIRs. He suggested that this may be due to the fact that middle-income students are not as eligible for financial aid or tax write-offs as low-income students are. Dr. Pitts responded that there are probably several reasons for this situation. One reason is that the relative proportion of white high school graduates is decreasing, while the proportions for other groups are increasing. Middle-class students are currently the group most pressured by UC fees. This is a sad fiscal reality. At the same time, data suggest that students do not select a college entirely based on cost; this is one factor in their decision, but other important factors are quality and geographic location.

Regent Makarechian requested information on the income levels of the student groups listed in the chart, including transfer students. Provost Pitts responded that he could provide family income data for these students.

Regent Blum observed that some students are disadvantaged by geographic location and the schools they attend. He asked about how UC is working with high schools and how it considers this factor in admissions. Dr. Pitts introduced systemwide Director of Undergraduate Admissions Susan Wilbur. Ms. Wilbur noted that one aspect of the University's comprehensive review process in admissions is "achievement in context." When campus admissions offices review applicants, they have a fair amount of data on the high schools applicants attend. The University knows the characteristics of the school, including the average test scores, how many students receive lunch free or at a reduced price, the number of fully and partially credentialed teachers, and the number of honors courses available. The University has a sense of the school environment and the student's accomplishment in that context. The University knows how many applications it has received from a school, and how an individual under review compares with other

applicants from the same school. The campuses receive this information and incorporate it in their overall review of the applicant.

Regent Blum asked how Advanced Placement courses are factored into the calculation of grade point average (GPA). Ms. Wilbur responded that by policy, the University allows students to receive up to eight semesters of honors grade points for their core UC GPA. But as part of the review in context, campuses have access to an unweighted GPA, so that they can consider students' achievement without honors courses. Campuses also receive a fully weighted GPA which includes all honors grade points. The University considers three GPAs – weighted as per policy, unweighted, and fully weighted – and gains a sense of the student's achievement. The unweighted GPA allows the University to balance the role of honors courses in the review appropriately. The fully weighted GPA provides a full picture of the student's achievements.

Regent Blum asked how much difference honors courses can make for a student's GPA. Ms. Wilbur responded that the University looks for students who have challenged themselves in high school and who have performed at a high level. GPA, number of courses completed, and number of honors courses completed are an important part, but not the only part, of the many factors UC takes into consideration in evaluating students.

Regent Schilling noted that some organizations, when asking individuals to identify their race, include a "multiracial" category. She asked if the University was contemplating including such a category, which could change some of the statistics presented. Ms. Wilbur responded that the University is currently following a protocol which has been in use for many years. This year, for the first time, all U.S. universities are adopting the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) reporting requirements, which include this data point as well. Dr. Pitts added that the exact formulation of the student group categories UC uses in its reporting has been discussed at various times by the Regents. UC has chosen to follow national standards. It will add the "multiracial" category in conformance with IPEDS standards. Ms. Wilbur noted that the IPEDS reporting requirements went into effect for fall 2010.

Regent Reiss requested data on students' family income and expressed concern about middle-income students who are ineligible for Cal Grants or Pell Grants. She noted that the federal government would now provide student loans directly and asked for data on possible changes in loan conditions for students, such as limits on loan amounts. Finally, she suggested that the chart which displayed the diversity of 2010 freshmen by ethnic/racial categories could include information on high school graduates; in this way UC could compare its trends in diversity with the pool of graduating high school seniors. Dr. Pitts offered to provide this information. Regarding the last point, he noted that this information has been presented in the past as the "gap report," showing the gap between percentages of high school graduates and those who choose to attend UC.

4. **BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS REPORT ON COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW IN FRESHMAN ADMISSIONS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, 2003-2009**

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

Provost Pitts and Faculty Representative Powell introduced Professor Sylvia Hurtado, the current Chair of the Board on Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS).

Ms. Hurtado quoted a Regents' resolution of May 16, 2001, which stated that UC "shall seek out and enroll, on each of its campuses, a student body that demonstrates high academic achievement or exceptional personal talent and that encompasses the broad diversity of backgrounds characteristic of California." BOARS considers this a mandate for inclusive excellence. At the request of then President Atkinson, BOARS developed evaluation procedures that would look at applicants in a comprehensive manner, using a variety of measures of achievement. This work resulted in the comprehensive review guidelines now followed by UC admissions offices. The comprehensive review guidelines were approved by the Regents in November 2001.

In November 2002, BOARS presented a report to the Regents on the first year of implementation. In September 2003, a second report summarized a study of the processes and outcomes at six UC campuses. The current report covers processes and outcomes between the 2003-04 and 2009-10 academic years for all nine campuses that admit undergraduates. The report also documents a new set of challenges, including State support, workload, demand for access to UC, replacement of experienced staff, and affordability. The focus on achieving academic excellence inclusive of diversity, especially in preparation for eligibility reform in 2012, gives the report a new context.

Campuses use three general models of comprehensive review. A single-score holistic model is used at UC Berkeley and UCLA. A two-stage, multiple-score model that assigns points and weights to academic and personal criteria is used at the Irvine, Davis, San Diego, and Santa Barbara campuses. Reader ratings cover much of the qualitative information in the application and supplement quantitative indicators. A fixed-weight model is used at the Santa Cruz, Riverside, and Merced campuses. All campuses review files before denying an applicant.

In practice, comprehensive review has become synonymous with the use of multiple criteria for selection and assessment of achievement in the context of opportunity. Twenty-eight indicators are used to assess the high school context. The student's own family background is also taken into account, including financial challenges and challenges related to being a first-generation college student. Individualized student review is an important component of the process. All campuses review "ineligible" applicants to look for indications of promise in case they may qualify for admission by exception. However, campuses differ in the weighing of criteria in selection and the value placed on reader ratings.

Campuses have clearly defined comprehensive review criteria, which are publicized on campus websites and communicated to high school counselors. Campuses strive for transparency by providing public information about processes. The employment of external readers by some campuses also provides transparency.

Over the last seven years, campuses have increased collaboration and shared best practices to better achieve their individual goals, create greater efficiencies in the review process, and effectively handle a growing number of applications. There have been improvements in technology. Meetings between BOARS and admissions directors have resulted in increased collaboration. For the first time, a common “read sheet” including the 28 high school context indicators will be available.

During the report period, there was a rise in the number of applicants and admitted students to UC, except for the years 2004-05 and 2009-10. Campuses have become more selective. Six campuses now admit less than 50 percent of their applicants. The academic qualifications of admitted students have improved at all campuses, with less change observed at UC Merced. The average weighted capped grade point averages range from 3.55 at UC Merced to 4.16 at UC Berkeley. These averages were facilitated by the raising of the minimum grade point average for eligibility in 2006. SAT and ACT test scores also increased during the report period.

Nearly 93 percent of UC freshmen are retained after the first year; at UC Merced that figure is 84 percent. Long-term degree completion rates have also improved. Only the Riverside and Merced campuses have four-year degree completion rates lower than 50 percent. Over two-thirds of all students complete their degrees in five or six years. At six of the campuses, 80 to 90 percent of students complete a degree within six years. The Eligibility in the Local Context program remains an effective way for UC to attract students from diverse high schools across the state and improve academic indicators.

Comprehensive review helps campuses to view academic accomplishments in the context of opportunity and to account for inequalities in California’s K-12 system while remaining selective. More first-generation college students are seeking and gaining admission to UC. They constituted more than one-third of all admitted students when the current report was written; in 2010 they represent 40 percent. Although admission rates have declined for all students, seven campuses have managed to increase the representation of low-income students in their admission pools: Riverside, Merced, San Diego, Davis, Santa Barbara, Irvine, and Santa Cruz. While students from high schools ranked lowest in the Academic Performance Index are least represented at UC, they are admitted at the same or a slightly higher rate as overall applicants at the Davis, Santa Barbara, and San Diego campuses. The University continues to serve as an engine of social mobility for promising students from modest family backgrounds.

More underrepresented minority (URM) students are becoming UC-eligible; however, campuses vary in their ability to recruit and subsequently admit URMs, and the relative admission rate for African Americans remains substantially below the admission rates for other racial/ethnic groups on every UC campus. Ms. Hurtado presented a chart which

displayed the percentage increases in URM applicants and admitted students for each campus during the report period. UC Merced has almost doubled the number of URM admitted students since 2005. The Davis and Santa Barbara campuses have admitted a high proportion of URM students. UC San Diego has shown the lowest rate of growth among the campuses for URM applications and admissions. There has been significant growth in URM applications to UC Irvine, but the campus has not been as successful in increasing URM admissions. Ms. Hurtado next discussed a chart showing disparate impact ratios for 2009-10. She explained that when the rate for admission of an ethnic/racial group relative to the group with the highest rate of admission falls below 80 percent, the federal Civil Rights Act may call for further disparate impact analysis. In general, the closer any group's ratio approximates the group with the highest rate of admission, the more equitable the policy. With the exception of UC Merced, African Americans fall far below the group with the highest admission rate. The use of multiple criteria in selection is intended to minimize these disparities, but campuses place different value on these criteria.

Ms. Hurtado noted that the report includes twelve recommendations, and she discussed some of them. BOARS recommends that campuses implement individualized review of all applicants to ensure that the boundary between admission and denial is not defined by criteria that are too narrow. Additional resources should be provided to admissions offices to train and retain external readers and experienced staff, to handle the increased volume of applications anticipated for 2012, and to implement outreach. She noted that application fees are an increasing revenue source for all campuses; expenditures are locally determined and could be used for this purpose.

BOARS recommends that the comprehensive review guidelines be revised, so that academic accomplishments and personal achievements are weighed comparably to identify students who strive for excellence in many areas. Priority should be given to admissions through the Eligibility in the Local Context program. Standardized tests and academic indices should be evaluated in the context of other factors. Campuses should take steps to ensure the quality and integrity of the application review process.

BOARS recommends that UC document and report outstanding personal accomplishments of admitted students to reflect many areas of excellence at the University. The University has many academic indicators for its admitted students, but lacks indicators for leadership, community commitment, or outstanding talents. Because electronic data about high schools can now be shared more widely, campuses should make more use of information about achievements in the high school context in decision-making. BOARS will consider wider use of ratings and scores that capture many dimensions of talents among all applicants, as well as a common scoring method.

BOARS recommends increased faculty involvement and oversight in admissions decisions and in guiding selection processes to ensure that campuses achieve excellence and diversity. Selective campuses should consider using a single-score holistic review model in selection, which relies on reader ratings that incorporate all information from

application files. Campuses should regularly conduct disparate impact analyses to monitor the differential impacts of their admissions criteria.

Ms. Hurtado concluded that UC should invest in a new strategic outreach campaign to increase the identification, recruitment, and academic preparation of underrepresented students with the help of distinguished alumni, local communities, and schools. Campuses should develop admissions policies that place value on the importance of diversity. A study group should assess how UC can use its expertise to diminish the achievement gap in California high schools and disparities due to lack of opportunity for African-Americans and other underrepresented groups.

Regent Lozano referred to the disparate impact findings and asked what obligations the University has under the Civil Rights Act. General Counsel Robinson responded that in general, the finding of disparate impact requires review of relevant policies to determine whether or not there are bona fide educational reasons for continuing these policies. Dr. Pitts added that UC is continually reviewing its policies and seeking to implement policies that will allow it to remediate disparate impact.

Regent Lansing expressed her support for holistic review in admissions. She asked if this approach was not in fact implemented on all the campuses. Ms. Hurtado responded that comprehensive review is practiced on all campuses; holistic review is one type of comprehensive review.

Regent Lansing asked why, if this is the case, the BOARS recommendations include the suggestion that campuses conduct individualized review for every student. Ms. Hurtado responded that, when the Regents approved comprehensive review, there were not specific indications about what a reader would do in evaluating an application. The main concerns were the use of multiple criteria and evaluation of context. The use of multiple criteria often requires readers to examine all parts of an application file. Many criteria can be expressed in other than quantitative terms.

Regent Lansing stated her understanding that readers are employed at all locations. Ms. Hurtado responded that this was correct, but that some locations use a fixed weight and cutoff point based on targets, and then employ readers for applications which are “on the border” between admission and denial. This is an economical way of processing applications.

In response to a question from Regent Lansing, Ms. Hurtado stated that BOARS would like readers for every applicant. Regent Lansing observed that this was an idealistic goal and that the University is unlikely to have the resources to implement it. Ms. Hurtado responded that the most selective campuses employ readers who probably read all applications twice.

Regent Lansing stated that, if UC is already close to reading all applications at most campuses, she would encourage the University to do so at all campuses. She asked about the difference between “comprehensive” and “holistic” review. Ms. Hurtado responded

that holistic review is one component of comprehensive review. In holistic review, adherence to a norm by the readers is important so that ratings are consistent. She discussed the use of fixed weight and multiple scoring.

Regent Lansing asked if the report recommendations seek consistency among the campuses. Ms. Hurtado responded that the report seeks consistency and attempts to clarify the actual admissions process on the campuses for the public.

President Yudof stated that about 70 percent of applicants are reviewed using a holistic approach and that their entire file is reviewed at least once, and expressed his wish that 100 percent of UC applicants be reviewed in this manner. He informed the Committee that he plans to work with BOARS and the Academic Council to develop a specific timeline to reach this outcome. He anticipated that there would be additional costs. The University might have to charge a higher application fee.

Chairman Gould requested more information about the impact of the comprehensive review process on low-income students and how low-income status is considered within the evaluation process. He also requested the same information about community college transfer students as a distinct group. Dr. Pitts responded that he would provide this information.

Regent Kieffer asked about the role of chancellors in the review process. Dr. Pitts responded that the chancellors are in charge of the admissions process on their campuses. The vice chancellors for student affairs and campus admissions directors report to the chancellors. Chancellors can have a great deal of influence on the admissions process. The campuses are currently engaged with admissions issues and open to discussion and questions. Dr. Pitts noted that the quality of students is increasing, and that the admissions process used a decade earlier might not be fine-tuned enough to evaluate UC's current applicants adequately.

Regent Kieffer asked if it was correct to assume that a campus admissions officer would not present a campus position to BOARS without the chancellor's knowledge. Dr. Pitts responded that he did not know whether campus admissions directors have necessarily discussed campus positions with their chancellors before meeting with other campus admissions directors or administrators. Chancellors can express their wishes to BOARS and other relevant groups at any time. President Yudof observed that these matters are discussed at meetings of the Council of Chancellors. He stated that all campuses are moving in the direction of holistic review. If a chancellor has concerns, those concerns will be considered. President Yudof expressed his feeling that there should be systemwide uniformity in this matter.

Regent Kieffer expressed concern that there may be systemwide efforts which do not involve chancellors. President Yudof responded that the University must be attentive to this concern. He recalled that the admissions process is developed at the Office of the President, but that admissions decisions are made on the campuses. Campus admissions

staff report to the chancellors. The review process is being made holistic, but actual admissions decisions are the prerogative of the chancellor and his or her administration.

Regent De La Peña expressed his concern that there be objectivity in the admissions process. He recalled that the campuses are using three different admissions models. He requested specific information on the relative weighting of different admissions criteria by the campuses in making decisions. Ms. Hurtado responded that she believes that only UC San Diego has publicized its admissions criteria weightings online.

Regent De La Peña emphasized that the Regents should understand how the different campuses are admitting students. He questioned the use of the term “minority” to designate various ethnic/racial groups in California at this time. He asked how Proposition 209 is affecting the UC admissions process. Ms. Hurtado responded that the University is constrained by Proposition 209. In the past, a high proportion of URM admissions were admissions by exception. More URM students are now UC-eligible and UC has become more selective. She presented a hypothetical example of an African American high school student from a middle-income family who attends a good high school and whose 2.8 grade point average makes him or her ineligible for UC, even if he or she is a promising student. If Proposition 209 were not in place, the University could target students like this. Instead, the University uses other criteria, such as income or first-generation college student status. In its recruitment efforts, the University must focus on schools rather than individuals or particular groups. This is a long-term matter of concern for UC and it requires creative and strategic solutions.

Regent De La Peña asked if the UC admissions process is consistent with the requirements of Proposition 209. Ms. Hurtado responded in the affirmative. All admissions readers and reviewers are informed about Proposition 209, and the consistency of the application review process is monitored.

Regent Reiss asked how application readers are selected. She asked about diversity among readers and about the guidance they are given. Ms. Hurtado responded that application readers must undergo a training and certification process. Some readers are “external readers,” such as high school counselors, alumni, or community members. These readers must also receive training and certification. Diversity of the reader pool might vary by campus. Ms. Hurtado noted that an effort was made at UCLA to ensure that high school counselors from lower-income schools were among the reader pool.

Regent Reiss requested data on the diversity of application readers by campus. Dr. Pitts responded that this information could be provided.

Regent Cheng asked about the possible effect on URM student yield at UCSD if that campus were to adopt a single-score holistic model of admissions. Ms. Hurtado responded that recruitment is important. Data indicate that the San Diego campus faces challenges with recruitment, in getting students to apply, as well as with actual student yield. When UCLA converted to a holistic model, it implemented a strategic recruitment process and worked with the community. She emphasized the importance of the

principles used in selection and suggested that UCSD should evaluate the underlying principles of its admissions process.

Regent Marcus asked if the University is able to identify and recruit the single most outstanding students and if the University is attracting enough such students. Ms. Hurtado responded in the affirmative; however, the current report indicates that an increasing number of the very best admitted students are choosing private institutions over UC. Regent Marcus found this to be unacceptable. He asked if the University is engaging in outreach efforts to attract and retain this category of students. Dr. Pitts responded that UC's yield rate is low for the highest category of admitted students because they are among the most highly recruited students in the U.S. There is an active competition for these students. He expressed his conviction that the campuses focus intense efforts on this category of admitted students in spite of financial constraints.

Regent Marcus asked how the Regents can assist the campuses in this effort. Dr. Pitts responded that the Regents could help with recruiting outstanding individuals.

Committee Chair Island asked how the report recommendations would be implemented. Ms. Hurtado responded that most of the recommendations could be implemented without the approval of the Board. However, the University needs the support of the Board in order to implement individualized review for all applicants. This will require funding from application fees. More specific recommendations regarding comprehensive review guidelines may come before the Board for approval.

Committee Chair Island stated that he will expect a response from the Chair of BOARS next year on the status of the recommendations. He referred to material distributed to the Regents in connection with the previous agenda item, *Fall 2010 Undergraduate Admission Outcomes*. Table 3 in the Report on Fall 2010 Freshmen and Transfer Intent to Register Outcomes showed the percentages of various groups of students who have submitted a Statement of Intent to Register (SIR) for fall 2010. Asian American students represented 54.3 percent of the total number of SIRs at UC Irvine, 56 percent at UC San Diego, and 45.5 percent at UC Berkeley. He asked what aspects of UC's admissions process lead to this degree of representation of by a particular ethnicity or community, given the Regents' directive to the University regarding comprehensive review. Ms. Hurtado responded that, if one focuses on any single criterion, different populations are privileged in selection. If one focuses on high school grades, women perform better than men. With respect to test scores, Asian American students are more likely to take tests and to perform well on those tests. If this criterion is highly valued, it will privilege this population in selection. This reflects the distribution of opportunity and the achievement characteristics of a particular population. The current report addresses this issue by stressing that multiple criteria are important throughout student quintile pools. The University may not be capturing all relevant criteria.

Regent Zettel referred to Figure 2 on page 19 of the BOARS report, which displayed UC versus non-UC college destinations of the top third of students admitted to UC for 2003-08. In 2003, 67 percent of these students enrolled at UC; in 2008, 65 percent enrolled.

The percentages remained static for the URM students in this category. She asked if this represented a trend or only a small fluctuation. Ms. Hurtado responded that there has been an increase in the percentage of the top students admitted to UC who choose to attend private institutions. She attributed this to the scholarships offered by private institutions.

Regent Ruiz referred to Regent Marcus' concern about the most outstanding students. He asked if the UC admissions process causes the University to lose highly qualified students. Ms. Hurtado responded that this concerns not admissions but recruitment. The most outstanding students are admitted to the University, but many are drawn to other institutions by scholarship awards.

Chancellor Birgeneau reported that parents of highly talented admitted students often ask about crowded courses and course availability. He stated his view that the underfunding of public education in California is the reason why students with other options choose to attend elite private institutions.

5. **UNDERGRADUATE ONLINE INSTRUCTION PILOT PROJECT**

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

[Regents were provided with a packet of correspondence received regarding this item, and a copy is on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

UC Berkeley School of Law Dean Christopher Edley began the presentation by clarifying the form of online instruction that the University is examining. It would be fully online instruction rather than a hybrid form. It would be asynchronous, meaning that it could be accessed at any time and in any place. It would be characterized by high production values. Discussion sections could occur in real time through desktop video conferencing. There could be opportunities for the use of chat rooms and discussion boards. An instructor could provide a discussion topic, allow a window of 48 hours for comments and responses, and grade that discussion. Online instruction would make use of all the strengths of social networking software with which students are increasingly familiar. Mr. Edley drew attention to the fact that UC Extension offered 1,250 fully online courses in 2009-10. Seventy-eight percent were UC credit-bearing courses. Roughly 85 percent conferred UC credit for transfer purposes, like many courses offered at community colleges. UC is already engaged in this endeavor and has experience it can leverage.

In order to demonstrate the need for considering online instruction at this time, Mr. Edley presented a chart showing projected growth of the University's budget gap, which may reach \$4.7 billion in ten years. This budget gap may be accompanied by an enrollment gap of 46,000 students relative to the goals of the California Master Plan for Higher Education.

As a higher education institution, UC has perennial, visionary goals such as producing knowledge. It strives to provide access and opportunity for students. Mr. Edley commented that a more mundane goal of UC is to remain competitive. The University has a bricks-and-mortar model for delivering education and it has excelled with this model. However, there are forces threatening the model, including financial and demographic pressures and developments in technology; these will create competition. Mr. Edley identified three imperatives in responding to these forces: to preserve quality, to expand access and serve more people and a more diverse population, and to create a durable business model. He emphasized that the excellence of the University cannot be treated like a precious object. The University would betray its mission if it did not respond to the increased demand for excellent education and became exclusive. Mr. Edley presented the goal of democratizing excellence as a principal motivation for exploring fully online instruction. If the University can guarantee sufficient quality, it should make its product available more broadly.

The purpose of the pilot program the University has undertaken is to shed light on questions concerning excellence, access, sustainability, net revenue, innovation, and partnerships. Mr. Edley contrasted “baseline” educational technology activities already occurring on the campuses and the pilot project. The pilot project focuses on 25 to 40 of the lower division courses most in demand by students, courses which are often oversubscribed. The project has ambitious production standards in order to determine if online instruction should become an increasingly critical part of UC’s activities.

There has been significant exploration of online instruction by various institutions of higher education. UC seeks to learn from those experiences, both positive and negative. Currently, undergraduate online degrees are only offered in the private sector. There are no selective undergraduate fully online degree opportunities available. Mr. Edley raised the important questions of whether such opportunities will become available and whether UC will participate in this development. He expressed his conviction that the University should participate in the shaping of the future and that UC has an opportunity for leadership in online education.

Mr. Edley compared the cost of building campuses with the cost of online instruction. UC Merced’s target for student enrollment is 11,000 FTE. If the University attempts to address the projected 46,000-student enrollment gap in the coming decade by creating the equivalent of another Merced campus, the traditional bricks-and-mortar investment would be \$1.8 billion to \$2 billion. Even without building research facilities, the cost would be about \$1.5 billion. By comparison, the cost of serving 25,000 additional students through existing online infrastructure would be approximately \$20 million. The University is raising \$6 million for the pilot project. If the project is as successful as hoped and UC faculty and the Regents decide to proceed with it, a relatively small additional investment would allow the University to create a substantial program, assuming student demand. After initial investment, a traditional bricks-and-mortar campus presents an ongoing cost of doing business. Once an online education strategy is created, it will produce a continuing stream of revenue. The University’s model suggests conservatively that, with 25,000 students, an online program might generate \$180 million

in annual net revenue, after all expenses, but not including financial aid. This is equivalent to an endowment of about \$4.5 billion.

Mr. Edley presented some disclaimers. The “baseline” campus activities mentioned earlier will continue, and they should be encouraged. The pilot program is being added to these activities to help the University decide on its future strategy. The University is not considering offering online degrees now or in the immediate future. Online degrees might be a longer-term goal, and it may be easier for the University to raise funds if it can offer a fuller picture of its direction in the further future. Decisions about quality and about course content and approval are the prerogative of the Academic Senate. The Academic Senate is the important guarantor of quality. This distinguishes UC’s efforts from the efforts of some of its peer institutions.

The UC Commission on the Future will present recommendations to the Regents regarding online instruction, including endorsement of the pilot project and campus-based efforts. Mr. Edley stated that the University should move quickly; this should not become a five-year project. The role of the Office of the President is limited in this area; it should add value where possible. The project does not entail the creation of a bureaucratic structure at the Office of the President, as the work will be carried out on the campuses.

The University must do many things to ensure that it maintains its excellence in the future. Online instruction is part of a portfolio strategy to address future needs. UC should be a leader in this area, not merely imitating the efforts of other institutions, but finding new ways to teach effectively. This will have a spillover effect on UC’s traditional campus-based programs. Mr. Edley concluded that it might be better for the University to err on the side of ambition and fall short of some goals, but to think beyond the immediate and obvious next steps. Given the pressures facing the University, UC should be ambitious and embrace the risk of failure. This is not recklessness, but the willingness to undertake new thinking.

Committee Chair Island asked about the path forward for this project and if it would require Regental approval. President Yudof responded that this discussion item was intended to familiarize the Regents with the pilot project. The University is committed to securing external funding for it. President Yudof described the project as a worthwhile experiment and the approach being used as conservative. Through an internal competition and regular Academic Senate processes, faculty will present a list of appropriate courses. The University will monitor the results, including student response.

Regent Blum expressed support for the project. With the expertise within the UC system, the University can achieve more than other institutions in this area.

Regent Varner noted the importance of students’ overall educational experience, including the campus experience of a diverse student body. He stated his view that the University should pursue online instruction and suggested that UC might consider including a requirement for some campus experience. Mr. Edley responded that this is a

situation envisioned in the further future. A combination of online and campus learning is attractive. On the other hand, the new student population targeted by this effort would face difficulties due to the greater cost of a campus program and the fact that it cannot be completed on a part-time basis. There are qualified students who would prefer to stay in their communities rather than traveling to a UC campus. There is necessarily a tradeoff between old and new models of delivering education. Mr. Edley predicted that the University will ultimately deploy a variety of strategies.

Chairman Gould stated that online instruction is one area the University should examine. It is not the single answer to UC's challenges, but part of a portfolio. He expressed confidence that the University is in a position to lead in the development of this field and he encouraged the University to move forward and to pursue outside funding.

Regent Lansing expressed enthusiasm for the project. The UC Commission on the Future recognizes that in difficult economic times, the University must find innovative ways to deliver education without compromising quality. Young people today learn differently. Computer use is part of their life and second nature to them. The University must adapt to a changing technological world, while continuing to uphold the traditional teacher-student relationship, although that relationship may not always be in person. Online instruction is a new field, and one which has experienced problems. No institution has yet succeeded in leading in the way that UC has the opportunity to lead. Regent Lansing acknowledged that there may be some uneasiness on the part of faculty about this direction in education. She stated that she was comfortable with the project because it is a pilot project, with results still to be determined, and because faculty are being asked to choose the courses and to ensure that they are intense and rigorous. This endeavor should be a high priority for the University.

Regent Kieffer expressed agreement with Regent Lansing's statement. He observed that some courses may not lend themselves to being taught in an online format. He commended the goal of the project, even if the University does not reach that goal. He expressed support for the project because it responds to the changing nature of teaching and learning, and his confidence in the faculty to exercise effective oversight over the project.

Regent Marcus expressed concern that, while the field of online instruction may be fashionable, the University must approach it as it approaches any other research project. It must examine the online learning process and what elements might be omitted. Many courses could be taught online, but students may miss part of the learning experience. He expressed certainty that the faculty would examine the matter in this light. When the Regents are asked to approve online instruction, they must have facts available to them, not opinions. Mr. Edley concurred that the pilot project must be accompanied by research and evaluation. He reported that Provost Pitts has formed a joint Academic Senate-administration advisory committee to assist in designing the evaluation component. History will tell whether or not online instruction is merely a passing fashion, but current indications are that young people are engaging more and more in online interaction. The possibility that students might miss part of the learning experience is an important

concern. The University must examine carefully those elements that account for quality in the educational experience and seek to replicate them in an online environment. For example, conversation with a graduate student instructor is possible online. Online instruction is obviously a different experience; the important point is whether UC can provide a different experience with high quality.

Regent Reiss expressed confidence in Mr. Edley's and the University's ability to ensure quality in this pilot project, which is intelligently focused and strategic. For better or worse, interaction over the internet and use of digital media are part of today's and tomorrow's reality. A majority of UC's own students may want to take online classes. California is leading the effort to provide digital content in K-12 education. Many foundations interested in educational initiatives are focused on this field. Regent Reiss predicted that outside funding would be available. This could be an exciting opportunity for the University.

Faculty Representative Powell reported that the Academic Council approved the pilot project several months previously, subject to the securing of private sector funding. He expressed agreement with Regent Varner's remarks on the importance of both online and campus experience. Students learn a great deal from each other. He noted that Vice Provost Greenstein has been receptive to discussions with the Academic Senate to identify and learn from successful experiences with online instruction, so that the University can avoid bad outcomes experienced at other institutions.

Mr. Edley directed the Regents' attention to "Online Learning at the University of California," a short video available on the UC Berkeley Extension website. He remarked that this field challenges the University to redefine and move beyond prejudices about outstanding performance, which in this case may not be what faculty have experienced or are accustomed to. It is important to realize that greatness comes in different forms.

Committee Chair Island urged faculty to lead this effort, to stay engaged, and to ensure its success.

President Yudof introduced UC Student Association (UCSA) president Victor Sanchez. Mr. Sanchez stated that some progress has been made on issues of concern to students. He expressed students' strong support for holistic admissions. After Proposition 209, the University must approach admissions more creatively. He thanked Committee Chair Island for his support for reforms in this area.

Mr. Sanchez expressed reservations regarding online instruction, observing that there are still many unanswered questions. Students are concerned about a possible loss of quality and about the University's technological and financial capacity to support such a change. They would like increased consultation with the UC community on this issue.

Mr. Sanchez conveyed UCSA's view that support for providing institutional financial aid to AB 540 students is greater now than ever. He urged the Board to be a leader among universities and to take action on this matter. He praised the proposed resolution regarding administrative efficiencies to be considered later that day by the Committee on

Finance. These efficiencies would return money to core functions of the University, such as teaching and student services.

Mr. Sanchez welcomed possible changes to UC hate bias policy guidelines, following incidents at UC San Diego and other campuses. He praised the University for responding to sensitive issues. He reminded the Board of UCSA's stance against fee increases. He noted that UC advocacy has produced some favorable results in recent State budget proposals. Mr. Sanchez informed the Board that this was the last meeting at which he would address the Regents as UCSA president. He hoped that there would be continued collaboration between students, the Office of the President, and the Regents.

The Committee recessed at 1:10 p.m.

.....
The Committee reconvened on July 15, 2010 at 9:45 a.m. with Committee Chair Island presiding.

Members present: Regents Cheng, Island, Johnson, Kieffer, Lansing, Lozano, Marcus, and Reiss; Ex officio members Gould, O'Connell, Yudof, and Zettel; Advisory member Powell, Staff Advisors Herbert and Martinez

In attendance: Regents Blum, DeFreece, De La Peña, Hime, Makarechian, Ruiz, Schilling, Varner, and Wachter, Regents-designate Hallett, Mireles, and Pelliccioni, Faculty Representative Simmons, Secretary and Chief of Staff Griffiths, Associate Secretary Shaw, General Counsel Robinson, Chief Investment Officer Berggren, Chief Compliance and Audit Officer Vacca, Provost Pitts, Executive Vice Presidents Brostrom and Taylor, Senior Vice President Stobo, Vice Presidents Beckwith, Duckett, Lenz, and Sakaki, Chancellors Block, Blumenthal, Drake, Fox, Kang, Katehi, White, and Yang, and Recording Secretary Johns

6. CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION – UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

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

Vice President Sakaki recalled that she made a presentation to the Regents at the May meeting about the University's career and technical education (CTE) program. She reported that the first UC Curriculum Integration Institute was a success. It brought together 60 teachers and administrators from across California to develop courses over four days, with a focus on mathematics, finance, and business. UC faculty leaders made presentations and provided feedback on curriculum questions. The goals of the Institute were to facilitate statewide collaboration, to train teachers to develop an integrated curriculum, and to design competitive courses that combine academic and CTE content. These courses will be assigned special program status, allowing any school in California to adopt them with the guarantee that they will satisfy UC "a-g" subject requirements.

Participants at the Institute worked in multidisciplinary teams to develop four courses. Each team experienced the challenge of combining mathematics and CTE content into one course that satisfies UC requirements. One of the exciting new courses developed is Business Algebra I, which combines entrepreneurial ventures and basic business applications. This course uses concepts such as profit and loss to teach linear equations and inequalities. Another course, Da Vinci Algebra I, incorporates multimedia art skills and algebra. Students in the course use proportions, linear relationships, and rational equations to master the artistic properties of design, composition, perspective, and anatomy. High school students have already expressed serious interest in these courses. South Tahoe High School has already enrolled 53 students in Da Vinci Algebra I for the coming fall.

While the University is pleased with the progress made so far, the CTE challenge includes more than course development. Teachers and schools must be involved in order for this effort to succeed, but faced with budgetary constraints and additional testing requirements, they struggle to achieve more with fewer resources. Although the development of integrated courses is not a simple task, the promise of an enriched relevant curriculum and expanded student access is a powerful motivation.

The University's next steps in this effort are to hold three more UC Curriculum Integration Institutes over the following 18 months, to continue collaboration with schools and teachers, and to further expand online resources in support of CTE goals. CTE offers the promise of opening the doors of higher education to more students, a benefit which is of interest not only to California, but to the nation. With the financial support and partnership of the California Department of Education, UC has made significant progress and is pleased to play a leadership role in this effort.

Regent Lansing hoped that the Regents would receive regular updates on the development of the CTE curriculum. She expressed the Regents' commitment to the program and to ensuring its success. CTE can engage students by demonstrating the practical applicability of certain subjects and can increase work opportunities. She praised the University's efforts in this area.

Regent Kieffer expressed satisfaction with the course descriptions provided. He urged the University to report its progress on CTE to State Senate President pro Tempore Steinberg. He observed that the CTE has become a better and more robust program than some people may have expected. Provost Pitts observed that Senator Steinberg has stimulated interest in this field. The California Department of Education is very much interested. The University has responded well, moving from 7,000 approved CTE courses toward 10,000 courses. UC is taking the next critical step of bringing together educators and others to design courses they could not have designed easily on their own. UC is not designing these courses by itself. Dr. Pitts pointed out that designing a course that no high school can adopt would not be useful.

Regent Lansing expressed enthusiasm for this program. Referring to the earlier discussion of online instruction, she emphasized that when UC faculty design courses or

collaborate on course development, the Regents and others can be assured of the credibility, rigor, and intensity of those courses.

President Yudof echoed Regent Lansing's enthusiasm. He observed that high school students who may not be intending to attend college but who have taken some CTE courses and have become interested in a subject will now have a better chance of qualifying for admission to UC. Even if this were to be a small number of students, it would be a worthwhile gain. Another benefit of this program is potential improvement of the high school curriculum and resulting greater proficiency in mathematics, science, and English composition skills among students. CTE course development is a slow process, but well worth the effort.

As a former mathematics teacher, Regent Lansing recalled that it was difficult to make mathematics relevant to students. If one can demonstrate how this or other subjects are relevant to many careers, students become excited about subjects and want to pursue them. This opens up job opportunities for them, even if they decide not to pursue a college education.

Regent O'Connell drew attention to the fact that in January 2003, high schools in the entire state offered only 288 CTE courses which fulfilled UC's "a-g" requirements. The number of such courses is now approximately 9,000, which indicates tremendous progress. California has adopted world-class content standards and frameworks. The most requested publication from the California Department of Education is its "Career Technical Education Framework for California Public Schools." College and career preparation are no longer mutually exclusive. In spite of the difficult budget environment, and with the Governor's support, the number of career partnership academies in California schools has been increased to around 500. Regent O'Connell expressed his wish that every high school in the state have such an academy, a "school within the school" focused on an industry sector such as health care, law enforcement, high technology, biotechnology, or nanotechnology. He informed the Regents that he recently sent a letter to the Governor requesting a statewide bond for education on the November ballot. This bond would include funds for modernization of California's CTE program. Regent O'Connell praised UC for its work with the K-12 system.

Regent Zettel asked about future UC Curriculum Integration Institutes. Associate Director for Undergraduate Admissions Don Daves-Rougeaux responded that the University would hold another Institute in November focused on English, history, and multiple industries. Two more Institutes are planned for 2011.

Regent Zettel noted that teachers can access the course templates online. She asked if the schools offering these CTE courses are networking with one another. Mr. Daves-Rougeaux responded that schools with access to the CTE course templates will also have access to contact information and be able to search for other participating schools.

Regent Zettel stated that Regents might be interested in visiting schools and seeing CTE courses in action. She praised the program, which will improve completion of K-12 education, college access, and preparation for real life careers.

Regent De La Peña asked if CTE courses would be available online. Mr. Daves-Rougeaux responded that the courses are designed to be offered in a traditional format. The University has not explored the option of online delivery, but it could consider this.

Faculty Representative Powell expressed pleasure at the development of the Da Vinci Algebra I course and at implementation of techniques which conceptually enrich mathematics training and connect it with humanistic disciplines. He commended this effort.

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 a.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff