

The Regents of the University of California

**COMMITTEE ON LONG RANGE PLANNING
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

March 24, 2010

The Committees on Long Range Planning and Educational Policy met jointly on the above date at UCSF–Mission Bay Community Center, San Francisco.

Members present: Representing the Committee on Long Range Planning: Regents Bernal, Kieffer, Marcus, Nunn Gorman, Reiss, and Schilling; Ex officio members Blum, Gould, and Yudof; Advisory members DeFreece and Simmons; Staff Advisors Abeyta and Martinez
Representing the Committee on Educational Policy: Regents Island, Lansing, Lozano, Marcus, and Reiss; Ex officio members Blum, Gould, Yudof, and Zettel; Advisory members Cheng and Powell; Staff Advisors Abeyta and Martinez

In attendance: Regents De La Peña, Makarechian, Ruiz, Stovitz, Varner, and Wachter, Regent-designate Hime, 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 Brostrom and Taylor, Senior Vice President Dooley, Vice Presidents Beckwith, Duckett, Lenz, and Sakaki, Chancellors Birgeneau, Block, Blumenthal, Desmond-Hellmann, Drake, Fox, Kang, Katehi, White, and Yang, and Recording Secretary Harms

The meeting convened at 2:20 p.m. with Committee on Long Range Planning Vice Chair Schilling presiding.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of the Committee on Long Range Planning of January 20, 2010 and the minutes of the joint meeting of the Committees on Long Range Planning and Health Services of January 21, 2010 were approved.

2. ANNUAL ACCOUNTABILITY SUB-REPORT ON THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ADMISSIONS AND ENROLLMENTS

[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 explained that the Regents already receive an annual report on admissions; however, this sub-report represented the first time this particular cohort of data has been pulled together to enable the University to analyze trends in freshman

admissions. He stated that the report places campus and systemwide data in the context of the University's accountability goals and will provide a baseline for future measurement. The purpose of this accountability report, said Dr. Pitts, is to identify problem areas and determine how to address and resolve them.

Vice President Sakaki informed the Regents that her presentation would be focused on trends in freshman admissions over the past 15 years. In March 2011, she will report on transfer admissions, and in future years she will alternate between the two. In April, she noted, the University will receive preliminary data on fall 2010 admissions, which she will present in July.

Ms. Sakaki remarked that decisions about admissions and enrollment are among the most important – and often the most difficult – the University makes. They are important because they define the character of each campus and the University as a whole. She observed that those decisions also provide life-changing opportunities to individual students, their families, and entire communities.

Ms. Sakaki reminded the Regents that, under the Master Plan for Higher Education, UC is to enroll from a pool of students equivalent to the top one-eighth of California's graduating seniors. In selecting students from that pool, the University follows the Regents' policy on undergraduate admissions, which stresses academic excellence and inclusivity. Ms. Sakaki stated that her data would speak to those goals.

Ms. Sakaki said that the number of California resident freshman applications has risen steadily over the past fifteen years with dips in 2004 and 2009. Those troughs correspond to years in which, as a result of State budget crises, UC announced that it would admit fewer freshmen. In both of those years, said Ms. Sakaki, fewer students applied. University-wide admissions track closely with applications because, in adherence to the Master Plan, UC admits every eligible applicant to at least one campus. The rising number of admitted students means that the number of students who meet UC's criteria continues to grow. However, because enrollment capacity has not grown as fast as demand, fewer students are receiving offers from the campus they would like to attend.

Ms. Sakaki noted that each of the nine undergraduate campuses has experienced strong application growth, with some sites doubling or tripling applications in 15 years. Demand has grown more quickly than enrollment capacity; campuses are denying more students. She informed the Regents that Merced and Riverside are able to admit most of their applicants, but for the most part, campuses are far more selective than they were 15 years ago. Most UC campuses admitted more than 70 percent of their applicants in 1995. By 2009, all but three were admitting 50 percent or fewer. Ms. Sakaki observed that although UC continues to meet its Master Plan obligation, and although it offers opportunity to tens of thousands of high school graduates each year, it also disappoints an increasing number of students and their families.

Ms. Sakaki remarked that most UC campuses have similar yield rates of 20 to 25 percent of their applicants. These rates reflect the high level of overlap among applicants; most

students will apply to three or four campuses and will be admitted to more than one. Yield at Berkeley and UCLA is higher, in the range of 40 percent; Merced's is lower, but has been increasing, and is expected to continue to grow. In response to increasing numbers of high school graduates and higher demand, UC has been increasing enrollment at every campus. With the exception of Merced, all of the undergraduate campuses now enroll between 3,000 to 4,500 freshmen each year. Santa Cruz and Riverside started as noticeably smaller schools, and now enroll essentially the same number of students as their sister campuses.

Ms. Sakaki stated that the University's most valid and reliable measure of academic quality is its students' high school grade point average (GPA). The average high school GPA for UC's enrolled students is approximately 3.75 and has increased over the past 15 years. Incoming GPA at every campus is well above the minimum requirement of 3.0, and on virtually every campus it is increasing.

Ms. Sakaki informed the Regents that UC measures inclusivity by several indicators including type of high school, family income, parental education level, geographic region, and race/ethnicity. The ethnic diversity of the campuses is driven by two factors: the diversity of California's population, and the preparation levels of students from various racial and ethnic populations. The proportion of white students on the campuses is declining, reflecting an overall change in California population. Although Latinos represent approximately 40 percent of California high school graduates, only 25 percent complete the required course sequences for UC and California State University. At UC, the number of Chicano/Latino students is increasing, reflecting overall growth in population, but they remain a small fraction of the University's total enrollment. African Americans, whose numbers are not increasing in the California population, face ever greater the challenges. African Americans represent only seven percent of high school graduates, and less than five percent of UC's freshman class.

Ms. Sakaki offered that the University must address the underlying challenge to its diversity, which is the very low percentage of underrepresented minority students who get adequate preparation in elementary, middle, and high school. She noted that recruiting and admissions practices are also important, and that the University must do all that it can to make them more effective. However, she said, it needs to strengthen its outreach and academic preparation programs and support statewide efforts to improve the K-12 system.

Reflecting specifically on the African American population, Ms Sakaki said that each of the campuses has seen steady application growth, yet applications from black students fell as a proportion of total freshmen from 1995 to 1999. This drop was a reaction to the 1995 passage of Regents' Resolution SP-1, *Policy Ensuring Equal Treatment – Admissions*, and the State's implementation of Proposition 209 in 1998. African American applications have recovered somewhat since then, and continue to increase; however at many campuses, black students remain a smaller percentage of total applicants than they were in 1995. Ms. Sakaki pointed out that four of the campuses – Riverside, Merced, Berkeley and UCLA – receive a higher proportion of applications

from African American students than the rest of the campuses. In addition, UC Santa Barbara experienced a jump in African American applications in 2008. That year, UCSB initiated innovative and effective new recruiting efforts.

Similarly, said Ms. Sakaki, admit rates for African American students were altered by Proposition 209 and by UC's overall increase in selectivity. Most campuses experienced sharp drops in admissions rates for black students, and consistent with the lower admission rates experienced by all applicants, admit rates for African Americans continued to decline. Ms. Sakaki remarked that this statistic is true on all campuses except Riverside and Merced, where enrollment growth has allowed them to admit most of their applicants.

Berkeley and UCLA have higher yield rates of black students than other UC sites. Recalling an earlier comment by Chancellor Fox, Ms. Sakaki observed that African American yield rates for UC San Diego are lower than those at the other campuses. Effectively, this shortfall means that UCSD would have to admit a greater number of students in order to meet the African American enrollment rates at the other campuses. Ms. Sakaki related the increased African American yield at Berkeley and UCLA to their new holistic review admissions processes put in place in 1999 and 2007, respectively. She also highlighted again the success of the recent enhanced recruiting program at UCSB.

Ms. Sakaki summarized the campus data, stating Riverside and Merced show increases in African American yield both because they have larger numbers, and also because their growth trajectories have enabled them to keep admit rates relatively high. Berkeley and UCLA saw large declines associated with declines in admissions at the beginning of this period, but because they have strong applicant pools and high yields for African Americans, they still enroll a greater proportion of black students than the other sites. In recent years, they have been joined by UCSB, which has experienced large increases in applications and yield. The remainder of the UC campuses had drops in African American enrollment at the beginning of this period and have been relatively stable since. However, black students still represent a very small fraction of incoming freshmen, a trend that was exacerbated by the systemwide enrollment reductions in 2009.

Ms. Sakaki remarked that the University has much work to do; in order to be truly excellent, UC must be more inclusive. Echoing earlier comments by President Yudof, she stated that UC must continually examine and improve its recruiting and admissions practices. In 2012, UC will open the door to a wider group of California high school graduates. However, she noted, it also must work to ensure that those students follow through to enrollment. Underrepresented students need better preparation in K-12, more information about the importance and value of higher education, and more support in navigating the college admissions process. She stressed that all UC students must be able to reach their full potential in a safe, welcoming, inclusive, supportive, respectful, and caring community. Diversity must be fostered in the classroom, in the residence halls, on the athletic fields, in the sororities and fraternities, in the laboratories, in campus

internship programs, and in UC's graduate and professional schools. Furthermore, it must be encouraged among faculty, staff, and administrators on all of the campuses.

Regent Island asked if the data from the Sub-Report would be used to assess the performance of the institutions and if there would be consequences resulting from that assessment. He commended UCSB for its substantial improvement in recruiting African American students under Chancellor Yang, and asked why the practices put in place at Santa Barbara had not been put in place systemwide.

Dr. Pitts explained that the data would be used to pinpoint areas of strength and improvement, such as at UCSB. He informed the Regents that UCSB had produced a pamphlet highlighting services of interest to black students in the Santa Barbara area. The students were encouraged by the attention to their needs and perceived UC Santa Barbara as a more welcoming place. Other campuses have been made aware of the material, and several have already started to generate similar services online. Dr. Pitts expressed regret that such actions had not been in place earlier. He observed that the data would also be used to identify campuses with shortcomings that warrant investigation and remediation. Furthermore, it would be compiled in late spring of each year, and would serve as a factor in each chancellor's annual review with the President.

Regent Island stated that the very low enrollment of African Americans at UC is shameful, and that he has been asking for four years for a process to actively address it. He observed that the data were helpful, but that they did not seem to be harnessed to a definite course of action. Dr. Pitts echoed Regent Island's frustration regarding diversity, and observed that the Office of the President ultimately relies on the campuses to react to the data and bring pressure to bear on their internal structures and be more responsive. He reflected that lack of diversity is a multifaceted problem, and that it will take many small steps to make it better. He stated that he did not as yet have a better plan than to focus on those campuses that are the least successful and the most successful and disseminate information and tactics that work. He speculated that change on the campuses would likely be slow.

Regent Bernal stressed that the University needs to establish a clear educational pipeline and reaffirm its commitment to helping K-12 address the educational needs of underrepresented minority students. He also expressed his belief that the most cost-effective means to increase student diversity is through student-initiated outreach programs. Ms. Sakaki responded that the decrease in academic preparatory funding has significantly impaired the campuses in terms of K-12 assistance. Funding was at \$65 million, and now is closer to \$20 million. She agreed that student-initiated outreach is very effective, but that it should also be supplemented with other efforts.

Regent Bernal stated that the Regents should consider using registration fees to fund programs that support student services and student-initiated outreach. He expressed a belief that students would support such a fee. Dr. Pitts said he would be pleased to discuss the topic. He observed that there are a variety of student outreach programs, and that some work better than others. The University will have to determine which methods

are the most effective and spend its money wisely. He added that UC needs to review the programs it supports, and examine whether or not they should continue.

President Yudof explained that the data that was presented had been discussed with each chancellor at his or her performance review. He observed that not all of those discussions were easy.

Regent-designate Cheng asked the Regents to consider Dr. Pitts' suggestion to strictly account for money spent on diversity efforts and the effectiveness of individual programs. He suggested that information should be included in future sub-reports. He also stated that the University should track the students who come to the campuses as a result of student-initiated outreach. He observed that student recruiters demonstrate ownership and accountability in relation to their student recruits. He asked what efforts were being made to expand the pool of UC-ready African American students and what barriers to their preparedness need to be addressed.

Dr. Pitts explained that the new Eligible for Review policy will bring thousands more students of all types into the UC applicant pool. One of the purposes of the change is to provide many more students with the opportunity to attend UC if they qualify under the new standards. The hope, he said, is that the possibility of review will increase the pool of available students, which should result in an increased number of qualified applicants and – ultimately – enrollees. Dr. Pitts emphasized the importance of outreach programs that target students when they are quite young and make them aware of college and the university experience.

Ms. Sakaki added that the University is hoping that private fundraising will encourage students who might go to a private college to choose UC. Dr. Pitts reminded the Regents that the African American yield rate at its two most successful campuses is still only 40 percent; 60 percent of eligible students go elsewhere. He echoed Ms. Sakaki's comment and said that UC should try to secure private financial support for those students.

Regent Ruiz expressed frustration with UC's continued lack of diversity and encouraged the Regents to keep applying pressure for change. He thanked President Yudof for incorporating diversity metrics in the chancellors' review process. He expressed gratitude to General Counsel Robinson for his work in regards to Proposition 209 and the constraints it places on the University.

Regent Ruiz stressed that the economic vitality of California is very dependent on UC's success in the diversity arena. He recalled a recent report which states that five to ten years from now, California is going to be 25,000 graduates short of the demand that the state needs to sustain its economic vitality. Furthermore, California businesses are moving more toward employees with professional training. Regent Ruiz said that the University had made only marginal progress in improving its faculty diversity, and that diversity among the faculty was critical to ensuring progress in the diversity of the student body. He noted that, as a Latino who had been frequently exposed to prejudice,

he is aware of the time and effort involved in changing a culture. He encouraged President Yudof to continue his efforts in this area.

Faculty Representative Powell remarked that private institutions are not constrained by Proposition 209 and can compete aggressively for African American students. He observed that the unrestrained ability of private institutions results in UC being much less diverse than it could be. He encouraged the Board to consider advocacy for modifications to Proposition 209 that would allow the University to effectively address its diversity issues.

The meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff