

The Regents of the University of California

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

September 15, 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 DeFreece, Kieffer, Lozano, Marcus, Reiss, and Schilling; Ex officio members Gould and Yudof; Advisory members Mireles and Simmons; Staff Advisors Herbert and Martinez
 Representing the Committee on Educational Policy: Regents Cheng, Island, Johnson, Kieffer, Lansing, Lozano, Marcus, Pattiz, and Reiss; Ex officio members Gould, O’Connell, Yudof, and Zettel; Advisory members Mireles and Simmons; Staff Advisors Herbert and Martinez

In attendance: Regents Blum, De La Peña, Hime, Makarechian, Maldonado, Ruiz, and Varner, Regents-designate Hallett and Pelliccioni, Faculty Representative Anderson, Secretary and Chief of Staff Griffiths, Associate Secretary Shaw, General Counsel Robinson, Chief Investment Officer Berggren, 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 10:45 a.m. with Committee on Long Range Planning Chair Reiss 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 May 19, 2010 were approved.

2. ANNUAL ACCOUNTABILITY SUB-REPORT ON DIVERSITY AT THE 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.]

Committee on Long Range Planning Chair Reiss referred to the presentation made earlier by Chancellor White, during the meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy. She praised the Riverside campus for setting an example of how diversity goals can be met

and emphasized the importance to the University of cultivating a welcoming, respectful climate on its campuses.

Provost Pitts presented the second Annual Accountability Sub-Report on Diversity at the University of California, as requested by the Regents. He first presented a chart displaying percentages of American Indian, African American, and Chicano/Latino students, academic appointees, and staff for fall 2008. He stressed that there are target areas in which the University can seek improvement; in particular, the least diversity was found among academic appointees on UC campuses. The number of recruiting opportunities has diminished in the current economic climate, but the University must nevertheless remain focused on diversity.

Dr. Pitts recalled that a number of incidents of intolerance occurred on UC campuses earlier in the year. He defined "campus climate" as a measure, real or perceived, of the campus environment as reflected in personal, academic, and professional interactions. In a healthy campus climate, groups feel welcomed, respected, and valued; in an unhealthy climate, groups feel isolated, marginalized, or even unsafe. He called attention to the fact that some aspects of a healthy campus climate might not feel positive. Uncomfortable or challenging situations can lead to increased awareness, understanding, and appreciation. These situations can be part of the learning experience.

Enhanced diversity on campus provides the potential for greater educational benefits. Campus climate can enhance diversity and facilitates positive interaction among groups. Dr. Pitts observed that perceptions affect outcome. A student's perception of an environment as welcoming or unwelcoming can affect his or her performance. The same is true for staff and faculty. Negative interactions lead to lower achievement.

Campus climate assessment is difficult. The student population is fluid, with a turnover and changing attitudes over time. In addition, there are smaller microclimates between and within campuses. Faculty, staff, and students influence and experience campus climate differently. Certain groups can feel disengaged. This is true not only for underrepresented minorities, but also for transfer students, foster youth, and students from rural communities. Campus climate assessment is not designed as a performance indicator, but it may lead to further questions and insight.

Dr. Pitts recalled that the UC Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES), which has been presented to the Regents, included material related to campus climate. UCUES is the only systemwide survey apparatus of the undergraduate experience. Dr. Pitts indicated that a similar survey apparatus for faculty and staff would be desirable. UCUES, a biennial survey sent to undergraduate students, has a 40 percent response rate.

According to 2008 UCUES data, 28 percent of students experienced negative or stereotypical views about race or ethnicity expressed by other students; only five percent of students experienced such views expressed by faculty or staff. It appears that students harbor more negative perceptions regarding race or ethnicity than faculty or staff. The same is true regarding views about political affiliation, religion, and sexual orientation.

UCUES also surveyed students regarding their sense of belonging. When asked if they would still choose to enroll at their campus, given what they have experienced there, somewhat more than 80 percent of most student groups responded that they would return to that campus. The percentage of African American students who felt they would return to their campus was somewhat lower, at 74 percent. Similarly, a somewhat lower percentage of African American students responded positively to the question of whether they felt they belonged on their campus. Dr. Pitts identified improvement in this area as a target of opportunity for UC.

Dr. Pitts discussed student responses to UCUES questions about their overall satisfaction with the value of the education they were receiving. About three-quarters of white and Chicano/Latino students felt satisfaction, but only about two-thirds of African American and Asian American students felt so. There were similar differences in these groups' responses regarding their overall academic experience and their overall social experience. Dr. Pitts stated that he did not know the reasons for these discrepancies, but that this presented another topic for the University to address.

Student ratings of campus environment, also part of the UCUES data, suggest that most students have a positive feeling about their campus experience. Similar feelings are expressed by all demographic groups, and virtually all UC students feel safe. Individual students may hear negative views expressed on campus, but students generally find campus environments to be safe, friendly, caring, and tolerant.

Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) students represent about five to six percent of the UC student population. LGBT students feel somewhat less well received on campus. In responses to survey questions about whether they feel respected and valued or feel that they belong on campus, the percentage of positive responses for LGBT students is lower than for non-LGBT students. Dr. Pitts identified this as another area where the University could focus effort.

UCUES data are gathered every two years and individual participants are tracked and can be surveyed again. This allows UCUES to question students about their growth in experience while attending the University. UCUES surveys students about how they perceive their own understanding of social class differences, racial/ethnic differences, and gender/sexual orientation differences. There is a dramatic shift between the responses of students when they enter UC and their responses two or four years later. While about 20 percent of entering students responded that they had a "very good" or "excellent" understanding of these differences, by their senior year this percentage increased to 50 percent and above. During the time students live at UC and interact with different groups they gain a greater understanding of issues concerning socioeconomic and other differences. This is a desired outcome, and the University must seek to improve this aspect of student learning.

The UCUES data are of great interest and inspire a search for further information, particularly regarding campus climate for staff and faculty, but the cost of assembling these data presents a challenge.

Dr. Pitts concluded by outlining next steps. Since the spring, President Yudof has established the President's Advisory Council on Campus Climate, Culture and Inclusion, the Regents have an Ad Hoc Committee on Campus Climate, and the chancellors have established campus climate councils. Updates from the campus councils would be presented to the President's Advisory Council in early October. The University has established a hotline available to all the campuses for reporting incidents of intolerance. Dr. Pitts noted that there are incidents which may not rise to the level of a police report, but if the University learns of a large number of incidents at one time or place, it may be appropriate to intervene at some level.

Regent Ruiz stated his view that the University has responded well to incidents of intolerance on its campuses, but expressed concern about lack of diversity in the UC system. He asked if the University of Texas system was more successful in achieving diversity. President Yudof responded that the representation of African American and Hispanic students at the University of Texas at Austin was likely close to that on major UC campuses. The University of Texas is less selective in admissions, has a broader pool of admitted students, and is able to employ affirmative action. The diversity of the student body is not radically different from that of UC. President Yudof stated that he could supply the relevant data. Dr. Pitts added that, because of its admissions standards, the University does not consider the entire California high school graduating population. The University succeeds in admitting classes which represent the qualified high school graduating population, rather than the general population. The University seeks to address this matter through academic preparation programs and other means.

Regent Johnson asked if the University had programs to educate staff about campus climate and inform them how they can reach out to students and create a more welcoming environment. Dr. Pitts responded that there are no systemwide courses or programs. The ADVANCE program at the Southern California campuses promotes diversity in faculty recruitment. The criteria for faculty promotion in the Academic Personnel Manual require the campuses to consider a faculty member's participation in diversity efforts.

Committee on Long Range Planning Chair Reiss observed that, as an example, mandatory training can reduce incidents of sexual harassment.

Regent Johnson stated that she was concerned about students' feelings of isolation on campus and about the need for staff and faculty to help create a positive climate by reaching out to students, which might mean simply taking the time to speak with them. Dr. Pitts responded that the University has asked campuses to provide a list of their activities in this area. If effective practices are identified, they will be communicated and disseminated systemwide.

Committee on Educational Policy Chair Island asked why UC ladder-rank faculty, lecturers, and senior management are not as diverse as the undergraduate student body. Dr. Pitts responded that the undergraduate student body is more diverse than the graduate student body, the latter is more diverse than UC lecturers, and this group is more diverse than UC faculty. The challenge concerns the number of individuals who progress from

one level to the next and provide a pipeline or supply of potential faculty members. This situation is not unique to UC and there is no easy solution. Dr. Pitts noted that there is variation by discipline. In some disciplines, the diversity of UC faculty reflects the national pool of available candidates; in others it does not.

Committee Chair Island called attention to the disparity in minority representation among ladder-rank faculty relative to the undergraduate student body. He suggested that there might be a bottleneck in the system and stated that the University is not moving appropriately to create diversity among UC faculty and senior management. He called on the UC administration and the campuses to focus on this area. Dr. Pitts responded that he and Interim Diversity Coordinator Jesse Bernal would be examining the faculty search process. With respect to senior management, Dr. Pitts noted that the President's annual review of the chancellors and other senior administrators includes a consideration of diversity issues.

Regent De La Peña questioned the use of the term "underrepresented minority" in California in light of the state's demographics at the present time. He commented on the complexity of achieving diversity in UC admissions, given the differences between the pools of UC-eligible and non-eligible high school graduates and the need to comply with Proposition 209. Dr. Pitts referred to the University's holistic review process and noted that the UC-eligible student population differs from the entire California graduating high school class in its ethnic composition. The University can address this matter through academic preparation efforts, although it would not be the primary agent in these efforts; it can provide support through research and service.

Regent Makarechian referred to UCUES results indicating that almost one quarter of African American and Asian American students were not satisfied with the value of the education they were receiving at UC. He asked why this was the case. Dr. Pitts responded that this was an important question requiring further research.

Regent Makarechian asked how the University could seek improvement if the reasons for this level of dissatisfaction were not known. Dr. Pitts responded that future surveys would explore this issue further and could ask these questions.

Regent Cheng asked if there are data on retention for various student groups. He asked if campus climate were a factor in retention of these groups and if there were data correlating the two. Provost Pitts responded that the data sets concerning retention and climate are distinct, but that the University could examine them to determine if there is a relationship between campus climate and student success.

Faculty Representative Simmons concurred with Committee Chair Island about the importance of faculty diversity. He noted that current UC policies require that recruitment plans focus on diversity. In order to develop a more diverse faculty, he suggested that UC should examine statistics regarding Ph.D. graduates at those institutions from which it recruits its faculty; UC might be able to broaden its recruitment

efforts. Dr. Pitts observed that, in addition to recruiting from other institutions, the University recruits its own graduates, and could do so more.

Regent-designate Pelliccioni noted that the data presented were from 2008. She asked if new data would be available in the current year. Dr. Pitts responded in the affirmative. The University had recently received the 2010 data but had not yet analyzed them. The analysis would take place over the coming months and a presentation would be made to the Regents at a future meeting.

In response to a question by Committee Chair Reiss, Dr. Pitts confirmed that students complete the UCUES survey online. The survey form may be viewed but not completed by others.

Staff Advisor Martinez emphasized the importance of diversity and asked about avenues for staff to advise the University on its diversity efforts. Dr. Pitts responded that the first meeting of the campus climate council for the Office of the President location included representation by the Council of UC Staff Assemblies (CUCSA). This would serve as a vehicle for staff at this location to communicate comments and suggestions. Mr. Bernal added that the University was currently gathering information from the campus climate councils, which include staff representation, regarding diversity measures on the campuses. He anticipated that a progress report would be presented to the President's Advisory Council by February 2011.

3. **BIENNIAL ACCOUNTABILITY SUB-REPORT ON GRADUATE ACADEMIC AND PROFESSIONAL DEGREE STUDENTS**

[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 Beckwith presented the first Biennial Accountability Sub-Report on Graduate Academic and Professional Degree Students. Under the California Master Plan for Higher Education, UC is responsible for training professional and doctoral students to meet the state's workforce needs. Approximately 49,000 academic and professional degree candidates were enrolled in the fall of 2009. There are about twice as many academic as there are professional degree candidates. The quality of UC graduate students is essential to the recruitment and retention of highly qualified faculty.

Mr. Beckwith discussed a chart displaying the percentages of graduate degrees awarded in California in 2008-09. UC awarded 63 percent of academic doctorates in California, 21 percent of academic master's degrees, and 15 percent of professional degrees. Academic doctoral degrees can be considered the market niche of the University. California led the nation in awarding 59,000 academic doctorates in that year. UC runs the nation's largest health sciences training program with more than 14,000 health sciences students and 16 health professional schools in dentistry, medicine, nursing, optometry, pharmacy, public health, and veterinary medicine.

Time to degree for graduate students varies by field. In business, law, and medicine, courses take up a large part of the time to degree. In medicine, there is a combination of courses and professional practice. In graduate degree programs in science, technology, engineering, mathematics, the social sciences, and the humanities, time spent on research may exceed the time spent on course work. Mr. Beckwith observed that graduate students are admitted on the basis of previous course work, which may not be an indicator of their research skills, and that there is a fairly high attrition rate.

The bulk of UC's graduate academic students are enrolled in the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields. Among graduate professional students, the largest enrollment is in business programs.

Mr. Beckwith presented a chart which displayed UC graduate admissions data for the past decade, including the numbers of applications, students admitted, and students enrolled. On average, applications to UC's academic graduate school programs increased five percent annually between 2000 and 2009, while applications at "Very High Research Universities" as defined by the Carnegie Classification increased by only 3.5 percent during the same period. UC enrollment increased by only one percent, on average, each year, while Carnegie Very High Research Universities' enrollment increased by 2.2 percent each year. UC has become more attractive and selective. Graduate admissions and enrollment at UC have remained flat over the decade, while the undergraduate population has grown; thus the percentage of graduate students in the total student population has decreased.

Mr. Beckwith observed that it is difficult to measure the quality of UC's graduate students. One possible assessment is the number of national fellowship recipients attending UC. National fellowship recipients – recipients of awards from the National Science Foundation, the Ford Foundation, and the Javits Fellowship Program – can choose to attend any graduate program, but the largest single group chooses to enroll at UC Berkeley, and many others choose other UC campuses. Overall, UC enrolls seven percent of graduate students in the U.S. but attracts between 20 and 30 percent of these prestigious fellowship award recipients.

The number of underrepresented minority (URM) graduate students has been steadily increasing annually as a fraction of the graduate population. As a percentage, UC educates more URM academic graduate students than Association of American Universities (AAU) public and private universities. Mr. Beckwith discussed a chart showing URM academic graduate enrollment as a percentage of the total and indicated that the pool of available URM candidates is smaller than URM representation in the general population. The University has been successful in increasing enrollment of Chicano/Latino academic graduate students. Presenting a chart displaying URM professional degree students as a percentage of the total, Mr. Beckwith observed that UC has been quite successful in recruitment of African American students and successful overall in comparison to AAU public and private institutions.

In a national ranking of the number of academic doctorates awarded in 2008-09, UC Berkeley was in first place, educating more doctoral students than any other university in the U.S., while UCLA and UC Davis ranked fifth and 20th, respectively. The UC average number of doctorates awarded also compared well to AAU public and private institutions. UC trains a larger percentage of doctoral students in the U.S. than any other university system. UC also compares well to its peers in a similar ranking of professional degrees awarded; the Los Angeles campus is prominent in this ranking.

Mr. Beckwith then discussed completion rates. Most undergraduate students who begin an education at UC also complete it. About 55 percent of UC doctoral students complete their degrees. He identified this difference in completion rates as a cultural difference between undergraduate and graduate education. The situation at UC is not significantly different than at other universities.

The University does not have the data it would like on post-graduation outcomes for its doctoral students for ten or 20 years after completion of a UC degree. The available data on immediate post-graduation outcomes indicate that more than 50 percent of doctoral students find employment upon completing their Ph.D., while 20 percent continue with postdoctoral studies. Ten to 12 percent have definite plans. About 15 percent state that they have no definite plans, which can be understood as unemployment. UC compares well to the national average in post-graduation outcomes.

Almost all academic graduate students are financially supported throughout their UC careers. UC support includes teaching assistantships and fellowships, which are especially significant for graduate students in the humanities and social sciences. In the physical and life sciences, UC support is balanced by support from the federal government for research assistantships and fellowships. Graduate fields such as engineering and biology, which present good employment prospects, enjoy a great deal of external support.

Mr. Beckwith concluded by stating that UC is a national leader in graduate education. It continues to strive for improved student quality and to maintain its competitive edge. The University has not met its goals for diversity and is concerned about its ability to provide student support. Campuses may be in danger of losing high-quality graduate students due to the amount of financial support they can offer. Future challenges for the University include monitoring the impact of financial support on graduate student quality and gathering more data on the career paths of graduate students after they complete their UC education.

Regent Kieffer asked how the University can determine if it is producing enough or too many Ph.D. graduates in any one field or across the board. Mr. Beckwith responded that the University does not know the answer to this question. However, it is clear that the demand for a UC education outstrips the University's ability to provide it. The market is robust. The question of whether the nation needs Ph.D.s in history, English, or physics is more complex. Nations which compete with the U.S., such as China, are emulating the U.S. in developing a highly trained workforce for the future. Unemployment statistics by

level of educational attainment in the U.S. indicate that individuals with Ph.D. degrees have the lowest percentage rate of unemployment, about 2.5 percent. These data suggest that there is a desire for UC's graduate programs, and that UC graduates go on to lead productive lives.

Faculty Representative Anderson referred to the information presented earlier about UC support for graduate students in the humanities and social sciences and emphasized the importance of these graduate students, who play a vital role in undergraduate instruction. Mr. Beckwith expressed agreement with this view and noted that, from a financial standpoint, teaching assistants in the humanities and social sciences are cost-effective, given the large number of undergraduates who receive instruction. In order to maintain robust scholarship in the humanities and social sciences, the University must invest in its graduate students.

Mr. Anderson asked whether students who do not complete the Ph.D. degree complete a master's degree. Mr. Beckwith responded that this was likely, but that he did not have data on this. Some students do not pass their qualifying examinations and leave at that point. The University's average Ph.D. completion rate is 55 percent.

Mr. Anderson observed that, if a graduate student leaves a program relatively early with a master's degree, this should not be considered a failure. On the other hand, the University should be concerned about graduate students who remain in a program for seven or eight years and fail to complete their degrees. Vice President Beckwith agreed that this is a matter for concern and noted that he did not have data on the percentage of such students, but that he would try to obtain these data.

Regent Marcus emphasized the importance of graduate students for maintaining the quality of the University. He stated that at a future presentation he would ask which chancellors were most effective in maintaining resources in order to attract highly qualified graduate students.

Regent Marcus asked about which elements of UC's programs are essential in attracting the most outstanding graduate students, those who could choose to study anywhere. Mr. Beckwith responded that the most important factor is the quality of the faculty. The quality of facilities is also important, but matters less than the quality of scholarship. The University's high rankings in research are an important factor in attracting graduate students. He presented a slide with information illustrating how the level of financial support offered to prospective graduate students by UC Berkeley, compared to offers by competing institutions, affected the percentages of those who chose to enroll at UC Berkeley. For every \$1,000 in stipend difference relative to other institutions, UC Berkeley gained or lost 15 percent of admitted students. In the context of graduate student stipends, \$1,000 is not a significant amount, and the University needs to consider this factor.

Regent Marcus asked about the University's process for identifying the most outstanding graduate students, who could then move on to become faculty members. Mr. Beckwith

responded that within academia, it is generally not the practice to hire one's own graduate students. Sometimes UC graduates may return to the University to serve as faculty after having completed postdoctoral fellowships at other institutions. Movement among institutions promotes intellectual diversity. It is important that UC train outstanding graduate students, but this may not be the same population the University draws on in recruiting faculty. Mr. Beckwith emphasized that the existing system is not a bad system, but that the University does not have control of the pool of available faculty. Dr. Pitts added that UC graduates are sometimes recruited as faculty at other campuses within the UC system.

Regent Zettel referred to the comparison of UC average and national average completion rates and asked if the national average included both private and public universities. Mr. Beckwith presented a chart comparing time to degree for UC, AAU public, and AAU private universities. There was no significant statistical difference between UC and these public and private institutions.

Chairman Gould expressed concern regarding the relative decline of graduate students as a percentage of the total UC student population. He asked if other AAU institutions were experiencing a similar change in the proportion of graduate to undergraduate students. Mr. Beckwith responded that he did not think this was the case. Outstanding research universities tend to have large graduate student populations. At the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the California Institute of Technology, graduate students represent about 50 percent of the population; at UC Berkeley, they represent about 30 percent, while at UC Santa Cruz they make up only about nine percent of the total student population. The proportion of graduate students, who carry out research, affects the culture of a campus. Mr. Beckwith estimated that UC's peer institutions maintain graduate student populations of 20 to 30 percent or more of the total, and that the graduate student populations at these institutions have not been decreasing.

Chairman Gould reiterated his concern about graduate student enrollment and stated that the University must be mindful of its commitment to graduate students if it is to remain competitive with its peer institutions.

Committee Chair Reiss asked what action the University could take to ensure that graduate student enrollment would not decrease. President Yudof noted that the University was challenged to reduce its budget by 20 percent while maintaining the existing fee schedule for graduate students. He concurred with the importance of support for graduate students, but cautioned that this was one of many compelling needs for which UC might not have adequate funding. It would be difficult to increase graduate student enrollment without increasing faculty size.

Regent Cheng asked if there were any survey data on graduate student experience. Dr. Pitts responded that this is an area for which the University lacks data. Mr. Beckwith observed that the graduate student experience varies significantly by field; it is by nature different from the undergraduate experience. Regent Cheng suggested that the University could focus on this issue in the future.

Regent Kieffer referred to the presentation slide which showed percentages of admitted graduate students who chose to enroll or not to enroll at UC Berkeley rather than another institution because of stipend differences of \$1,000. He asked for the actual numbers of these students. Vice President Beckwith responded that he would provide an exact number.

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff

Pending Approval