

The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

January 19, 2011

The Committee on Educational Policy met on the above date at Price Center, San Diego campus.

Members present: Regents Cheng, Island, Johnson, Kieffer, Lansing, Lozano, Marcus, and Pattiz; Ex officio members Gould, Torlakson, Yudof, and Zettel; Advisory members Hallett, Mireles, and Simmons; Staff Advisors Herbert and Martinez

In attendance: Regents Blum, DeFreece, De La Peña, Hime, Makarechian, Newsom, Ruiz, Schilling, and Varner, Regent-designate Pelliccioni, Faculty Representative Anderson, 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 Darling, Duckett, Lenz, and Sakaki, Chancellors Birgeneau, Block, Blumenthal, Desmond-Hellmann, Drake, Fox, Kang, Katehi, White, and Yang, and Recording Secretary McCarthy

The meeting convened at 9:40 a.m. with Committee Chair Island presiding.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of November 17 and the joint meeting of the Committees on Educational Policy and Finance of November 17, 2010 were approved.

2. CAMPUS PRESENTATION, SAN DIEGO CAMPUS

[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 Chair Island stated that the Regents were pleased to be at UC San Diego to hear its campus presentation.

Chancellor Fox began by noting that the current year is the 50th anniversary of the founding of UC San Diego. Faculty, alumni, and students are proud of UCSD's accomplishments during this relatively brief time. Her presentation would cover the campus' founding, its rise to international prominence, its strategic goals, and the formidable challenges that lie ahead. UCSD founder Roger Revelle insisted that the campus be distinctive, believing that increasing understanding of the universe would bring the vision to face the future. In only 50 years, UC San Diego transformed a military training ground to a world-renowned public research university.

Chancellor Fox stated that UCSD's four strategic goals involve institutional preeminence, diversity and campus climate, affordability for students and their families, and the necessity of obtaining new, reliable revenue sources. UC San Diego is ranked first in the nation for service by *Washington Monthly*, recognizing its commitment to social mobility, cutting edge research, and extensive service to the community. Earlier in the current month, *Kiplinger's Personal Finance* ranked UCSD the best value of any public institution in California.

UCSD faculty have received Nobel Prizes, MacArthur Fellowships, and Pulitzer Prizes. Current faculty include 89 members of the National Academy of Sciences, 37 members of the Institute of Medicine, and 22 members of the National Academy of Engineering. In 2009-10, UCSD ranked first in the UC system in total sponsored research, surpassing \$1 billion, and in federal awards, totaling more than \$750 million, including \$150 million from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. This was more stimulus funding than any other UC campus received.

UCSD faculty and alumni have started more than 200 companies locally, including many of the biotechnology companies on the Torrey Pines Mesa. A 2007 independent analysis by the CB Richard Ellis consulting firm concluded that UCSD contributed \$7.2 billion annually to the State, including \$4.2 billion in direct and indirect spending, \$2.6 billion in personal income, and 39,000 jobs created by the local companies started by faculty and alumni. Since January 2005, UCSD has initiated or completed more than 50 major capital projects totaling over \$3.2 billion, one-quarter of which were funded by the State and three-quarters by other sources, producing three million assignable square feet (ASF) of space.

Chancellor Fox stated that UCSD's foremost challenge is to recruit and retain stellar faculty despite current budget constraints, with retention costs and start-up packages currently costing UCSD approximately \$17 million per year. Entrepreneurial faculty have secured federal grants that provide funding in a time of decreasing State support, although indicators predict that federal research support will likely decrease as well in coming years.

UCSD will likely have 1,500 undergraduates who are unfunded by the State in 2011-12, costing the campus an additional \$15 million. Increasing the number of graduate students is made difficult if the University is unable to offer competitive support packages. Having too few graduate students would make it difficult to attract faculty. UCSD's undergraduate population has grown to over 23,000, while its graduate student population has grown more slowly than anticipated by the enrollment plan, which calls for 20 percent of the student body or 5,600 graduate students by 2020. Currently UCSD enrolls only 4,150 graduate students.

Chancellor Fox emphasized the importance of UCSD's strategic goal of improving diversity and the campus climate to ensure that the campus is fully inclusive and welcoming to all students, faculty, and staff. UCSD's roadmap for climate efforts is

outlined in its “Administrative Commitments to Improve Campus Climate,” issued in March 2010, and progress is discussed in the Campus Climate Council.

UCSD has sought to increase its number of enrolled students from minority communities, particularly the African American community. The prior fall, UCSD enrolled 420 or 1.8 percent African American undergraduates out of an undergraduate population of 23,663. The percentage of African Americans is 5.6 percent in the local San Diego area and 6.6 percent in the state. According to the California Department of Education, 79 percent of California students graduate from high school, but only one-third of those have taken the courses required for UC admission. Chancellor Fox cautioned that UCSD programs sponsored by campus leadership and the Academic Senate to support student success are under scrutiny for major budget cuts.

Chancellor Fox applauded the Regents and President Yudof for their upcoming proposed action on holistic review of student applications. UC San Diego can achieve a more diverse student population only through outreach to prospective students and their families. Efforts thus far have focused on helping students from underrepresented groups become UC-eligible, persuading eligible students to apply to UC San Diego, ensuring a fair evaluation of the students’ applications through evaluation of the totality of a student’s achievements, and being ready to provide viable financial aid packages and effective counseling to ensure that all admitted students have the necessary support to succeed.

UCSD staff frequently travel to local schools to explain UC requirements and to encourage students to apply, sponsoring events such as “An Evening with UC San Diego.” Chancellor Fox stated that it is especially important to visit high schools in underrepresented communities to explain the admissions process, student life, financial aid, the Blue and Gold Opportunity Plan, and to communicate the fundamental idea that a UC education is obtainable. This program has been so successful in local high schools that it has been expanded to include middle schools and community colleges.

UC San Diego has also worked to increase the percentage of admitted underrepresented students who actually enroll. Data show that UCSD offers admission to as many underrepresented minority students as do UC Berkeley and UCLA, between 15 and 17 percent of freshman applicants. Yield, however, varies, with UC San Diego’s at 24 percent, compared with UCLA’s yield of 45 percent, and UC Berkeley’s of 38 percent. These data show that UCSD must focus both on admissions policies using best practices and holistic review, and also on activities to increase yield. For example, the Black Student Union held a community barbecue as part of their overnight program. Of the 24 students who participated in the Black Student Union student-led Admit Day program, 15 accepted admission offers, a much higher yield than average. In the prior year, yields of underrepresented minorities increased across the board: the number of enrolled African American freshmen and transfer students increased 33 percent and 67 percent respectively; the number of enrolled Mexican American freshmen and transfer students increased five percent and 23 percent respectively; the number of enrolled Latino freshmen and transfer students increased by ten percent and 40 percent

respectively; and the number of enrolled freshmen and transfer Native American students, although small in number, doubled. The early telephone calling yield initiative is being expanded to encourage admitted students to choose UCSD; faculty will be assisting with this early calling campaign.

Chancellor Fox reported that UCSD is successful in retaining students once they enroll. The two-year retention rate is 89 percent; the six-year graduation rate is 84 percent. Average time to degree at UCSD is 4.2 years. She cautioned that, as UC continues to face budget cuts, UCSD will be challenged to provide academic sections and academic support so that students can continue to make timely progress toward their degrees.

Regarding affordability, Chancellor Fox stated that, given recent budget cuts, return to financial aid is critical, since 64 percent of UCSD's undergraduates require financial aid. She stated that UCSD needs to triple its current scholarship pool for undergraduates. UCSD raises and awards \$3 million each year in privately-funded scholarships, but UC Berkeley raises \$19 million, and UCLA raises \$10 million. Chancellor Fox emphasized the importance of providing financial aid to middle class families as well as low-income families, and applauded President Yudof for expanding the Blue and Gold Opportunity Plan. In September 2009, UCSD launched "Invent the Future," a three-year campaign to raise \$50 million in undergraduate scholarships and graduate fellowships. To date, \$22 million has been raised. The Black Alumni Scholarship Fund administered by the San Diego Foundation has also been a source of support, having awarded \$40,000 to a total of 25 African American students in 2010-11.

Chancellor Fox stated that UCSD must find new revenue sources in order to preserve the excellence upon which its reputation is based. Possible new sources of revenue include: increased numbers of nonresident students, philanthropy, creative funding, debt restructuring, increased contract and grant awards with corresponding increases in indirect cost recovery, and innovative partnerships. As noted by the UC Commission on the Future, a one percent increase in the number of non-resident students systemwide would generate approximately \$1 million.

While philanthropy is an alternative revenue source, it also presents challenges. UCSD enjoys the confidence of the San Diego community resulting in major gifts toward critical programs. For example, a \$75 million gift in the prior year from Irwin and Joan Jacobs will be transformational in improving health care in San Diego's only center of academic medicine. In 2007, UCSD completed a \$1 billion campaign and the campus is in the silent phase of a new campaign. Chancellor Fox cautioned that providing predictable funding for operations through philanthropy is difficult. Many UCSD alumni are successful, but still young, with other obligations.

Chancellor Fox stated that, while UCSD has been successful in obtaining research contracts, new research partnerships must be developed. Examples of innovative partnerships include the Sanford Consortium for Regenerative Medicine (Consortium) in collaboration with the Sanford-Burnham Medical Research Institute, the Salk Institute for Biological Studies, and the Scripps Research Institute. The Consortium received a

\$30 million donation from T. Denny Sanford to build a jointly operated research facility currently under construction. Since the formation of the Consortium, principal investigators have been awarded approximately \$225 million from the California Institute for Regenerative Medicine, including \$78 million awarded to UC San Diego stem cell researchers.

As a second example, UC San Diego has developed a strong partnership with J. Craig Venter, a UCSD alumnus, recipient of a 2009 National Medal of Science, and leader in the field of genomics. He and his team at the J. Craig Venter Institute recently announced creation of the first fully-functioning reproducing cell controlled by synthetic DNA. Mr. Venter will establish a genomics research facility at UCSD, aiming for a Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Platinum certification for the building. This institute will collaborate with the Scripps Research Institute, the California Institute for Telecommunications and Information Technology, UCSD's health sciences departments, and the general campus to provide opportunities for UCSD graduate students and to share expenses.

The scientists at Scripps Institution of Oceanography at UCSD and Earth Networks, the owner and operator of the popular WeatherBug products, launched a global greenhouse gas observation network. Earth Networks committed \$25 million over the upcoming five years and will deploy 100 greenhouse gas observing systems worldwide, enabling the quantifying and mapping of two of the most significant greenhouse gases, carbon dioxide and methane. This innovative collaboration has garnered international attention; *The Economist* stated, "[Earth Networks] has a partnership with Scripps to ensure its precision and quality control. There's no better pedigree."

Chancellor Fox summarized that UCSD has come a long way in its brief 50-year history: \$1 billion last year in sponsored research; successful completion of a \$1 billion capital campaign; \$3 billion in construction of three million ASF; \$7 billion in annual academic impact on the State of California; 200 startup businesses, which created almost 40,000 jobs. Chancellor Fox stated that UCSD would continue to achieve the extraordinary in years to come.

Provost Pitts reported that Chancellor Fox had received Christ United Presbyterian Church's community service award at their Martin Luther King celebration the prior week for promoting unity and diversity throughout San Diego and beyond. He stated that this award is a testament to Chancellor Fox's hard work and commitment to improving diversity and unity throughout the community.

Committee Chair Island congratulated Chancellor Fox on her award and commended her presentation. He expressed his appreciation for her focus on diversity and campus climate, an area which he stated had been in need of attention, and encouraged her to continue her work to include more underrepresented minorities in the UCSD community.

Regent Lansing complimented Chancellor Fox on UCSD's being the first campus to establish a stem cell consortium, which led the way for other campuses, and is an outstanding example of partnering with the private sector to leverage UC's funding.

Regent Marcus stated that UCSD is exemplary in its advancement in all areas of quality and asked Chancellor Fox to identify the main factors behind her campus' success. She noted that she is often asked how UCSD went from green fields to world prominence in only 50 years. She stated that the main elements of UCSD's success were the triangle of excellence, affordability, and access for students, staff, and faculty to the best instrumentation and colleagues. These elements combine to form a cluster of high productivity. She stated that UCSD has developed the best faculty through attractive compensation, great weather, excellent graduate students, and world-renowned colleagues.

Staff Advisor Martinez commented that UCSD staff consistently report their pride in working for the campus. She thanked Chancellor Fox for her work with the campus staff and for her leadership.

Regent Pattiz asked Chancellor Fox what the effect of impending budget cuts would be on UC San Diego. Chancellor Fox concurred with analysis that suggests it is essential to maintain UCSD's excellence in teaching, research, and service to the community; therefore pressure would necessarily increase on affordability and access. She noted that the cadre of faculty could shrink as the University becomes unable to fill vacancies. UCSD would not be able to attract the same number of graduate students who, in turn, help with faculty retention packages. The campus would not be able to afford the more expensive retention packages that will be necessary to retain the best faculty, while simultaneously making packages available for new hires. Attracting and retaining faculty and the best graduate students require the best support, and she reiterated the value of UCSD staff in this regard.

3. **RESOLUTION REGARDING INDIVIDUALIZED REVIEW AND HOLISTIC EVALUATION IN UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS**

The President recommended that the following resolution be adopted:

WHEREAS, the University of California is committed to achieving excellence and inclusiveness in its undergraduate student body; and

WHEREAS, in May 1988, the Regents adopted a Policy on Undergraduate Admissions that states in part that "Mindful of its mission as a public institution, the University of California...seeks to 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;" and

WHEREAS, in 2002, the University, acting on the recommendation of the Academic Senate, implemented an application evaluation procedure that calls for campuses to

utilize a broad range of criteria to assess each applicant's academic and personal achievement in the context of opportunities; and

WHEREAS, proper evaluation of applicants' achievements in the context of opportunity requires that information about their schools and community be available in a uniform manner, and several campuses have made considerable progress in accomplishing this through the use of extensive school-based information; and

WHEREAS, evaluation of applicants' achievements in the context of opportunities and challenges requires that a trained reader examine the entire application in considering personal achievements, challenges, leadership, and contributions to applicants' communities alongside context information; and

WHEREAS, a form of Comprehensive Review in which the reader produces a single holistic score based on all information in the applicant's file has been shown to thoroughly evaluate each applicant's achievement in relation to opportunities and challenges; and

WHEREAS, the Regents expect the Office of the President, in consultation with the Academic Senate and local admissions committees, to exercise leadership in the realization of best practices in undergraduate admissions;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Regents direct the President, in consultation with the Academic Senate and campus admissions professionals, to ensure that all applicants receive an individualized review that ensures trained readers examine applicants' full files to evaluate their accomplishments in the context of opportunity;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Regents direct the President, in consultation with the Academic Senate and campus admissions professionals, to continue to research and develop a database to be used with the human read of every application that provides background on the available opportunities and challenges faced by the applicant within his or her school and community;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Regents direct the President, in consultation with the Academic Senate, to affirm that single-score holistic evaluation is the expected implementation of Comprehensive Review, while allowing flexibility for campuses that can demonstrate that alternate approaches employed by their campuses are equally effective in achieving campus and University goals;

BE IT RESOLVED that University of California campuses must remain committed to recruiting students from the full range of California high schools and regions in order to achieve the potential of the University's admission policy for California's students;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Regents direct the President to annually report to the Board on the progress of these initiatives on each campus.

Provost Pitts stated that the Office of the President has worked with the Academic Senate on this resolution. Dr. Pitts reported that holistic review is already practiced at UC's most selective campuses and by many of the most selective universities throughout the nation; he and President Yudof believe it to be the best admissions process in providing a thorough and fair evaluation of each applicant. The resolution in the current item requests that the Regents direct the President, in consultation with the Academic Senate, to affirm that single-score holistic evaluation is the expected implementation of comprehensive review, which is already Regental policy, while allowing flexibility for less selective campuses that can demonstrate that an alternative approach employed is equally effective in achieving campus and University goals. The resolution builds on existing policy and has been endorsed by both the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) and the Academic Council at their December meetings.

Dr. Pitts noted with some sadness that Director of Undergraduate Admissions Susan Wilbur would retire soon and would be missed. Ms. Wilbur recalled that in 2001 the Board approved comprehensive review, an undergraduate application review process consisting of 14 individual indicators, including strength of program, grades, personal achievements, and other factors. Comprehensive review is characterized by three principal features: a careful review of the information in the application, a review in context examining the full range of an applicant's achievement in the context of available opportunities, and the requirement that every applicant be reviewed for admission.

Campuses adopted various approaches to comprehensive review, including a fixed weight method in which points are assigned to individual factors such as grades and test scores, and the single-score holistic method, characterized by the extensive use of context or school-based information to assess individual student achievement in the light of opportunities available to each applicant. The single-score holistic method has been used at UC Berkeley for many years and at UCLA since 2007, in addition to being used by some of the finest public and private universities in the nation. UC Irvine adopted the holistic approach in the current year, and UC San Diego also began using a holistic model.

The single-score holistic process, having been well-defined over the past decade, is more labor-intensive than comprehensive review, with campuses' admissions staffs being augmented with external readers. Campuses have developed multi-step reader certification processes to ensure that readers are fully trained along faculty-approved guidelines. For example, at UC Berkeley all readers, including experienced readers, undergo 30 hours of training each year, with training continuing throughout the review process. Most applications are read twice.

Campuses use a variety of strategies for quality control, including monitoring readers' scoring throughout the process. Following the initial scoring process, campuses conduct reviews to reread applications of students that have strong academic indicators but who were not initially slated for admission. Ms. Wilbur stated that her office believes holistic review to be the best practice because of the wealth of data used in considering each application. Holistic review is a way to identify the most deserving students from the

highly qualified pool of UC applicants. Ms. Wilbur invited the Regents to visit any campus during the holistic review process. She noted that the current resolution includes the requirement that the President report annually to the Board on the progress of holistic review initiatives at each campus.

Dr. Pitts added that faculty on admission committees at some campuses that have not been using holistic review had been skeptical about the process until they had attended training sessions for application readers. Dr. Pitts stated that holistic review is a good way to distinguish between highly qualified applicants, not all of whom can be accepted. He invited the Regents to attend the reader training programs.

Regent Lansing stated that she is a supporter of holistic review. She recalled that, when comprehensive review was adopted by the Regents, it was designed to take into account the life of the applicant, and that all campuses were to use comprehensive review. She asked if all campuses currently use comprehensive review. Dr. Pitts responded that all campuses use comprehensive review, although the method can be interpreted differently from campus to campus.

Regent Lansing requested clarification of the difference between comprehensive review and holistic review. Dr. Pitts noted that the current resolution calls for single-score holistic review, which would take comprehensive review one step further by giving the comprehensive review a single holistic score.

Regent Varner asked whether readers are trained by the individual campuses or on a systemwide basis. Ms. Wilbur responded that the training programs are designed at the campus level with some participation by the Office of the President. She noted that both UC Berkeley and UCLA have developed elaborate and sophisticated reader training programs. Regent Varner asked that the Regents be provided with more information about the reader training and supervision programs at UC Berkeley and UCLA, so that they could be assured that basic standards would be applied systemwide. Ms. Wilbur stated that UCLA's training process involves five or six stages before the readers deal with any actual applications. Lead readers answer questions and monitor scoring throughout the process to ensure consistency; the process is carefully documented. Regent Varner asked how the Office of the President oversees the review process. Ms. Wilbur said that the Office of the President receives scores from the campuses at the end of the review process and evaluates the outcomes of campus admissions decisions on an annual basis. Dr. Pitts added that BOARS reviews the admissions process each year and would continue to review the process annually under the proposed resolution.

Ms. Wilbur agreed that quality reader control and supervision are critical to the success of the holistic review process and expressed her opinion that campuses using holistic review are accomplishing this at a high level.

Regent Lozano asked why campuses would be given flexibility in implementing holistic review under the proposed resolution if they can demonstrate alternative approaches, since holistic review is considered the best practice. Dr. Pitts responded that the two

campuses that have been using holistic review, UC Berkeley and UCLA, are UC's most selective. Since all campuses are not as selective, some would not need to use holistic review of all applications. Holistic review is most important in circumstances where there is a large group of highly qualified applicants clustered together who cannot all be admitted. This type of review may not be necessary for all applicants for all campuses, but as campuses become more selective, they would migrate toward increasing use of holistic review. The long-term goal is to have holistic review of all students at all campuses.

Regent Pattiz expressed the opinion that admissions standards were clear-cut when he applied to college and expressed concern that admissions criteria under a holistic review process could become difficult to explain clearly to students and their families. He asked why it would be necessary for the Regents to pass a systemwide resolution, if campuses could adopt holistic review on their own and some campuses have chosen not to use holistic review.

Dr. Pitts responded that holistic review looks at a student's accomplishments in the setting of his or her opportunity. Regent Pattiz expressed concern that there could be attempts to exploit the admissions process by advising students to include material on their applications just to gain more points. Dr. Pitts expressed his opinion that there is less opportunity for taking advantage of the admissions process under holistic review, since the entire application would be considered. He pointed out that the same admissions application is used for all campuses, whether they use holistic review or a different admissions review process, and that the current resolution is an encouragement for campuses to move toward holistic review.

Regent Lansing noted that the high academic level required of applicants by campuses would not change. Holistic review would provide a method for distinguishing among highly qualified applicants, since not all can be accepted by the campus of their choice. Students would be advised to do as much as they can in addition to meeting academic standards for admission, because there are more applicants than the University can accept. Regent Lansing expressed her support for moving toward standardizing the admissions process across all campuses.

Committee Chair Island pointed out that holistic review is not an alternative to being UC-eligible, since a student must be UC-eligible to be considered by holistic review.

President Yudof explained that the resolution in the current item was brought to the Board since it is an amplification of the policy of comprehensive review that the Board adopted several years ago. Also, the resolution would give the Board's authority to the President's oversight of individual campuses' movement toward holistic review.

Faculty Representative Simmons stated that the Academic Senate and BOARS support the adoption of the current resolution. He reiterated that holistic review brings all elements of comprehensive review into a single score instead of using four or five scores. The holistic review process allows a reader more flexibility to offset one factor with

another in accordance with the guidelines to which the readers are trained. Various factors could be more appropriately weighed in assessing applications.

Mr. Simmons stated that the most important aspect of holistic review is that each application would receive an individualized reading, which would require more resources. He stated that BOARS is concerned that campuses direct sufficient resources to accomplish the individual reading; BOARS felt that the \$60 application fee would be sufficient to fund holistic review, but Mr. Simmons pointed out that the application fees go into general campus funds from which other important campus initiatives such as outreach programs must be funded. In order for holistic review to be successful, it must be adequately funded by the campuses, particularly given that admissions standards have changed for the fall 2012 class and the University will see record numbers of applications.

Regent Blum commented that students are aware of what is required for a competitive application to the most selective campuses. He expressed concern about achieving consistency in admissions, particularly given current budget cuts.

Regent Johnson recalled that she took a training course in comprehensive review at UC Berkeley. She asked Provost Pitts how many times an application would be read under holistic review. Dr. Pitts noted that two-thirds of applicants already have at least one holistic reading of their applications. To increase efficiency, holistic scores could be shared across campuses, although campuses could also perform their own reviews. He stated that all applications to UCLA and UC Berkeley are read twice, and are read a third time if there is a discrepancy between the first two scores. Dr. Pitts expressed his opinion that the costs of holistic review can be met.

While he expressed support for the spirit of holistic review, Regent Marcus cautioned that perceptions of subjectivity in scoring and inconsistencies among campuses could be troublesome, particularly since UC is a public institution. He expressed his concern that the resolution goes beyond affirming the spirit of holistic review by endorsing a particular method of implementation. Regent Marcus also asked if there are any scientific studies regarding outcomes for students admitted under holistic review compared with other admissions procedures. He stated that admissions standards should be consistent, fair, and uniform. Dr. Pitts responded that both UC Berkeley and UCLA are outstanding universities with rising numbers of eminently qualified applicants and have been using holistic review for some time without experiencing public criticism of the process. Many other public institutions such as the University of Michigan and the University of Virginia also use holistic review. Regent Marcus recalled that California had experienced controversy concerning Proposition 209, an experience the other states did not share. Dr. Pitts responded that the UC admissions process provides no specific consideration for ethnic background.

Ms. Wilbur added that the strength of the holistic review process is that it is more sensitive to individual differences. She cited the example of a student who had an overall grade point average (GPA) of 3.2, UC-eligible, but not competitive at many

UC campuses. However, a closer analysis of the student's application showed that he had a 2.5 GPA his sophomore year; the student explained the issues he faced his sophomore year and how he had addressed them. He earned a 3.75 GPA his junior year. The holistic review gave a richer understanding of the student's situation and his readiness for the University. Regent Marcus responded that critics could say it would be unfair to admit this student in place of a student who had a 4.0 GPA. Ms. Wilbur noted that one of the fourteen factors evaluates a student's ability to overcome challenges. Making a decision in favor of this student would be in line with the comprehensive review policy already used.

Regent Marcus asked again if there were any scientific studies demonstrating that students who are selected holistically perform better. Ms. Wilbur responded that UC's systemwide first-year persistence rate of over 90 percent of admitted students moving on to their sophomore year demonstrates that the admissions process is effective in selecting a class that can be successful.

Regent Cheng stated that the holistic review process is endorsed by one of the most important stakeholders, the students themselves, because it reflects the University's commitment to its public mission through its admissions policies, and because it ensures that their applications will be evaluated by a trained reader at least once. Holistic review is a method of searching for students who are not just scholars, but who are potential leaders and innovators. Regent Cheng stated that students and their families have been calling for holistic review of applications for years.

Faculty Representative Anderson pointed out that some of the issues in the current discussion actually relate to comprehensive review, which has been Regental policy for several years. He recalled that the Regents heard a report the prior spring about the effects of comprehensive review. Mr. Anderson clarified that the current item asks whether single-score holistic review is the best way to implement the existing policy of comprehensive review and was drafted following extensive collaboration among the Office of the President, the Academic Council, and BOARS.

Mr. Anderson commented that the Academic Senate supports comprehensive review and single-score holistic review as its most fair implementation, particularly as the University becomes more selective. Acknowledging the desire of some to have systemwide holistic review of applications, Mr. Anderson pointed out that campuses vary in their level of selectivity. He noted that UC Santa Barbara has achieved very good results using its own admissions process stressing Eligibility in the Local Context combined with a great deal of outreach; Mr. Anderson would support UCSB's desire to continue using its process while the campus is at its current level of selectivity. He emphasized that the current resolution would not affect the existing Regental policy of comprehensive review; it only creates more emphasis on implementation by single-score holistic review, particularly at the most selective campuses, and gives the President the authority to deal with individual campuses.

Mr. Anderson stressed the necessity of having adequate resources to implement holistic review, particularly since the number of applicants eligible for review has been expanded for the subsequent year. For the admissions process to be successful, the chancellors must be provided with and allocate appropriate resources for adequate review.

Regent De La Peña stated that it is important to understand the process of holistic review, including the training and the outcomes of the policy. He noted that UC San Diego would institute single-score holistic review in the upcoming year, but would maintain a parallel system of comprehensive review with a point system. He questioned the necessity of adopting the current resolution given that individual campuses can already choose to adopt single-score holistic review.

President Yudof responded that in his opinion single-score holistic review is the best method of comprehensive review, and is consistent with admissions policies of the best public and private universities. He stated that the current resolution would give him leverage to make sure that all campuses are moving in a meaningful way in that direction. He noted that, while the intention of the prior resolution adopting comprehensive review was clear, it had been implemented in various ways by campuses.

Regent Kieffer affirmed his support for the resolution. He expressed his opinion that it would be a fallacy to assume that the more mechanical admissions reviews of the past were necessarily fair or accurate in assessing competence. He requested follow-up information about how the new policy is working and what the public reaction is.

Regent-designate Mireles expressed agreement with Regent Cheng's prior statement of student support for holistic review. He asked what schools already use holistic review. Dr. Pitts and Ms. Wilbur responded that the University of Virginia, University of Michigan, University of Florida, and the University of Washington use holistic review, as well as all of the private schools in the Comparator 8, and most other selective private universities.

Regent Hime asked if the same readers are used to do holistic review and comprehensive review. Dr. Pitts responded that in general the same readers could be used, but would undergo additional training in holistic review. Regent Hime asked if the training would be the same at each campus. Dr. Pitts stated that admissions committees are taking advantage of cross-campus resources in the training of readers and learning from UCLA and UC Berkeley. Regent Hime emphasized that it is important to treat applicants consistently, particularly when more subjective elements would be considered. He suggested standardizing reviews on a systemwide basis to ensure fairness.

Regent Pattiz expressed concern about implementing a review system that would be more labor-intensive and more expensive in the current time of budget cuts. He added that it would be natural for students who have been accepted to the University to support holistic review, but that students who were not accepted might have a different opinion. Regent Pattiz also questioned the necessity of the current resolution, since some

campuses already use holistic review and the resolution would still allow campuses to choose whether or not to implement single-score holistic review.

Chairman Gould expressed his support for the resolution as an extension of the existing policy of comprehensive review. The issues of opportunity and fairness are critically important, particularly as campuses become more selective. Given the Regents' interest in this policy, Chairman Gould suggested that they receive a rigorous evaluation of how this policy works over time.

Committee Chair Island pointed out that the current resolution calls for the President to report to the Board annually on the progress being made. He expressed his full support for the resolution and noted that single-score holistic review used for ten years at UC Berkeley has produced an exceptional student body. He underscored Regent Lansing's comment that an applicant must first be UC-eligible to have his or her application undergo holistic review.

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

The meeting adjourned at 11:20 a.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff