

The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

July 13, 2011

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

Members present: Regents Hallett, Island, Kieffer, Lozano, Marcus, Mireles, and Reiss; Ex officio members Gould, Lansing, and Zettel; Advisory members Rubenstein and Simmons; Staff Advisors Herbert and Smith

In attendance: Regents De La Peña, Makarechian, Pattiz, Pelliccioni, Ruiz, Varner, and Wachter, Regents-designate Mendelson and Stein, Faculty Representative Anderson, Secretary and Chief of Staff Kelman, Associate Secretary Shaw, General Counsel Robinson, Chief Investment Officer Berggren, Chief Compliance and Audit Officer Vacca, Provost Pitts, Executive Vice President Brostrom, Chief Financial Officer Taylor, Senior Vice President Stobo, Vice Presidents Darling, Duckett, Lenz, and Sakaki, Chancellors Birgeneau, Block, Blumenthal, Desmond-Hellmann, Drake, Fox, Katehi, Leland, White, and Yang, and Recording Secretary McCarthy

The meeting convened at 9:45 a.m. with Committee Chair Reiss presiding.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of May 17, 2011 were approved.

2. FALL 2011 UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSION OUTCOMES

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

Committee Chair Reiss noted that, even though the University has been forced to increase tuition in recent years, the number of both freshman and transfer applicants is increasing, which reflects well on the efforts to improve the transfer pathway for community college students. She noted that the State's funding priorities make it impossible for UC to admit all qualified transfer and freshman students. While the fall 2011 admission outcomes show increases in the proportion of Hispanic students, the proportion of African American students remained flat, reflecting the education gap at the K-12 level.

Regent Mireles asked Vice President Sakaki to explain why UC offered admission to almost 9,000 fewer students than in 2010, even though a record number of applications were received. Ms. Sakaki stated that each year approximately 12,000 applicants are not admitted to a campus to which they have applied, and are placed in the referral pool. In

the current year, for reasons of efficiency, rather than send the referred students full acceptance packets from UC Merced, e-mails asking about the students' interest were sent. An offer of admission was given only if a student responded positively. While it appears that the number of offers was reduced systemwide, the yield for UC Merced was roughly the same as the prior year. In response to another question from Regent Mireles, Ms. Sakaki stated that in effect the University offered admission to all eligible California residents.

Regent Kieffer asked what the acceptance rate was for nonresident students. Interim Director of Undergraduate Admissions Pamela Burnett stated that her office would provide him with that data. Regent Kieffer stated that he would like to see admitted nonresident students' grade point averages and SAT scores, from the 25th to 75th percentile, as they are commonly reported in publications.

Faculty Representative Simmons noted that in 2011 more than 45 percent of expected freshmen come from families in which neither parent has a four-year college degree and more than 40 percent are from low-income families.

Regent Zettel asked if the University is enhancing its recruitment of international students. Ms. Sakaki responded that the University is very interested in increasing the number of nonresident students, both domestic and international. She recently co-chaired a systemwide workgroup with UCSF Vice Chancellor for Student Academic Affairs Joe Castro to make recommendations for collaboration across the system to reach out to nonresident students. In response to a question from Regent Zettel, Ms. Sakaki stated that the academic profile of UC's nonresident applicants is higher than that of most of the California applicants.

Regent Makarechian asked why there could not be a higher tuition rate for international students whose families pay no U.S. taxes. Ms. Sakaki responded that the proposal would be discussed the following day. Committee Chair Reiss stated that it would be helpful to have the number of international students for a discussion about possibly charging them higher tuition than domestic nonresident students.

Regent Ruiz commented that, since the community colleges provide students with an efficient way to get an education, UC should accept more transfer students. Such students would be at UC for only two years, and this pathway might be more efficient for UC also. Provost Pitts responded that UC already has more qualified transfer students than it can accommodate; this is a policy issue that would be discussed at the following day's sessions. Without an increase in capacity through additional State funding, the trade-off to accepting more transfer students would be to reduce the number of admitted freshman students. He noted that UC has been working diligently to improve transfer pathways; however, if there are more qualified transfer students than there are spaces for them at UC, frustration is created. He noted that President Yudof has strongly supported a gradual increase in the number of transfer students.

In response to an inquiry from Committee Chair Reiss, Dr. Pitts stated that transfer students' time to degree and graduation rates are very close or equal to those of students who enroll as freshmen.

Faculty Representative Anderson pointed out that there is a financial disincentive to admitting more transfer students. The State pays UC for a portion of the number of enrolled students; however, the cost of instruction of upper division students is higher because their class sizes tend to be smaller. Taking more transfer students would produce more UC degrees, but would actually exacerbate the University's financial problem.

Regent Gould noted that there is a large demand by nonresident students for UCLA, UC Berkeley, and, increasingly, UC San Diego. While nonresident admissions were at 12 percent, systemwide, Regent Gould asked about the levels of nonresident admissions at those high-demand campuses, and how nonresident enrollment should be managed at those campuses, given the Regents' guidance of approximately ten percent nonresident enrollment systemwide. Dr. Pitts responded that nonresident enrollment is less than seven percent systemwide of which one-quarter are international students. He reported that all campuses are interested in increasing enrollment of nonresident students, both international and domestic. UC communicated its interest to nonresident students, and the number of applicants, offers of admission, and statements of intent to register (SIR) rose substantially at all campuses, but more disproportionately at UCLA, UC Berkeley, and UC San Diego. Dr. Pitts pointed out that more than one-third of the undergraduate student body at the University of Virginia is nonresident students.

Regent Gould asked that the Regents be provided with the percentage of both domestic and foreign nonresident freshman enrollment by campus in future reports. He expressed his opinion that the increase in nonresident enrollment should be actively managed and planned by the Regents. He noted that nonresident enrollment at some campuses may be dramatically higher than the systemwide percentage. Nonresident enrollment has some benefits, but also may have negative consequences if California students are crowded out of certain campuses. Dr. Pitts stated that his office would make that data a standard part of the admission report each summer, including the academic qualifications of the nonresident students. He noted that the UC Commission on the Future made it clear that the University should continue to admit all funded eligible California students. All campuses have more than 1,000 unfunded students; should the State fund all students, then policy questions about nonresident enrollment would become particularly important.

Regent Kieffer stated that UC is different from either the University of Michigan or the University of Virginia, and that nonresident enrollment should be carefully watched. Regent Kieffer requested information about how UC's acceptance rate is reported for all campuses, since this rate affects the University's ranking and faculty recruitment.

In response to a question from Regent Pattiz, Ms. Burnett stated that annual tuition is \$10,300 for California undergraduates and \$32,300 for nonresident students. Regent Kieffer stated that tuition at a comparable private institution might cost \$45,000 to \$50,000. Regent Pattiz noted that UC provides support for low-income students and that

middle class families earning more than \$120,000 would have the most hardship with increased tuition.

Regent Varner asked what impact admitting additional nonresident students has on resident students. He stressed that it would be important for the Regents to address the issue of admission of additional nonresident students to gain revenue, if this would impact the admission of eligible resident students. Dr. Pitts responded that the campuses have assured him that they are not turning down California students in lieu of nonresident students.

Regarding the level of admission of nonresident students, particularly at UC Berkeley, UCLA, and UC San Diego, Regent Hallett asked if the process for redirecting nonresident applicants to other UC campuses is the same as that for resident students. Ms. Sakaki responded that a pilot program was started in the current year for nonresident applicants. If they were not accepted at the campus to which they applied, their files were forwarded to all the other campuses. In response to a further question from Regent Hallett, Ms. Burnett said there were 4,000 nonresident applications forwarded to other campuses, and 70 SIRs from that pilot program.

Regent Marcus stated that UC has an obligation to attract and retain the brightest students in the world. He noted that the Master Plan states that all qualified California students are admitted and UC does that. He stated that admitting the brightest nonresident students would energize the educational system and the state's economy, because a large part of the innovation in California is by foreign students.

Mr. Simmons stated that in the prior year the Academic Council adopted a set of principles, which were recently clarified, regarding the admission of nonresident students. On any campus, nonresident students must be competitive with the resident students admitted to that campus.

Regent Kieffer questioned whether UC is able to compete with private colleges in recruitment of highly qualified out-of-state underrepresented students. Dr. Pitts said that foundations or community groups could be helpful in offering scholarships to such students, but that Proposition 209 limits how much of the University's resources can be dedicated to that effort. Chairman Lansing pointed out that UC can assist low-income students, but cannot offer the same financial aid to middle and upper income families as private colleges can. The University must find alternative ways to help such students. Dr. Pitts noted that the data shows that the yield rate for students with the highest holistic review scores is less than for students with slightly lower holistic review scores, because students with the very highest scores are recruited by the best universities in the country, some of which can offer more generous financial packages than UC can. Regent Kieffer expressed concern that, as pressure is put on individual campuses to raise private funds for return-to-aid, efforts to fundraise for merit scholarships could suffer. Dr. Pitts responded that campuses are working with local foundations to enable merit-based recruitment of highly sought after underrepresented students.

Regent Lozano requested that yield rates be included in the annual admissions report.

Regent-designate Mendelson stated that the Cal Alumni Association at UC Berkeley can sponsor an equity scholarship program because it is an independent alumni association; to date this program has funded \$5,000 per year for four years to 20 minority students.

Regent De La Peña noted that 45 percent of UC's admitted freshman students' families earn less than \$45,000 per year, and that financial aid is also provided for students of families with incomes up to \$120,000.

Dr. Pitts stated that students are admitted to UC campuses without regard for their financial circumstances. Regent De La Peña pointed out that aspects of being underprivileged are often revealed in the holistic application process.

3. **DESIGNATION OF STEELE BURNAND ANZA-BORREGO DESERT RESEARCH CENTER, SAN DIEGO COUNTY, NATURAL RESERVE SYSTEM**

The President recommended that the Regents designate the University-owned property located at 401 Tilting T Drive, Borrego Springs, California consisting of a 3.94+/- acre parcel with improvements adjacent to the Anza-Borrego Desert State Park, as a component of the Natural Reserve System named the Steele Burnand Anza-Borrego Desert Research Center, with day-to-day management of this reserve provided by the Irvine 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.]

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 10:25 a.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff