

The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

May 11, 2016

The Committee on Educational Policy met on the above date at the Sacramento Convention Center, 1400 J Street, Sacramento.

Members present: Regents Elliott, Gorman, Gould, Island, Kieffer, Lansing, Newsom, Ortiz Oakley, Oved, and Reiss; Ex officio members Lozano, Napolitano, and Varner; Advisory members Chalfant, Ramirez, and Schroeder; Staff Advisors Acker and Richmond

In attendance: Regents Davis, De La Peña, Pattiz, Pérez, Rendon, Sherman, and Zettel, Faculty Representative Hare, Secretary and Chief of Staff Shaw, General Counsel Robinson, Chief Compliance and Audit Officer Vacca, Provost Dorr, Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer Brostrom, Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer Nava, Senior Vice Presidents Henderson and Peacock, Vice Presidents Brown, Budil, Duckett, and Sakaki, Chancellors Block, Blumenthal, Dirks, Gillman, Hawgood, Khosla, Leland, Wilcox, and Yang, Acting Chancellor Hexter, and Recording Secretary McCarthy

The meeting convened at 10:20 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 March 23, 2016 were approved.

2. ESTABLISHMENT OF POLICY ON STUDENT-ATHLETES AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES TO ENHANCE STUDENT-ATHLETE WELFARE

The President of the University recommended that the Regents:

A. Adopt the following Policy on Student-Athletes:

POLICY ON STUDENT-ATHLETES

- (1) Athletic directors at Division I and Division II campuses shall report directly to the Chancellor of their campus.
- (2) Because of the time required for travel and practice schedules, student-athletes shall receive priority registration through the established institutional priority registration process at each campus.

- (3) For those campuses that provide athletic scholarships, if a student sustains an incapacitating injury while participating in intercollegiate athletic activities and is medically unable to continue his/her athletic commitments, the campus shall not revoke financial aid or scholarships, and shall provide the student-athlete with an equivalent grant or scholarship to finish his/her degree.

B. Endorse the following guiding principles:

- (1) Student-athlete academic performance should be considered a central element of annual performance evaluations for athletic directors and all athletic coaches.
- (2) During the recruitment and admissions process, Athletic Departments should work to identify those student-athletes who may need additional support to succeed academically at the University of California, and collaborate with other campus departments and available resources to mitigate obstacles to success.
- (3) Athletic Departments should help facilitate regular collaboration and communication between admissions personnel and athletic coaches in order to help identify student-athletes who are able to succeed at UC. Consistent with the faculty's governance over admissions policies, athletic coaches should continue to have no decision-making authority in the admissions of student-athletes.
- (4) For those students on athletic scholarships at Division I and II campuses, each campus should make publicly available the athletic scholarship appeals process to ensure student-athletes and their families are aware of their rights regarding athletic scholarship renewal.
- (5) As with the recruitment and admissions process, Athletic Departments should work to identify and support student-athletes once they have matriculated. Each Athletic Department should ensure that student-athletes have access to academic counselors who are integrated into university-wide academic and advising programs, and have been trained specifically to work with student-athletes.
- (6) Each Athletic Department should require those student-athletes who are identified as at-risk academically to meet with their academic counselors regularly and should encourage all student-athletes to meet with their academic counselors.
- (7) Athletic Departments should work in conjunction with campus career counselors to provide a comprehensive approach to addressing career

education and preparation as they pertain to the unique needs of student-athletes.

- (8) To continue providing a balanced academic and athletic environment for student-athletes, Athletic Departments should remain diligent in complying with the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) rule limiting practice for student-athletes to the NCAA maximum (currently 20 hours) per week.
 - (9) Athletic Departments should offer a freshman/transfer orientation for student-athletes that communicates the academic and behavioral expectations of student-athletes as campus leaders and often highly visible members of the campus community. Additionally, this orientation should inform student-athletes of all available academic and career resources.
 - (10) Athletic Departments should either provide, or partner with other campus departments to provide, training and counseling services to address systemwide student issues such as sexual assault, campus climate, and mental health.
- C. Require the Office of the President to provide annual reports to the Regents on how the campuses have addressed the guiding principles and the implementation of the proposed policy changes, provided they are approved by the Regents.

[Background material was provided 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 briefly introduced this action item, which he said had been of particular interest to Regent Newsom. Provost Dorr affirmed that the University has the important responsibility of supporting its student-athletes in both their academic and athletic endeavors. The vast majority of UC's student-athletes do well at both and UC's athletic programs serve as a national standard of excellence. She noted the growing trend among universities with the necessary financial resources to provide more benefits to their student-athletes. She thanked Regent Newsom for bringing these broad student-athlete welfare reforms to the attention of the Office of the President. Discussions with Regent Newsom resulted in the convening of a working group of athletic directors and senior Athletic Department personnel from six UC campuses to discuss what the University was currently doing well with regard to its student-athletes and areas in which UC campuses could improve the benefits and services they provides to their student-athletes.

Ms. Dorr pointed out that the UC campuses have a range of athletic programs that belong to various athletic divisions and conferences. Division One and Two programs compete at the highest levels of intercollegiate athletics and provide scholarships for student-athletes. Division Three programs tend to have fewer resources and are unable to provide athletic scholarships. Aside from the two UC campuses belonging to the Pac-12, funding

for UC athletic programs is limited to what campuses are able to provide through fees, institutional support, and finite revenue streams. To bolster existing efforts on UC campuses to improve student-athlete welfare, the working group of athletic directors and senior Athletic Department personnel proposed guiding principles and policy changes based on UC campus best practices.

The working group recommended that the Regents adopt a Policy on Student-Athletes that includes three elements and endorse ten guiding principles, which together cover five areas: administrative accountability, admissions, financial and injury support, academic and career support, and student life. Administrative accountability involves the integration of athletic administration into campus leadership. To this end, the working group recommended as policy that UC's Division One and Two campuses' athletic directors report directly to their chancellors. Holistic review is used for student-athlete admission, as it is for all UC students, and must be based on a belief that the student-athlete has the capacity to do UC-level academic work and earn a bachelor's degree. As for all students, early identification of student-athletes who might need special attention to ensure they are progressing academically would be emphasized.

The differing financial capacity of UC campuses' athletic programs affects financial and injury support for student-athletes. Recent Pac-12 reforms include the guarantee of four-year athletic scholarships to student-athletes and enhanced support should they become injured. For UC's non-Pac-12 campuses, increasing scholarship guarantees or providing a cost-of-living stipend is much more difficult and cannot be done on a 100-percent basis. The working group recommended adoption of a policy for those campuses that provide athletic scholarships stating that if a student-athlete sustains an incapacitating injury while participating in intercollegiate athletic activities and is medically unable to continue his or her athletic commitment, the campus shall not revoke the student's financial aid or scholarships and shall provide equivalent grant and scholarship money, if not from the same funding source, from another funding source. This would enable the injured student-athlete to finish his or her degree with the financial support expected.

In the area of academic and career support, the working group recommended guiding principles that promote the provision of broad academic guidance, the preparation of student-athletes for the post-athletic phase of their lives through career support, and provision of a balanced athletic and academic environment by limiting practice time. Since student-athletes travel and have demanding practice schedules, the working group recommended adoption of a policy allowing student-athletes to receive priority registration on each campus, as do certain other students.

The working group examined the area of student life closely. Student-athletes represent the University on and off campus, and while traveling. The guiding principles recommend that student-athletes be provided from the beginning of their time at UC the expectation and resources needed to ensure appropriate comportment, and are educated and trained in UC policies.

Regent Newsom expressed appreciation for the effort of the working group and urged the Regents to support the recommendation. He provided contextual information underlining the importance of these issues. The area of intercollegiate athletics has been under increasing attention for good reason, since it is predicated on the idea that these are student-athletes, yet that presumption is questionable in revenue-generating sports. The reality is that large-conference student-athletes often spend more than 50 hours per week in their athletic endeavors, despite the National Collegiate Athletic Association's mandate that they cannot spend more than four hours per day or 20 hours per week. These athletes generate hundreds of millions of dollars of revenue in merchandising and ticket sales. Public university football coaches earn an average of more than \$2 million per year, increasing at a rate 20 times greater than faculty salaries. Regent Newsom recalled being struck by news headlines a few years prior that UC Berkeley's football team had the lowest graduation rate in the Power Five at 44 percent and lowest in the Pac-12 for men's basketball, at only 38 percent. He noted the racial element to this issue, with African American male athletes faring particularly poorly. He acknowledged there had been a good deal of improvement over the last few years, and expressed appreciation to the Regents and the Office of the President for taking this issue seriously. The annual reporting that would now be required would signal the seriousness with which UC takes this issue. UC should lead the nation in this discussion and reforms. Regent Newsom commented that Chancellor Dirks had been extraordinary in his engagement on this issue. UC Berkeley Athletic Director H. Michael Williams was exceptionally talented and involved in setting a new tone in negotiating contracts for athletic directors and coaches systemwide. He thanked UCLA for being a model in setting best practices.

Regent Pattiz noted the vast sums of money coming in to intercollegiate athletics. During these times of shrinking public support of education, these athletic monies allow campuses to do many things they would otherwise be unable to do. He agreed that there were racial issues involved. He cautioned against shutting off the pathway to higher education at excellent universities for those student-athletes who might be admitted only on the basis of athletic scholarships. Regent Pattiz asked if requiring student-athletes to make a four-year commitment to the University in exchange for scholarship support had been considered. Mr. Williams responded that UC Berkeley athletes enroll with the intention of completing degree requirements and graduating. UC Berkeley occasionally has student-athletes who leave early for professional careers and expects that they will return in the future to complete degree requirements. For example, a high-profile UC Berkeley football player, recently the first choice in the National Football League draft, was on campus this week completing his exams and expected to graduate on schedule in December. UC Berkeley has a robust program for student-athletes who return to UC Berkeley to complete their degrees following professional athletic careers.

Regent Lansing expressed appreciation for the working group's effort and to Regent Newsom for drawing attention to this issue. She cautioned that athletic accomplishment should be appreciated in its own right as an extraordinary achievement. She suggested that a more detailed comparison of UC's graduation rates with other universities' might reveal that some other schools simply push their student-athletes through to graduation.

She favored the recommended provisions ensuring that an injured athlete would continue to receive financial support.

Regent Newsom affirmed that UC's recruiting would not be hindered by these provisions. It is the University's responsibility to give its student-athletes the best opportunity to succeed in life, particularly considering that only a very small percentage would go on to professional athletic careers.

Regent Ortiz Oakley expressed his strong view that UC should never underestimate the academic potential of any student who comes to UC or fail to support a student-athlete's opportunity to gain a UC degree.

Mr. Williams thanked Regent Newsom for his cooperation and collaboration, and pointed out the efforts made by UC Berkeley's coaches and student-athletes.

Regent Gould affirmed the values expressed in the proposed Policy and guiding principles. He asked about the costs that would be associated with implementing this Policy, since most UC athletic programs are not self-supporting and additional scholarship costs would be incurred. He asked whether the cost to the University would be mitigated through insurance or other sources. As this program moves forward, the Regents should be provided with information about how the program would work, its costs, and strategies to mitigate those costs. UC Davis Interim Athletic Director Teresa Gould noted the difference in funding models among various UC campuses. About 85 percent of UC Davis' athletic programs are funded through student fees and institutional support. The proposed Policy would not have a financial effect on UC Davis' current operating budget.

Regent Davis noted that most UC athletic programs run at a deficit. He asked if the working group had considered protection of the physical health of student-athletes, for instance from concussions to football players. Mr. Williams responded that UC Berkeley takes the health of its student-athletes very seriously.

Chairman Lozano thanked the working group and particularly Regent Newsom for bringing this issue to the attention of the Board. This Policy and guiding principles would align UC with extraordinary standards and expectations for its athletic directors whose compensation would be tied to the academic performance of their student-athletes. She expressed pride in UC's leadership in this area. The Regents would be updated annually on the implementation of these principles.

Committee Chair Island also expressed appreciation to Regent Newsom for his valuable contribution to the University's athletic program and to the working group for completing a difficult task.

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

3. **UPDATE ON UNDERGRADUATE FINANCIAL AID AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

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

Provost Dorr said this presentation would involve financial aid goals and outcomes for UC's undergraduate students. While financial support of graduate students was very important, the means of providing that support are very different from support of undergraduates. This presentation would focus exclusively on undergraduates. Overall, UC has a robust and effective financial aid program for its undergraduates.

Vice President Sakaki stated that UC's financial aid policies and education financing model have made it a national leader in affordability and access. Many individual UC campuses enroll more low-income students than the entire Ivy League. UC accomplishes this with strong support from the Cal Grant program and strong direction from the Regents. Regents' policy very clearly states that the goal of UC's systemwide financial aid policy is affordability. While UC's financial aid program aims to make UC an affordable option, campuses may also use local scholarship money to attract top students and students with special talents.

UC's commitment to affordability starts with the Blue and Gold Plan, which promises that California students whose families earn less than \$80,000 per year and who are eligible for financial aid will pay no tuition. More than half of UC's California undergraduates have their tuition paid by a combination of grants and scholarships, and an additional 20 percent of undergraduates have a portion of their tuition paid.

While tuition gets the most attention, the University recognizes that the total cost of attendance includes other costs such as housing, food, books, transportation, and personal expenses, about which the University surveys its students every three years. An underlying assumption of UC's financial aid is that it should acknowledge the total cost of education. In fact, most of the cost of a UC education is not tuition.

UC's Education Financing Model (EFM) is based on a three-way partnership. Parents are asked to contribute based on their financial resources calculated by a methodology determined by the federal government. Students are asked to contribute by working part-time during the school year and full-time during the summer, and borrowing. The University coordinates federal, State, and University grants to meet the balance.

Director Christopher Carter described how the EFM works in practice. He displayed a graph showing sources of financing for students with varying levels of family income, showing student work and loans, Pell Grants, Cal Grants, UC Grants, and parent contributions. He stressed the importance of the State's Cal Grant program to maintaining UC's ability to meet its students' financial needs. UC students received about \$820 million in Cal Grants the prior year, more than twice the amount they received in federal Pell Grants.

A new contributor to UC students' financial aid is the State's Middle Class Scholarship Program, established through legislation carried by Regent Pérez when he served as Speaker of the Assembly, and half implemented in the current year. The Program extends aid eligibility beyond traditional aid programs. Once fully implemented in 2017-18, the University estimates that more than 8,000 UC students with family incomes up to \$150,000 would receive a total of more than \$25 million in support. These students would otherwise receive little if any grant support through traditional financial aid programs. Mr. Carter emphasized that every family does not fit neatly into the EFM. Financial aids directors and their staffs on every UC campus meet with students and parents whose family and financial circumstances require individualized attention and flexibility.

Mr. Carter stated that UC enrolls a higher percentage of Pell Grant recipients than comparable public universities. Its data-driven EFM has allowed UC to remain a national leader in affordability and access. More importantly, UC helps these students to graduate. On average, students with similar academic preparation levels have similar persistence and graduation rates, regardless of their family income levels. In September 2015, the *New York Times* included six UC campuses in its top ten engines of social mobility. UC's own analysis shows that low-income UC students succeed in the California workforce, earning more on average within five years of graduation than their parents' combined incomes. UC students graduate with lower debt than the national average. In 2014-15, undergraduates who entered UC as freshmen and borrowed, graduated with an average debt of \$20,800, compared with a national average of about \$29,000. Mr. Carter displayed a graph showing that the average cumulative borrowing for UC students did not vary greatly with parent income. The percentage of students borrowing dropped from three-quarters of students from the lowest-income families to one-quarter of students from the highest income families. Importantly, UC's policies strive to ensure that UC students' debt payments are manageable after graduation. State wage data show that UC graduates' educational loan payments average about seven percent of their annual earnings.

Mr. Carter expressed pride in UC's record of making the University financially accessible to California students. By maintaining a strong systemwide policy on affordability, UC strives to ensure that family finances are not a barrier for admitted California students to enroll at one of its nine undergraduate campuses. More importantly, UC students succeed, regardless of income level.

Regent Pérez expressed appreciation for this presentation that addressed the total cost of attendance for UC students, rather than only tuition. He asked for confirmation of the expectation that each student, regardless of family income, contribute \$10,000 per year through a combination of work and loans. Mr. Carter confirmed that the expectation was slightly less than \$10,000. Regent Pérez noted that the presentation confirmed the generosity of the Cal Grant Program that provides UC students twice as much as Pell Grants. He recalled the difficult decisions made in years past by the State Legislature to maintain that amount of Pell Grant funding. He stated that long before the concern at the federal level about default rates at private, for-profit universities, the State Legislature and the Governor acted to narrow the eligibility of the Cal Grant Program to remove

private, for-profit universities with poor graduation rates. That effort plus increased State funding enabled continued funding of the Cal Grant Program. This must be considered when the overall level of State investment in UC is discussed.

Regent Pérez expressed his view that the California Student Aid Commission had not been as aggressive as it could be in reaching out to potential applicants for the Middle Class Scholarship Program. Some students whose families were not eligible for any other type of financial aid were unaware that they would qualify for this assistance.

Regent Pérez asked what “similar academic preparation” meant in the slide display caption, “Students with similar academic preparation perform similarly, regardless of family income.” Mr. Carter said that language referred to the students’ academic index.

Regent Pérez commented that the data presented could indicate that some students work to earn more than \$5,000 per year and his conversations with UC students at various campuses indicated that amount of work takes a toll on them. Even though these students generally persist and succeed in equal numbers, the pressure of work time is a matter of concern.

Regent Pérez also noted that the perception of \$20,000 in student debt by students from low-income families, who might earn \$20,000 to \$30,000 per year, would likely be very different from the perception of the same amount of debt by students whose families earn \$150,000 per year. A more negative perception of the potential post-graduation debt obligation can be stressful for students, and affect their persistence and success. Regent Pérez said this has been supported by his conversations with students at various UC and California State University campuses. He stated that the data presented did not reflect what he perceived to be a real difference in perception between students from different income levels.

Regent Oved stated that he had hoped this item would address problems faced by students from middle-income families, who suffer from other economic pressures in the current economy. He asked Mr. Carter whether the proportion of students at UC from middle-income families was decreasing. Mr. Carter responded that his office conducts annual surveys and can compare the ratio of students from various income bands to the proportion of families from those income bands in the general state population. Typically, UC’s lower-income students are underrepresented relative to their proportion in the population, and students from upper-income families are over-represented. Some income bands that could be defined as middle-income were trending somewhat toward being underrepresented.

Regent Oved commented that families with incomes above \$80,000 per year might not receive a UC Grant. Mr. Carter responded that the UC Grant is a need-based award, with no income ceiling as there is with the Cal Grant Program. Families with incomes higher than \$80,000 might have multiple students in college and be eligible for a UC Grant.

Regent Oved observed that UC has no systemwide policy defining middle income. For example, UC Berkeley's Middle Class Scholarship Program defines middle income from \$80,000 to \$150,000, while UC Davis' Aggie Grant Plan defines middle income from \$80,000 to \$120,000. The lack of a uniform definition of middle income causes confusion for UC families and does not provide equal opportunity for UC students.

Regent Oved expressed his view that the Free Application for Federal Student Aid, based on adjusted gross income, does not indicate a student's financial need in the best way. For example, a family with a wage-based income of \$50,000 would likely have very different financial need than a family with \$50,000 of interest income. Regent Oved stated that the CSS/Financial Aid PROFILE of the College Board, used by some of UC's competitor universities, would be a more effective measure of need.

Regent Oved added that UC should compete more to recruit middle-income students. He suggested a systemwide philanthropy campaign focused on support for middle-income students.

Regent Reiss supported the comments of Regent Oved. She agreed that it was important to define "middle income," particularly in areas like San Francisco and Los Angeles. She said it would be helpful to know what portions of the \$10,000 that students are responsible for contributing were from loans or from work. She questioned whether parents earning \$130,000 adjusted gross income would be able to provide the \$15,000 gap between aid provided by the Middle Class Scholarship Program when fully implemented and the \$33,100 total cost of UC, particularly if they had other children at home. Regent Reiss requested information about the trend in the number of applications for admission to UC from students from middle-class families, those earning from \$80,000 to \$150,000, and whether the number of applicants had changed over the past ten years.

Regent Lansing thanked Regent Pérez, who was the architect of the Middle Class Scholarship Program during his term as Speaker of the Assembly. She noted that, while the economic status of middle-class families is a central national issue, it had not been addressed sufficiently by the University. She questioned whether the upper limit for middle income families should be increased to \$180,000, particularly for families with more than one child attending college. Mr. Carter responded that federal standards for financial aid take into account the number of college students in the household. Regent Lansing asked if the upper limit of the middle-income range is increased for families with more than one student in college. Mr. Carter responded that need is calculated on the federal basis without regard to a cap on a range for middle income, but programs for middle-income families such as the Middle Class Scholarship Program do have an income cap. He said it would be possible to model these programs for need and number of household students in college. Regent Lansing expressed her view that it would be valuable for middle-income scholarship programs to consider basing awards on need, including the number of children in college, rather than solely on income.

Regent Pérez asked for confirmation that the UC Grant program takes into account how many children a family has in college. Mr. Carter confirmed that it does.

Regent Lansing asked if a family that earned \$180,000 per year could apply for the Middle Class Scholarship Program. Regent Pérez noted the difference in that regard between the Middle Class Scholarship Program and the UC Grant. Regent Pérez said he was unable to garner support to incorporate those provisions into the Middle Class Scholarship Program, so it does not take into account the number of college students in the household, while that is considered by the UC Grant program. Regent Pérez commented that the broader question is that all the data being considered are for UC's actual students, rather than for admitted students who chose not to attend UC. The total financial aid package from UC for students from middle-class families must be compared with the total package from other institutions. The data for actual UC students would not capture this other group. Regent Pérez expressed his particular concern about the data's application to UC's capture rate for admitted African American students who did not choose to attend UC. His sense from available information is that UC has a lower yield rate of middle-class African American students than competitive private institutions and out-of-state institutions. He suggested considering pursuing private philanthropy to help fill the financial aid gap for middle-class students, and particularly those from underrepresented minorities.

Staff Advisor Richmond appreciated this discussion about economic pressure on students from middle-class families and said data are available that address this subject. For instance, the private sector sometimes uses geographic multipliers to adjust income levels. Rather than set a defined upper and lower limit for middle class, existing data indices and variables could be considered that could yield a more flexible and effective methodology to address disparities in cost between various areas of the state.

Regent Oved commented that both UC Berkeley and UC Davis had implemented campus-based middle-class scholarship programs. The average debt of those campuses' undergraduates upon graduation is \$3,000 less than the UC systemwide average and \$13,000 less than the national average.

Committee Chair Island asked if data were available about the effect of students' time working during the academic year on their time to graduation. Ms. Dorr replied that data show that working on campus is much better for students than working off campus, in terms of academic performance and time-to-degree. Also, data show a benefit in academic performance to working on campus up to 20 hours per week, but a significant detriment to working on campus more than 20 hours per week. The data were consistent across several student cohorts and various subsets of students. The University recommends that no student work more than 20 hours per week during the academic year, and some UC campuses have adopted this as a requirement. The University strongly encourages its campuses to provide on-campus jobs for students.

Chairman Lozano commented that this valuable discussion revisited issues to which the Regents had given considerable attention in the past. She suggested that Ms. Dorr report

back to the Regents on points raised during this discussion and possible modifications of UC's financial aid program based on Regents' comments, particularly regarding the definitions of middle class and family income, and consideration of a philanthropic effort to assist middle-class students.

4. **ANNUAL ACCOUNTABILITY SUB-REPORT ON DIVERSITY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

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

Provost Dorr said this presentation of the Annual Accountability Sub-Report on Diversity at the UC would focus on four topics: progress UC has made in several areas to advance representational diversity among undergraduate students, graduate students, and faculty; challenges the University continues to confront in its efforts to increase representational diversity; strategies for addressing these challenges; and accountability structures in place to help the University continue to make progress. UC's Accountability Report of 2015 is the source for all presentation data, based on data from 2014 and earlier. This presentation would focus on students and faculty, and would not cover staff. Ms. Dorr stated that a future presentation would focus on staff diversity and inclusion.

Vice Provost Yvette Gullatt discussed recent developments in diversity and inclusion for UC undergraduates. She reported that UC was making progress in a number of important areas of representational diversity among undergraduates. The percentage of new underrepresented minority freshmen has nearly doubled in the last 15 years, from 15 percent in 1999 to 28 percent, with a similar increase among transfer students. Chicanos/Latinos are the fastest-growing population, reflecting both demographic changes in California and increasing levels of preparation among those students. Four- and six-year graduation rates for all ethnic groups have steadily increased over time. Ms. Gullatt expressed the University's dissatisfaction with progress in certain areas. Among undergraduates, the proportions of African Americans and American Indians have remained relatively unchanged, mirroring in part their unchanging proportion among California high school graduates. There remains a ten-percent gap between graduation rates of white and Asian students, at 86 percent, and students from underrepresented minorities at 76 percent.

Ms. Gullatt displayed a slide showing a good deal of variance among UC campuses in the percentage of underrepresented minority undergraduates. The proportions of African American undergraduates range from two percent to 7.5 percent, and the proportions of Chicano/Latino undergraduates range from 13 percent to 44 percent. However, the proportions of American Indian undergraduates are less than one percent on almost every campus.

An opportunity exists for the University to enhance its representational diversity as it adds 5,000 more California freshman and transfer students this upcoming year. Under President Napolitano's leadership and with thoughtful input from UC student leaders, the

University has launched new diversity initiatives particularly aimed at high school and community college African American, American Indian, and Chicano/Latino students. This initiative is addressing key issues such as lack of awareness of UC, preparation for UC, and information and support to apply and, if admitted, to enroll. One goal is a threefold increase by 2020 in the number of African American and other underrepresented students who participate in K-12 and community college outreach programs and enroll at UC. The Achieve UC initiative, which shows families how to get on and stay on a path to UC, is being brought to schools, churches, and other community-based organizations. In addition to UC's longstanding outreach programs such as Early Academic Outreach, MESA, and Puente, the University has taken the additional step to identify ninth and tenth-grade high performers, called President's Pre-College Scholars, who can benefit from more contact with UC. For the duration of their time in high school, these students are engaged in UC campus life, receive advising in course-planning and financial aid, and assistance with applications and personal statements. For prospective transfer students, transfer pathways in 21 of UC's most popular majors will help more underrepresented community college students be competitive for UC admission by increasing the number of UC campuses for which a student is prepared.

In just a short period of time, these efforts are showing results. In the current year, UC saw a 32 percent increase in the number of African American students participating in UC's outreach programs, a five percent increase in freshman applications from African Americans, a 26 percent increase in transfer applications from underrepresented students, and a 37 percent increase overall in underrepresented freshman admissions for fall 2016.

The University is also focused on increasing the enrollment rate of underrepresented students, and particularly African American students, accepted to UC. A student's decision to enroll at a particular UC campus is influenced by several factors, including financial aid, academic program offerings, campus climate, housing options, and student life. Many students are unable to visit campuses to which they were admitted because of cost and distance. The University has taken aggressive measures to remedy this problem for fall of 2016. This spring 1,000 additional admitted students were invited to visit every campus to which they were admitted, to stay overnight in a residence hall, to meet students and faculty, and to have their questions answered before they made their enrollment decisions by May 1. Statements of intent to register are still being processed, but the University has reason to believe that many UC campuses would see an increase in the number of underrepresented students, and particularly African American students, enrolling for the fall of 2016. These efforts are consistent with UC policy and State law, which allow UC to pay particular attention to underrepresented groups as part of a comprehensive outreach effort.

Ms. Gullatt discussed important efforts to retain students from underrepresented groups. To support successful graduation for more undergraduate students, every undergraduate advisor has received new guidance on advising practices that help undergraduate students graduate on time and can close performance gaps among students of various backgrounds. Every campus has resource centers to foster leadership and create a sense

of community for students who are underrepresented, first-generation, veterans, undocumented, or former foster youth, among others.

Campuses have also taken the importance of an inclusive campus climate seriously. At UC Berkeley, that means building and sustaining a critical mass of African American students, faculty, and staff, improving classroom climate through better training, and raising a \$20 million endowed scholarship fund for undergraduates. UC San Diego's Black Academic Excellence initiative will increase scholarship funds to ensure that African American students can pursue higher education with less apprehension about covering the cost of their education. For the first time, four of the nine undergraduate UC campuses are now designated as Hispanic-Serving Institutions by the federal government, making those campuses eligible for federal and foundation funds to support Chicano/Latino students.

Ms. Dorr discussed recent developments regarding graduate student and faculty diversity. The availability of qualified underrepresented minority candidates lessens at each step from high school graduates, to undergraduates, to graduate students, and faculty. Systemwide, UC enrolls about 26,000 Ph.D. students, 7,000 academic master's degree students, and 20,000 graduate professional students. UC's 6,000 medical residents would not be considered in this presentation. The proportion of graduate students varies greatly among UC campuses and even more with graduate professional students. Various disciplines also differ in their diversity. For example, graduate academic students in the physical sciences, engineering, and computer science are less diverse by race, ethnicity, and gender than are students in other fields. Social sciences and psychology are the most diverse by race and ethnicity. Similar proportions are found in graduate professional programs, with business being less diverse by race, ethnicity, and gender than other fields. Education graduate professional students are by far the most diverse by race, ethnicity, and gender.

Ms. Dorr reported that there had been a fairly steady increase in the proportion of underrepresented minority graduate students in both academic and professional areas over the past 15 years, largely attributable to growth in the percentage of Chicano/Latino students. Progress during that time in increasing the proportion of female graduate students is much more varied by discipline. To date, UC has achieved improvements in racial, ethnic, and gender diversity of graduate academic and professional students. Campuses have worked very hard to this end, but realize there is more work to do.

Ms. Dorr displayed a chart showing the racial and ethnic distribution of underrepresented graduate academic and professional students at each UC campus and systemwide in fall 2014, indicating that the campuses varied considerably in the proportion of underrepresented minorities. The proportions of African American graduate students range from two to five percent for academic students and one to six percent for professional students. The proportions of Chicano/Latino graduate students range from seven to 12 percent for academic students and from three to 26 percent for professional students. The proportions of American Indian graduate students range between zero and two percent on all campuses. Ms. Dorr displayed a similar chart showing gender

distribution in fall 2014 by campus and systemwide. The proportions of female graduate academic students range from 36 percent to 59 percent, and of graduate professional students from 31 percent to 83 percent.

The University is working to increase diversity among its graduate students. In cultivation and preparation of diverse graduate students, a comparatively new program is the UC/Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) Initiative, which supports UC faculty research that involves HBCU undergraduates on a UC campus with faculty and graduate students during the summer, followed by continued engagement during the academic year. If these students subsequently are admitted to UC as graduate students, they are provided with financial support for at least two years. This program started four summers prior and UC has already enrolled 20 additional African American Ph.D. students from the program. This program had been funded by carried-forward monies, but is currently funded by the President's office on a regular basis each year.

The University has also increased scholarship and fellowship support for underrepresented graduate academic students. The President and chancellors have increased funding for the Eugene Cota-Robles Fellowship for graduate students interested in becoming faculty; that Fellowship is intended to increase the number and diversity of candidates for faculty positions.

Campuses have been increasing their efforts to create inclusive climates, which women and underrepresented minority students would find attractive. UCSF has an Office of Diversity and Outreach that offers education and training in 13 topics including six about climate and five about compliance in areas related to climate, diversity, and inclusion. Sessions are offered to graduate students upon request.

UC Programs in Medical Education (PRIME) at each UC medical school are responsible for roughly a ten percent increase in underrepresented minority enrollment in UC medical schools. Each PRIME program focuses on meeting the needs of an underserved California population through specialized coursework, structured clinical experience, advanced independent study, and special mentoring. The PRIME programs have been both popular and effective.

As with graduate student diversity, faculty diversity varies in similar ways by field and must be addressed by field. Over the past 15 years, there has been a systemwide increase in underrepresented minority faculty from six to ten percent. The increase is largely attributable to an increase in the percentage of Chicano/Latino ladder-rank faculty, which has increased from four to six percent. Overall the faculty are a stable group, so change is slow. The percentages of African American and American Indian faculty have remained relatively constant over the past 15 years, during which time the proportion of female faculty has increased from 23 percent to 30 percent.

The University is focusing on the opportunity presented by the hiring of new faculty. The hiring rates for underrepresented minority and female faculty are higher than current proportions, a positive indication. Ms. Dorr displayed a chart showing the distribution of

underrepresented minority faculty by campus and systemwide. In 2014 the proportions of African American faculty at UC campuses ranged from two to four percent; the proportions of Chicano/Latino faculty ranged from two to 12 percent; and the proportions of American Indian faculty ranged from less than one percent to less than two percent. She showed a similar chart showing 2014 proportions of female faculty at the campuses and systemwide, ranging from 25 percent to 38 percent. President Napolitano has been very engaged, encouraging UC chancellors to use present hiring opportunities as a chance to increase faculty diversity.

Ms. Dorr reviewed ways in which the University is attempting to increase faculty diversity. Many UC campuses have participated in the National Science Foundation's ADVANCE program, which promotes an inclusive climate and the advancement of women and faculty of color in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics fields. Recently, UC campuses changed their faculty hiring practices in several ways. For example, chairs of search committees must have training in implicit bias and in the characteristics of an open and equal opportunity search. The systemwide UC Recruit project, which collects data on available faculty positions, candidate pools, and hiring, is functioning on all campuses, shedding light on hiring, and providing opportunities for campuses to cooperate on hiring. The very successful President's Postdoctoral Fellowship Program (PPFP) encourages outstanding female and minority Ph.D.s to pursue academic careers at UC. President Napolitano recently provided additional funding for PPFP. The Office of the President and UC campuses have a variety of hiring incentive programs. In a program affiliated with the PPFP, former Fellows who are hired as UC faculty will have most of their academic year salary covered by funds from the Office of the President for five years. This incentive comes with a committed full-time equivalent line and total commitment to the faculty member after five years. These faculty have been very successful, with 99 percent of those seeking tenure being approved. UC Irvine's faculty hiring Inclusive Excellence supplement program allows the campus to hire two candidates for an available faculty position, if both are outstanding and hiring both would contribute to inclusive excellence.

Ms. Dorr displayed a graph showing the increase in hiring of underrepresented minority faculty over time since 2005-06 and projected hiring under various scenarios aimed at reaching 14 percent underrepresented minority faculty, the percentage of underrepresented minority students obtaining Ph.D.s at the current time. The graph showed that if UC continues to hire underrepresented minority faculty at its ten-year average rate of 11 percent, it will still not have reached 14 percent by 2045-46. If UC hires at the 14 percent availability pool rate, it would reach 14 percent underrepresented minority faculty in 2055-56. If UC were to hire underrepresented minority faculty at twice its current rate, or 22 percent, it would reach the goal of 14 percent by 2022. These projections demonstrate how much UC has to do to increase the proportion of underrepresented minorities in its faculty. The same is true for female faculty.

Ms. Dorr discussed accountability for diversity, emphasizing the importance of the leadership of the President, chancellors, and senior leadership, whose support for increasing diversity makes a huge difference in what is accomplished. Many UC

campuses have put in place senior leaders to oversee matters of inclusion and diversity, spearhead initiatives, and engage the Academic Senate to effect campus change. On some UC campuses, these individuals have oversight of faculty searches, including the authority to pause a search. Campus provosts also review faculty hires and have the authority to pause a search. Other areas of established oversight include the Academic Senate's Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools, which is responsible for ensuring that campus admissions follow the policies that the Regents have approved. University policy can help encourage diversity. A recently established policy requires that all faculty be reviewed in terms of their contributions to diversity through research, teaching, or mentoring. Faculty must account for their accomplishments in this area and what difference their actions made.

The University also has more optional and required education and training for students, faculty, and staff. Most campuses have a diversity requirement for undergraduates. Sexual violence and sexual harassment training is mandatory for everyone at UC. Search committees on most UC campuses have some mandatory training requirements.

Ms. Dorr concluded by stating that all of these efforts help the University make progress toward the Regents' diversity goals. Achieving these goals is a shared responsibility of the Office of the President and the campuses. Continuing support for those programs shown to be effective, sharing knowledge, and fostering a culture of shared responsibility and personal leadership would lead the University to be a model of inclusion and excellence.

Regent Pérez commented on faculty diversity, noting that discussions at prior Regents' meetings indicated that the upcoming enrollment growth would necessitate the hiring of 571 new faculty over the next several years. These new positions, in addition to the roughly 200 positions that would open from faculty retiring, would offer an opportunity to increase faculty diversity. While he supported prior and ongoing efforts to increase diversity, Regent Pérez urged stronger measures, including engaging Regents in consideration of policy initiatives to maximize what he called a once-in-a-generation opportunity to increase faculty diversity.

Regent Pérez noted that, in the chart showing the fall 2014 racial/ethnic distribution of ladder-rank faculty, international and domestic faculty were aggregated, even though they were disaggregated in the 2015 Annual Accountability Report. Since a disproportionate number of Chicano/Latino faculty are international, aggregation of these two groups is misleading and would not address issues about the faculty pipeline. Regent Pérez noted the particular concern of the public and the Legislature about the diversity of domestic faculty rather than international. Disaggregated figures show that the proportion of domestic Chicano/Latino faculty increased from three percent to 4.3 percent over the past 15 years. More troubling, domestic African American faculty had increased from two percent to only 2.4 percent. He acknowledged that a few UC campuses were statistical outliers. UC Santa Cruz had a good number of Chicano/Latino faculty 15 years prior and had significant growth to its current seven percent domestic Chicano/Latino faculty. UC Merced had also made good progress. However, the University was not making much

systemwide progress. He requested information about how hiring rates would have to be adjusted to reach UC's goals if the data were based only on domestic faculty. Regent Pérez asked the Chairman of the Board and the Committee Chair to have the Regents consider possible policy regarding increasing faculty diversity during the upcoming faculty hiring opportunity, informed by data disaggregated for domestic and international faculty.

Staff Advisor Acker expressed a concern about the lack of diversity of underrepresented minorities and women at the highest levels of the administration on the University's campuses, such as chancellors, provosts, and deans. She pointed out that in 2014 UC deans systemwide were 78 percent white and 72 percent male. These campus leaders shepherd the hiring of new faculty. She encouraged Regents' involvement with efforts to increase diversity by emphasizing accountability.

Regent Oved expressed his view that using systemwide data was ineffective. His earlier request for disaggregated data for each UC campus had not been fulfilled.

Regent Ramirez emphasized that diversity among UC's graduate students is important as the pipeline for faculty diversity. She stated that it would be helpful to hear from the individual campuses about best practices and particular challenges. Regent Ramirez also asked for a clarification of diversity goals. Diversity for women of color should be considered, along with other groups. Campus climate is important in retaining diverse faculty.

Regent Ortiz Oakley echoed Regent Pérez's view of the unique opportunity upcoming with the large number of anticipated faculty hires. Changing the diversity of the University would require a great deal of sustained and intentional effort. He expressed the view that this was not an accountability report, since there was no accountability or consequences. If nothing different is done, the numbers would be the same next year. The Regents should hold themselves accountable with specific metrics for the Board through use of a dashboard. Regent Ortiz Oakley observed that diversity at UC cannot be considered separately from the work being done in the K-12 system. He suggested inviting Michael Kirst, President of the California State Board of Education, to speak to the Regents on this subject.

Regent Pérez agreed it was important to set a goal for diversity and challenged the presentation's presumption that the goal should be 14 percent underrepresented minority faculty. Ms. Dorr agreed that the University needs to be much more aggressive with every hire to achieve progress in diversity. Since underrepresented minority students are currently 14 percent of Ph.D. graduates, that figure provided at least a point of illustration.

Regent Pattiz suggested examining roadblocks that impede significant progress, such as any institutional blockades to the kind of progress desired. He expressed displeasure that pertinent information had not been provided to Regent Oved.

Committee Chair Island commented that the diversity statistics, particularly as to African American undergraduate students, were sad. He associated himself with Regent Ortiz Oakley's remark that there is no accountability in this report. He said the chancellors bear the responsibility to lead change in this area, but they had not. In spite of the Regents' 2007 adoption of Policy 4400: Policy on University of California Diversity Statement, which held great hope as the basis for change, there had not been significant change. There are impediments to change in the proportion of African American undergraduates, but those impediments had not been addressed. He asked President Napolitano to bring additional focus to this area. If change is to occur, the University cannot continue to repeat methods that have been ineffective.

Regent Elliott shared Committee Chair Island's great disappointment in the progress in enrollment of African American undergraduate and graduate students. He expressed his firm belief that both the Regents and the campuses need to be held accountable for the lack of progress. Regent Elliott also shared concern for the lack of response to Regent Oved's request for information and said that he had asked several times in recent months for the results of a study that was to have been undertaken by UC San Diego on the rate of enrollment of African American students admitted to UC. He had yet to receive a response as to why the results were not available.

Regent Lansing agreed with the frustration of hearing substantially the same results year after year, and emphasized the importance of outreach efforts. She asked that Ms. Dorr's next diversity report to the Regents include UC's outreach efforts to middle and high school students from underrepresented communities. Regent Lansing expressed her view that UC campuses have a responsibility to their local high schools and should adopt many local high schools to provide supplemental teaching and other outreach.

Regent Gould said the Regents have indicated the desire to be much more targeted and strategic in working with the chancellors and the Office of the President on ways UC can achieve better results.

President Napolitano affirmed the importance of this issue for the University. UC is a public university whose business is providing opportunity for all groups. The University must determine how this can be accomplished after Proposition 209. There is a relative shortage of Ph.D.s from underrepresented communities at all universities and a competition to recruit them. UC must develop strategies to address these challenges. She agreed that early identification of students is crucial, and expressed her wish to expand the new Presidential Preschoolers Program, which has already identified 1,400 students from underrepresented communities by their Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test scores. The University will track and work with these students to encourage them to come to UC. She asked that the Committee provide her with suggestions about what kinds of reports on specific aspects of diversity Regents would like to receive on a regular basis at Regents' meetings, and ways to measure progress and hold the institution accountable.

Chairman Lozano added that it would be important to clarify how success would be measured and mechanisms of accountability. She noted the frustration of the Regents and the sense of urgency about the lack of progress.

The meeting adjourned at 12:45 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff