

**THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
MEETING AS A COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

March 18, 1999

The Regents of the University of California met on the above date at UCSF-Laurel Heights, San Francisco.

Present: Regents Atkinson, Bagley, Connerly, Davies, Davis, Eastin, Espinoza, Hopkinson, Johnson, Khachigian, Kozberg, Lansing, Leach, Lee, Miura, Montoya, Moores, Nakashima, Parsky, Preuss, Sayles, Villaraigosa, and Willmon

In attendance: Regents-designate Pannor, Taylor, and Vining, Faculty Representatives Coleman and Dorr, Secretary Trivette, General Counsel Holst, Treasurer Small, Provost King, Senior Vice President Kennedy, Vice Presidents Broome, Darling, Gomes, Hershman, and Hopper, Chancellors Berdahl, Bishop, Carnesale, Cicerone, Dynes, Greenwood, Orbach, and Yang, Executive Vice Chancellor Grey representing Chancellor Vanderhoef, and Recording Secretary Nietfeld

The meeting convened at 1:15 p.m. with Chairman Davies presiding.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairman Davies explained that the Board had been convened as a Committee of the Whole in order to permit members of the public an opportunity to address matters on the afternoon's agendas. The following persons addressed the Board concerning the items noted:

1. ***Item 303, Committee on Educational Policy: Proposed Establishment of UC Freshman Eligibility in the Local Context***
 - A. Ms. Heather Bergman, a student at the Berkeley campus, addressed matters not on the afternoon's agendas.
 - B. Ms. Pam Inglesby, the statewide coordinator of the University Council of the California Federation of Teachers, reported that the Council strongly supports the proposed policy on freshman eligibility in the local context; however, it believes that six percent is a more appropriate figure because four percent will not diversify the student body such that it begins to represent the population of the state. The Council urges the University to attract these newly eligible students by expanding student support programs and financial aid, and it asks that the University assist high schools that do not offer the full range of (a)-(f) courses to expand their curriculum so that all students in the state will have the chance to become UC eligible. Finally, the Council does not consider the four percent proposal to be a substitute for affirmative action. If put into place, it will increase the economic and geographic diversity of the student body, but it will not increase ethnic diversity.

- C. Ms. Tanya Kappner, a student at the Berkeley campus, urged the Regents to rescind SP-1 and SP-2, which would send a better message than the four percent proposal that the University welcomes minority students.
- D. Ms. Sheree Laucirica, a student at the Berkeley campus, did not believe that the four percent plan would address discriminatory practices that exist in secondary and postsecondary educational institutions, such as the lack of advanced placement courses in poor schools and outdated textbooks.
- E. Mr. Mark Airgood, a teacher at King Estates Middle School in Oakland, suggested that while the four percent plan recognizes the existence of inequality in admissions to the UC system, it does nothing to remedy racism in society and does nothing to stop the resegregation of the UC system. Preliminary admissions figures which have been released indicate that the percentage of Black and Latino students is falling on almost all UC campuses. He urged the Regents to restore affirmative action at the University.
- F. Ms. Elaine Johnson, Executive Assistant to the President of the California Federation of Teachers, stated that the CFT welcomes the four percent proposal as a way to address inequities in the UC admissions process and to broaden the University's student population to reflect more accurately the state's geographic and economic diversity. She suggested, however, that the Regents increase the percentage of those made eligible to six percent, and she asked the Regents to join with California's teachers in asking community leadership to address the systemic underpreparation of most high school students for university-level work.
- G. Ms. Tennessee Reed stated that students who come from middle-class suburban communities need to be exposed to the diversity of the state's population. She believed that the four percent plan was irrelevant because it did not address the difference in the quality of the schools.
- H. Mr. Hoku Jeffrey, a student at the Berkeley campus, suggested that the Regents started a policy of resegregation when they adopted SP-1 and SP-2. He did not believe that the four percent plan would address this situation.
- I. Ms. Mariah Lichenstern stated that as long as schools are unequal the four percent plan will not diversify the University. If the Regents rescind SP-1 and SP-2, they will help to stop the attack against affirmative action.

- J. Mr. Ronald Cruz, a student at the Berkeley campus, believed that the four percent plan would do nothing to counter the effects of SP-1 and SP-2, and he urged the Regents to rescind these policies.
- K. Mr. Larry Tillie, a student at Lowell High School in San Francisco, reported that of the 846 students who applied to Lowell, only 17 African-American students and 44 Latino-surnamed students were accepted. He stated that the four percent plan would not address the problem of underrepresentation because Black and Latino students are not in the top four percent of schools like Lowell.
- L. Ms. Mica Pollock, a doctoral candidate at Stanford University, addressed matters not on the afternoon's agendas.
2. ***Item 306, Committee on Educational Policy: Davis Campus/McClellan Air Force Base Research Initiative***

Mr. Linden Blue, Vice Chair of General Atomics, spoke in favor of the initiative, noting that the reactor is a powerful research tool that has the potential to be used to treat certain cancers. Because the Air Force Base is being closed, the reactor will have to be decommissioned if it is not acquired by the Davis campus.

The meeting adjourned at 1:40 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary