

The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

February 18, 1999

A Special Meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy was held on the above date at UCSF-Laurel Heights, San Francisco.

Members present: Regents Atkinson, Bagley, Connerly, Davies, Davis, Eastin, Espinoza, Khachigian, Kozberg, Miura, Montoya, Nakashima, Villaraigosa, and Willmon; Advisory members Taylor and Vining

In attendance: Regents Bustamante, Johnson, Lee, Parsky, Preuss, and Sayles, Faculty Representatives Coleman and Dorr, Secretary Trivette, General Counsel Holst, Provost King, Senior Vice President Kennedy, Vice Presidents Broome, Darling, Gomes, Gurtner, and Hershman, Chancellors Berdahl, Bishop, Carnesale, Cicerone, Dynes, Orbach, Vanderhoef, and Yang, Executive Vice Chancellor Simpson representing Chancellor Greenwood, and Recording Secretary Nietfeld

The meeting convened at 10:10 a.m. with Committee Chair Connerly presiding.

1. **PROVIDING ACCESS TO THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA -- A PROGRESS REPORT ON LONG-RANGE ENROLLMENT PLANNING**

Provost King stated that, while today's presentation would focus on enrollment, at the crux of the issue is the nature of the University as a research university and how it will serve California and the nation in the future. A research university focuses on new knowledge and the teaching and nurturing of creativity in its students. It engages both undergraduate and graduate students in research with faculty and postdoctoral scholars. The research university exposes all of its participants to the growing frontier of knowledge, and it has as its core the integration of research and teaching. It prepares both undergraduates and graduate students to serve California and the nation well and thereby produces a stronger economy and a richer culture. Provost King stressed that the balance among faculty, graduate students, and undergraduate students is the key to producing the most effective results in research and education. Graduate students have multiple roles. They are the principal people through whom the faculty in the sciences and engineering carry out their own research. They also serve as day-to-day collaborators with undergraduate students in research. Graduate students serve as the most effective mechanism to transfer these research results to industry when they join the workforce. The role of graduate education is detailed in the booklet *Making Discovery Work*, which was mailed to all Regents in advance of the meeting.

Turning to graduate enrollments, Provost King reported that California has been under-investing in graduate education. While all 15 of the other major states have been increasing graduate enrollment, in California fewer graduate students are being educated now than was

the case ten years ago. Over the last thirty years, there has been a 100 percent increase in undergraduate enrollment and only a 7 percent growth in graduate student enrollment. As a result, the proportion of graduate students to undergraduate students is lower at the University of California than at its comparison institutions. California as a technological leader and generator of new industries has a great need for graduate education. California has 12 percent of the nation's population and 20 percent of the nation's R&D. California also has one-third of the nation's venture capital firms, which is key to the success of its economy. The new economy requires innovation and creativity, highly technical skills, skills in creative problem solving, and the ability to work in an international context. It is widely understood that the University's research provides real strength to California's economy. What is less appreciated is the key role of graduate students in that research.

Provost King pointed out that California faces serious problems. Its continued prosperity will be affected by the challenges of poverty, immigration, and a growing economic and educational gap. The state faces serious environmental problems, and health care, crime, and urbanization pose problems for California that are as difficult as anywhere in the country. The plans for growth in graduate education directly recognize these needs and target the disciplines in which the University should have powerful positive impacts. Growth in graduate enrollment will not be across the board. Instead, it will be targeted to engineering, computer science, and other science fields. There will be some growth in the newer professions and in the social sciences, especially those that emphasize international issues or solving complex social problems. There will be modest growth in the arts and the humanities to keep pace with the needs of the academic job market. The total growth proposed is an increase of 7,800 graduate students by 2010. This will return the University to approximately 18.3 percent graduate students, which is still significantly below the percentage of graduate students at comparison institutions in other states.

Regent Montoya expressed concern that Ph.D.s are having difficulty finding permanent, long-term employment. Provost King noted that this point had been taken into consideration when the enrollment plans were formulated. He added that, for Ph.D.s in the arts and the humanities, the California State University system is a major employer, and it expects a large turn-over of its faculty in the coming decade due to retirements.

Regent-designate Taylor referred to Figure 1 of Item 303, which portrays general campus undergraduate and graduate enrollments from 1967-68 to 1997-98 and asked for this information broken down by campus.

Regent Lee asked for information on how much of the funding for research that is spent in the State of California goes to the University of California and to the two national laboratories.

President Atkinson noted that a report will be issued soon by the California Council on Science and Technology which will provide a detailed analysis of research spending. It is

clear that federal funding through universities in the state is high, and the funding by industry for R&D is extremely high in comparison with other states. On the other hand, the State of California is low among the states in the actual dollars that it invests in research.

Regent Preuss asked how the situation had developed with respect to graduate enrollment. Provost King pointed out that there has been an intense need to accommodate undergraduate enrollment demand, and the primary interest in Sacramento has been to ensure that this demand is met. The University has found it more difficult to find State funding to support graduate education. Regent Preuss noted that the quality of undergraduate education is dependent upon the ratio of graduate to undergraduate students as well as the student-to-faculty ratio.

Regent Villaraigosa expressed surprise that the University had found the Legislature unwilling to support graduate enrollment, noting that in his experience in budget hearings the issue had not been raised by the University. He supported bringing graduate enrollment to a more competitive level. He urged University administrations to alert the Legislature to the problem, noting that graduate enrollment is crucial to the economic well-being of the state. Provost King agreed that the University had been remiss in not bringing the matter forward sooner.

Regent Espinoza asked how financial support for graduate students may have affected enrollment. President Atkinson stated that there is no lack of students who wish to attend the University of California; the drop in enrollment resulted from the low level of State support.

Regent Eastin pointed out that the decline in graduate enrollment is stunning in light of the population growth in California. She hoped that the University would consider expanding its graduate schools of education in light of the State's need for 300,000 new teachers over the next ten years.

Regent Johnson observed that when alumni and Regents visit the Legislature in March they will be provided with an opportunity to discuss the State's underfunding of graduate education. She then referred to the ongoing problem of the University's high student-to-faculty ratio. She noted that the administration had estimated that it would cost approximately \$60 million per year to restore the 16:1 ratio and suggested that the University consider breaking this down to a four-year plan, with \$15 million provided each year to begin to make some progress on addressing this problem.

Regent Preuss pointed out that the University was attempting to improve the student-faculty ratio at the same time that it is promising to admit more students. He asked whether graduate enrollment, which includes professional schools, would be even lower if professional schools were not taken into account. Assistant Vice President Smith reported that the University's professional schools are primarily law and business. The law school numbers have not gone up for a long period of time, while business enrollment has grown. She

confirmed that the percentage of graduate student enrollment would be slightly lower if these schools were not included.

Assistant Vice President Smith continued the presentation by discussing graduate school enrollment in the larger context. The University of California remains a popular choice for undergraduate students, and the need to expand graduate enrollment compounds the issue of the coming wave of students. The University's commitment to providing access for the top 12.5 percent of California's public high school graduates continues to be strong, and the University's efforts to increase the number of transfer students is beginning to make some headway. The University has been planning for enrollments for the past ten years within the context of the campuses' Long Range Development Plans, which place boundaries on the number of students they can plan to take. These carefully developed physical plans provide the framework within which each campus has projected its growth.

Ms. Smith reported that the administration believes that within the LRDPs and with the opening of UC Merced, the University will be able to add 31,500 undergraduates and 7,800 graduate students by 2010. Recently the Department of Finance released its annual projections of high school graduates and college enrollments. She recalled that the DOF's projections have gone up and down over the years. The very high projections made in 1988 caused the University's administration to suggest the need for three new campuses. These projections collapsed during the recession of the early 1990s, primarily because more people were leaving the state than were moving in. Now that the economy has improved and people are moving to California again, DOF's projections of high school graduates are rising. While these figures should be taken seriously, it is also important to note that DOF projections show a leveling off and a slight decline in enrollment after 2008.

The Department of Finance projections and the University's now indicate that demand may substantially exceed the enrollments that were planned for in the LRDPs. The various projections of possible undergraduate enrollments indicate that the University's current enrollment plans are likely to fall short by about 20,000 undergraduates by 2010. The University will want to keep graduate enrollments at an appropriate balance with any additional growth in undergraduate student enrollment, making the difference in total enrollment approximately 23,000 more than has been planned. As a result, the University's enrollment will grow by about 60,000 students between now and 2010 rather than the 40,000 that were projected in the campuses' LRDPs. Thus, the University faces the problem of how to meet its commitment to undergraduate access while further contributing to California's future through graduate education.

Assistant Vice President Smith noted that the University is looking at a variety of possible solutions. Some of the ideas, such as expanding the Education Abroad Program and the program in Washington, D.C., will not contribute much in numerical terms. Revising the LRDPs and expanding summer enrollments are promising ideas, but they need in-depth investigation to determine whether they are the right options. At this point the administration

has only approximations of what these various options might make possible, but they offer hope that the University will be able to respond to enrollment demand at the existing campuses, including Merced, through 2010.

Ms. Smith drew to the Committee's attention the following points which should be kept in mind when evaluating any proposals for change:

- The University must plan cautiously because projections tend to change.
- Because the University of California operates academic programs year-round now, any changes that are programmatic will involve tradeoffs that will need to be assessed.
- The University should not overplan because after 2010 there will still be growth potential on the existing campuses and at UC Merced.
- Short-term solutions must make long-term sense.
- Any solutions must be premised on the existence of adequate resources to make them work.

President Atkinson observed that the University presently enrolls 150,000 full-time students. Within ten years, that number will increase to 210,000 students. With Merced accommodating 5,000 students, 55,000 remain to be accommodated on the existing campuses. The University has agreed to provide the Legislature with a report on the options that are open to meet this demand, including summer instruction.

Regent Davies noted that the report makes it clear that the University will be confronted with some difficult decisions over the next few years. He believed that it was unlikely that Sacramento would be able to be more generous towards the University as it confronts the problems described by Provost King and Assistant Vice President Smith. Regent Davies suggested that the University would not be able to continue to guarantee access without giving consideration to raising student fees.

Regent Bagley recalled that in 1960 the Legislature provided sixty percent of the University's budget. That percentage has declined by about one percent per year.

Regent Kozberg referred to the fact that the California State University intends to open a campus at the former hospital in Camarillo and asked whether the University would be looking at similar solutions in the future. Provost King confirmed that off-campus sites are being considered as one way to meet enrollment demand. President Atkinson pointed out that CSU faces the same problem as the University in that it anticipates 120,000 new students between now and 2010. The community college system will have to accommodate an

additional 500,000 students. He suggested that the politics of the coming decade will be focused on issues of higher education rather than K-12.

Faculty Representative Dorr reported that the faculty share the goals and concerns of the Office of the President, the Regents, and the Legislature, noting that the quality of undergraduate and graduate students is of great importance to them, as is the provision of adequate resources to sustain the vision of the University of California as a land-grant research university. The budget cuts of the early 1990s put pressures on the faculty to maintain quality. They now look forward to a balanced consideration of their multiple goals and the resources to meet them. The faculty have been involved in working with the Office of the President to understand what the options are with respect to meeting enrollment demand, and they look forward to continuing this work in order to meet the challenges of the future.

Regent Eastin recalled that in the 1960s the nine campuses of the University were open. A new campus has not been constructed in 35 years. She acknowledged the great interest in the tenth campus but also suggested the need for the University to have a serious conversation about year-round education, a system which has been undertaken in K-12. The Superintendent reported that many school districts have found that year-round operations work well. She noted that for UC students the opportunity to graduate in four years or less would be enhanced by year-round education. Regent Eastin added that prisons in California now receive more annual funding than higher education and suggested the need to address priorities as the State moves into the 21st century. She urged the Regents to go to the Legislature to seek increased funding to accommodate the increasing enrollment demand.

Regent Villaraigosa called attention to the disconnect between the needs of higher education and the public's perception of those needs. He suggested that the University would have to convince people that the money the University spends is spent wisely and efficiently. He recalled that the California Postsecondary Education Commission had also raised the issue of year-round operations; he hoped that the University would not devote too much time to studying this proposal before taking action. He believed that this proposal would be an efficient way to provide the access to the University that will be required in the future. The Speaker suggested that the implementation of year-round operations would be a message from the University to the public and to the Legislature that it was doing everything possible to maximize its resources in order to provide access.

President Atkinson responded that there is no question that the University will move to some type of year-round operation; the Legislature will receive a report on March 1 on how it plans to do that.

President Atkinson announced that William McElroy, fourth Chancellor of the San Diego campus, had died. The President noted that Professor McElroy had played a vital role in the transformation of biology following World War II.

2. **PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE REQUIREMENTS FOR FRESHMAN ELIGIBILITY**

Regent Connerly welcomed State Senator Hughes to the Board table.

Regent Connerly asked that the presentation on the four percent proposal address the following four questions:

- What effect will it have, if any, on the academic quality of the University of California?
- Is the four percent proposal a Trojan Horse for reinstating race-based affirmative action?
- Will there be any displacement of higher-performing students, and where will the funding come from to incorporate the additional 3,600 students?
- Because it is assumed that the students in the four percent plan will not be competitively admissible, will there be a disproportionate effect on certain campuses to absorb these 3,600 students? If so, does that translate into remedial education or other financial needs to support the additional absorption?

Provost King recalled that the Board of Regents had delegated to the Academic Senate the authority to determine the conditions for admissions through Standing Order 105.2, subject to the approval of the Board. The 1997 eligibility study by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) found that 11.1 percent of public high school graduates satisfy current UC eligibility criteria. The California Master Plan for Higher Education recommended, and the University adopted as policy, that UC select first-time freshmen from the top 12.5 percent of all graduates of California public high schools. In response to the CPEC findings and in order to adhere to University policy, the Academic Senate has proposed revisions to the eligibility criteria that would re-establish an eligibility pool of 12.5 percent. These proposals were discussed with the Committee at its May and July 1998 meetings. Provost King stressed that the University is under an obligation to return to the 12.5 percent eligibility rate, regardless of how that is achieved, and he acknowledged that this will result in enrollment pressures should those additional students choose to attend the University of California. He expressed appreciation to the Academic Senate and to its Board on Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) for its dedicated attention to this issue. Provost King introduced the faculty members who would make the presentation on proposed changes in the requirements for freshman eligibility: Professor Keith Widaman, the chair of BOARS; Professor Dorothy Perry, the vice chair of BOARS; and Professor Douglas Smith, a member of BOARS.

Professor Widaman reported that the proposal pertaining to changes in eligibility requirements was approved by the Academic Council at its meeting in December 1998 and will be presented shortly to the Academic Assembly for its approval. He stated that the faculty remain firmly committed to the Master Plan and to ensuring that the top 12.5 percent of students graduating from California's public high schools are eligible for admission. The BOARS proposal is designed to yield this 12.5 percent eligibility, which currently stands at 11.1 percent. Professor Widaman drew the distinction between eligibility and admissions. He noted that all students who are eligible to attend the University of California are not necessarily admitted by all campuses because some campuses have more competitive admissions standards than others. Both eligibility and admissions occur within a framework of principles that have historically guided the University in this area. The Organic Act of 1868, which provided the charter for the University, contains several principles that should guide UC admissions. First, the University should draw students from all parts of the state, providing a geographic diversity to the student body. Secondly, the University should be selective, admitting only those students who have the ability to complete a degree at a research university. Subsequently, additional principles were adopted regarding admission to the University. The 1988 policy formulated by the Board of Regents states that the University shall enroll "...a student body that demonstrates high academic achievement or exceptional personal talent, and that encompasses the broad diversity of cultural, racial, geographic, and socio-economic backgrounds characteristic of California." The faculty and the Regents remain firmly committed to this policy.

Professor Widaman noted there are currently two paths to UC eligibility. Students determined to be eligible through Path 1 may be identified as "UC eligible in a statewide context." Students must meet three requirements: subject, scholarship, and examination. The subject requirement consists of completing a pattern of 15 college preparatory courses, which is usually referred to as the (a)-(f) requirement. The scholarship requirement is met by attaining a grade point average of at least 3.3 in the 15 college preparatory courses. If the high school GPA is between 2.82 and 3.29, the student must achieve a minimum score on the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT). The examination requirement is met by taking the SAT I (or ACT) plus three SAT II subject tests, to include writing, mathematics, and a third test of the student's choice. The current Path 2, demonstrating academic potential by examination alone, may be taken by students who fail to complete the subject or scholarship requirements. Regardless of GPA and courses, achieving a combined score of 1400 on the SAT I (or 31 on the ACT) and a combined total score of 1760 on the three required SAT II tests with a minimum of 530 on each test will qualify the student as eligible for admission. BOARS intends to retain Path 1, with certain revisions. Path 2 will remain unchanged. BOARS will propose a third path to eligibility, Path 3, defined as "UC eligible in the local context." Professor Widaman stated the three characteristics of BOARS' proposal. First, the plan aims to develop a 12.5 percent eligibility pool. Second, the plan reflects validity study research findings regarding the best predictors of academic success at the University. Third, the plan restructures the course work, grade point average, and test requirements for UC eligibility to meet refined educational goals.

Professor Perry stated that her presentation would focus on the proposed revisions to the existing statewide eligibility criteria. Simulations have shown that the proposed criteria will make eligible 99 percent of those students who are currently eligible to attend UC. The eligibility criteria that represent modifications of current requirements are as follows. First, a required visual and performing arts course will replace one of the two elective courses now required. The requirements for history/social studies, English, mathematics, laboratory science, and language other than English will not change. Instead of two years of college preparatory electives, only one year will be required, and one year of required coursework in visual and performing arts will be added. This change provides a broader liberal arts preparation to students entering UC. This field, including the entertainment industry, is one of the largest industries in California. Along with changes made by CSU, this brings the UC and CSU required course patterns into alignment and facilitates students' college preparation. Second, BOARS proposes that extra grade points for honors, advanced placement, and international baccalaureate courses be reduced from 1 to 0.5 for each course. The University encourages all students to take rigorous coursework and to challenge themselves by undertaking advanced, specialized, collegiate-level courses. To provide an incentive, the University grants special credit in the GPA computation for completion of up to 8 semesters of honors-level coursework. The proposed change continues to provide an incentive, is a better indicator of how well a student will do at the University, and reduces disadvantages faced by students attending schools that offer few honors courses.

The third change is that the UC eligibility index will be used for all students. At present, the index is used only for applicants with high school GPAs from 2.82 to 3.29. Making the index apply to all students takes advantage of two sources of information about student achievement and potential for success at UC; namely, grades and test scores. The lower the student's GPA, the higher will be the minimum composite test score required for eligibility. SAT II scores will be incorporated into the UC eligibility index. The current index consists of combinations of high school GPA and SAT I (or ACT) scores. SAT II scores will be factored into a revised UC eligibility index, together with SAT I (or ACT) scores and GPA. The composite test score used in the index will be the sum of four numbers: (1) the average of the two SAT I tests or the ACT score, (2) the SAT II writing score, (3) the SAT II mathematics score, and (4) the SAT II score on a test chosen by the student. The SAT II scores will be weighted more heavily than SAT I scores because they are better indicators of learning and achievement and better predictors of UC performance.

Professor Smith reported that Path 3 is an entirely new path to eligibility which will identify a small number of high-achieving students in each California public high school as UC Eligible in the Local Context (UC-LC). The criteria and procedures for identifying Path 3 students are as follows:

- UC-LC students will be identified at the end of the junior year. Under both the current and the proposed Path 1, students apply to UC by November of their senior year. Their eligibility is determined based on performance through the junior year. Path 3

eligibility is also based on performance through the junior year. Students who are identified as UC Eligible in the Local Context will know earlier than others that they are UC eligible. UC will have more time to recruit the top students from every high school, which may lead to higher enrollments by these very well-qualified students.

- In number, UC-LC students will not exceed four percent of juniors who are on track to graduate from the given high school. UC-LC students must complete a specified pattern of at least 11 of the 15 required courses by the end of their junior year. Students who become eligible by Path 3 will be chosen from among those who have satisfactorily completed these required courses. These requirements ensure that students who are UC Eligible in the Local Context are making consistent and balanced progress toward completing the course pattern requirement.

Professor Smith reported that, in a pilot study of seven high schools, less than one-quarter of the students regularly apply to UC. Further, many of the students receive Aid to Families with Dependent Children, and substantial numbers are underrepresented minorities. In five of the seven high schools, about 50 percent of the students are underrepresented minorities. Nevertheless, the top four percent of the students from these seven high schools are of academically high quality, with GPAs in the required courses fully comparable to those of UC-eligible applicants. They have taken comparable numbers of honors courses and have performed as well on the SAT I and SAT II.

Analysis has shown that no students who are currently eligible will be displaced by the local context eligibility plan. The CPEC eligibility study indicates that approximately two-thirds of the students admitted under Path 3 will also be eligible under Path 1. Other students have successfully completed the UC required academic work but are ineligible because they have not completed the required exams. UC-LC students will be selected through a ranking of the GPA achieved in the required 11 academic courses. Continuing current Path 1 practice, the GPA calculation will be on sophomore and junior year courses.

Professor Smith observed that the local context plan is a novel way to expand the eligibility pool from the current 11.1 percent to the mandated 12.5 percent. As it will make eligible students from high schools throughout the state, the plan will promote geographic diversity within the UC student body, although it will accomplish little for ethnic diversity within the University of California. This local context plan will also permit access to UC because high school students will easily understand what is needed to become eligible. In turn, the University will be able to begin recruitment for these students by the end of their junior year, thus showing them that they are welcomed by UC. The combination of these two features may promote a change in the high school culture such that, in time, more than four percent will aspire to attend UC, which will facilitate the University's diversity goals.

Professor Widaman reiterated that the BOARS plan was formulated to allow multiple paths to eligibility for the top 12.5 percent of graduates of California's public high schools, consistent with the Master Plan. The plan reflects validity study findings regarding the best

predictors of student success at the University, and the plan restructures the coursework, grade point average, and test requirements for UC eligibility to meet educational goals. As outlined above, the changes include a revised eligibility index that must be met by all students. The second change is the implementation of Path 3, whereby students are deemed UC eligible in the local context. BOARS proposes that these two changes be implemented for students entering UC in fall 2001. The third change is the reduction in the extra grade point for honors, advanced placement, and international baccalaureate courses, which will be implemented in fall 2002. Finally, the visual and performing arts course requirement will be instituted for fall 2003. Virtually all public high schools offer adequate visual and performing arts courses, but this date of implementation will ensure that they are able to offer a reasonable selection of such courses for students graduating from high school in spring 2003. Professor Widaman explained that BOARS feels strongly that the proposed plan maintains and enhances both the excellence of students identified as eligible for the University as well as access to the University by a broad spectrum of academic high achievers. Given the changes proposed, BOARS and the University will monitor for several years the quality and progress of students admitted under the proposed plan. The plan is designed to represent the University's historical commitment to represent in its student body the entire population of the State of California through ensuring geographic diversity in the eligibility pool. The plan yields multiple paths to UC eligibility, allowing students to demonstrate their potential for success at the University through superior grades and test scores in a statewide context, through high test scores alone, or through a high level of achievement in the context of the student's high school. Students gaining eligibility in any of these ways have shown that they have the academic qualities that the faculty seek and have thereby demonstrated their potential for success at the University of California.

Governor Davis recalled that two years ago he had suggested that the University admit the top ten students at every high school. This suggestion has now been developed into a more refined plan, as described by the members of BOARS. The plan is a very simple but powerful one because it rewards excellence. The Governor observed that under this plan, it will no longer matter what school a student attends; rather, it will matter only that the student excel at that school. The plan does not attempt to circumvent Proposition 209. It seeks to empower every child to do his or her best, which is not currently the case, due to the uneven quality of high schools throughout the state. Governor Davis noted that UC administrators had testified before the Senate Higher Education Committee that class rank is one of the best determinants of performance in the UC system. He stressed the importance of the University's being able to state that no qualified students will be displaced. The Governor pointed out that, whether or not diversity is increased, under the new plan more students will be admitted to the University of California. Of those additional students who will be admitted, some will be minorities, so in absolute numbers more underrepresented minorities will be able to attend the University. He suggested that there will be benefits resulting from the plan for students who do not finish in the top four percent because high schools will improve their offerings, and these students will be recruited by other high-quality institutions. If all students are challenged by a more rigorous curriculum, then all students will benefit. He

expressed concern that no previously eligible student should be displaced by the four percent proposal.

Professor Widaman responded that no student will be displaced as a result of the four percent plan. The potential displacement of a small number of students will result from the eligibility index being applied to all eligible students, rather than only to students with a grade point average lower than 3.3. Because students with low GPAs and test scores do not have a high probability for success, BOARS has revised the eligibility index so that the points on the index correspond to a constant probability of success at the University. As a result, about three hundred students will become ineligible, and another five hundred students will become eligible. This proposed change will still make eligible 11.1 percent of high school graduates.

Governor Davis requested that the recommendation that the University adopt a Path 3 to eligibility be presented to the Committee separately from the proposed revisions to Path 1. President Atkinson observed that an important change to Path 1 will be to place more importance on the SAT II examinations. He believed that The Regents should be asked to approve a total package of changes to the eligibility requirements.

Governor Davis stressed that the matter would be clearer if the Regents were to vote on the four percent proposal at one meeting and on the changes to Path 1 at another one.

Regent Connerly agreed, noting that the issue of whether students would be displaced by the adoption of Path 3 was not clearly understood by the public, thus casting doubt on the plan because people worry that higher-performing students would not be admitted. He stressed that separating the two issues was very important.

Professor Widman referred to the questions posed by Regent Connerly prior to the BOARS presentation. He emphasized that affirmative action had to do with the admission selection process, while the proposals from BOARS pertain to eligibility. BOARS is establishing the pool of students who will be eligible to apply to the University. Under prior affirmative action guidelines, the campuses selected their entering class using different criteria for different groups. The BOARS proposal does not pertain to either SP-1 or Proposition 209. With respect to the question as to which campuses the students admitted under the four percent plan would attend, Professor Widaman pointed out that the data had shown that these students were superior to the average student who is currently eligible. In addition, BOARS voted to add presence in the top four percent of a graduating class as a tenth academic criterion that may be used by the campuses during the selection process. This proposal will be forwarded to the President once the changes in eligibility requirements are approved by The Regents. Because the highly selective campuses will be able to use presence in the top four percent in their admissions decisions, this may improve at least the geographic diversity of these campuses.

Professor Widaman clarified for Governor Davis and Lieutenant Governor Bustamante that the application of the eligibility index would displace a small number of less-qualified students. Professor Perry added that the intention was not to disqualify the bottom four percent of currently eligible students. BOARS attempted to redefine the academic index so that it captured 100 percent of the students who are currently eligible; in fact, it will capture 99 percent. Professor Widaman added that about 200 more students will become eligible as a result of the use of the eligibility index, and these students will have a higher likelihood for success than the approximately 300 students who are displaced.

Regent Bustamante believed that the University should continue to make eligible all students who are currently eligible for admission. President Atkinson explained that under the proposed changes in Path 1 there will be an increased emphasis on the SAT II and decreased emphasis on the SAT I, which is often described as measuring an innate aptitude, while the SAT II examinations measure achievement. As described by the members of BOARS, under the new system a small number of students will be disqualified, while a corresponding number of students will become eligible.

Regent Villaraigosa believed that the four percent proposal was a step in the right direction. He recalled that twenty years ago, as the son of an immigrant who attended a high school with no advanced placement course offerings and who grew up in a poor socio-economic area, he did not have the same opportunity to achieve a high grade point average as someone who went to an academically richer school. Through the four percent plan the University will be able to tell students who succeed that it will reward their ability to overcome adversity. He was concerned, however, that the proposal would not produce a student body that reflects the state's diversity. The Speaker recalled that last year the University had worked with the Legislature to strengthen its outreach efforts in order to level the playing field. These outreach programs represent the best hope of having the student body reflect the state's demographics. He was also concerned about issues of affordability because many of the students who are made eligible by the four percent plan will come from families who cannot afford to send their children to UC. He suggested that there was a need to focus on the issue of financial aid in order to afford these students the necessary resources to attend the University. Regent Villagraigosa also believed that there should be an accountability mechanism to measure and quantify the plan's success. He suggested that, due to limited course offerings at some schools in subjects such as mathematics, it might be necessary as the plan is implemented to consider making students UC eligible in the local context in their senior year. He supported the Governor's request that the four percent plan be presented for implementation independently of the other changes in order to avoid any potential divisiveness.

Regent Montoya supported the fact that the four percent proposal will be pro-active on the part of admissions officers who will contact the top four percent of high school students to let them know that they are UC eligible. She pointed out that many students, particularly minority students, do not know how to become UC eligible. She agreed with the Governor's

view that, were the four percent plan to be implemented, low-performing schools would have to become more competitive as a result of pressure from students who wish to be competitive once they enter the University of California. Regent Montoya reported that she had attended a meeting of the National Academy of Sciences on testing and admissions. At the meeting the importance of advanced placement classes was questioned. Professors from Princeton and the California State University stated that their faculties are considering not awarding college credit for advanced placement courses in chemistry because too many sophomores are failing the second-year courses. She supported BOARS' proposal to reduce the amount of credit for advanced placement courses.

Regent Khachigian drew the Committee's attention to the difference between eligibility on the one hand and admissions on the other. She did not want the four percent proposal to raise hopes on the part of students who may not be competitively eligible. With respect to the SAT requirements, Regent Khachigian observed that the University of California is somewhat unique in requiring students to take three SAT II tests. She pointed out that removing that requirement could result in increasing the eligibility pool to more than 12.5 percent and asked why that alternative was not being considered. Professor Widaman explained that the high school grade point average and SAT II scores are the best predictors of performance at the University.

Regent Bagley supported Path 3 because it sends the message that students who do not think about attending the University should do so. He pointed out that the GPA of the top four percent at non-feeder schools is between 3.7 and 3.8, which indicates that their students are of high quality. He did not believe that the proposal was a Trojan Horse for returning to race-based admissions. Regent Connerly believed that in doing anything that is designed to affect the racial outcome of the student body, the University would violate Proposition 209 and thus be open to lawsuits.

Regent Parsky stated that while he was generally in favor of the four percent plan, he was concerned that the overall academic quality of the University not be negatively affected by the proposal. He asked what attention was given in developing the proposal to the fact that some of the students who might fall within the new criterion would not be adequately prepared to attend the University and therefore not succeed. Professor Widaman responded that the issue of quality was directly in front of BOARS throughout its deliberations. A variety of simulations have shown that the overall student body would be unaffected in terms of grade point average by this plan, while a six percent plan would show a lessening of academic quality.

In response to a question from Regent Parsky regarding student preparation, Professor Widaman recalled that the University will require a specified pattern of 11 courses by the end of the junior year. Once students have been identified as eligible, they still must complete the remaining four required courses and the SAT examinations. These data will be used in follow-up analyses to see how this cohort of students performs at the University.

Regent Parsky suggested that if the proposal is approved by The Regents there will need to be a rigorous reporting mechanism so that the Board will receive the outcome of Path 3 on a regular basis. President Atkinson assured Regent Parsky that such a report will be a regular aspect of the process.

In response to a further question from Regent Parsky regarding students who fall below the top four percent, Professor Widaman assured him that there would be no maximum number of students who could be eligible from any high school. For example, 40 percent of the graduating seniors from Lowell High School are eligible for admission to the University. Under the new plan, the top four percent would be eligible through Path 3, and the remaining 36 percent would remain eligible under Path 1.

Regent Davies noted that while the idea of providing a Path 3 to students who would not have a chance to attend UC under the current system is appealing, he expressed concern that these students might not have the capacity to compete. He requested an analysis of how the students in the top four percent who are not currently eligible compare with those who are. While he would prefer to have the Regents consider the Path 3 proposal, he pointed out that BOARS had analyzed the changes in eligibility requirements as a package. To do otherwise would require an analysis of the effects of the four percent proposal alone. He was skeptical about reducing the credit for honors and advanced placement courses because they are of such higher quality than regular courses. Regent Davies also noted that the faculty at the Irvine campus had not endorsed the Path 3 proposal and requested that the Regents be provided with the opportunity to hear from the Irvine faculty the reasons they do not support the proposal.

Faculty Representative Dorr recalled that admissions policies are established systemwide and apply to all campuses. They are proposed by BOARS through the Academic Council and then voted upon by the Academic Assembly. Throughout the process, all parts of the BOARS proposal have received strong, although not unanimous, support, except in BOARS, where the support is unanimous. The campuses have been engaged in discussions about the proposal, with the exception of the San Francisco campus, which in general does not admit undergraduate students. At six campuses the faculty supported all aspects of the proposal with varying degrees of enthusiasm. Two campuses were negative about certain aspects of the proposal. At the Irvine campus, the faculty were positive about all aspects of the proposal except the four percent plan for a variety of reasons, including the fact that the campuses are already over-enrolled. The faculty were also concerned about the quality of the students who would be made eligible under the four percent plan and that the plan would cost money that could be better spent elsewhere. The San Diego campus prefers its own version of the four percent plan which would extend an offer of admission to the top four percent of UC eligible students in every high school in the local community.

Superintendent Eastin observed that many students in California's rural and urban areas are setting their sights too low because they do not believe they are prepared to attend the

University of California. She believed that success for these students will be created when they begin to visualize themselves as successful. In addition, the teachers and counselors will begin to focus more on getting their students ready for higher education. She believed that the four percent plan would be helpful in promoting geographic diversity because rural and urban areas share low eligibility. She hoped that the state's high schools would require the University's (a)-(f) courses for graduation, because this would offer students more choice upon graduation. Regent Eastin also supported the proposed changes to Path 1 because she believed that reducing the extra credit for advanced placement and honors courses would treat students more fairly.

President Atkinson stated that he considered the proposal of a Path 3 to eligibility to be an historical event, comparing it to what the University of California did in the early 1980s. He recalled that, prior to the 1980s, admission to the University required minimal courses which could be taken in the freshman and sophomore years of high school because admission was a function of grade point average. The University instituted the (a)-(f) requirement in the early 1980s, and most high schools have adopted these courses. Those that have not will now have an incentive to do so.

Regent Kozberg believed that the BOARS proposal was a thoughtful one, noting that while the University's outreach programs are good long-term solutions, the four percent plan represents a fair and immediate-term solution to create access and increase the eligibility pool. She thought that the proposal would bring to the University a group of extremely well-motivated students, and she particularly supported the idea of notifying these students at the end of their junior year so that communities and University alumni could support them to become competitively eligible.

Senator Hughes thanked the faculty and the Regents for their hard work, noting that she is the parent of six UC graduates.

Regent Kozberg referred to the revision to Path 1 which would add the requirement of a visual or performing arts course to the (a)-(f) requirements. She hoped that the University would work with the Superintendent to assure that these courses are of high quality.

In response to a question from Regent Lee, Provost King observed that it is incumbent upon the University to return to the 12.5 percent eligibility pool. The questions of capacity and funding relate to that fact. Regent Lee asked how capacity and funding will be dealt with. He felt these questions should be answered before the proposal is implemented. Provost King reported that the enrollment projections which he had presented to the Committee took into account the need to return to 12.5 percent eligibility.

Regent Johnson requested that the administration address the issue of underfunded undergraduate enrollment before the Board is asked to vote on Path 3. She quoted from the *Notice*, which is published by the Academic Senate, which stated that "Added all together,

the fully eligible and potentially eligible pool comprise 20.5 percent of California's high school graduates. The question now being debated is whether UC is drawing its students from this larger pool or from the 11.1 percent of students who are fully eligible. The State's Legislative Analyst Office is among those saying the larger pool is the one actually being used." She added that the determining factor in admissions seems to be the SAT II examinations.

Regent Connerly asked that the administration provide the Regents with a full report on the issue of enrollment funding for the University.

Regent Sayles expressed his misgivings about the proposed revisions to Path 1, in particular the effect they might have on minority students. He was concerned that students would not be rewarded for the hard work that is required in advanced placement courses. He was convinced that the four percent plan should be approved because students in rural and urban schools need to know that they have a chance to succeed at the University, and this proposal provides that understanding. Regent Sayles believed that the proposal should be considered separately from the reduced credit for honors and advanced placement courses, which he did not support.

Professor Widaman responded that the proposed revisions to Path 1 will not affect the racial and ethnic composition of the eligibility pool. With respect to credit for advanced placement courses, he noted that the revision will be phased in so that any students who are currently enrolled in those courses will receive full credit throughout their high school career.

Regent Miura noted that students who are potentially eligible may become eligible by taking the required SAT II examinations, and she asked whether any thought had been given to encourage these potentially eligible students to take these tests. Under the proposed four percent plan, students will be required to fulfill all of the University's eligibility requirements. She asked what would motivate students to take the SAT II examinations if they have not in the past. Regent Miura referred to the proposal that Path 3 be added to the criteria for admissions and asked whether admissions officers would be required to use this category for admission. She noted that under the proposed revisions to Path 1, the SAT II scores will be incorporated into the eligibility index, and she asked that the Regents be provided with the proposed new index.

Regent-designate Taylor reported that, as part of the outreach effort, the alumni association had identified six hundred teachers and counselors in the Los Angeles Unified School District who are University of California alumni. In discussing the four percent plan with this group, there was unanimous support for the proposal from a policy sense, but these teachers and counselors were concerned about it with respect to administration. They expressed a need for the University to work with the schools to make Path 3 work.

Regent Espinoza supported the four percent plan because it provides an opportunity to students who have already achieved in the local context, but he cautioned that the University should be mindful of Proposition 209 as it is implemented. At the same time, as demographic

changes continue to take place in California, the University will be faced with a serious challenge with respect to whom it admits. He was not convinced that the current method of determining eligibility and admissions is fair in terms of identifying the students who are capable of succeeding at the University of California if given the opportunity to do so. He asked why students were required to take the SAT if the faculty consider it to be a low predictor of success. In addition, he asked whether any thought had been given to evaluating students' achievement through the use of a test other than the SAT, such as the Golden State exam, which is modeled after what is being taught in the schools. Regent Espinoza referred to the one percent of students who would not be admitted under the revised Path 1 requirements and asked that the Regents be provided with data on whether the students in this category who attended the University had succeeded there.

Provost King stated that the administration would be able to provide the Regents with a description of the characteristics of that one percent of students who would no longer be eligible because of the changes in Path 1.

Regent Willmon recalled that Regent Montoya had discussed the fact that some universities are considering not giving credit for advanced placement courses because they do not seem to prepare students adequately for second-year college work. He asked that the Regents be provided information on the University of California's experiences with respect to this issue. He expressed concern about the differences between the level of course work at high schools throughout the state and asked about the cost of whatever remediation may be necessary to address this problem.

Regent Connerly reiterated the request that the Path 3 proposal be presented to the Regents separately from the proposed changes to Path 1 in light of the opposition on the part of some Regents to reduced credit for advanced placement courses.

The Committee recessed for lunch at 1:00 p.m.

.....

The Committee reconvened at 2:26 p.m.

3. **RESEARCH LIBRARIES AND SCHOLARLY INFORMATION**

The Committee was informed that this item would be deferred to a later meeting.

The Committee adjourned at 2:27 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary