The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
March 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, Hopkinson, Johnson, Lansing, Leach, Lee, Moores, Parsky, Preuss, and Sayles, Regent-designate Pannor, 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 2:30 p.m. with Committee Chair Connerly presiding.

1. **STATUS REPORT ON EVALUATION OF UC OUTREACH PROGRAMS**

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

2. **PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF UC FRESHMAN ELIGIBILITY IN THE LOCAL CONTEXT**

The President recommended that changes in the requirements for freshman eligibility recommended by the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools and adopted by the Assembly of the Academic Senate on February 25, 1999 be approved as follows:

> Effective for students entering UC as freshmen for Fall 2001, four percent of the eligible students will be identified on the basis of superior academic performance in the context of their own high school.

Provost King recalled that the Standing Orders of The Regents provide that the Academic Senate shall establish the conditions for admission to the University, subject to the approval of the Board. The Academic Senate's Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS), after extensive consultation with high schools and UC campuses, has proposed a set of changes to admissions policy which have been approved by the Academic Council and the Assembly of the Academic Senate. The changes were presented to and discussed by the Committee in May and July 1998 and in February 1999.

At the February 1999 meeting, the Regents discussed the final Academic Senate proposal, "Proposed Changes in the Requirements for Freshman Eligibility," which described all current eligibility criteria and what future eligibility criteria would be if proposed changes were made.

The Academic Senate has proposed the adoption of a new path to UC eligibility, Path 3: UC Eligible in the Local Context (UC-LC). This path will be used along with the current paths, Path 1: UC Eligible in the Statewide Context, and Path 2: UC Eligible by Examination Alone. The primary goal in adopting Path 3 is to expand UC's eligibility pool. The recent Eligibility Study by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) found that 11.1 percent of California public high school graduates satisfy 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. Path 3 is a way of returning to the 12.5 percent figure.

The new local-context path to eligibility will make approximately 3,600 high school students newly eligible and will not displace any other student from the eligibility pool. All Path 3 students will be taking the college-preparatory courses required for UC. Based on their grade point average (GPA) in these courses, the top students from each high school will be selected as UC Eligible in the Local Context. Using superior scholarship identified in every high school in the state as a basis for eligibility will foster equal opportunity to attend UC for students from all parts of California, regardless of their socio-economic background or the richness of educational opportunities available to them.

Criteria and Procedures for Identifying Path 3: UC Eligible in the Local Context (UC-LC) Students

- UC-LC students will be identified at the end of their junior year. Eligibility will be determined based on performance through the junior year just as it is for other students eligible for UC. Students who are identified as UC Eligible in the Local Context will be so informed.

- In number, UC-LC students will not exceed four percent of juniors who are on track to graduate from the given high school**.** The total number of juniors in the high school who are on track to graduate will be the reference group, which allows compliance with the Master Plan and Regental stipulations that overall UC eligibility be attained by 12.5 percent of graduates from public high schools in California.

- UC-LC students must complete a specified pattern of required courses by the end of their junior year. Students identified as UC Eligible in the Local Context will be required to complete the same course pattern as other students eligible for UC. To ensure that UC-LC students are making consistent and balanced progress toward

completing the course pattern requirement, a specific number of courses in a particular pattern will be required by the end of their junior year.

- UC-LC students will be selected through a ranking of the GPA achieved in the required academic courses**.** The GPA will be calculated exactly the same as it is for other students eligible for UC. The University will rank students in each high school by this GPA, and the highest-ranking students will be selected as UC Eligible in the Local Context.

- UC-LC students must apply to be admitted and complete remaining eligibility requirements prior to freshman enrollment. Students must complete a UC application form. Their admission to UC will be contingent on satisfactorily completing the course pattern and all tests required of other students eligible for UC. Test scores will be used in the selection process for campuses unable to accommodate all eligible applicants and for research.

Effects on the Eligibility Pool and on Freshman Enrollment

The upper four percent of public high school classes amounts to approximately 10,000 students. Most of these students are already UC eligible. The adoption of Path 3 will add about 3,600 new students to the eligibility pool, or 1.33 percent of California public high school graduates. When this new 1.33 percent is added to the approximately 11.1 percent who are now and will be eligible under Path 1, and to the very small percentage eligible under Path 2, the size of the eligibility pool will come very close to the 12.5 percent mandated by the Master Plan and Regental policy. Currently, about 7.4 percent of California public high school graduates enroll in UC. Assuming that the newly eligible students apply and enroll at about the same rate, approximately 2,000 additional students will enroll. Traditionally, the Legislature has respected UC's commitment to educating all eligible students who apply and has provided the necessary funding.

Academic Qualifications of the Newly Eligible Students

Two different kinds of evidence indicate that the newly eligible students will be very able academically. A pilot study of seven schools that send few graduates to UC showed that their students who would become eligible under Path 3 have academic qualifications that fall well within the Path 1 eligibility parameters and are associated with success at UC. Simulations using College Board data on California students who took the SAT I showed that students who would become newly eligible under the four percent proposal are roughly comparable, as a group, to those in UC's existing statewide eligibility pool.

These simulations compared the newly eligible pool of students who will be in the top four percent of their school but are not currently eligible, an overlap pool of students in both the top four percent of their school and currently eligible, and a non-overlap pool of students

who are not in the top four percent of their school but currently are eligible in a statewide context. The overlap pool stands out clearly on all measures of academic quality, as might be expected for students who rank at the top of both the statewide and the by-school pools. The more relevant comparison, however, is between the newly eligible pool and the non-overlap statewide pool. The newly eligible pool generally fares well in this comparison. The newly eligible pool has a substantially higher GPA, 3.91, than the non-overlap pool GPA of 3.56, although the mean SAT I score for the newly eligible pool, 1025, is lower than that for the non-overlap pool, 1130. However, when grades and test scores are combined into a frequently used summary measure, the Academic Index, the newly eligible pool has an average score of 6471, as compared to that of the non-overlap pool, 6384. The Academic Index is an 8,000-point scale that provides an overall summary measure of academic preparation based on grades and test scores combined.

These findings suggest that, in terms of academic quality, students who will become newly eligible for UC under Path 3 are comparable to students in UC's existing eligibility pool. Based on past experience, students in the newly eligible pool have a strong probability of success at UC.

Implementation and Evaluation

The Office of the President will be responsible for implementing Path 3, with special efforts to minimize the additional work load for the high schools. Path 3 will be a pilot program and as such will at some point either cease or be adopted as permanent. BOARS, in cooperation with the Office of the President, will conduct an ongoing evaluation of Path 3 and will use comparative information on Path 1 and on Path 2 in this evaluation. Studies will include evaluation of applications, admissions, and enrollments from students made eligible by these three paths as well as follow-up analyses on their performance, persistence, and graduation. Changes will be recommended and evaluated as appropriate. The Regents, the Assembly of the Academic Senate, and the Academic Council will receive reports on the implementation and the effects of Path 3 beginning in spring 2002.

Faculty Representative Dorr, as Chair of the Academic Senate, affirmed that the faculty support the three recommendations pertaining to eligibility. At the meeting of the Assembly on February 25, regulations were approved which addressed the addition of a visual or performing arts course to the list of required courses, the reduction of elective courses from two to one, and the change in the GPA calculation for honors, advanced placement, and international baccalaureate courses. The Assembly also voted to endorse Path 3: Eligible in the Local Context by a large majority. The Assembly did not vote upon such matters as the use of an Academic Index because such matters are already covered by broad policy. Professor Dorr recalled that last year BOARS, working with the Office of the President, initially developed the proposed changes in eligibility requirements; to ensure that the proposals would be supported by the faculty, the proposals were presented to the Assembly as discussion items in May and in October. At both meetings, straw votes were taken on each

element of the proposal, and all were supported by a majority vote. The faculty believe that the proposals will help to bring the University into compliance with the Master Plan and will identify bright young students who will be encouraged to come to the University.

Governor Davis recalled that originally he had suggested that the University admit the top ten students at every high school. Senator Hughes put forward the idea that the top 12.5 percent of all students be admitted, similar to the 10 percent used in Texas. The faculty reviewed this concept and have now proposed that the top four percent be made eligible. The Governor supported the plan because it rewards excellence. It also acknowledges the fact that, while some schools are better than others, this situation is not the fault of the students. Studies have shown that students in the top four percent of their high schools will do well at the University of California because class rank is the best determinant of success. Governor Davis stressed the fact that the four percent proposal will not displace any student who is currently eligible. The proposal will add about 1,800 more students who will enroll. Of those 1,800, about half will be people of color, so the proposal may or may not affect the overall diversity at the University of California. He noted that the suggestion had been made in the press that the four percent proposal is a back-handed effort to circumvent Proposition 209. Governor Davis stated that, while he had opposed Proposition 209, affirmative action had displaced some qualified students. He stressed that the four percent proposal would not displace any qualified students, regardless of what school they attend. He was in favor of the proposal because it sends a signal to schools that have not traditionally offered advanced placement courses that they should give their students a chance to excel.

Regent Davies stated that while he agreed that the proposal sends a strong signal to some schools, he disagreed as to the type of signal that it sends. It is unfair for students who do well at poor schools to not have the opportunity to attend the University of California, but it seemed to him that the four percent proposal would not encourage these schools to raise their standards because their students would be made eligible regardless of their high school preparation. Regent Davies suggested that the four percent plan should not be considered to be a permanent part of the University's admissions policy. Once the Governor's educational reforms go into effect, the schools that need improvement should begin to prepare their students to be competitive within a statewide context.

Regent-designate Pannor stated her support for the proposal because it will encourage more students to become competitive, thus raising the quality of UC students. She also believed that it would be a step in the direction of establishing a higher education system that reflects the state's diverse population.

Regent Lee expressed some concern about the proposal, noting that if the University enrolls an additional 1,800 students, housing will have to be provided for them. He reported that, as the Chair of the Committee on Grounds and Buildings, he had received many complaints about the lack of adequate student housing. He pointed out that the student-to-faculty ratio

is the highest in the University's history, at almost 19:1. The addition of 1,800 students will require one hundred new professors, who also will have to be accommodated.

Regent Lee was concerned that students accepted under the four percent plan may not be able to graduate, and he asked that the Office of the President monitor the progress of students admitted by Path 3. President Atkinson responded that the campuses have elaborate counseling and tutorial programs. He stated his intention to review these programs with Regent Lee. He further commented that the University's plan to accommodate these additional students had been shared with the Legislature and that this plan would be mailed to all Regents.

Committee Chair Connerly acknowledged the presence of State Senator Teresa Hughes, noting that her proposal had been the catalyst for the University's thinking on this new concept.

Regent Khachigian stated that while originally she was impressed by the concept of geographic diversity that would result from the four percent plan, she was troubled by the fact that many rural and urban schools do not offer the courses that prepare students to attend the University of California. Consequently, she did not support the proposal because she believed it would permit low-quality schools to continue to fail to provide an equal educational opportunity for their students. Regent Khachigian suggested that the proposal fails to address the source of the problem, which is inadequate educational preparation, but rather puts effort and resources into the results of inadequate preparation. The University's outreach program has begun to address the problem statewide. For example, students from Compton have been attending Saturday mathematics classes at the Irvine campus because their school has not offered algebra for the past fifteen years. Through the campus' outreach efforts, faculty are working with high school students, their families, and their teachers to offer such courses. Regent Khachigian continued that another problem with the proposal is that it might offer false hopes that the plan will increase diversity. In addition, it will be unfortunate if students who are not prepared are encouraged to enroll and thereby forced to compete with students who have had a higher level of preparation. She believed that the proposal will send the message to students that if they attend a less competitive high school they will be guaranteed eligibility for the University of California. Regent Khachigian concluded that the four percent proposal whittles away at the foundation of academic excellence at the University of California, and she advised her fellow Regents to consider their votes as trustees to guard this level of excellence for the future.

Regent Miura stated that she would support the proposal because she believed that it will make every high school in the state visible to UC and will make UC visible to every high school. There are, however, three public misperceptions which must be corrected. The first is the impression that UC eligibility means admission to a particular UC campus. Eligibility does not equal admission. The second misperception is that only the top four percent of each high school will be UC eligible. This proposal does not replace Paths1 and 2. The third

misperception is that the proposal will guarantee a spot for students who graduate in the top four percent of their class, regardless of whether they meet the other eligibility requirements. She stressed that students made eligible by the proposal must complete the (a)-(f) courses and the University's test requirements.

Regent Kozberg stated her strong support for the proposal, which she believed would produce motivated, high-quality students. She noted that the University's outreach programs are by their nature long term, while the four percent plan will have an immediate effect. The four percent plan also guarantees that students who reside in areas that are not served by outreach programs will have access to the University.

Regent Montoya stated that, having reviewed letters from students who were not accepted by the University, she was convinced that many students do not know what it takes to be UC eligible. She particularly supported the fact that under the new plan, students in the top four percent of their high schools will be so notified in the eleventh grade. She believed that the proposal would force schools to perform better.

Regent Villaraigosa recalled that when he was recently recognized as the UC Legislator of the Year, he had commented that he was a poster child for an earlier era when young people were given the opportunity to succeed. He noted that some of the students who will fall in the top four percent would be the children of immigrants, like himself, many of whom live in socially and economically deprived areas. These students have confronted adversity throughout their lives, and now their excellence will be rewarded. Speaker Villaraigosa believed that the four percent pool would contain students who will go on to successful careers. As the architect of the State's largest expansion of outreach programs in UC's history, he pointed out that these programs will begin to have an effect in the future; the four percent plan's effects will be more immediate. The Speaker noted that he was able to gain support for increased funding for outreach within the Legislature by communicating the fact that many schools do not offer honors and advanced placement courses. He added that, following the passage of Proposition 209, there must be agreement on the part of the public that diversity is something to be valued. He commended the Governor and the Regents for supporting the proposal but reiterated the concern about raising expectations for students and then not providing them with a safety net to help them to succeed. He recognized the fact that many students who have chosen not to attend the University cannot afford a college education; as a result, financial aid packages and scholarships will need to be created to make the new dream a reality. He stressed that monitoring and evaluation of what happens once the new plan is implemented would be critical. Regent Villaraigosa observed that Path 3 requires students to have completed three years of mathematics by the end of the junior year in order to be identified as UC eligible in the local context. He urged that this requirement be revisited given the fact that some students may not have been able to complete three years of mathematics in this time frame.

Regent Eastin observed that some high schools in the state had not provided educational opportunities for their students. She believed that the Governor's education reforms would produce results in the years to come. The Superintendent pointed out that half of the high schools in the state, many of which are located in remote rural areas, have fewer than 2,000 students. These schools will always be too small to offer many honors or advanced placement courses. She noted that, according to the CPEC Eligibility Study, the areas of the state that have the lowest eligibility are rural. The small cohort that forms the top four percent of these schools will succeed at the University of California. At present, rural students do not visualize themselves as being able to attend UC. Regent Eastin added that California is 50th in the number of high school counselors; as a result, many students do not receive the advice they need to prepare them for college. She believed that the four percent plan would create an image for the teachers and principals that they will be able to send their tops students to UC and that these students will need to prepared for higher education.

In response to a question from Regent Willmon regarding the Academic Index, Provost King noted that the President's three recommendations are needed to change Regental policy, while other changes are at the discretion of the faculty. The new index was described in the letter to the Regents which contained questions and answers regarding the various proposed changes to the eligibility requirements. Regent Willmon commented that he supported the position that any changes should not result in the displacement of any students who are presently eligible for admission. The proposed revision to the index will cause approximately 300 students to no longer be eligible. He asked Faculty Representative Dorr to confirm that the faculty were comfortable with the fact that the index is a good predictor of success. Professor Dorr stated that the faculty believe that the newly eligible students are highly likely to do very well at the University. The academic index is typically well associated with success.

Regent Willmon supported the Governor's position that the four percent plan would raise students' aspirations and enable them to visualize their futures in a new way.

Regent Parsky asked that the three points that were raised by Regent Miura be included in any statement to be released to the public regarding the four percent plan. He continued that the maintenance of quality at the University must be the Regents' highest priority. Faculty Representative Dorr confirmed for Regent Parsky that the faculty do not believe that the four percent plan will result in any diminution of that quality. Regent Parsky noted that while the newly eligible students will be qualified, they may need to be given attention in order to ensure their success.

Regent Bagley emphasized that a major attraction of the proposal is that a student at the end of the junior year will know whether he or she is qualified to attend the University.

Regent Espinoza thanked the faculty for finding a new way to attract the very best students to the University. He noted that he had received a great deal of correspondence regarding

minority admissions and enrollment at UC; if the goal of the proposal were to increase significantly the number of underrepresented students attending the University of California, then it does not go far enough. Speaking as a product of affirmative action, Regent Espinoza stated that he understands the challenges that students today face. At the same time, he will support all of the President's proposals because they will move the University in the right direction in providing more opportunities, not only for students of color but for the people of the State of California. He recalled that concerns had been expressed as to whether the newly eligible students would be qualified to attend the University. He stressed that the data clearly show that these students are high achievers who will be well prepared for rigorous academic work. He echoed the concern raised by other Regents, however, that many well-prepared students still have difficulty completing their undergraduate education. He suggested that the University will need to ensure that all students have access to the services that enable them to achieve at the highest level.

Regent Johnson stated that she had been ambivalent about the four percent proposal because while she did not want to deny opportunity to students who have succeeded against all odds, on the other hand she was concerned about how it would affect quality at the University. She noted that charts produced by the Office of the President had been helpful in convincing her that the students who will become eligible are excellent. She suggested that, because the program will be evaluated each year, language be included in the resolution to the effect that the proposal would come up for thorough review in five to seven years. This would give the Regents a chance to evaluate the program in conjunction with the University's outreach programs.

Regent Nakashima stated that while he also had been ambivalent about the proposal, he had come to the conclusion that its effect will not be known if it is not tried out. He did not believe that it would take seven years to find out whether or not the policy was working.

Regent Connerly reported that he had originally been opposed to the four percent proposal because it seemed to him that a local competition concept was a step in the wrong direction. Since that time, however, he has met with the Academic Senate and discussed the proposal with counselors, teachers, and students and has come to the conclusion that the proposal is a good one. It does not violate Proposition 209, nor does it displace any students. It will not diminish the quality of the University of California. If this proposal can hold the promise of sending students from schools that do not traditionally send them to the University, then it will be worthwhile. Regent Connerly suggested that when the Board adopted SP-1 in July 1995, it challenged itself to try new options. He believed that the Regents owed it to Governor Davis to advance his education agenda. Regent Connerly pointed out that financing their education will be a problem for some of the students who are admitted through Path 3 and asked that the University consider offering means tested financial aid for students in the top four percent. He did not believe that the Regents should feel that they were setting these students up for failure, as they will all be well qualified high achievers.

Governor Davis noted that the four percent proposal will not change the fact that if forty percent of the students at Lowell High School currently are eligible to attend UC, they will remain eligible. The proposal will increase opportunity and reward excellence.

(For speakers' comments, see the minutes of the March 18, 1999 meeting of the Committee of the Whole.)

Upon motion of Governor Davis, duly seconded, the Committee approved the President's recommendation and voted to present it to the Board, Regent Khachigian voting "no."

3. **PROPOSED CHANGES IN ACADEMIC COURSE REQUIREMENTS FOR UC FRESHMAN ELIGIBILITY**

The President recommended that changes in the requirements for freshman eligibility recommended by the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools and adopted by the Assembly of the Academic Senate on February 25, 1999 be approved as follows:

> Effective for students entering UC as freshmen for Fall 2003, the current course pattern requirement will be modified to include: (1) the addition of one year of study of the visual and performing arts and (2) the reduction of the college preparatory elective courses from two years to one year.

It was recalled that May 1990 was the last time that the Academic Senate recommended and The Regents approved changes to the course pattern requirement. At that time, it was noted that BOARS had expressed strong interest in adding one year of study in the visual and performing arts (VPA) and intended to reconsider this matter at a later time. The visual and performing arts are an important part of a liberal arts education. Adding such a requirement would expand student preparation for UC and complete a collaborative effort by the University of California and the California State University to align their course pattern requirements for freshman eligibility.

Under this proposal, UC will continue to require 15 units of academic preparation for freshman eligibility. The requirements for history/social studies, English, mathematics, laboratory science, and a language other than English will not change. Instead of two years of college preparatory electives, however, only one year will be required, and one year of required coursework in visual and performing arts will be added. The VPA course will be chosen from a list of approved courses established by UC and CSU, who will also jointly develop a description of the types of courses that satisfy the VPA requirement. The minimum grade requirement for the VPA course will be the same as that for other required courses, and the VPA course will be included in the GPA calculation in the same way other required courses are included.

Visual and performing arts courses are available at almost all California high schools. The University also is pursuing the possibility of an on-line Internet provision of material for such courses. However, there is concern that some high schools may not be able to provide adequate VPA offerings, in number, convenience, or quality, for their college-bound students. BOARS will examine these issues in 2000-01, after high schools have had some experience with helping students meet the VPA requirement, and will report to the Academic Council and to the Assembly of the Academic Senate in Spring 2001 how students are faring with respect to the VPA requirement. If the analysis indicates that any policy changes are needed, they will be brought to The Regents at that time.

Regent Montoya stated that she would be interested in knowing what courses would fulfill the visual and performing arts requirement. She was also concerned that the addition of this requirement would reduce the number of elective classes to one. Provost King explained that the details of the course requirement would be done by the Board on Admissions and Relations with Schools, working with the Office of the President. There is a visual and performing arts course being developed for the California Virtual High School with the support of the J. Paul Getty Museum.

Regent Kozberg noted that, since the passage of Proposition 13, arts education in the state has not received adequate funding. The Office of the President has a program that will train teachers in arts implementation.

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

4. **PROPOSED CHANGES IN GPA CALCULATION FOR UC FRESHMAN ELIGIBILITY**

The President recommended that changes in the requirements for freshman eligibility recommended by the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools and adopted by the Assembly of the Academic Senate on February 25, 1999 be approved as follows:

> Effective for students entering UC as freshmen for Fall 2002, students will continue to receive extra grade points for honors, advanced placement, and international baccalaureate courses, but the amount extra will be reduced by one-half.

The Committee was informed that the University encourages all students to take rigorous coursework and to challenge themselves by undertaking advanced, specialized, collegiate-level courses. Until 1984, grades earned in honors-level courses were counted the same as grades in all other courses. Since 1984, to provide an incentive to take these courses, the University has granted special credit in the GPA computation for completion of up to eight semesters of honors-level coursework.

The recommended change would move from providing a full grade point extra in the GPA calculation to providing a half grade point extra for a maximum of eight semesters of honors, advanced placement, and international baccalaureate courses. In 1982, when The Regents first approved the use of extra grade points for honors-level courses, there was no evidence about how much extra credit was effective in motivating students to take honors-level courses. There is still no empirical evidence on this question. Faculty believe, however, that the half grade point extra should be an incentive for students to take rigorous, advanced courses, and the reduction from one point to half a point should not act as a disincentive. Although current UC eligibility requirements allow extra credit for a maximum of eight honors-level courses, students often take many more than eight. In addition, taking these courses can help improve their achievement test scores and also improve their chances of admission at more selective UC campuses. Faculty see such advanced coursework as evidence of a student's striving for enrichment and challenge.

Research studies have shown that the full extra grade point inflates students' GPAs. The BOARS validity studies indicated that prediction of UC freshman grades was better when the GPA was calculated with the extra half point than the extra full point. The reduction in credit would make the honors policy more fair than the current policy. At present, not all schools can offer an extensive array of honors-level courses, and students coming from schools with lesser availability of such courses do not have the same opportunity as other students to get extra points in their GPA. Altering UC eligibility requirements to provide a half point for honors-level courses would not diminish the built-in incentives for students to take these courses, but it would provide a more level playing field for determining UC eligibility.

Regent Leach stated that he was not able to support the proposal because it would send the opposite message from the four percent plan by telling schools that the University does not value honors and advanced placement courses. It also tells students that they do not need to challenge themselves.

Committee Chair Connerly stated that he would entertain a motion to send the proposal back to the Academic Senate for further reconsideration. Such a motion was duly made and seconded.

Regent Preuss did not support the proposal because he believed that it would encourage students to take less challenging classes in order to improve their UC eligibility.

Regent-designate Taylor pointed out that extra points are given for grades earned in eight honors or advanced placement courses, while many students take more of these courses. The average freshman at UCLA has taken 14 such courses. The proposal will continue to encourage students to take difficult courses but will also help to level the playing field for students at schools that are not able to offer as many advanced courses.

Regent Villaraigosa stressed that, if the Regents agree that it is unfair for a student who has no access to honors and advanced placement courses to have to compete with those who do, then the situation will need to be addressed. He noted that, in addition to the proposal before the Committee, there is a proposal to fund advanced placement classes in every school in California, which he would support in the Legislature. The Speaker hoped that the Committee members would be willing to support the recommendation.

Governor Davis stated that he was not prepared to support the proposal at this time because he believes that excellence should be rewarded. He stated that he would need more persuasion to believe that a reduced incentive to take advanced placement courses would not lead to a reduction in enrollment in these courses. He stressed the need to make a high school education a demanding process which will bring out the best in students.

The motion was put to a vote and carried, Regents Espinoza and Villaraigosa voting "no."

5. **DAVIS CAMPUS/MCCLELLAN AIR FORCE BASE RESEARCH INITIATIVE**

Executive Vice Chancellor Grey reported that the Davis campus has the opportunity to acquire the McClellan Nuclear Radiation Center (MNRC) from the Department of Defense (DOD), at the request of the local community leaders, the Air Force, and the Department of Energy (DOE). This center includes the youngest research reactor in the United States. The campus is investigating only the financial scenarios that are based upon a self-sustaining cost recovery system, with no long-term capital outlay from the University. The closing of three military facilities in the Sacramento region necessitates extensive economic redevelopment and results in strong support from regional leaders for UC Davis involvement at McClellan.

The Air Force is considering two options for the MNRC, either to transfer the reactor complex to UC Davis or to close the facility. The DOE has appropriated $8 million to fund research costs for four years and to support the reactor conveyance from the DOD to the University. The campus proposes to develop the reactor complex as a Pacific coast research asset and to invite all universities west of the Mississippi to compete for research funds.

The MNRC Facility

Vice Chancellor for Research Smith reported that the MNRC, 25 miles from the core of the UC Davis campus and approximately 11 miles from the UC Davis Medical Center, was built by General Atomics in 1990 at a cost of $16 million. Currently there are no plans to build any other research reactors in the United States. The custom designed TRIGA (Training, Research, Isotopes, General Atomics) reactor has five radiation bays, one of which was built specifically for medical research. The reactor has neutron flux levels of 2 megawatts, and a conservative estimate of 30 years of productive service remaining. The only operating reactor in the UC system is at Irvine, a 250 kilowatt reactor built in 1969.

A UC Davis due diligence audit will likely confirm the current record of safety at the MNRC reactor. This type of research reactor is designed to be fail-safe as it is a passive reactor with no action required to maintain safety. In the last 58 years there have been no known environmental or safety problems with reactors of this design.

Program Connection

The MNRC was developed to use neutron radiography to detect low-level corrosion and hidden defects in aircraft. Over the last six years, applications at the reactor expanded beyond the traditional support of non-destructive inspection to include commercial applications for the semiconductor industry and a growing research portfolio.

The $8 million DOE appropriation will be used to fund start-up and exploratory research programs with the following criteria: (1) scientific merit; (2) ability to leverage funds with other existing research grants; (3) ability to continue the research with other sources of income; and (4) programmatic contribution to a comprehensive research base. Past appropriations for the reactor have paid for planning and reactor modifications in anticipation of future clinical trials for cancer treatment therapies. Other potential areas of program development include materials science, agriculture and environmental science, and industrial isotope research and development. In addition, an active program on the Davis campus involves neutron-capture therapy for the treatment of tumors.

UC Davis proposes to develop a unique educational program within the UC system and is collaborating with Berkeley's Department of Nuclear Engineering to expand the laboratory component of Berkeley's existing academic program. Discussions with UC Irvine center on the expansion of both education and commercial applications for the two reactors. The campus believes that the reactor will provide the opportunity for faculty recruitment and has two endowed chairs in the business plan for the reactor.

Considerations

The three basic considerations under investigation involve the financial exposure of the University related to annual operating expense and revenue, safe disposal of contaminated waste, and decommissioning of the reactor at the conclusion of its useful life. Concerning the annual operating expense and revenues, the reactor should be a self-supporting enterprise after four years. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) license for this reactor will require that the majority (51 percent) of the workload be for the purposes of education and research. The remaining workload may be commercial in nature. UC Davis is investigating three consulting companies to provide professional services to advise on development of the business plan and long-term program and administrative structure.

The campus is also proceeding with a series of comprehensive audits and due diligence investigations. The areas under investigation include: (1) health and physics audit; (2)

operations/maintenance audit; (3) liability and risk management assessment; (4) police services and security; and (5) facility investment evaluation. Of primary concern in the analysis is the safe storage and disposal of the spent fuel rods from the reactor operations.

UC Davis is analyzing the costs and responsibilities of decommissioning the reactor to ensure that sufficient funding will be available for either short-term or long-term decommissioning. The DOD has committed to retaining financial responsibility for decommissioning and wants to provide funding for these costs in the current budget year.

Timeline

The Air Force timeline is dictated by their funding cycle. Operating funding for the reactor will decrease significantly in October 1999, resulting in the loss of jobs for highly-trained technicians. Initial UC Davis business plans are based upon the retention of the most highly skilled McClellan employees. UC Davis is moving as quickly as possible to complete the analysis essential for the decisions on a conveyance.

Regent Preuss stated that, in his function as the President of the Preuss Foundation for Brain Tumor Research, he had been skeptical about the use of neutron therapy treatment. He did believe, however, that the reactor would provide many research opportunities for the University. He asked whether or not the University would be protected against any unforeseen liabilities that may be discovered in the future. Vice Chancellor Smith responded that the appropriations bill contains language which was approved by the General Counsel which will indemnify the University in this regard.

Regent Miura asked for an update on the investigation into the safe storage and disposal of spent fuel rods and for more details on the cost of decommissioning the reactor. Vice Chancellor Smith responded that the McClellan Nuclear Radiation Center is on a Department of Energy list for disposal of spent fuel rods in 2002. With respect to the decommission costs, he reported that Air Force did its own survey and determined what the cost would be before the campus was involved. The campus later retained a consultant to investigate whether the decommissioning costs were realistic. The consultant determined that the funding should be sufficient. The funds will be provided up front by the Department of Defense and will be invested by the Davis campus. In addition, the technology for decommissioning reactors is developing, such that it should be less expensive in the future. Executive Vice Chancellor Grey added that the campus will not acquire the reactor if the appropriations are not provided in the current year.

(For speaker's comments, see the minutes of the March 18, 1999 meeting of the Committee of the Whole.)

6. **QUARTERLY REPORT ON PRIVATE SUPPORT**

In accordance with the Schedule of Report, the **Quarterly Report on Private Support** for the period October 1 through December 31, 1998 was submitted for information.

Vice President Darling reported that private support had increased by 42 percent for the first half of the fiscal year over the same period last year, to a total of $478.9 million. The results of the first half of this fiscal year exceed the entire results of 1992-93. The report includes two gifts totaling $55 million for the UCLA Medical Center and a gift of nearly $6 million for student scholarships at all UC campuses.

In response to a question from Regent Lee regarding the effect of fundraising for the medical schools, Vice President Darling could not give a precise answer as to whether or not fundraising in one area drains funding from another area. He did note, however, that the Berkeley campus, which does not have a medical school, had a 72 percent increase in private support over the same period last year.

[The report was mailed to all Regents in advance of the meeting, and a copy is on file in the Office of the Secretary.]

The Committee went into Closed Session at 4:18 p.m.

. . . . . .

The meeting adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary