

The Regents of the University of California

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

January 20, 2000

The Committee on Educational Policy met on the above date at UCSF-Laurel Heights, San Francisco.

Members present: Regents Atkinson, Bustamante, Connerly, Davies, O. Johnson, Khachigian, Kozberg, Lansing, Pannor, and Taylor; Advisory members Kohn and Miura

In attendance: Regents Bagley, Hopkinson, S. Johnson, Lee, Montoya, Moores, Preuss, and Vining, Faculty Representatives Coleman and Cowan, Secretary Trivette, Associate Secretary Shaw, General Counsel Holst, Provost King, Senior Vice President Kennedy, Vice Presidents Broome, Darling, Gomes, Hershman, and Pister, Chancellors Bishop, Carnesale, Cicerone, Dynes, Greenwood, Orbach, Tomlinson-Keasey, Vanderhoef, and Yang, and Recording Secretary Nietfeld

The meeting convened at 10:50 a.m. with Committee Chair Connerly presiding.

**1. EXAMINATION OF FACTORS RELATED TO ACADEMIC UNDERPERFORMANCE AND UNDERACHIEVEMENT**

The Committee was informed that a major focus of the University of California's outreach efforts to enhance diversity within the institution is evidenced through campus partnerships being established as a priority with those low performing schools where the majority of underrepresented minority students are enrolled. These partnerships are varied in nature. Some focus on professional development for teachers, while others enrich college preparatory curricula to enhance the academic achievement and performance of educationally and economically disadvantaged minority student populations. At the same time, current research findings suggest a continuing educational performance gap between African American, Latino, and Native American students when contrasted with their white and Asian student counterparts.

Many educators have recognized that the performance gaps between majority and minority groups are correlated with the high percentages of African American, Latino, and Native American students who grow up in circumstances of economic disadvantage. These differences continue, however, even when social class differences are held constant. As a consequence, one finds that underrepresented minority students of middle- and upper-income socio-economic status often perform at lower levels on standardized tests than their white and Asian counterparts. This tends to hold true not only at the same socioeconomic level but also when compared to whites and Asians from lower socioeconomic classes.

Given the challenge that the University of California faces in working within low performing schools, there is a body of research knowledge related to modified perceptions

and academic practices. These findings have enormous potential for generating improved student achievement and enriching the effectiveness of UC's partnerships with the K-12 segment.

Based upon the research findings that have focused upon institutional and societal factors impeding or contributing to underperformance and underachievement by underrepresented minority students, successful intervention strategies have been developed. Their design has been to minimize the influence of the institutional and extra-institutional factors that suppress academic performance and educational achievement among African American, Latino, Native American, and other disadvantaged students.

Regent Connerly observed that the Regents were fortunate to hear from some of the best minds in the nation on the subject of academic underperformance. He recalled that when the Regents became involved in outreach, they made the decision to pursue all students who are disadvantaged. The University's outreach efforts are beginning to produce results.

Vice President Pister recalled that two years ago he had pointed out that with its outreach programs the University was embarking upon a new course that was historic and unprecedented. That statement is more true today than it was two years ago. The University's outreach programs have been designed to address improvement in academic achievement, with particular attention given to UC eligibility for disadvantaged students. These programs are largely focused on students in their school settings. Educational disadvantage stems from a large set of factors, some of which are largely beyond the school site. Such factors have different impacts on different subgroups of educationally disadvantaged students. An understanding of such relationships is a necessary condition for the design of effective intervention programs.

Vice President Pister introduced Professor Patricia Gandara, who serves on the faculty at UC Davis and is a staff social scientist at the RAND Corporation. She recently completed a national survey for the National Postsecondary Education Cooperative on K-12 intervention programs. Professor Gandara explained that her survey attempted to review the research on impediments to greater academic success for underrepresented students, to make sense of the ways in which intervention programs address these impediments through their programmatic strategies, and to assess the extent to which these strategies are successful in helping more students go on to college. Ten impediments have been identified, the first being inequalities of familial, cultural, and social capital. Poor families and those from underrepresented groups are less likely to have sufficient familiarity with the social and educational system and to have access to information and resource networks. A second major factor is an inequality of resources in neighborhoods and communities because poor communities have fewer resources such as libraries and museums that support academic achievement. The lack of peer support for academic achievement is also a major problem. Racism remains a significant factor in educational mobility for students of color. Although most Americans no longer concede that they believe that Black and Hispanic students are innately

intellectually inferior, they do attribute these students' school problems to their own lack of a desire to do better rather than to structural factors that might impede their advancement. Racism also works to undermine the self-confidence of students of color and can cause them to doubt their own abilities. A fifth area is inequality in K-12 schools, including the unequal distribution of well-qualified teachers. These schools, largely in urban centers, have been shown to enjoy fewer resources and have higher discipline problems. They also offer less-rigorous course work and generally have lower aspirations for their students. Students who attend these schools are more likely to finish school unprepared for postsecondary study than are students from suburban schools, and they are less likely to be competitive for selective colleges because their test scores reflect a less-rigorous preparation. A sixth area is the segregation of Black and Hispanic students. After two decades of desegregation, American schools and schools in California are as segregated today in many cases as they were in the 1970s. There are concomitant declines in achievement as schools begin to re-segregate. Poor high school counseling is a seventh element. This contributes significantly to the tracking of underrepresented students into non-college-preparatory course work. Underrepresented students receive less encouragement from their teachers, who may harbor doubts about their abilities and thereby contribute to a self-fulfilling prophecy of underachievement. These students are also more likely than middle-class white and Asian students to have low or unrealistic aspirations for themselves. High drop-out rates remain a major problem among underrepresented students, and limited financial resources cannot be discounted. Low-income students with high test scores are significantly less likely to pursue higher education than high-income students with similar test scores.

Professor Gandara reported that some comprehensive programs which focus on the problems outlined above have succeeded in doubling the college-going rate of underrepresented students. This results when students who otherwise would not have gone on to higher education enroll in community colleges and then transfer to less-selective four-year institutions. The programs do not appear to move students from less-selective to highly-selective colleges such as the University of California. This is largely because such programs do not result in significant improvement in academic achievement as measured either by grade point average or test scores. The programs motivate students and provide them with the information that they need to make the transition from high school into college. Professor Gandara continued that little is known about these students once they go to college.

It appears from the limited data that the number of students who receive a degree is relatively low. The biggest problem that these programs face is attrition, with between one-third and one-half of the students who enroll in intervention programs actually completing them. Professor Gandara stressed that programs that are add-ons to the normal school content cannot substantially change the course of a student's academic outcomes. There is a critical need to integrate the programs into the core of the school experience. The most helpful strategies for increasing the college-going rate of underrepresented students are high-quality instruction, a relationship with a key adult who monitors and guides the student over a lengthy period of time, paying attention to the cultural background of the student, providing a supportive peer group, and financial assistance. Professor Gandara reported that she had

been troubled over the course of her study by the fact that very little rigorous evaluation of these programs is performed, despite their high cost. Vice President Pister noted that Professor Gandara serves on the University's outreach assessment team.

Vice President Pister introduced Mr. Claude Steele, the Lucy Stern Professor in the Social Sciences and Chair of the Department of Psychology at Stanford University. Professor Steele's research includes a study of the processes of self evaluation and a theory of how group stereotypes can influence intellectual performance and academic identities.

Professor Steele explained that his remarks would focus on standardized test results and, in particular, what effects a person's life circumstances have on his or her test performance. He noted that over the past thirty years, certain groups of students, including African Americans, Hispanics, and Native Americans, have scored lower on general aptitude tests used in college and professional school admissions. This fact has had a negative effect on higher education's attempt to be as inclusive as possible. This performance gap will gain importance as the use of affirmative action declines. As enrollment demand increases, particularly for highly selective colleges and universities, these test scores will be weighted more heavily in the admissions process. As a result of these circumstances, the percentage of students from these minority groups who are admitted to selective colleges and professional schools will decline.

Professor Steele discussed the nature of standardized tests, which have been designed to measure general ability that may be applied to various intellectual activities. The belief is that this ability may be measured early in life through one test. Mr. Steele stressed that scientists question the existence of such general ability and the usefulness of a standardized test in measuring such ability. The Scholastic Assessment Test does not adequately assess what a student has learned in high school, nor does it serve as a test of underlying intellectual potential. The United States is the only country in the world that uses this type of test in admissions decisions; most other countries measure students' knowledge by achievement tests based on a national curriculum.

Professor Steele turned to the question of why some groups underperform on standardized tests. His research has focused on how a person's life circumstances come to bear on test performance. For example, a Black student is more likely to attend a poorly funded school where the teachers are the least well trained. It is also well documented that Black students experience differential treatment by those teachers, including lower expectations with regard to the students' future. These students have less access to Advanced Placement courses and to test preparation courses. These factors that are tied to race or gender tend to build cumulatively as students progress through school, affecting their ability to perform well and reducing the effectiveness of standardized tests to measure their potential for success. Professor Steele explained that his laboratory research has examined factors that are tied to the identities of minority students. They respond to a stereotype threat which derives from being in a situation where a negative stereotype about a group of which you are a part

becomes relevant. In order to test this hypothesis, academically strong Black and white students at Stanford University were individually given a difficult section of the Graduate Record Exam in literature. When the Black students become frustrated with the difficulty of the exam, this occasions the relevance of a racial stereotype for the Black students. The resulting emotion interferes with their performance. It is possible to eliminate this reaction by telling Black students that this particular test is not racially biased or that it is not diagnostic of ability. In addition, the performance of white engineering students on a mathematics test may be influenced if these students are told that Asians perform better on the test than whites do. As a result of such studies, it becomes clear that it is difficult to analyze a person's test results without knowing something about his or her life circumstances.

Professor Steele believed that institutions of higher education would be confronted with this problem for some time because the achievement gap is rooted in the way in which society is organized. There is no simple solution to this problem. Affirmative action gave admissions officers the ability to use race in interpreting test scores. The elimination of affirmative action calls into question the importance of standardized tests in the admissions process. In order to avoid a complete drought of minority students at selective institutions, it will be necessary to reconsider the relevance of standardized tests and how they are used. The only long-term solution will be for society to confront the issues that promote and continue racial and class inequality at the K-12 level.

Vice President Pister introduced Mr. Pedro Noguera, Associate Professor of Sociology in the School of Education at the University of California, Berkeley. His research has focused on the ways in which schools respond to social and economic forces within the urban environment. Before making his presentation, Professor Noguera remarked on the growing number of affluent students who are being diagnosed as *Adisabled* in order to earn extra time to take the SAT. The fact that test-taking services such as Kaplan guarantee that a student's score will be raised by 200 points suggests that these scholastic assessment tests measure a student's test-taking skills.

Professor Noguera commented that the achievement gap among races is reflected in other forms of inequality. A study which was recently released by the Centers for Disease Control shows that African-American children have a 75 percent higher chance of having asthma than any other group, which speaks to the fact that certain populations are more apt to suffer a disadvantage. The achievement gap must be seen as part of a broader phenomenon in American society. Professor Noguera discussed his research in the English-speaking Caribbean, where children do extremely well in school regardless of the fact that they are poor and Black. In Barbados, 300 students who were applying to American schools took the SAT and achieved an average score of 1250. Mr. Noguera referred to a recent article in the *New York Times Magazine* which focused on the fact that schools cannot solve the problems of society. The author argues in favor of investing heavily in preschool programs. Professor Noguera pointed out that this solution will not solve any problems if the K-12 schools are

not improved. It is necessary to focus on how environmental factors affect a student's performance in the inner city, where schools are underfunded and in poor condition.

Professor Noguera turned to the University's outreach programs and what will be required for them to increase the numbers of eligible minority students. He stressed that outreach is a long-term approach that will not pay off immediately in the increased eligibility of underrepresented students. An important obstacle that will limit the ability of outreach programs to have an impact is administrative disorganization within the K-12 schools. The average tenure for a superintendent in urban schools is less than three years. Political turmoil distracts educators from focusing on the promotion of learning. University resources are wasted in schools where the administration is not interested in creating a partnership. Mr. Noguera noted that in the past outreach programs had been designed to complement the teaching that occurs during the normal school day. If the teaching is poor, outreach programs cannot compensate. As a result, a much deeper engagement is required. Children must have access to rigorous courses taught by qualified teachers. Studies have shown that underrepresented students have less access to such courses in mathematics and science. The most important resource for students who seek admission to selective schools is peer support, which provides academic skills and counters peer pressure not to succeed. Catholic schools hold accountable those students who are not succeeding, while public schools do not. There is a need for professional development for teachers which links teaching to learning because teachers tend to focus on teaching their specialized subject rather than on whether or not the students are learning the material. Professor Noguera pointed out that it is also necessary to develop better partnerships between parents, the community, and the schools, particularly in high-poverty areas. There is evidence that charter schools create this sense of community and provide a safe environment by working closely with parents. There must be a sense of accountability such that all elements are responsible for the outcomes. There is a tendency in public education to create new programs without analyzing whether or not they achieve the intended results. Good evaluation of results is the best way to avoid wasting resources.

In response to a question from Regent Lansing, Associate Vice President Galligani recalled that the University had adopted an eligibility index based upon GPA and test scores, with the three SAT II achievement tests accounting for 75 percent of the weighting. He confirmed for Regent Lansing that the University now requires a minimum score on the SAT, depending upon a student's GPA. Regent Lansing observed that the SAT poses a threat to anyone who takes the test because there are innumerable factors that may affect the outcome. She questioned the overemphasis on preparation for the SAT, especially in light of the questions raised by experts as to what it actually measures. President Atkinson recalled that discussion of the role of the SAT in the admissions process had been ongoing in the Academic Senate and its Board on Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS). He supported the use of an achievement test in lieu of the SAT. Professor Steele added that while he was more hopeful about the use of achievement tests, there are real concerns related to relying exclusively on an achievement-test system. The results on an achievement test reflect the quality of the curriculum to which a student is exposed, and factors such as race

and social class will thus come into play. The phenomenon of the stereotype threat bears on an achievement test as much as it does on a general aptitude test. Professor Gandara recalled the she had argued against the shift in balance from the SAT to achievement tests because students who receive an inferior education in underperforming schools cannot be expected to be competitive due to the education that they receive. The only way to improve scores on the SAT II is to improve the quality of instruction in the K-12 schools.

Regent Hopkinson requested information on the motivating factor that resulted in the use of the SAT in college admissions. Professor Steele referred her to **The Big Test** by Nicholas Lemann, which provides a detailed description of how the Berkeley campus adopted the test in the 1960s for a variety of egalitarian reasons. In the interim, some of the inherent discriminations in the system have come to light.

Regent Hopkinson recalled that Professor Gandara had referred to the lack of rigorous evaluation of outreach programs and asked her to comment further. Professor Gandara explained that, of the thousands of outreach programs around the country, 99 percent are not evaluated. The conclusions that she reached in her study are based upon 13 rigorous evaluations that were done nationwide.

Regent Connerly saw the need to give more consideration to the issue of testing.

Regent Bagley referred to the dramatic decrease in enrollment of underrepresented students in graduate and professional schools, particularly in law and medical schools, and asked whether qualified students who had been admitted had chosen not to enroll. Professor Noguera responded that one obstacle to their enrollment is that the University of California is not able to provide its graduate students with the type of funding that is available at private colleges and universities. Minority students choose not to enroll in professional schools at UC when they perceive that minority enrollment is low. He believed that there is cause for concern when the numbers of underrepresented students drop precipitously, as they have at schools like Boalt School of Law at Berkeley. A high percentage of African-American male students at Berkeley and Los Angeles will be athletes as a result of the elimination of affirmative action. In that environment, the campus becomes a much less attractive option for graduate students and for the faculty.

Regent O. Johnson asked how the presenters were making their research findings known to the K-12 community. Professor Noguera explained that he meets with teachers and principals throughout the Bay Area to raise the issues that he had raised at today's meeting.

It is important to establish a dialogue between UC researchers and the K-12 community, especially in light of the fact that K-12 educators do not view the University as a resource. Professor Gandara added that her grant proposals contain a request for funding to visit the schools where her research is performed to share the information that has been gathered. Referring to a report by RAND on why students do not enroll at UC, she reported that one finding was that underrepresented students characterize UC as a place where they would not

feel comfortable. Associate Vice President Galligani continued that the RAND study was commissioned by the Outreach Task Force and involved focus groups around the state. The report was used to help develop informational outreach materials.

Regent O. Johnson referred to the Governor's accountability measures for K-12, including an assessment test, and she asked how this and other tests would improve students' academic achievement. Professor Steele observed that there is a national trend of using high-stake tests as graduation requirements. While the intention is to pressure schools to be more accountable to the populations they serve, unless these tests are accompanied by more resources and more thought about how to improve the schools, the results will not be productive. Professor Noguera pointed out that the State has not put forth a plan to help low-performing schools to improve. In addition, no thought has been given to how the schools will accommodate the increased enrollment pressure when students who do not perform well on the exit test are retained.

Chancellor Berdahl reported that, as the Berkeley campus reworks its admissions process, it has been attempting to understand merit in a more contextualized fashion, in the absence of the use of race as a factor in admissions. He noted that some Regents had been invited to observe one of the campus' norming sessions and offered to make this opportunity available to as many Regents as may be interested.

Regent Pannor returned the discussion to the SAT, noting that it does not measure knowledge, especially in light of the fact that private testing companies are able to raise test scores for those students who are able to afford this service. She asked whether the presenters believe that admissions decisions at the University of California would be improved without the use of standardized tests. Professor Steele responded in the affirmative, noting that all that the University gains through the use of standardized tests, in terms of predictive outcomes, is a tiny percentage. The test was instituted as a general aptitude test in order to account for different curricula at a time when the undergraduate population was much more homogenous. Professor Steele believed that there was no statistical justification for using the SAT in admissions. Professor Noguera added that the GRE is rarely considered as a major factor in graduate admissions decisions. He believed that in undergraduate decisions more weight should be placed on contextual factors such as a person's motivation. Professor Gandara did not believe that the elimination of the use of the SAT would have a significant effect on admissions decisions.

Regent Khachigian requested more information about how teachers treat students of some racial groups differently from others and what is being done to address the situation. Professor Steele described a study which asks the observer to watch a videotape of two students interacting and to interpret the nature of the interaction. Observers of both races tend to interpret the shoving of a white student by a Black student as violent, while they view it as playful when the situation is reversed. Professor Steele believed that these findings indicate that behavior is influenced by underlying stereotypes of which people are not



consciously aware. Professor Gandara addressed the question of how teachers are being trained to avoid discriminatory behavior. She explained that one problem with respect to teacher preparation is the fact that teachers tend to be trained in schools that are unlike the schools in which they will actually teach because the schools that cooperate with University teaching programs tend to be in well-funded districts. She confirmed for Regent Khachigian that a great deal of work remains to be done in this area.

Faculty Representative Coleman recalled that when BOARS presented its recommendations pertaining to eligibility to the Regents, these recommendations were preceded by extensive studies of the predictability of the various factors which go into the admissions process. BOARS is working hard to collect relevant data in order to inform the Board of how the changes in admissions and eligibility standards are reflected in the success of the University's students.

Regent Taylor asked for further comment on the role of parents in outreach. Professor Noguera believed that it was the responsibility of the schools to inform parents about how they can participate in their children's education. The University should form contractual relationships with the schools where it performs outreach in order for the programs to be successful. This will ensure that the schools are providing the University with the resources it needs to produce results. Some outreach programs, such as MESA, specifically require parental involvement. Mr. Taylor suggested that it may be necessary to involve parents at an earlier stage in order to accustom them to participating. Professor Noguera pointed out that because parents are more likely to be involved in the education of their children when the children are younger, this participation should be encouraged. He noted that parents are more likely to become involved when they perceive that the school is serving their children well.

Regent Connerly observed that the College Board requests information about a student's race when he or she takes the SAT and asked whether that question alone could trigger a stereotype threat. Professor Steele pointed out that the stakes for a person taking the SAT are so high as to affect a minority student regardless of whether the question is asked. The College Board now requests that students identify their race on an application form which is submitted prior to taking the test.

The Committee recessed at 12:45 p.m.

.....

The meeting reconvened at 2:45 p.m.

Members present: Regents Atkinson, Connerly, Davies, O. Johnson, Khachigian, Kozberg, Lansing, Pannor, and Taylor; Advisory members Kohn and Miura

In attendance: Regents Hopkinson, S. Johnson, Lee, Montoya, Preuss, and Vining, Faculty Representatives Coleman and Cowan, Secretary Trivette, General Counsel Holst, Provost King, Senior Vice President Kennedy, Vice Presidents Darling and Hershman, Chancellors Berdahl, Dynes, Greenwood, Orbach, Tomlinson-Keasey, Vanderhoef, and Yang, and Recording Secretary Nietfeld

2. **PROGRESS REPORT ON ENROLLMENT PLANNING TO MEET THE CHALLENGE OF TIDAL WAVE II**

Provost King recalled that in October he had presented information about the magnitude of enrollment growth projected for California's public and private institutions of higher education over the next decade. The University of California expects to grow as much in the next twelve years as it has in the last thirty, by about 63,000 students. Beyond the year 2010 enrollment growth may decline slightly. These projections are based upon demographics provided by the California Department of Finance. As reported at the October meeting, the number of budgeted FTE students is expected to grow from 147,000 in 1998-99 to 210,000 in 2010-11, an increase of 43 percent. In the current year, the University has already accommodated 5,400 new students. Provost King stressed that the University is committed to the Master Plan for Higher Education, which asks the University to admit the top 12.5 percent of public high school graduates. A similar commitment is made to the state's private high schools. The University has a Memorandum of Understanding with the California Community Colleges to increase the number of students transferring from community colleges to a UC campus, and the projections are based upon satisfaction of the MOU. Planning has assumed that graduate enrollment will remain constant at about 18 percent. The administration believes that this percentage of graduate students is necessary for the effective functioning of the research university; in addition, the state requires this number of Ph.D.s for economic and societal benefits.

The assumption is made that the University will sustain and enhance the quality of instruction and research. As a result, there are limits to the growth rate that may be accommodated on a particular campus. There is a requirement that solutions to increased enrollment pressures be cost effective and achievable.

Provost King described the challenges that the administration faced during its planning for Tidal Wave II. Over the next twelve years, it will be necessary to recruit 7,000 faculty. The transfer process is a challenge which requires continuing attention on both ends of the process. Federal and private support will need to increase in order to sustain the research base.

Provost King presented the suggested general campus budgeted FTE enrollment targets that the campuses have been asked to consider in order to increase overall enrollment from 147,000 in 1998-99 to 210,000 in 2010-11. Campuses have been asked to develop and submit plans for evaluation by the Office of the President based on these enrollment targets.

These targets are based upon existing campus growth plans which have been in place for the past decade and do not include the health sciences or fully-funded programs. The average annual growth rate for UC as a whole will average 3 percent and will range from 1.1 percent at Berkeley to 6.3 percent at Riverside. These are the maximum growth rates that can be accommodated while still maintaining the quality of instruction.

Provost King reported that the administration had considered a number of elements to accommodate increased enrollments, which he outlined as follows.

### **Build an Eleventh Campus**

This solution would relieve the enrollment pressure on the existing campuses and was the approach taken by the University in the 1950s and 1960s. However, it is an expensive way to accommodate new enrollment and would take too long to meet the current growth surge. The leveling off of demand after 2012 suggests that an eleventh campus may not be necessary in the foreseeable time frame. This option has been rejected.

### **Expand Fall-Winter-Spring Enrollments**

Substantial growth will be met through the solution of expanding fall-winter-spring enrollments; however, this growth has been built into projections over the past decade. In dealing with fall-winter-spring enrollment increases, the Office of the President will recognize the constraints posed by the campuses' Long Range Development Plans and community concerns about growth.

### **Admit Fewer Students**

This solution would be a major loss for the State. Admitting fewer students would reduce access for the many elements of California's population at a time when demand is strong. This policy would further disappoint expectations which already exist with respect to admissions. This option has been rejected.

### **Increase Off-Campus Enrollments**

This approach involves greater use of the Education Abroad Program, the University's center in Washington, D.C., and off-campus centers. Increasing off-campus enrollments helps to lessen the impact of campuses on their local communities. This solution will require careful articulation with the requirements of various majors. The number of students for whom off-campus enrollment works well is limited.

### **Use Technology More**

Abilities for technology-enhanced instruction are increasing rapidly. The use of technology in instruction can enhance the quality of instruction, can help off-campus programs work better, and can add new dimensions for instruction that were not available in the past. The use of technology requires major investments for networking and for equipment. Technology

is not seen as an individual method of accommodating enrollment growth, but it is taken into account in campus plans.

### **Shorten Time to Degree**

The University has already accomplished a great deal towards shortening the time to degree. Reduction of the time from 4.25 years to 4.15 years would allow for the accommodation of 5,000 additional students.

### **Expand Summer Enrollments**

The administration has projected that an additional 15,000 FTE may be accommodated by expanded summer enrollments. The ingredients required for achieving this goal are incentives to induce students to enroll in the summer, State funding for summer enrollment, and phasing in of summer enrollment.

Provost King explained that next steps in the planning process will include a presentation at the March meeting and the April 1 report to the Legislature on the University's plans to meet the increased enrollment demand.

In response to a question from Regent Hopkinson regarding the feasibility of the projected enrollment targets, Chancellor Greenwood recalled that the Santa Cruz campus had been asked by the Office of the President to consider these targets in its planning to 2010. The new off-campus center should assist the campus in meeting its targeted growth rate of 4 percent.

Regent Hopkinson referred to the fact that the enrollment targets do not include the health sciences or fully-funded programs. Provost King explained that they are not included in the report being prepared for the Legislature, which is the basis for today's presentation. Regent Hopkinson asked that at the March meeting the Regents be provided with budget information on the entire student population. She presumed that the presentation in March would include the costs associated with the projected enrollment increases, both from increased student enrollment and capital needs.

Regent Kozberg saw the need to look into the amount of debt that the University is carrying for its capital program and the sources of that debt.

In response to a question from Regent Pannor regarding the admission of out-of-state students, Provost King explained that the percentage of such students is small, ranging from 6 percent to 8 percent of undergraduates. Assistant Vice President Smith commented on the necessity to sustain some geographical diversity for academic reasons. President Atkinson added that the University will be reducing the number of students from out of state as it responds to increasing enrollment pressures. Regent Preuss supported the concept of

geographical diversity rather than limiting enrollment to students from California in order to enrich the environment for the campus community.

In response to a further question from Regent Pannor, Provost King assured her that the projected enrollment targets would be accompanied by increases in the numbers of teaching assistants and faculty in order to maintain the research university.

Regent Pannor drew attention to the extra costs associated with attending an off-campus program such as the Education Abroad Program. Provost King stated that the Office of President is looking seriously at ways in which to fund these extra expenses. The State of Wisconsin provides an additional \$2,000 to students who go abroad to study.

Regent O. Johnson asked how much growth will be attributed to community college transfers. Assistant Vice President Smith recalled that the MOU between President Atkinson and Chancellor Nussbaum calls for an increase of 4,500 students between now and 2005. It is assumed that the increase after that time would continue to grow proportionately to the rest of the growth.

(For speakers= comments, see the minutes of the January 20, 2000 meeting of the Committee of the Whole.)

### 3. **QUARTERLY REPORT ON PRIVATE SUPPORT**

In accordance with the Schedule of Reports, the **Quarterly Report on Private Support** for the period July 1 through September 30, 1999 was submitted for information.

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

### 4. **REMARKS OF REGENT TAYLOR**

Regent Taylor referred to a recent article in the **Los Angeles Times** in which it was reported that some students may be unfairly gaming the system by improperly claiming disabilities so as to obtain special consideration in taking the SAT. He suggested that the Regents= concerns be communicated to BOARS and to the College Board. Regent Connerly stated the Committees= consensus that this practice is a matter of great concern to the Regents. Regent Davies added that a report is being prepared by the President on this subject which will be transmitted to the Regents.

The meeting adjourned at 3:25 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary