

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

May 16, 2001

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

Present: Regents Atkinson, Bagley, Bustamante, Connerly, Davies, Eastin, Fong, Hertzberg, Hopkinson, O. Johnson, S. Johnson, Kohn, Kozberg, Lansing, Lee, Marcus, Miura, Montoya, Moores, Parsky, Preuss, and Sayles (22)

In attendance: Regents-designate T. Davis, Morrison and Seymour, Faculty Representatives Cowan and Viswanathan, Secretary Trivette, Provost King, Senior Vice President Mullinix, Vice Presidents Broome, Drake, Gomes, Gómez, and Gurtner, Chancellors Berdahl, Bishop, Carnesale, Cicerone, Dynes, Greenwood, Orbach, Tomlinson-Keasey, Vanderhoef, and Yang, and Recording Secretary Bryan

The meeting convened at 8:50 a.m. with Chairman S. Johnson presiding.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairman Johnson explained that the Board had been convened as a Committee of the Whole in order to permit members of the public an opportunity to comment on matters on the morning's agenda.

1. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

The following persons addressed the Board on the subject of Board Item RE-28, *Resolution Concerning Future Admissions, Employment, and Contracting Policies*:

- A. Ms. Kinshasa Curl, a UCLA graduate student, called for the repeal of SP-1, *Policy Ensuring Equal Treatment – Admissions* and SP-2, *Policy Concerning Equal Treatment – Employment and Contracting* and the elimination of tiered admissions. She believed that the Los Angeles and Berkeley campuses should reflect the demographics of the state.
- B. Hoku Jeffrey, an Associated Students senator at the Berkeley campus, stated that the majority of Californians support affirmative action. He asked the Regents to repeal SP-1 and SP-2 and to not replace them with a weakened version.
- C. Mr. Luke Massie, representing the Coalition to Defend Affirmative Action By Any Means Necessary (BAMN), urged the supporters of affirmative action on the Board not to bow to the wishes of Regent Connerly. He stated that to amend the ban on affirmative action begrudgingly would be worse than to let it stand.

- D. Mr. Ron Cruz, representing the Oakland Education Association, believed that the passage of SP-1 and SP-2 had made students feel unwelcome on UC campuses and caused minority admissions and hiring setbacks. He called for an unequivocal reversal of the ban on affirmative action.
- E. Ms. Joyce Schon, representing BAMN, supported a repeal of SP-1 and SP-2 which she believed would return California to the forefront of progressive politics.
- F. Mr. Hal Pashler, a professor at UC San Diego, praised the Regents for upholding the principles embodied in SP-1 and SP-2, which he noted were supported by the majority of UC faculty. He believed that the passage of Proposition 209 was a strong indication that Californians oppose racial preferences.
- G. Mr. Salvador Sanchez Strawbridge, a high school senior, believed that if steps were taken to make educational opportunities equal at all California high schools, there would be no need for preferences in college admissions.
- H. Mr. Richard Nguyen, a UC Irvine student, noted that not all groups of Asians are well represented at the University. He believed that SP-1 was discriminatory because UC applicants do not receive equal high school educations and might not be able to afford courses to help them prepare for the SAT.
- I. Mr. Jonathan Huey, representing California Young Americans for Freedom, believed that the admissions process should be free from racial preferences. He believed that, because the University's job was to promote learning, students should be admitted on the basis of academic merit.
- J. Ms. Coreen Amoo, a UC Irvine student, stated that although her race should not matter in a free society, it continues to do so. She believed that SP-1 helped to exaggerate the disparity among social classes.
- K. Ms. Brushira Crawford, a UC Irvine student, believed that, because high schools do not provide equal educations, it was necessary to rescind SP-1.
- L. Mr. Daniel Rego, a UCLA student, stated that people should be treated as individuals and not as members of a particular race. He supported SP-1 and SP-2.
- M. Mr. Gabriel Perez, a UCLA student representing the California Statewide Affirmative Action Coalition, believed that the repeal of SP-1 would send the message to underrepresented students that the University welcomes them.

- N. Ms. Paule Cruz Takash, a professor at UCLA, urged the Regents to repeal SP-1 and SP-2 and to demonstrate leadership by planning new programs that will ensure equal treatment for all.
- O. Ms. Martha Escobar, a UC Riverside student, opposed RE-28 because she viewed it as simply a rephrasing of SP-1 and SP-2.
- P. Ms. Elisa Haro, a UC Riverside student, believed that the Regents had been ignoring the cry for equal educational opportunities. She supported the repeal of SP-1 and SP-2.
- Q. Ms. Eva Paterson, Executive Director of Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights, called for the repeal of SP-1 and SP-2 and the tiered admissions system. She also urged the Regents to refrain from supporting political causes.
- R. Mr. Jose Lopez, a UC Riverside student, observed that as long as high schools provided unequal educations, racial preferences in college admissions would be necessary.
- S. Assemblymember Marco Firebaugh, asked for the unambiguous rescission of SP-1 and SP-2, as recently supported by the Legislature in Measure 21. He believed the University should embrace all students, and he stated that he had accepted President Atkinson's verbal commitment to eliminate the two-tier admissions system.
- T. Assemblymember Wilma Chan, a member of the Asian Pacific Caucus, believed that the University should welcome the best and brightest. She supported the repeal of SP-1 and SP-2 and the 75 percent admission rate based on academic achievement.
- U. Senator Gloria Romero, who represents East Los Angeles, reported that students in her area tend not to take college preparatory courses and cannot afford SAT preparatory courses. She supported rescinding SP-1 and SP-2.
- V. Assemblymember Jackie Goldberg supported the passage of RE-28. She believed that SP-1 and SP-2 had prevented minority students from attending the University. She indicated that, although approval of RE-28 would be a positive step, the Legislature would be monitoring the University's admissions programs closely.
- W. Assemblymember Dion Aroner believed that sweeping changes in admissions criteria would be necessary in order to accommodate Tidal Wave II and that SP-1 and SP-2 should be rescinded.

- X. Assemblymember Elaine Alquist supported the passage of RE-28. She believed that the University's admissions criteria were antiquated and that different criteria were needed for the new century.
- Y. Assemblymember Jerome Horton stated that a decline in stakeholders was the greatest threat to a democracy. He advocated considering societal differences as a way to make the admissions process more inclusive. He supported RE-28 and pledged to work with the Regents to make sure that the appropriate changes are carried out.
- Z. Ms. Debbie Davis, representing the University of California Student Association, played a video that contained interviews with students about their campus experiences. She believed that the complexities of creating true access to the University would require the cooperation of all sectors and that the repeal of SP-1 and SP-2 would represent the triumph of common sense.

2. **OVERVIEW OF THE PRESIDENT**

President Atkinson introduced Mr. Manuel Gómez, the newly appointed Interim Vice President for Educational Outreach. He noted that under Mr. Gómez's guidance as Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs on the Irvine campus, there had been a significant increase in the number of minority students.

The meeting adjourned at 10:15 a.m.

Attest:

Secretary