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

September 23, 2004

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

Present: Regents Anderson, Bustamante, Dynes, Hopkinson, Johnson, Kozberg, Lansing, Lee, Lozano, Marcus, Montoya, Moores, Novack, Núñez, O'Connell, Ornellas, Parsky, Pattiz, Preuss, Ruiz, and Wachter

In attendance: Regents-designate Juline, Rominger, and Rosenthal, Faculty Representatives Blumenthal and Brunk, Secretary Trivette, General Counsel Holst, Provost Greenwood, Senior Vice Presidents Darling and Mullinix, Vice Presidents Doby and Drake, Chancellors Bishop, Carnesale, Cicerone, Fox, Tomlinson-Keasey, Vanderhoef, and Yang, Acting Chancellor Chemers, and Recording Secretary Nietfeld

The meeting convened 9:55 a.m. with Chairman Parsky presiding.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Chairman Parsky explained that the Board had been convened as a Committee of the Whole in order to permit members of the public an opportunity to address University-related matters. The following persons addressed the Board concerning the item noted.

Committee on Educational Policy, Item 304: Academic Senate Recommendations on Freshman Eligibility Requirements, Office of the President:

1. Ms. Princess Allen, a student at the Berkeley campus, reported that studies had shown that students who enter the University with GPAs between 2.8 and 3.0 perform as well as those students with higher grade point averages. Speaking as an outreach coordinator to underrepresented minority students, she believed that raising the bar for admission would be detrimental to these students.

2. Ms. Carmel Levitan, last year's graduate student representative to the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools, reported that BOARS had not been permitted to address the question of whether the 12.5 percent eligibility pool was a reasonable goal. During its deliberations, the Committee found that any proposal to reduce the pool would have a disproportionate impact on underrepresented minority and low-income students. She emphasized, however, that if the Board chooses to reduce the eligibility pool, the option being presented by the Academic Senate represents the best solution.

3. Ms. Tina Park, representing the University of California Student Association and speaking also on behalf of Mr. John Vu and Mr. Eligio Martinez, recalled that the eligibility study

conducted by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) had been based upon the transcripts from 48 high schools, chosen because they could submit their data electronically. She alleged that the study did not accurately represent all high schools in California. In addition, the study has a margin of error of 1.8 percent, double that of the study performed in 1996.

4. Mr. Bill Kidder, a member of the Equal Justice Society, observed that the University has an obligation to guarantee eligibility to the top 12.5 percent of California's high school graduates. Because of the margin of error in the CPEC study, the confidence range is plus or minus three percent. He suggested that changes to the admissions requirements adopted in July may result in a reduction of the eligibility pool to 12.5 percent. He did not believe that high school students were being given enough advance notice of the change.

5. Mr. Allende Palma/Saracho, the student body president at the Los Angeles campus and speaking also on behalf of Ms. Jocelyn Wong and Ms. Felicia Cruz, reported that 167 African-American students had been admitted to UCLA for Fall 2004, from a class of 4,400, with less than 100 of those admitted having enrolled. He pointed out that low-income students without access to honors and Advanced Placement courses would not be able to attain GPAs which will qualify them for admission. He urged the Regents to develop ways to enroll more students of color.

6. Ms. Linda Salinas, a graduate student at the Berkeley campus, suggested that the decision to raise the GPA requirement would adversely affect individual students' lives.

7. Professor Emeritus Charles Schwartz pointed out that while the changes adopted by the Board in July would reduce the eligibility pool to 13 percent, there still exists an uncertainly gap of plus or minus 1.7 percent. He suggested that it would not be necessary to further reduce the eligibility pool by raising the minimum GPA.

8. Ms. Cammeil Gilkerson of the Greenlining Institute was opposed to any changes in the eligibility requirements, which she believed would most affect already underrepresented students. She suggested that the Regents should focus their attention on the fact that at most 22 African-American males not on athletic scholarships would enter UCLA's Fall 2004 freshman class, which represents less than one percent of the incoming class.

9. Ms. Jennifer Pae, the student body president at the San Diego campus, believed that the quality of education at the University of California was dependent upon access. She suggested that the Board should not make a decision based upon flawed data.

10. Ms. Claire Reichstein spoke on behalf of the California Coalition for Civil Rights, which consists of 47 organizations that oppose the Academic Senate's recommendation. She recognized in particular the Asian Law Caucus, the Coalition for Economic Equity, California's Women's Agenda, the Equal Justice Society, the Greenlining Institute, Housing Rights, Inc., La Raza Centro Legal, Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights, MALDEF,

NAACP, the National Center for Lesbian Rights, and the University of California Student Association.

11. Ms. Annalyn Perre, an ASUC senator on the Berkeley campus, explained that she worked with underrepresented minority high school students in Oakland and suggested that increasing the eligibility requirements would be harmful to them.

12. Ms. Lakshmi Sridaran, an ASUC senator on the Berkeley campus, believed that the prestige of the system comes not from increasing the entrance requirement but rather from increasing access. She saw raising the required GPA as part of a trend which included raising tuition while employees' salaries remain frozen.

13. Mr. Rigo Marquez, the ASUC vice president for external affairs at the San Diego campus, discussed the outreach work that he performs in underserved communities. He asked that the students he sees be given the opportunity to attend the University of California and to succeed.

14. Mr. Brian McInnis, a Yolo community higher education activist, described the disparities between high schools in Yolo and Solano Counties, with Dixon High School graduating only 25 students who were eligible to attend the University of California or the California State University. At Davis High School, 388 students were similarly eligible. He noted that these results reflect the lack of Advanced Placement courses available to Dixon students. He urged the Regents to take these facts into consideration when making their decision.

15. Mr. Max Besbris, a student at the Berkeley campus, speaking also on behalf of Ms. Amanda Pajanamus, Mr. Frederick Von Bose, and Ms. Maria Preciado, expressed concern at the lack of diversity there, in contrast with the diversity found at his high school in Los Angeles. He believed that the campus was unrepresentative of both the racial and economic make-up of the state. Raising the GPA will serve to worsen the situation because students in the state do not have equal opportunities to succeed.

16. Ms. Noerena Limón, an ASUC senator on the Berkeley campus, spoke of her experiences as a counselor at Castlemont High School in Oakland, which is considered to be one of the worst high schools in the state. The last year she worked there, only three students went on to the University of California. She believed that the conditions in the school made it difficult for these students to learn.

17. Ms. Denise Valez, a student at the Berkeley campus, related the poor conditions at her high school and urged the Board to reject the eligibility proposal.

18. Ms. Yvette Falarca, a member of the Coalition to Defend Affirmative Action By Any Means Necessary and speaking also on behalf of Ms. Josie Hyman, Mr. Ronald Cruz, and Ms. Adi Hoag, believed that the Regents should stand up for students of color rather than voting to restrict access.

19. Ms. Marta Gomez, speaking as a concerned parent and community member, noted that students and parents were confused by the proposal to raise the eligibility requirements, and she urged the Regents to study the matter carefully.

The meeting adjourned at 10:40 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary