

The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

January 15, 2004

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

Members present: Regents Bodine, Dynes, Hopkinson, Huerta, Johnson, Kozberg, Lansing, Moores, Murray, and Sayles; Advisory members Novack, Ornellas, and Blumenthal

In attendance: Regents Blum, Connerly, Davies, Lee, Montoya, Pattiz, Preuss, and Seigler, Regent-designate Anderson, Faculty Representative Pitts, Secretary Trivette, General Counsel Holst, Treasurer Russ, Provost King, Senior Vice Presidents Darling and Mullinix, Vice Presidents Broome, Drake, Gomes, and Hershman, Chancellors Berdahl, Bishop, Carnesale, Cicerone, Córdoba, Tomlinson-Keasey, Vanderhoef, and Yang, Acting Chancellor Chandler, and Recording Secretary Nietfeld

The meeting convened at 10:05 a.m. with Committee Chair Kozberg presiding.

1. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of November 20, 2003 were approved.

2. **TRANSFER EDUCATION AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

Provost King noted that the report **Transfer Education at the University of California** had been provided as background information for today's discussion.

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

Provost King introduced Ms. Martha Kanter, Chancellor of the Foothill-De Anza Community College District, and Ms. Christina Maslach, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education and Instructional Technology at UC Berkeley.

Chancellor Kanter briefly described the successful academic careers of two community college students, the first of whom came to Foothill College following ten years in the Navy. He earned three associate degrees and then enrolled at the Berkeley campus, where he is now a Haas scholar. The second student enrolled at DeAnza college, transferred to the Los Angeles campus, was accepted at the Harvard School of Medicine, and will spend his residency at the Davis campus. Ms. Kanter noted that both students are members of underrepresented minority groups. Chancellor Kanter explained that at the community

colleges, an attempt is made to connect students with a network of resources and assets. She underscored the importance of outreach in this effort, as well as transfer centers, tutoring, and mentoring. With respect to the quality of the curriculum, she noted that faculty from UC and the community colleges must work together to ensure that students attain eligibility to transfer to a UC campus. An intersegmental committee is working to articulate courses in the major and in general education. The Chancellor continued that more than 80 percent of her students are not proficient in English and/or mathematics when they enroll as freshmen; the curriculum must assist them in meeting their transfer goals. Foothill-DeAnza has succeeded in increasing the transfer rate by 51 percent over the past decade, but budget cuts are resulting in students being turned away from the community colleges.

Vice Provost Maslach explained that the goal of a UC campus is that transfer students will have the same academic experience in the upper division as those who enter as freshmen. Transfer students are graduating at the same high rate as native freshman and are earning high grade point averages. The success of the transfer option is predicated on a balance between the four-year program, which composes two-thirds of the undergraduate student body, and the two-year program. The campus feels that this ratio must be maintained, even in light of budget cuts. Vice Provost Maslach described some key differences between the four-year and the two-year programs, noting that while both pools of applicants are highly qualified, the number of students who apply to Berkeley as freshman far outweighs those who apply as transfer students. She noted that students who are qualified but whom the campus is unable to admit as freshman are offered the opportunity to spend two years at a community college, with guaranteed admission to Berkeley; however, few students accept this offer, choosing to enroll in a four-year program elsewhere. While transfer students have high graduation rates, the time to degree tends to be longer due to a lack of course-work preparation, particularly in the hard sciences and engineering, because these courses are not offered at the community-college level. The campus has instituted a transfer center designed to assist these students through a difficult first semester, but the center is threatened by budget cuts. The campus has also found that transfer students express more satisfaction with the upper-division experience than native students do, while they are less satisfied with the social aspects because they are not afforded a residential experience on campus. They also tend to have outside commitments such as jobs and family. The Berkeley campus believes that the Master Plan works in terms of providing two excellent paths to a UC degree.

Provost King commented on the effectiveness of transfer, noting that transfer students achieve the same results as native students and are well distributed across the majors. The number of transfer students has increased recently through enhanced advising and other mechanisms in response to the Memorandum of Understanding between the University and the California Community Colleges. The pool of transfer students is somewhat more diverse than that of entering freshmen, with an increase of 50 percent in underrepresented minorities over the past five years. One challenge presented by the transfer program is the fact that transfer is highly variable among the community college campuses, with 70 percent of transfer students coming from 30 percent of the campuses. Provost King observed that there

are several public policy issues which are raised by the transfer program. It affords the student the opportunity to start college while living nearer to home, and it provides a second chance for many students who are not UC-eligible as freshmen. The Governor's budget contemplates that the University will add a transfer option for students who are eligible as freshmen, with assured upper-division enrollment at a UC campus. The University is considering how this option would work from a number of different viewpoints, beginning with the State's. While it would appear that this program would produce cost savings, this result could be offset by the fact that transfer students take longer to complete the upper division. There will be additional costs for the community colleges that would be asked to enroll these additional students, and there is a question of the capacity of these colleges to provide the specialized course work the University requires. Provost King observed that the transfer program could provide guaranteed admission to a UC campus, but he also reported a low level of interest in the Dual Admissions Program, which was implemented for fall 2003. For the University, the program offers a way to address enrollment demand. The Master Plan specifies at least a 60:40 ratio of upper-division to lower-division enrollment; currently the ratio is at 62:38. The Governor's program has the potential to affect students who choose the traditional transfer route.

Regent Lee pointed out that one of the State's more serious problems is a shortage of students studying science and engineering, resulting in the need to import skilled workers. He noted that the community colleges were not able to offer enough courses in these fields and asked for comment on how that might change. Chancellor Kanter described an intersegmental project that brings together at-risk high school students, high school faculty, and community college faculty and provides the students with internships at the NASA-Ames Research Center. She believed that, in order to address Regent Lee's concern, there would need to be a more intense interaction among universities, the community colleges, and the high schools, with a focus on science and engineering. As the result of the passage of a local bond measure, Foothill-DeAnza is able to construct three new science centers.

Vice Provost Maslach reiterated the fact that the community colleges are not able to provide the required courses in these fields, adding that they should not be expected to do so. The Berkeley campus is looking at developing online courses in engineering to provide training for students in the community colleges. The campus has found that transfer students are also underrepresented in the biological sciences, which she speculated was due in part to a lack of preparation in high school.

In response to a comment by Regent Davies regarding the lack of preparation in English and mathematics, Chancellor Kanter confirmed that this is a statewide phenomenon. The tenth grade exit exam serves as the standard for assessing preparedness. She acknowledged the major challenge this presents for the community colleges.

Regent Connerly raised the issue of the comparative cost of educating a student at the University of California, the California State University, and the California Community Colleges. Vice President Hershman explained that UC receives approximately \$8,000 per

student FTE, while CSU receives about \$6,000 and the community colleges \$4,000 per student. He indicated that this is why the State believes it will save money as students are shifted from UC and CSU to the community colleges. Regent Connerly suggested that economic realities would effectively force a change in the Master Plan as UC-eligible students are diverted to the community colleges, and he asked how the University intended to encourage students to participate. Provost King noted that this question was a prime subject for the California Education Round Table and that the State will provide funding for UC counselors at community college campuses.

President Dynes recalled that Vice Provost Maslach had touched on some aspects of the undergraduate experience which are lost to transfer students and suggested that the issue also needed to be considered in this light.

Regent Bodine believed that it would be difficult to convince a student who is UC eligible to attend a community college. She pointed out that the State would never have sufficient funding to enable all 108 community colleges to provide the level of course work required by the University. She asked whether it was envisioned that in the future there would be two tiers of community colleges, those focused on vocational training and those concentrating on college preparation. While she was not convinced that a two-tier approach was the best solution, she did believe it would be necessary to create campuses that specifically prepare students to transfer to the University. Chancellor Kanter pointed out that access to higher education should be afforded to all regions of the state. Regent Bodine acknowledged the need for diversity in the geographic locations of feeder schools.

Regent Kozberg commented on the diverse curriculum that is provided by the community colleges, ranging from the training of health-care professionals to technology training to automotive repair. She asked whether consideration had been given to specialization within the local community college districts. Chancellor Kanter recalled that historically the focus of community colleges had been vocational programs, with the core general offerings available at each of the campuses. She believed that it would be a mistake for some community colleges to concentrate only on transfer students.

Regent Huerta commented on the social problems that are reflected in the lack of preparation on the part of students who enter the community colleges and asked about research being performed in this area. Provost King noted that a component of the University's outreach program is UC ACCORD, a Universitywide program based at UCLA, that does research on issues that affect college-going rates among different population groups.

Regent Moores predicted that the most-qualified students who are not offered direct admission to UC would go elsewhere. He believed that the least-competitive applicants would choose to defer enrollment, which could lower the University's academic standards. Referring to the statistic presented by Chancellor Kanter that 80 percent of the students who enroll in a community college are not prepared in English and/or mathematics, he anticipated that these students would have a difficult time upon transferring to the University of

California. Chancellor Kanter noted that the community colleges were working with the high schools to improve students' preparation for college.

In response to a question from Regent Sayles regarding the number of underrepresented minority students in the transfer pool, Provost King explained that the overall pool of community college students is quite diverse. Due to a host of factors, however, this diversity is not as present in the transfer pool. He emphasized the role played by counselors in the community colleges in improving the transfer rate of underrepresented minority students. Chancellor Kanter commented that these factors include the need to work or to care for a child. Vice Provost Maslach discussed a successful program that was established at the transfer center on the Berkeley campus which provides mentoring to community college students at Vista College.

Regent Montoya commented on some of the benefits that could be gained from attending a community college, including hands-on attention and the ability to live closer to home. Vice Provost Maslach confirmed that economic considerations are an important factor for most transfer students.

Faculty Representative Pitts recalled that the Master Plan for Education was before the Legislature for approval. The University is not entirely in agreement with some of the proposals contained in this legislation. UC faculty are working with the other segments to keep the higher education portions of the original Master Plan intact. The new Master Plan represents a bold effort to improve K-12 education, but the economy is not favorable for implementation.

3. **UPDATE ON ELIGIBILITY AND ADMISSIONS STUDY GROUP**

Senior Vice President Darling reported that the study group had met three times since the November 2003 Regents meeting; the purpose of these meetings was to provide background to the study group members about UC eligibility and admissions policies and processes. The first meeting focused on eligibility requirements, including the eligibility index formulated by the faculty and the upcoming eligibility study to be issued by the California Postsecondary Education Commission in May. The second meeting focused on comprehensive review and included a presentation on the wide variation of academic preparation in California's high schools. This provided a basis for understanding why the University evaluates students in the context of the opportunities for achievement they have had in their respective schools. Campus faculty and admissions directors discussed the three types of comprehensive review that are used by UC campuses: the fixed-weight process used at the Davis, Santa Barbara, and San Diego campuses; the matrix model used at Irvine and UCLA; and the unitary process used by UC Berkeley. Mr. Darling continued that at its third meeting the study group examined the composition of the student body both before and after the adoption of comprehensive review and examined data on student academic performance upon completion of the first year at the University of California. The study group discussed efficiencies that are under way and under development to streamline the admissions process

and the challenges of improving the clarity of UC's admissions processes. The group's next meeting will focus on the policy issues that will guide its findings and recommendations.

Regent Connerly observed that if the State's economy fails to improve, resulting in structural changes at the University of California, UC would be in the position of accepting the top 11 to 11.5 percent of eligible high school graduates. The University will need to address the criteria by which these students will be admitted. He stressed the need for the study group to take economic considerations into account during its deliberations.

In response to a comment by Regent Murray regarding the timing of the CPEC eligibility study, Vice President Darling recalled that it is the responsibility of the Board on Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) to make recommendations to The Regents with respect to adjustments to admissions criteria following the issuance of an eligibility study.

Faculty Representative Pitts noted that the Eligibility in the Local Context program had been recommended by BOARS as a direct result of CPEC's 1996 study. BOARS is working in parallel with the study group on the issues that are under consideration, including a statement of principles related to eligibility.

4. **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, 2003 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.]

Senior Vice President Darling pointed out that the University had doubled the level of private support over the past decade. Funds raised have remained at over \$1 billion for the past four years.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

Attest:

Secretary