

The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

March 18, 2004

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

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

In attendance: Regents Connerly, Montoya, Parsky, 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, Doby, Drake, Foley, Gomes, and Hershman, Chancellors Carnesale, Córdoba, Tomlinson-Keasey, and Yang, Executive Vice Chancellor Gray representing Chancellor Berdahl, and Recording Secretary Nietfeld

The meeting convened at 11:56 a.m. with Committee Chair Kozberg presiding.

1. READING OF NOTICE OF MEETING

For the record, it was confirmed that notice had been given in compliance with the Bylaws and Standing Orders for a Special Meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy, for this date and time, for the purpose of acting on ***RE-43: Adoption of Resolution Reaffirming Policy on Comprehensive Review in Undergraduate Admissions.***

2. UPDATE ON ELIGIBILITY AND ADMISSIONS STUDY GROUP

President Dynes reported that the study group had recently held its final meeting; a written report is in preparation. He expressed his appreciation to the members of the study group, which was co-chaired by Regent Kozberg and Senior Vice President Darling, noting that a considerable amount of time and effort had been required. The President recalled that the University had recently released new admissions data that had compared students of different races and ethnic backgrounds before and after the passage of Proposition 209 and had examined whether any groups of students had been treated differently in the admissions process. The results show that before Proposition 209 there were large differences in how similar students of different races fared in the admissions process, which at the time expressly and legally considered race and ethnicity as a factor. The data show that these large differences have been dramatically reduced in the current race-neutral process. The analysis demonstrates that African-American and Latino students continue to be underrepresented at the University compared with other groups and with their representation in the high school population.

President Dynes emphasized that the University takes these issues seriously and will continue to share results.

Regent Kozberg explained that the report to be presented by Senior Vice President Darling was an abridged version of the study group's report. She acknowledged the benefits that had been derived from the ability of Regents, faculty, students, and administrators to work together on issues related to eligibility and admissions. She noted that the group had provided an opportunity for the Board on Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) to share faculty input.

Senior Vice President Darling commented that the study group had recognized that the integrity of the admissions process is crucial to the University's credibility with students, parents, the schools, and the public. In keeping with the spirit of openness, all of the study group's agendas and narrative materials were posted on the University's website. Mr. Darling reported that the study group had unanimously adopted 15 findings and recommendations that cover eligibility, admissions, oversight, efficiency, clarity, and compliance with State and federal laws. He briefly outlined the definitions of eligibility and admissions, noting that the Master Plan for Higher Education stipulates that the top 12.5 percent of California's public high school graduates are guaranteed admission to at least one UC campus. Students become eligible by completing required academic courses, earning sufficient grades, and achieving appropriate scores on college admissions tests. Individual campuses evaluate the applications of eligible students and make admissions decisions using the process known as comprehensive review.

Vice President Darling presented the study group's three recommendations related to eligibility:

- BOARS should recommend to The Regents in July 2004 how to adjust eligibility criteria, based upon data provided in the California Postsecondary Education Commission's (CPEC) eligibility study to be issued in May 2004. It has been estimated that current eligibility rates may be as high as 15 percent. BOARS should also examine the test scores and grade point averages used in the UC eligibility index.
- CPEC should monitor eligibility rates at three-year intervals. Longer intervals between studies increase the likelihood of substantial differences between the goal of 12.5 percent and the actual percentage of students who are eligible. The study group also asks that BOARS consider annual or biannual monitoring of eligibility rates in order to inform the University on a more timely basis about the need to make adjustments in eligibility criteria.
- BOARS should re-examine the guidelines on Admission by Exception. Since its inception, the University has admitted students who do not meet all of the eligibility criteria but who demonstrate unusual achievement or potential. The Master Plan

and Regental policy limit the admission to six percent of the enrolled class. The study group strongly recommends that the University retain the ability to use the full six percent, even though the number of students admitted by exception is less than two percent.

The study group looked at the multiple goals of the University's admissions process in some depth and made six findings and recommendations. First, the study group recommends that the following Regental policy on undergraduate admissions, adopted in 1988, be reaffirmed:

“To seek out and enroll on each of its campuses a student body that demonstrates high academic achievement or exceptional personal talent, and that encompasses the broad diversity of backgrounds characteristic of California.”

The study group affirms that the University is best served when each campus admits its students from the full range of the eligibility pool. The group does not believe that the campuses should be segregated into quality tiers. At the same time, it recommends that BOARS study campus practices and report to The Regents on the benefits and consequences of admitting from the full range of the eligibility pool. The study group has asked the faculty to examine how well campus admissions practices align with Regental and BOARS policies in order to ensure that comprehensive review is being implemented effectively across the University. While the study group acknowledges that there are sound reasons for the University's policies with respect to letters of recommendation, the use of the personal statement, and the appeals process, it has nonetheless asked BOARS to examine whether the University should require applicants to submit at least one letter of recommendation from an academic source. A further question is whether the personal statement should be used to assess an applicant's writing skills and grammar, as currently it is read only for content. Finally, BOARS should determine whether campus appeals processes should be more consistent.

Turning to oversight of the admissions process, Vice President Darling explained that the study group was recommending that BOARS expand the information in its annual report on admissions to include data on the full distribution of applicants and admitted students. The report should provide information on student persistence to degree and academic performance once enrolled, as well as data on applicants who are denied admission. The report also should include information on aspects of the admissions process that present greater risk of error, such as admissions of students with relatively weak academic qualifications and denial of students with relatively strong qualifications.

The study group provided a forum where key constituents could address admissions issues in depth. The group recommends that the President appoint the study group, or a similarly constituted body, which would meet twice a year to address salient eligibility and admissions issues. In addition, incoming Regents should receive a comprehensive orientation on issues pertaining to eligibility and admission.

Because the study group wishes to make the admissions process more efficient and clearer, it recommends that the University streamline admissions processing using technology to eliminate unnecessary duplication of effort. The study group requests that BOARS report on its progress in its next annual report. President Dynes asked the study group to improve communications with the public about UC's admissions policies. The group recommends more aggressive efforts, including the convening of focus groups to identify applicants' information needs, simplifying publications, and improving the clarity of the information made available on University websites.

The final topic addressed by the study group was compliance with State and federal law. Mr. Darling explained that federal law prohibits practices that have the effect of discriminating on the basis of race or ethnicity, even when there is no intent to discriminate. Any practice that results in a significant disparity in admit rates between ethnic groups must be justified on the ground that it is educationally necessary and that alternatives creating smaller disparities do not exist. State law prohibits the University from granting preferential treatment in the admissions process to any individual or group on the basis of race, sex, color, ethnicity, or national origin. Although State and federal law are not congruent, the University must comply with both. The study group examined data to determine whether UC's admissions processes, policies, and outcomes are in compliance with State and federal law. The group found that African-American and Chicano/Latino students are substantially underrepresented at the University of California, which is due to the fact that a lower proportion of these underrepresented students meet UC's eligibility requirements. Not all of California's students receive the academic preparation required to qualify for admission. The University and the State should continue to invest in programs that help students of all backgrounds prepare for a four-year college education.

Turning to compliance with State law, Vice President Darling explained that the study group had focused on whether race and ethnicity played a role in the admissions process similar to the role they had played prior to the adoption of Proposition 209. The group looked at data from 1997 and 2003 and performed a logistic regression analysis, holding constant multiple factors in admissions, to determine what role, if any, race and ethnicity play in the process. This method was recommended by outside statistical experts whom the study group consulted to ensure that it was using the most appropriate methodology. Mr. Darling recalled that comprehensive review involves the use of 14 evaluative criteria. An analysis based on only four or five of these criteria would suggest that race plays a larger role in admissions decisions for students of different ethnicities. The study group was not able to include all of the criteria in its analysis because some of them are not easily quantified. The study group found that major differences in the admission rates of similar students of different races and ethnicities had been substantially reduced at each campus since Proposition 209 took effect.

Senior Vice President Darling displayed graphs depicting admissions data by ethnic group at the San Diego campus for the years 1997 and 2003. He observed that far fewer African-American and Chicano/Latino students than white and Asian students had been admitted in

both years; this pattern holds true across all UC campuses. In 1997, before Proposition 209 took effect, the San Diego campus admitted 77.4 percent of African-American applicants. The statistical model predicted that if race had not been a factor, the admission rate would have been 39 percent. In 2003, 30.2 percent of African-American applicants were admitted, while the model predicted 28.5 percent. The study group believes that these data demonstrate the University's good-faith effort to comply with Proposition 209. The analysis also showed a consistent pattern of slight differences on every selective campus between the predicted and actual admission rates for African-American and Chicano/Latino students because they have been admitted at slightly higher rates than those suggested by the model. On several campuses there is a pattern of slightly fewer Asian-American students being admitted than the model predicted. The Office of the President, in cooperation with the campuses, is examining both sets of patterns to determine whether they are artifacts of the model or whether preferences might still exist in campus admissions processes. Vice President Darling then presented a chart showing predicted and actual admits by racial/ethnic group for the Berkeley campus which indicated that the gap between predicted and actual admit rates for underrepresented students had narrowed since 1997, although they are higher than those predicted by the model. The Office of the President and the Berkeley campus are conducting a rigorous analysis to understand these differences and to quantify those admissions criteria that the study group was unable to quantify. If the initial analysis does not eliminate any areas of concern, President Dynes has asked that changes be made to campus admissions practices prior to the next admissions cycle. The final recommendation of the study group is that this initial analysis be completed as soon as possible in order to resolve any remaining concerns.

Regent Bustamante asked whether it was the view of the study group that comprehensive review was in violation of Proposition 209. Vice President Darling assured the Lieutenant Governor that it is the opinion of the General Counsel that UC's comprehensive review policies are in compliance with Proposition 209. In response to a further question, Mr. Darling noted that the data have shown that any preferences that may exist are minimal. Regent Bustamante asked about the predictive value of the SAT versus grade point average. Mr. Darling recalled that, following extensive study, the faculty and BOARS came to the conclusion that the high school grade point average is a better predictor than is the SAT. BOARS has recommended that the GPA be given greater weight than SAT scores.

Regent Bustamante referred to a letter from Chancellor Berdahl to *Forbes Magazine* in response to the article by Regent Moores and asked that the letter be distributed to the Regents and placed into the record of the meeting. He believed that the Chancellor's letter discounted the points put forward by Regent Moores in his editorial.

Regent Connerly recalled that when The Regents voted to abolish affirmative action at the University of California, it was with the goal of treating all applicants for admission fairly and equally. Students should be guaranteed that no preferences exist in the admissions process. Regent Connerly observed that he had supported comprehensive review, as well as the rescission of SP-1, in order to effect as smooth a transition as possible. While he

continued to have some misgivings about the possibility that academic measurements would be overwhelmed by other criteria used in the admissions process, he believed that ultimately comprehensive review would result in the best admissions process in the country.

Regent Hopkinson commented that the summary report presented by Vice President Darling on behalf of the study group had reinforced her belief that a positive process had been put into place. She agreed with the need to pursue any remaining issues and expressed her confidence that most would be explained when the remaining criteria used in comprehensive review were taken into account. She expressed concern that funding for outreach was not being provided to the University, which could lead to even lower levels of enrollment by underrepresented minority students.

Regent Murray informed the Committee that he had been approached by students who had concerns about protecting individual privacy rights in the admissions process and asked that the General Counsel assure him that the release of data had followed appropriate policies and federal and State privacy laws. General Counsel Holst confirmed that a foremost consideration had been rigorous attention to the appropriate handling of personally identifiable information, particularly as it applies to the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act.

In response to a question from Regent Montoya, Senior Vice President Darling explained that a number of changes to the University's admissions processes had taken place as a result of the work of the study group. Current technology permits the elimination of an applicant's name from the application form. Regent Montoya requested a full list of the changes in the comprehensive review process that had resulted from the eligibility and admissions study.

Faculty Representative Pitts acknowledged the contributions of the faculty through BOARS to the work of the study group. He extended an invitation to the Regents to inform the faculty of any issues they may wish to see included in the next annual report on comprehensive review.

Regent Connerly was pleased to learn that campuses would be able to remove a student's name from the application, but he remained concerned that students are being coached to use references in the personal statement that may reflect their race or ethnicity.

President Dynes emphasized the fact that the issues considered by the study group are ongoing and would continue to evolve.

Speaking as a member of the study group, Regent Lozano believed that there had not been a conclusive assessment of the impact of admissions policies on the admissions program. As a result, BOARS has been asked to continue to look at this issue, using all of the 14 evaluative admissions criteria. She suggested that it would not be appropriate for anyone to draw conclusions from work performed to date.

3. **ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION REAFFIRMING POLICY ON COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW IN UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS**

Regents Hopkinson, Lozano, and Marcus recommended that the following resolution be adopted:

Whereas, on May 16, 2001, the University of California Board of Regents adopted RE-28, stating that “the University shall seek out and enroll, on each of its campuses, a student body that demonstrates high academic achievement or exceptional personal talent, and that encompasses the broad diversity of backgrounds characteristic of California,” a goal that is in keeping with the mission of a public land-grant university; and

Whereas, The Regents adopted comprehensive review on November 15, 2001, to accomplish this goal of evaluating undergraduate applicants using multiple measures of achievement and promise while considering the context in which each student has demonstrated academic accomplishment; and

Whereas, the vast majority of selective public and private research universities throughout the United States use comprehensive review to admit their undergraduate students; and

Whereas, The Regents has confidence in the academic qualifications and potential of the students admitted through comprehensive review on the basis of fourteen criteria, rather than solely on high-school grade-point average and college-admissions test scores; and

Whereas, the University’s comprehensive review policies comply with California law as enacted by Proposition 209; and

Whereas, in approving the comprehensive review resolution, The Regents called for an annual review and reporting on the implementation of these policies; and

Whereas, The Regents affirms the role of the faculty, subject to approval of The Regents, in setting the conditions for admissions to the University through the Academic Senate Board on Admissions and Relations with Schools, which has served the University well and contributed immeasurably to the University’s rise to international academic prominence; and

Whereas, the Eligibility and Admissions Study Group has performed a valuable review of undergraduate admissions policies and practices, identified certain areas that need further evaluation and study, and underscored the University’s commitment to continue its ongoing review of these policies and modify them as needed; and

Whereas, The Regents commends President Dynes, the chancellors, and the faculty through BOARS for their continued improvement of UC's admissions processes, evidenced by their commitment to make any necessary changes in time for the next admissions cycle;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that The Regents affirms the use of comprehensive review in the University's undergraduate admissions;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that The Regents is committed to the continued monitoring, evaluation, and improvement of the implementation procedures and methods to assure their effectiveness and compliance with University policies as well as federal and state law;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the views on UC admissions policies expressed by Regent John J. Moores in the March 12, 2004, edition of *Forbes* magazine do not represent the views of the Board of Regents.

Regent Hopkinson observed that the proposed resolution reaffirms the commitment to comprehensive review and indicates that the opinion of Chairman Moores expressed in his article in *Forbes* is not the position of The Regents.

Chairman Moores referred to the role of the Regents in the oversight of the University's admissions policies. He noted that the study group had brought to light campus admissions practices of which the Regents had not been aware. For example, no Regent knew that the Berkeley campus had admitted some students with SAT scores lower than 1,000, as his research has demonstrated. When he shared his data with several former and current Regents, all expressed shock at these findings. Chairman Moores stressed that the Regents should have been kept informed. He believed that, when The Regents adopted comprehensive review, the Board had not been informed that every campus would be encouraged to admit students from the entire eligibility pool, which is a significant departure from prior University policy. Regent Moores felt that the standards for admission to the University were quite low because the eligibility index is used to admit students who are in the top 12.5 percent of California's high school students but who may have average grades or test scores. He continued that the University has recently been in the practice of admitting more than the top 12.5 percent of high school graduates, which is a policy matter that should have been discussed by the Regents, given that senior management was aware of this fact. Regent Moores referred to a recent editorial in the *San Francisco Chronicle* which had decried the fact that the University could fail in its historical commitment to admit the state's top 12.5 percent of high school students. He stressed that the University would continue to do so, given the fact that it admits a higher percentage of students than is called for in the Master Plan.

Regent Moores expressed concern that numerous studies which had been performed by the University on the issues outlined by Vice President Darling on whether or not the University

is in violation of the State constitution with respect to the use of race or ethnicity in admissions had not been disclosed to the Regents. He believed that his study and others had demonstrated that Asian-American applicants were being discriminated against. One study was identified as being confidential under the attorney-client privilege. Regent Moores suggested that General Counsel Holst faced a difficult situation, as it was his responsibility to advise the University while at the same time serving as counsel to the Board. In concluding his remarks, Regent Moores expressed his disappointment that the study group had failed to provide transparency to the University's admissions process.

Regent Parsky pointed out that questions still remain with respect to comprehensive review and suggested that the proposed resolution should not be viewed as a conclusion. He believed that Regent Moores has a right, as an individual and as a Regent, to express his views on the University's admissions process, as have other Regents in the past. Regent Parsky suggested that a different issue pertained to Regent Moores' role as Chairman of The Regents, because a statement by the Chairman could be interpreted as the views of the entire Board, when that is not the case. He noted that the *Forbes* article identified Regent Moores as Chairman. Regent Parsky urged the Committee to amend the resolution to indicate the objection to Regent Moores' expressing his views in his role as Chairman, as follows:

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the views on UC admissions policies expressed by Regent John J. Moores, as Chairman of the Board of Regents, in the March 12, 2004, edition of *Forbes* magazine do not represent the views of the Board of Regents.

Regents Hopkinson and Marcus accepted Regent Parsky's suggestion.

Regent Lozano shared the concerns expressed by Regent Parsky as reflected in the amended resolution. She believed that the role of the Chairman was to serve as a liaison between the Regents and the President. She noted that the resolution reaffirms the University's commitment to enrolling a diverse student body. The study group has identified areas that require further examination and study. She urged The Regents to support the resolution.

Regent Connerly pointed out that what was being contemplated was the censure of a member of the Board for one magazine article. He suggested that a more appropriate response would be for a Regent with differing views to submit another article articulating that viewpoint. He believed that it was clear that some Regents did not agree with the conclusions drawn by Regent Moores about the University's admissions process. He did not see the need for The Regents as a body to adopt a resolution censuring Regent Moores. Regent Connerly also drew attention to the generous contributions that Mr. and Mrs. Moores have made to the University of California as an indication of their feelings for the institution.

Regent Preuss observed that members of the Board should have respect for one another and should take pride in their ability to disagree without losing their civility. He believed that both the work of the study group and the research performed by Regent Moores had been

based upon a careful examination of the relevant data. Regent Preuss stated that he was unable to support the resolution, and in particular the statement that “the University’s comprehensive review policies comply with California law as enacted by Proposition 209.” He, too, saw the need for further study before any conclusions may be drawn.

Regent Johnson was concerned about the remarks made during the public comment period by African-American students at the Berkeley campus who alleged that a climate of racism exists there, in part as a result of the publication of Regent Moores’ views. She believed that the University had a responsibility to ensure that all students feel welcome on campus. The study group had received information that the small number of students who were admitted to Berkeley with comparatively low SAT scores were making good progress. She did not want these students to feel that the Regents believe that they do not belong at Berkeley. Regent Johnson believed that the adoption of the resolution would reinforce the view that all admitted students are qualified to attend the University of California.

Regent Marcus believed that Regent Moores’ article could be potentially damaging to the University because it presented a partial argument. He did not feel that it was appropriate for a Regent to endanger the reputation of the University, particularly when the issues related to comprehensive review are not fully understood. He stressed that the quality of the institution depends upon its ability to attract the best faculty, students, and staff. He supported the resolution, which was not about Regent Moores but rather any Regent who purports to express the views of the University.

Regent Kozberg stressed that it was important to clear the record with respect to The Regents’ commitment to comprehensive review in order to reinforce the fact that the *Forbes* article is an opinion and not necessarily a reality.

Regent Moores commented on the irony that his research had mainly focused on the Berkeley campus, which was the home of the Free Speech Movement. He believed that the resolution was aimed at stopping his right to exercise free speech. Regent Moores emphasized his belief in the data his research had produced and suggested that the Berkeley campus was using comprehensive review to circumvent Proposition 209. He saw no justification for the resolution coming to The Regents at this time, noting that Vice President Darling’s presentation on behalf of the study group had made it clear that some issues need to be examined further. Regent Moores did not believe the *Forbes* article could be mistaken for anything but his own personal opinion; the first paragraph of the article makes it clear that he has one vote on the Board of Regents. Because multiple studies have indicated that some problems persist with respect to admission, Regent Moores asked what would happen if those studies are confirmed.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the resolution, as amended, and voted to present it to the Board, Regents Bodine, Dynes, Hopkinson, Johnson, Kozberg, Lozano, Marcus, Murray, and Sayles (9) voting “aye,” and Regent Moores (1) voting “no.”

4. **DESIGNATION OF REAL PROPERTY, NEVADA COUNTY, SAGEHEN CREEK FIELD STATION, NATURAL RESERVE SYSTEM**

Secretary Trivette corrected the recommendation which had been submitted to the Committee to read as follows:

The President recommends that the Committee on Educational Policy recommend to The Regents that The Regents designate the Sagehen Creek Field Station (Sagehen) as a component of the University's systemwide Natural Reserve System (NRS), with no change in the day-to-day management of Sagehen by the Berkeley campus.

The Committee was informed Sagehen is located on the east slope of the northern Sierra Nevada, approximately 7.8 miles north of Truckee, California. In 1951, the University entered into a long-term cooperative agreement with the U.S. Forest Service for the University's non-exclusive use of certain Tahoe National Forest lands within the 8000-acre Sagehen Creek basin for research, teaching, and related activities. Thereafter, the Forest Service issued a number of Special Use Permits that allowed the University to construct modest cabins and supporting infrastructure on the site. The Berkeley campus has managed 445.5 acres and 1.5 miles along Sagehen Creek since 1951; currently, the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research administers Sagehen with additional support from the Berkeley Natural History Museums and the California Biodiversity Center.

In spring 2003, the Berkeley campus requested the inclusion of Sagehen Creek Field Station within the NRS, as membership in the NRS would enhance Sagehen's ability to develop additional links with faculty, students, and other investigators throughout the UC system and beyond. Furthermore, the Berkeley campus would benefit by making this field station a part of a systemwide unit that provides guidance on broad policy issues, extensive support in reserve administration, data management, and publications. Inclusion of Sagehen within the NRS will not result in increased costs because administrative and fiscal responsibility will remain with the Berkeley campus, consistent with the administrative structure of the NRS.

In accordance with NRS guidelines, the Universitywide NRS Advisory Committee appointed a multi-campus review committee to analyze the site and the program, and the review committee unanimously recommended such inclusion, concluding that Sagehen would add to the suite of NRS reserves a site with high biological and physiographic diversity.

Sagehen is embedded in a mosaic of vegetation communities that includes coniferous forest, montane chaparral, sagebrush steppe, wet and dry meadows, and spring-fed fens. The forest varies in age and composition but is dominated by Jeffrey pine, lodgepole pine, and white fir. This high-habitat diversity is due to the topographic and hydrologic complexity of the basin, combined with a strong east-west precipitation gradient. No existing NRS reserve contains this particular constellation of habitats.

Sagehen has been the focus of substantial research and teaching activity in the environmental sciences, providing valuable opportunities on a watershed-wide scale. The field station is assuming an increasingly prominent role as a regional center for analysis and integration of environmental and other data. Sagehen is also the hub of a larger regional network of UC field facilities and reserves, the Central Sierra Field Research Stations, which includes Sagehen Creek Field Station, Central Sierra Snow Laboratory, the Chickering American River Reserve, and the North Fork Association lands.

The proposed designation, which solely involves an internal administrative change that does not involve a name change, is not defined as a project under the California Environmental Quality Act.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the President’s recommendation and voted to present it to the Board.

The Committee recessed at 1:25 p.m.

.....

The Committee reconvened at 1:37 p.m. with Committee Chair Kozberg presiding.

5. **QUARTERLY REPORT ON PRIVATE SUPPORT**

In accordance with the Schedule of Reports, the **Quarterly Report on Private Support** for the period October 1 through December 31, 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.]

6. **MULTI-ETHNIC DESIGNATION ON THE UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS APPLICATION**

Committee Chair Kozberg indicated that this matter was being deferred to the May 2004 meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 1:38 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary