The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
May 19, 2004

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

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

In attendance: Regents Blum, Connerly, Lee, Montoya, Pattiz, Preuss, and Seigler, Regent-designate Anderson, Faculty Representative Pitts, Associate Secretary Shaw, General Counsel Holst, Treasurer Russ, Provost Greenwood, Senior Vice Presidents Darling and Mullinix, Vice Presidents Broome and Doby, Chancellors Bishop, Carnesale, Cicerone, Córdova, Tomlinson-Keasey, Vanderhoef, and Yang, Acting Chancellor Chemers, and Recording Secretary Nietfeld

The meeting convened at 1:55 p.m. with Committee Chair Kozberg presiding.

1. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meetings of March 17 and 18, 2004 were approved.

2. **FRESHMAN ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS AND THE CPEC ELIGIBILITY STUDY** and **UPDATE ON THE FALL 2004 ADMISSIONS CYCLE, INCLUDING THE GUARANTEED TRANSFER OPTION**

Provost Greenwood explained that her presentation would focus on eligibility and admissions and would provide background information for the July discussion of proposed changes to UC's eligibility requirements. The question of the best process and calendar by which to review and adjust UC eligibility criteria was discussed by the Eligibility and Admissions Study Group, which recommended that following receipt of the California Postsecondary Education Commission's eligibility study, the Board on Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) present a plan for determining the top 12.5 percent of public high school graduates to The Regents by July 2004. Provost Greenwood recalled that the foundation of eligibility had always been based upon academic factors alone. These subject and scholarship requirements are drawn up by the Academic Senate and must be approved by The Regents. Under the Master Plan, attainment of these requirements has traditionally guaranteed admission to the University of California, although not necessarily to the campus or program of choice. The selection of an applicant by a campus is based upon overall guidelines set by BOARS, while the campus faculty determine local criteria and processes using the principles of comprehensive review. The Provost noted that, in addition

to statewide eligibility, two other paths to UC exist: the Eligibility in the Local Context program and the eligible by examination alone, which captures students who may not have completed the full course pattern nor achieved high grades but who excel on standardized admissions tests. Once they have achieved eligibility, students are admitted to a campus of the University. Students who are not admitted to the campus or campuses to which they applied are referred to a campus with enrollment capacity, typically Riverside and Santa Cruz. In addition, UC policy permits campuses to admit a small number of students (no more than six percent of the enrolled freshman class) in exception to the eligibility requirements. At present, less than two percent of the class is admitted by exception.

Provost Greenwood continued that, in order to attain statewide eligibility, a student must complete a minimum of 15 year-long (a)-(g) college preparatory courses, with the earned grade point average in these courses carrying the greatest weight in the admissions process. Scores on a required pattern of five standardized tests are taken in consideration, although they carry less weight than the GPA. Most applicants to the University far exceed the minimum requirements, and the number of approved (a)-(g) courses UC-bound students enroll in has climbed steadily. For example, the average number of year-long, UC-certified college preparatory courses completed by UC-eligible applicants in 2003 was 23, or more than five such courses every term for four years. Seventy-five percent of the students in the eligibility pool have GPAs of 3.5 or higher, and 80 percent earn average scores of 500 or higher across all five required tests. Provost Greenwood displayed a graphic illustration of how the GPA and average test scores are weighted in order to determine eligibility. A student with a relatively low grade point average will be required to earn high SAT scores. Fewer than two percent of eligible 2003 applicants had GPAs below 3.0, and the average test scores for these students were above 600. Another 0.3 percent had average test scores below 400, with average GPAs above 3.65.

Turning to the fall 2004 admissions process, Provost Greenwood recalled that enrollment reductions had resulted in the redirection of some eligible students to the community colleges through a program known as the Guaranteed Transfer Option. The University received nearly 64,000 applications from California resident freshman applicants, which represents a slight decline from the previous year. In addition, there were 22,541 California resident transfer applicants, an increase of 12.9 percent from 2003. About 73.5 percent of fall freshman applicants, totaling 46,923, were admitted to a campus of choice, while about six percent were offered winter or spring admission at a campus of choice or referred to the Riverside campus. A further 11.9 percent of eligible applicants were offered the Guaranteed Transfer Option. The transfer outcomes and the freshman statements of intent to register in the GTO are not yet available.

Provost Greenwood reported that the academic quality of applicants as measured by grades and test scores had consistently improved over the past ten years. For fall 2004, the proportion of first-generation college going and low-income admitted students increased slightly. Underrepresented minority students also increased slightly as a proportion of total

students admitted, although the numbers of students admitted declined and, for some groups and some campuses, the decreases were pronounced.

The budget principles that were adopted by The Regents stated that there would be no unfunded enrollments. The Governor's January budget proposed a reduction in enrollment and suggested redirecting students to community colleges, with a waiving of the community college fees for students who are redirected. The University faced the option of denying eligible applicants or deferring their enrollment. Provost Greenwood recalled that in 2001 The Regents had approved the Dual Admissions Program, which was intended to enable students who were not eligible as freshmen to attend a community college for two years and then to enroll at a UC campus. Using the Guaranteed Transfer Option, which is modeled on the DAP, 7,620 UC-eligible applicants were deferred to a community college for fall 2004 and guaranteed transfer admission. The Provost stressed that the main objective with guaranteed transfer had been to provide students with a clear path to the University of California.

Regent Montoya asked about the objective criteria that were used to determine which applicants should be redirected to the community colleges. Provost Greenwood explained that the criteria were those that every campus would have used in a normal year. These students would not have been admitted to any of the campuses to which they had applied and would have been referred to Riverside or Santa Cruz. Only a small percentage of affected students accept these referrals.

In response to a question from Regent Moores, Provost Greenwood confirmed that those students who would normally have been placed in the referral pool but this year were given the option of guaranteed transfer are able to choose from those campuses that offer them this path to admission. Regent Moores observed that it would be likely that the most highly qualified students would not accept the guaranteed transfer option. Provost Greenwood reported that to date 560 students had responded positively to the offer, many of whom wish to enroll at a selective campus. She confirmed Regent Moores' assumption that the best students would choose to go elsewhere.

Regent Moores pointed out that, because the University has been admitting more than the top 12.5 percent of high school graduates specified in the Master Plan, it is likely that some of the students who typically are placed in the referral pool would not have been eligible were UC making eligible only the top 12.5 percent. Provost Greenwood agreed that, had the University corrected its eligibility requirements, there would be students who would not have been in the present eligibility pool. It is also the case that some highly-qualified students who apply to only one or two campuses and are not admitted are placed in the referral pool.

Regent Moores was of the opinion that the Guaranteed Transfer Option should have been approved by The Regents. Provost Greenwood agreed that the brief presentation to the Committee on Finance had not been sufficient for purposes of educational policy. She stated her commitment that this would not happen again.

Regent Lansing believed that all of the students in the eligibility pool are highly qualified to attend the University of California. It was her opinion that the Guaranteed Transfer Option would be chosen mainly by students who had applied to, but not been admitted by, only one campus.

Provost Greenwood presented the results of the California Postsecondary Education Commission's eligibility study for the University of California and the California State University. Established when the Master Plan was adopted, one of CPEC's main responsibilities has been to develop the methodology to assess whether UC and CSU are meeting their goals by determining the proportion of graduates who meet their eligibility requirements. The studies are typically conducted every three to eight years; the last study was performed in 1996. At that time, there was speculation that the University was admitting more than the top 12.5 percent of high school graduates. The study found that only 11.1 percent of public high school graduates met UC's requirements for eligibility. This finding led to the development of the Eligibility in the Local Context program, which was created to bring eligibility back to 12.5 percent. A secondary purpose of the ELC program was to attract applicants from schools that had never sent students to the University of California.

In response to a comment by Regent Preuss, Provost Greenwood recalled that in the 1980s, when only eight percent of the high school population was achieving eligibility, CPEC had created a category known as "potentially eligible" to describe students who were on track to college but had not fulfilled all of the entrance requirements. The 1986 eligibility study included some of the potentially eligible students to assist the University in devising strategies to reach 12.5 percent. In 1996 some campuses identified potentially eligible students and discussed with them how they could become eligible.

Turning to the methodology used by CPEC to perform its eligibility study, Provost Greenwood explained that, prior to this year's study, sample paper transcripts from every high school in the state had to be analyzed. The 2003 study involves all of the transcripts from a representative sample of high schools that are able to provide data electronically. The sample reliability was tested by outside statistical experts retained by CPEC.

The CPEC study found that 28.8 percent of the high school graduating class of 2003 were eligible for admission to the California State University and 14.4 percent were eligible to the University of California, in contrast to the Master Plan target for CSU of 33.3 percent and of 12.5 percent for UC. Provost Greenwood suggested that these results for the University should be regarded as positive because they indicate that more students have met the eligibility requirements. Although eligibility rates for African Americans and Latinos are still low at 6.2 and 6.5 percent respectively, they have shown significant improvement since the 1996 study. Provost Greenwood concluded her remarks by noting that the overall number of students graduating from California high schools who are eligible for admission to UC had grown from 28,600 in 1996 to 43,300 in 2003.

Faculty Representative Pitts provided an introduction to the discussion of BOARS' deliberations to date on changes in eligibility requirements. Because there was general agreement that the University was admitting more than the top 12.5 percent of high school graduates, BOARS began discussing the issue in September 2003, with the expectation that recommendations would be issued in May 2004. The Academic Council and Assembly will consider and finalize the recommendations in June, and they will be presented to The Regents in July.

Professor Sawrey, the chair of BOARS, observed that the University's eligibility criteria, in addition to defining the eligibility pool, provide a message to the schools and to the students about UC's expectations. In deliberating changes to the criteria, BOARS assumed that the University would continue to assign primary importance to the quantitative academic criteria that correlate with success at the University of California. These criteria must be clear and understandable to the public and should provide a stable goal for students and high schools. Professor Sawrey then outlined the following six eligibility principles:

- Students should be able to determine prior to application whether they have met the criteria for eligibility.

- The University of California should be accessible to the best students from every high school in the state.

- Since the high school record in (a)-(g) courses has the greatest predictive validity for success at UC, it should retain the highest importance among the criteria.

- The University should continue to provide admission paths for students who may be educated in non-traditional schools and programs and for those who might not meet statewide eligibility.

- BOARS should monitor statewide high school examinations and other tests that might in the future be considered for helping determine eligibility to UC.

- The definition of eligibility should be monitored and adjusted on a regular basis to ensure compliance with UC admissions goals.

Regent Moores asked how BOARS knows that a student's performance in high school is the best predictor of how well he or she will do at UC. Professor Sawrey explained that the 2001 Geiser-Studley study had confirmed this understanding, and Regent Moores requested a copy of their report.

Professor Sawrey outlined the ways by which students become eligible to attend the University, noting that the Eligibility and Admissions Study Group had recommended that consideration be given to using Admissions by Exception more frequently than is presently the case. BOARS will develop guidelines to assist the campuses in this process. BOARS

will continue to monitor what effects any changes in the eligibility criteria might have on the freshman class the University admits.

Regent Connerly was interested in knowing whether the University had always interpreted the Master Plan as requiring that it should accept the top 12.5 percent of public high school graduates or from within the top 12.5 percent. Associate Vice President Galligani pointed out that, while the Master Plan asks the University to select from the top12.5 percent, any student who meets the eligibility criteria is considered to be eligible. Provost Greenwood continued that the language that was used in various revisions of the Master Plan had evolved from "select from" to "will take."

Regent Connerly asked whether there were any way of knowing what the academic quality of accepted students would have been had enrollment been limited to the top 12.5 percent of public high school graduates. Provost Greenwood commented that there should be a way to exclude certain students from an eligibility pool and noted that she would get back to Regent Connerly on this question. She added that while the number of students in the eligibility pool had fluctuated over time, the number of students who actually enroll has remained fairly constant.

Regent Connerly expressed concern about the recommendation that the campuses make greater use of Admissions by Exception. Provost Greenwood commented that the policy permits the campuses to admit up to six percent of the freshman class. Over the past decade, however, the percentage of students who are actually admitted has dropped from four percent to 1.8 percent. Often these are talented students who have not completely fulfilled the eligibility requirements. Senior Vice President Darling continued that the Eligibility and Admissions Study Group recognized that, as the criteria for admission are tightened, the campuses will probably seek to make fuller use of this program. Professor Sawrey noted that students who receive non-traditional educations may need to come through Admissions by Exception until BOARS can develop a more normal pathway. In response to a comment by Regent Preuss, Senior Vice President Darling assured the Committee that the administration and BOARS intend to present a set of recommendations pertaining to Admissions by Exception to The Regents.

Referring to the six principles outlined by Professor Sawrey, Regent Hopkinson commented that they did not address the issue of the effect of new eligibility criteria on children who are progressing through high school according to the existing eligibility criteria. She hoped that the recommendation would have a principle that would permit students to correct as necessary to continue to be eligible for admission.

In response to a related question from Regent Murray concerning timing, Professor Sawrey noted that the implementation of new eligibility criteria would depend upon the nature of BOARS' recommendations. She recalled that the University has a policy of warning students in an appropriate time frame. Regent Murray raised the issue of the next CPEC eligibility study. Provost Greenwood pointed out that it would depend upon funding for

CPEC, as well as the cooperation received from the University and from the high schools. The hope is that the study would be conducted every four years. Committee Chair Kozberg added that the Eligibility and Admissions Study Group had recommended that the University monitor the eligibility rates.

Regent Moores observed that the number of students enrolled in private schools has been on the rise. Provost Greenwood agreed to provide him with information on the number of students who are enrolled in the state's private schools and their performance in high school and at UC relative to public school students. Professor Sawrey confirmed for Regent Moores that the participation rate of graduates of private high schools is higher than that of public schools. Regent Moores referred to the presentation by Professor Sawrey and asked about any intention to change the demographics of the entering class. Professor Sawrey explained that BOARS will consider issues such as the need to change how many students might come from low-income families or from rural or urban schools.

Regent Moores observed that, in setting the eligibility criteria, change is possible only in the areas of test scores and high school GPA. Professor Sawrey responded that BOARS would also consider class standing and the probability of success in the first year.

Regent Preuss suggested that the margin of error in the CPEC study would lead one to conclude that the data are soft. Provost Greenwood noted that a confidence level of 95 percent would not be uncommon in studies of this type.

In response to a question from Regent-designate Novack, Provost Greenwood explained that the intention had been to reduce the size of the entering class in 2004 by approximately 3,200 students, to 31,000. As the compact with the Governor goes into effect, the University will return to the 1999 growth plans, which calls for 5,000 new students per year.

In response to a request from Regent Seigler that she comment on the use of the probability of success in the first year, Professor Sawrey explained that one of the principles that had guided BOARS in establishing the eligibility index had been that all eligible students should have a projected probability of 70 percent or greater for achieving a minimum GPA of 2.0 in the freshman year.

3. **PROCESS FOR INFORMING REGENTS ABOUT ALIGNMENT WITH THE CALIFORNIA MASTER PLAN**

It was recalled that Regent Moores had suggested that The Regents consider putting into place a process to ensure that the University is in alignment with the California Master Plan for Higher Education in its admissions processes. The Master Plan calls for the University of California to admit the top 12.5 percent of the graduating public high school seniors in the state. The study conducted in 1996 by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) found that UC was admitting fewer than 12.5 percent. The University responded by adding new pathways to eligibility, including the Eligibility in the Local Context program. As a result, eligibility rates increased, and the University came into alignment with the Master Plan.

During the eight years since the CPEC study, more than 12.5 percent of the graduating students from California's public high schools have achieved UC eligibility, with some estimates putting the rate as high as 14 to 19 percent. This year, UC was unable to admit all students who met eligibility requirements. Until final data from the 2004 CPEC study are released, there exist no definitive data about the number of students who have been deemed eligible over the past eight years. Some independent studies have been conducted by the University that have been able to estimate the number of students who are considered to be eligible.

Many Regents were unaware that the UC eligibility requirements were allowing campuses to admit more than the 12.5 percent of graduating public high school students. This lack of information has prevented the Regents and the Academic Senate from adjusting eligibility requirements in order to be in alignment with the Master Plan.

Regent Moores has suggested that the Board may wish to consider methods for gaining accurate information about eligibility rates in the absence of the study performed by CPEC. Once this information is obtained, the Regents should be kept up to date on an annual basis.

Provost Greenwood assured Regent Moores that it would be her intention to continue discussions with the Regents concerning the University's eligibility and admissions requirements. If CPEC fails to perform an eligibility study at least every four years, the administration could propose that processes be put into place whereby the University would monitor eligibility using its own database. President Dynes added that the Eligibility and Admissions Study Group would continue to meet.

Regent Moores believed that the Regents should have a clear understanding of who is admitted to the University and why. The information should include the campuses to which they were admitted, test scores, and grade point averages, as well as an identification of the referral pool.

Regent Connerly stated that, while he supported the goals outlined by Regent Moores, he wished to dispel any implication that the President is responsible for the culture at the University. He noted that President Dynes had attempted to ensure that the Regents were informed about issues as they arise.

Regent Montoya requested data on students who drop out in the first quarter or semester. Regent Preuss commented on the lack of a comprehensive study of drop-outs at the University. Provost Greenwood assured him that the data would be available, and Regent Kozberg asked that the information be included as part of the report from BOARS. Provost Greenwood suggested that the Regents may wish to schedule an agenda item on the top ten questions they would like answered.

Regent Lansing asked whether it would be possible to analyze why certain students with exceptional talent in one area were not admitted. Provost Greenwood offered to follow up on this question with the eligibility study group. A further analysis should look at why certain students who do not appear to be eligible were admitted.

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

The Committee was informed that Regent Connerly had suggested that The Regents consider the issue of whether the President, in consultation with the General Counsel, should be directed to appeal the current federal paradigm for self-reporting racial or ethnic identity in order to include the option of "multi-racial" or "multi-ethnic" as a category at the University.

As a recipient of federal funds, the University of California is required to follow the federal reporting requirements of the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) of the National Center for Education Statistics in the U.S. Department of Education. IPEDS' reporting requirements are guided by OMB Statistical Policy Directive 15, *Standards for Maintaining, Collecting, and Presenting Federal Data on Race and Ethnicity*, which was last revised in 1997.

In its report announcing the revision to Directive 15, the OMB recommended that data on multiple races or ethnicities should be collected and specified that:

- *When self identification is used, a method for reporting more than one race should be adopted.*

- *The method for respondents to report more than one race should take the form of multiple responses to a single question and* ***not*** *[OMB emphasis] a "multi-racial" category*.

- *When a list of races is provided to respondents, the list should not contain a "multi-racial" category.*

Although OMB Directive 15 was implemented on January 1, 2003, the federal government has yet to issue guidelines for educational institutions regarding the aggregation of individuals reporting more than one race or ethnicity. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) of the U.S. Department of Education has asked OMB to provide more guidance to the federal statistical community in order to achieve agreement across agencies. In the meantime, NCES has published guidance to education institutions strongly recommending that institutions "do nothing at this time to change their current race and ethnicity reporting systems and formats."

UC data on students' race and ethnicity are collected on the undergraduate application, which lists 13 racial or ethnic categories, one of which is "other." Reporting of race or ethnicity is entirely voluntary. All application data are processed by an outside contractor, entered into admissions data bases, and become a part of a student's record if that student is admitted and enrolls. For the purposes of reporting to IPEDS, and consistent with OMB guidelines, these 13 categories are aggregated into five: African American/Black, American Indian, Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander, and White. Students who report "other" or who decline to state their ethnicity are reported to IPEDS in its "Unknown" category and are retained as a separate category in most UC reports.

Since 1990, UC has offered undergraduate admission applicants the option of reporting more than one race or ethnicity. The instruction reads, "Indicate your ethnic identity by checking the appropriate boxes." However, because IPEDS has not yet provided direction to institutions on the reporting of more than one race or ethnicity and has asked institutions not to change their data reporting formats, UC has continued to assign a single racial or ethnic category to applicants who check more than one box.

At present, data on multiple racial or ethnic identities that applicants report on the paper application are not retained in electronic form. As a result, the number of UC undergraduate applicants reporting more than one race or ethnicity is not known with any degree of accuracy. The electronic application, Pathways, does allow UC to retain data for applicants who report more than one identification in this category.

Coincident with the implementation of an all-electronic application which will allow the University to capture all of the ethnicity data that applicants provide, the Office of the President plans to add to its current non-federal reports the total number of applicants who indicate multiple ethnicities. Thus UC would *report* data on the number of students who are "multi-racial" but would continue to *collect* the data from applicants in a manner consistent with OMB Directive 15. The University is also asking the National Center for Education Statistics for a resolution of the unresolved question of how multiple race information should be tabulated.

Regent Connerly has suggested that UC should *collect* data from potential students using a "multi-racial" or "multi-ethnic" check box and that the President should request that the OMB revise its guidelines to permit this.

The University is conducting a UC Undergraduate Experience Survey which is targeted at all undergraduate students. The survey will query how students view and describe their own ethnicities by asking the following question: "Is your racial or ethnic identification multi-racial or multi-ethnic?" If yes: "As a multi-racial or multi-ethnic student, which of the following would you prefer on the optional racial identification section of the UC application form:

- An opportunity to check more than one racial or ethnic category
- An opportunity to check a multi-racial/multi-ethnic box instead of individual racial or ethnic category boxes
- No preference."

Provost Greenwood noted that, as these data will be available in fall 2004, it may be preferable to ascertain students' opinions before suggesting any action, either internally or with the federal government. That decision, however, rests with The Regents.

Regent Connerly commented on his opposition to government-sponsored race classifications. He recognized that this belief was not the prevailing one in American society. He assured the Regents that it was not his intention to rekindle an issue which had been rejected by California voters in the recent election. Regent Connerly suggested that, regardless of one's opinion on the classification of individuals by race, there are several factors upon which agreement should be obtained. First, one's identity should be self-proclaimed rather than imputed by the government. Second, if such classification does occur, individuals should be given all possible options as to race. Third, the rule should be to record and report the race that is identified by those persons surveyed. For example, it would be inappropriate to record an individual's identity as "white" if the individual had checked "black." If an individual lists two or more categories, the government should not allocate that individual to one group in order to inflate the numbers of the group that is underrepresented. He suggested that it was unconscionable that the American government prevents his children and grandchildren from having the option to classify themselves as multi-racial. Regent Connerly urged the University to give this option to its faculty, staff, and students if it intends to continue identifying people on the basis of racial or ethnic identity, even if this requires the University to petition the federal government.

President Dynes stated that he was looking forward to the response to the undergraduate survey, which should convey a sense of how the students view this matter. The data will be presented to the Regents.

Regent Johnson agreed that each individual should have the right to indicate his or her race or ethnicity. While she considered herself to be African American, if given the choice she

would check "multi-racial" in recognition of her racial background. However, she also believed that to offer such an option could prove to be confusing to students, noting that they have the chance to choose "other" when identifying their race.

Regent Bodine recalled that when she was involved with recruiting for the federal government, many applicants would self identify as many as four races. On the other hand, people of some ethnic backgrounds did not know which box to check. While it may create some confusion to offer multi-ethnic or multi-racial categories, Regent Bodine believed that it might also provide some clarity for the increasing number of people who see themselves that way. She agreed with the President that the University should wait for the data from the undergraduate survey, but she also suggested that this may be an area where the state and the University might wish to take the lead with the U.S. government to encourage it have a more nuanced approach to the complexity of American culture. She predicted that the students surveyed would show a strong preference for the multi-racial option.

Regent Lee spoke in support of the University's taking a leadership role in this effort.

Regent Murray expressed his agreement with the three principles offered by Regent Connerly, noting that the undergraduate survey would be an important factor in the decision as to how to proceed. He suggested one solution would be to offer both a choice of various races and a separate choice of multi-racial.

The meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

Attest:

Associate Secretary