The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
July 14, 2004

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

Members present: Regents Anderson, Connerly, Dynes, Hopkinson, Johnson, Kozberg, Lansing, Lozano, Marcus, Montoya, Novack, Parsky, and Sayles; Advisory members Juline, Rominger, and Blumenthal

In attendance: Regents Blum, Bustamante, Lee, Ornellas, and Wachter, Faculty Representative Pitts, Secretary Trivette, General Counsel Holst, Treasurer Russ, Provost Greenwood, Senior Vice Presidents Darling and Mullinix, Vice Presidents Broome, Doby, Drake, Gomes, and Hershman, Chancellors Berdahl, Bishop, Carnesale, Cicerone, Córdova, Tomlinson-Keasey, Vanderhoef, and Yang, Acting Chancellor Chemers, and Recording Secretary Nietfeld

The meeting convened at 3:00 p.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 May 19, 2004 were approved.

2. **ACADEMIC SENATE'S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHANGES IN ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS**

The President recommended that changes in the requirements for freshman eligibility recommended by the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) and adopted by the Assembly of the Academic Senate on June 30, 2004 be approved as follows:

A. Effective for students entering UC as freshmen for Fall 2005, the calculation of the grade point average (GPA) for determining Eligibility in the Statewide Context shall reflect grades earned in all (a)-(g) courses taken in the 10th and 11th grades, consistent with current requirements for students Eligible in the Local Context. Students identified as Eligible in the Local Context shall complete the University's course and test-taking requirements by the end of their senior year to be deemed fully eligible, consistent with current requirements for students Eligible in the Statewide Context.

B. Effective for students entering UC as freshmen for Fall 2007, the minimum GPA required for students Eligible in the Statewide Context and Eligible in the Local Context shall be increased to 3.1. Additional adjustments shall be made to the

Eligibility Index or other factors as needed to bring UC's eligibility rate to 12.5 percent of California public high school graduates.

[The report from the Academic Senate, *Recommendations for Adjustments to University of California Freshman Eligibility Requirements*, was mailed to all Regents in advance of the meeting, and a copy is on file in the Office of the Secretary.]

Committee Chair Kozberg indicated that a number of Regents had requested a one-month delay on the action with respect to the minimum grade point average portion of the recommendation in order to allow them to become more fully briefed and to obtain more input from members of the public. The Committee will be asked to approve the President's recommendation, with the provision that the action taken by the Board with respect to the GPA be deferred to a special meeting to be held in mid-August, when The Regents will also be asked to approve the 2004-05 budget. This approach will ensure that a variety of constituencies have ample opportunity to review the proposal.

Provost Greenwood recalled that at the May meeting there had been a general summary of eligibility issues and a report on the findings of the eligibility study performed by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC), which found that 14.4 percent of California's public high school graduates were eligible to attend the University of California. She pointed out that the University's eligibility criteria have a number of functions, which include the following:

- Identify the top 12.5 percent of public high school graduates as called for in the Master Plan for Higher Education, with a guarantee of access for those who meet the eligibility requirements.

- Determine the college preparatory curricular standards for California schools.

- Set clear achievement standards for students.

The Provost noted some characteristics of UC-eligible applicants. In fall 2003, 75 percent of eligible high school graduates had GPAs of 3.5 percent or higher. UC-eligible applicants enroll in an average of 23 year-long, UC-approved college preparatory courses. In addition, 80 percent earn average scores of 500 or higher across all five required admissions tests.

Faculty Representative Pitts observed that the Academic Senate had been challenged by the fact that, for the first time in 25 years, UC eligibility had exceeded 12.5 percent. As a result, it will be necessary to eliminate qualified students from the eligibility pool in order to return to the desired percentage. The faculty has as one of its premiere goals the maintenance of a high-quality student body. An equally important goal is to balance excellence and access by enhancing quality while ensuring that no group is disproportionately affected. Dr. Pitts recalled that CPEC conducts an eligibility study every three to eight years; the last one was performed in 1996, when 11.1 percent of public high school graduates met UC's eligibility

requirements. The Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) program was created to bring eligibility back to the Master Plan goal of 12.5 percent. Faculty Representative Pitts commented that the Board on Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) had begun its deliberations on eligibility in September 2003, at which time the CPEC data, which became central to the faculty's work, were not available. In March 2004, the Eligibility and Admissions Study Group recommended that any changes in UC's eligibility requirements be submitted to The Regents at the July 2004 meeting. The CPEC study was released in May 2004, at which time its results were presented to the Committee. BOARS issued its recommendations, and in June they were adopted by the Academic Council and the Academic Assembly. The faculty believe that these changes will protect academic quality while least adversely affecting the various demographic groups that are represented in the University of California as students.

Professor Sawrey, Chair of BOARS, opened her presentation by reviewing the terminology used by the faculty when discussing the admissions process. Eligibility refers to the basic academic requirements needed for admission to the UC system. Eligible students are guaranteed admission to at least one campus if they apply. Selection refers to the process by which a campus makes its admissions decisions using comprehensive review. The participation rate is the percentage of high school graduates who choose to enroll at UC. Professor Sawrey outlined the three paths to freshman eligibility: statewide eligibility, Eligibility in the Local Context, and eligibility by examination alone. For fall 2003, 92.4 percent achieved statewide eligibility, while three-quarters of the ELC students are also eligible by other pathways.

Professor Sawrey outlined the components of the Senate's recommendation, as follows:

Students Entering in Fall 2005: The GPA will be calculated using all (a)-(g) courses taken in the 10th and 11th grades. Adjustments to calculation of the GPA for students Eligible in the Statewide Context and course and test requirements for students identified as ELC would be put in place. These changes are projected to bring UC's eligibility rate from 14.4 percent to 13 percent. The Academic Senate supports early implementation of these changes because they provide immediate advantages in terms of returning the size of the pool closer to the 12.5 percent target and of improving the clarity and consistency of UC requirements.

Students Entering in Fall 2007: Increase to 3.1 the minimum GPA for both statewide eligibility and ELC students. Making these changes effective for students entering in fall 2007 provides time for UC to inform students of the changes at the beginning of the sophomore year in high school. Based on data currently available from the CPEC Eligibility Study, these changes would bring the size of the eligibility pool to 12.7 percent. The Eligibility Index also would be adjusted as needed to bring UC's eligibility rate to 12.5 percent.

Professor Sawrey discussed the rationale behind the Academic Senate's recommendation as it relates to the components that make up eligibility. With respect to the (a)-(g) course

requirements, she noted that changes in the courses themselves would require multiple years' advance warning. Because the University's course requirements are in alignment with those of the California State University, it would be unwise to make unilateral changes. In addition, most students now enroll in a greater number of (a)-(g) courses than are required. With respect to standardized test scores, she recalled that The Regents had approved the use of new core tests that will become available in 2005. The faculty will need data on new test results before recommending any changes to the test requirements. BOARS is not recommending any changes to the Eligibility in the Local Context component, but it will be studying the effects of increasing the percentage of students from each high school who are considered eligible. Professor Sawrey continued that the primary academic component to be changed is the grade point average achieved in the (a)-(g) courses, because the GPA is the single best predictor of success at UC, and it is the criterion that is in the hands of the students themselves to affect. Minor adjustments will be made to the eligibility index once the new tests have been implemented.

At Committee Chair Kozberg's invitation, State Senator Alarcon addressed the Committee. Mr. Alarcon recalled that the Academic Senate's recommendation was designed to cause the least damage for each group represented at the University. It was his belief that the University should raise all of the standards that its students would be expected to meet, rather than focusing entirely on academic achievement, in order to ensure that underrepresented students have an opportunity to enroll at UC. Senator Alarcon explained that his comments were focused on Berkeley and UCLA; he believed that it was unconscionable that the numbers of African-American students on these two campuses had declined to virtually nothing. He challenged the University to accept the top leaders in every high school in the state. He believed that the Berkeley and UCLA campuses lacked a commitment to underrepresented students who have overcome life challenges and asked that the leadership component be taken into account in admissions decisions. Senator Alarcon suggested that Berkeley and UCLA should make a stronger commitment to enrolling students who reside in the surrounding communities, which tend to have more diverse populations than the campuses. He commented on the positive economic conditions that are created when a UC-educated physician returns to practice medicine in South Central Los Angeles. He urged the Regents to place more emphasis on students who excel in a difficult environment.

Committee Chair Kozberg expressed the Regents' appreciation to Senator Alarcon for his thoughtful remarks and emphasized the University's commitment to comprehensive review in admissions.

Senator Alarcon introduced a student from the Santa Clarita Valley who had attended UC Davis after having not been accepted at UCLA. The student had a GPA of 4.0 and numerous outside activities. After pursuing her undergraduate degree at UC Davis, she is now enrolled in a graduate program at UCLA.

In response to a question from Regent Parsky regarding the impact of raising the minimum required grade point average, Professor Sawrey reported that statistical modeling carried out on the class of fall 2003 had found that between 700 and 800 students would be affected by the change.

Regent Blum raised the role played by geography in admissions decisions. He was also interested in knowing how students who are admitted through the Eligibility in the Local Context program are dispersed among the campuses, and Professor Sawrey agreed to provide this information. With respect to geographic location, she recalled that the Eligibility and Admissions Study Group had asked BOARS to look at the use of geographical preferences in admissions. At present, geography does not play a significant role in comprehensive review.

Senator Alarcon was under the impression that students made eligible for admission to the University under the Eligibility in the Local Context program were typically not admitted to Berkeley or UCLA. Regent Blum asked to see the pertinent statistics. Committee Chair Kozberg asked that this information also be provided to Senator Alarcon.

Provost Greenwood responded that the University's data indicate that the ELC students who apply to the University are accepted at very high rates at all UC campuses. Both Berkeley and UCLA have a 40 percent acceptance rate for these students, while the average acceptance rate for students who achieve statewide eligibility is 25 percent. In response to a question from Regent Sayles, Provost Greenwood confirmed that these ELC students have also attained statewide eligibility. Students who are informed by the University that they are in the top 4 percent of their high school class tend to take the classes required in order to enroll at UC.

In response to a question from Regent Hopkinson regarding the effect of the recommendation on underrepresented minority, rural, and low-income students, Professor Sawrey displayed a slide which indicated current eligibility rates and those that would result from the proposal, as follows:

	Current	Under Proposal
African American	6.3%	4.7%
Chicano/Latino	6.5%	5.5%
Asian	31.4%	27.8%
White	16.1%	14.2%

These percentages were used to confirm that the proposal satisfies the requirements of the federal government with respect to disparate impact. Regent Hopkinson observed that it would be helpful to have data presented in terms of absolute numbers of students in addition to percentages.

Professor Sawrey continued that the rate of eligibility for rural students is 17.9 percent, with a 41 percent eligibility rate for both suburban and urban students. Under the proposal, the percentage of rural students in the eligibility pool would drop by 0.1 percent, suburban students would increase by 0.8 percent, and urban students would go from 41.1 percent of the pool to 40.4 percent. While the faculty do not have data with respect to family income, Professor Sawrey noted that the percentage of students from schools with a high number of students who receive a free lunch would drop from 23.9 percent of the eligibility pool to 23.4 percent.

Regent Connerly looked forward to the day when there was no longer a preoccupation about who is accepted at Berkeley and UCLA. He recalled that the Master Plan had defined the top12.5 percent of public high school graduates as the pool that would preserve quality at the University of California. The University is faced with the challenge of returning to the 12.5 percent by the fairest way possible. Regent Connerly pointed out that no one would be denied an education through a reduction in the eligibility pool and suggested that the California State University and the community college systems should not be devalued. He believed that the faculty's proposal was the fair approach to returning the eligibility pool to 12.5 percent.

Regent Lozano believed that the issue of reducing the eligibility pool should be considered in a larger context. She recalled that when the Master Plan was adopted, the state had a population of 10 million; the present population is 35 million and growing. She questioned whether the 12.5 percent eligibility standard was still appropriate given the circumstances that the state faces today. Regent Lozano observed that the fact that 14.4 percent of California's high school graduates were eligible for UC should be applauded as an achievement of which the Regents should be proud. She believed that it would be a tragedy for the University to turn away students who had worked hard to become eligible. Regent Lozano was encouraged by the fact that BOARS intended to examine whether a higher percentage of students should be considered to be eligible in the local context. She stressed that, before acting on the proposed change in the GPA requirement, the Regents would need to understand the impact it will have on who is admitted to the University. She believed it would be important to include students in the debate. She also wanted to make sure that these changes are communicated to students and their families as far in advance as possible.

Regent Bustamante suggested that the 12.5 percent eligibility pool as defined by the Master Plan could be seen as a floor rather than a ceiling. He agreed with Regent Lozano's observation that the 14.4 percent eligibility pool should be seen as a cause for celebration, as these students would be able to compete at a world-class institution. He commented on the hard work that is required on the part of students to qualify to attend the University of California. Regent Bustamante pointed out that, in the new agreement with the State, the Governor had committed to funding future enrollment and asked why the University was limiting the number of students who would be admitted.

Provost Greenwood noted that the Master Plan does not require the University to admit the top 12.5 percent of public high school graduates, but the University traditionally has done so. The University has not viewed the Master Plan as permitting the University to change the size of the eligibility pool. Senior Vice President Darling quoted from the original Master Plan that "...the University shall select from among the top 12.5 percent." The clear implication was that it represented a ceiling rather than a floor.

In response to a comment by Regent Sayles, President Dynes stated that the section of the Master Plan that addresses the eligibility pool was not part of the legislation which was adopted as the Donahoe Act.

Referring to the review of the Master Plan that had been conducted by the Legislature and the resulting intent language, Faculty Representative Pitts believed that the present intention is for the University to admit the top 12.5 percent of students. Vice President Darling continued that, in its most recent review, the Legislature had sought to reinsert the phrase "from among;" the University requested that such language not be restored in order to permit the University to achieve its goal of admitting the top 12.5 percent.

Regent Lee expressed concern about graduation rates. In particular, he was interested in knowing the persistence rate of students who are admitted with relatively low grade point averages. Professor Sawrey assured him that students with GPAs between 2.8 and 3.1 are successful at the University and stated that she would provide Regent Lee with stratified graduation rates by GPA. She observed, however, that while the high school GPA is a good predictor of performance in the freshman year, many factors contribute to ongoing success.

Regent-designate Juline asked about the proposal to calculate the GPA for determining eligibility in the statewide context using grades earned in all of the (a)-(g) courses taken in the 10th and 11th grades. Professor Sawrey explained that during the period when fewer than 12.5 percent of high school graduates were eligible to attend UC, efforts were undertaken to make the maximum number of students qualified. These efforts included the use of a "best of pattern" GPA which allowed admissions officers to choose the best grades achieved to calculate the GPA. As campuses have become more selective, admissions procedures have moved toward the use of all grades to calculate the GPA. She confirmed for Mr. Juline that the use of the "best of pattern" was not widely known by the public.

Regent Montoya agreed with the need to increase the eligibility rate of students from low-performing high schools. She raised the issue of whether there was a tendency for some affluent parents to move their children to these schools in order to achieve a high class rank. Regent Montoya was also concerned about how the proposal would affect students at high schools that do not offer all of the (a)-(g) courses. Professor Sawrey reported that there was no evidence of parents transferring their children to low-performing schools in order to become eligible in the local context.

Regent Johnson expressed the opinion that the 12.5 percent should be seen as a floor and that the University should be able to admit more students if the resources were available to do so. She believed that the Academic Senate's proposal would deny access to qualified students. She urged Senator Alarcon to support funding for the University in the Legislature that would permit the University to enroll the 14.4 percent of students who are now eligible.

In response to a question from Regent Sayles, Professor Sawrey reported that, had the GPA requirement been 3.1 rather than 2.8, five students who were eligible only in the local context would have been affected.

Regent Marcus observed that the Master Plan had been lauded throughout its history as the most brilliant structure for higher education. He did not believe that the University would have the choice of modifying it without input from the other constituencies that would be affected by any change in the eligibility rate. He resonated with Regent Connerly's observations concerning the availability of a quality education at the California State University and spoke strongly in favor of retaining an eligibility rate of 12.5 percent. Regent Marcus felt that not enough attention was paid to low-income students. Provost Greenwood noted that the University of California has the highest participation of low-income students of any public university in the country and offered to provide him the relevant data.

Regent Anderson believed that BOARS' proposal was the best choice for returning the eligibility pool to 12.5 percent. The Academic Senate believes, however, that 12.5 percent is an arbitrary number and that students who can succeed at the University of California will be excluded. Regent Anderson noted that the University of California Student Association would be holding its statewide meeting in mid-August and suggested that this would be a good opportunity for student feed-back on the changes in eligibility requirements.

In response to the questions that had been raised in the discussion about the Master Plan, General Counsel Holst read from his letter to the Regents, which stated that the 1960 Master Plan had been embodied in a series of documents. The Donahoe Act placed some of the components in the Education Code, and there was a constitutional amendment allowing for the establishment of the California State University Board of Trustees. The University is committed to the principles of the Master Plan, including its provision that the University draw its students from the top 12.5 percent of public high school students, but this commitment is not mandated by any legislation, nor could it be, given The Regents' constitutional autonomy.

Regent Lansing celebrated the fact that more students were becoming eligible to attend the University, but she also believed that it was not unreasonable to raise the admissions standards. She questioned why the admissions process did not take into account grades that are earned in (a)-(g) courses in the 9th grade.

Regent Hopkinson stated her belief that the use of a 12.5 percent eligibility standard had been very effective over the years. She would require overwhelming evidence that it was

appropriate before she would agree to changing this rate. She noted that the eligibility pool for CSU was at only 28 percent rather than the 33 percent called for by the Master Plan. This fact needs to be viewed as part of the bigger picture.

Regent Connerly suggested that it would be useful to hear from the faculty about the quality of the students who are included in the 12.5 percent eligibility pool. Faculty Representative Pitts stressed that students who wish to attend the University are interested in the preservation of quality. The University of California is a distinguished research institution, and the faculty are drawn by a wide variety of reasons, including the high quality of the education. It would not be responsible to increase the size of the eligibility pool without ensuring that the quality of the institution would not be eroded. The faculty would accept a larger eligibility pool if additional resources were provided by the State.

President Dynes suggested that it was his responsibility, along with the faculty and the administration, to protect the quality of the University of California. He noted the erosion of graduate education in the recent past as a result of budget constraints and expressed concern about student-faculty ratios as well as the ratio of undergraduate to graduate students. A valuable experience for students is the exposure to the creators of new information; if the University is overenrolled, that experience will be diminished.

Committee Chair Kozberg drew the Committee's attention to the many contributions to the University that had been made by Professor Sawrey in her role as chair of BOARS, including a revamping of admissions testing requirements and the implementation of comprehensive review in the admissions process.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the President's recommendation and voted to present it to the Board, with the understanding that action on the proposal with respect to the grade point average would be taken at a special meeting of The Regents to be held in August, Regents Connerly, Dynes, Hopkinson, Kozberg, Lansing, Lozano, Marcus, Montoya, Novack, Parsky, and Sayles (11) voting "aye," and Regents Anderson and Johnson (2) voting "no."

(For speakers' comments, see the minutes of the July 14, 2004 meeting of the Committee of the Whole.)

3. **FUNDRAISING CAMPAIGN INITIATIVE, LOS ANGELES CAMPUS**

It was recalled that in May 1997 The Regents had approved the launch of the public phase of Campaign UCLA, then a $1.2 billion comprehensive campaign to conclude in 2002. Due to the campaign's success, the goal was increased in 2002 to $2.4 billion and the conclusion moved to 2005. As of June 2004, the campaign had generated over $2.5 billion.

The campus is now pursuing an initiative which is an outgrowth of Campaign UCLA to raise an additional $250 million for student and faculty support, in addition to the $287 million

received for that purpose during the campaign. Created to meet the campus' growing competitiveness challenges, and designed to take advantage of the campaign's final 18 months, the initiative will provide renewed attention to the private support needs for the academic core.

Goals for the initiative are to secure $100 million in funding for the recruitment and retention of top faculty, $100 million for fellowships and scholarships in the College of Letters and Science, and $50 million for fellowships and scholarships in the professional schools, which are seen as essential to meeting the campus' competitiveness goals.

Members of The UCLA Foundation Board of Trustees and the Campaign Cabinet have been involved in the planning and have formally endorsed the initiative. A Chancellor's Competitiveness Council is being formed, to be headed by Mr. Henry Samueli.

All initiative activities will be conducted in accordance with University policy. Gifts and endowments will be solicited on behalf of The Regents and The UCLA Foundation. The initiative will be funded from the Development Office budget, and donors will be so notified. Gifts to the Foundation for endowment will be invested by the Foundation prudently to ensure that assets will be protected and that a reasonable return will be achieved for support of the purposes of the gift. In accordance with the guidelines for campus foundations, restricted funds received and unrestricted funds allocated for support of University departments or programs shall be transferred to the University, administered in accordance with University policies, and expended from University department or program accounts.

4. **QUARTERLY REPORT ON PRIVATE SUPPORT**

In accordance with the Schedule of Reports, the **Quarterly Report on Private Support** for the period January 1 through March 31, 2004 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.]

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary