The Regents of the University of California

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**
September 23, 2004

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

Members present: Regents Anderson, Dynes, Hopkinson, Johnson, Kozberg, Lansing, Lozano, Marcus, Montoya, Moores, Novack, Núñez, O'Connell, and Parsky; Advisory members Juline, Rominger, and Blumenthal

In attendance: Regents Blum, Bustamante, Lee, Ornellas, Pattiz, Preuss, Ruiz, and Wachter, Regent-designate Rosenthal, Faculty Representative Brunk, Secretary Trivette, General Counsel Holst, Provost Greenwood, Senior Vice Presidents Darling and Mullinix, Vice Presidents Broome, Doby, Drake, Gomes, and Gurtner, Chancellors Bishop, Carnesale, Cicerone, Fox, Tomlinson-Keasey, Vanderhoef, and Yang, Acting Chancellor Chemers, and Recording Secretary Nietfeld

The meeting convened at 10:40 a.m. with Committee Chair Kozberg presiding.

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

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of July 14, 2004 were approved.

2. **ANNUAL REPORT ON THE UNIVERSITY PRIVATE SUPPORT PROGRAM, 2003-04**

In accordance with the Schedule of Reports, the **Annual Report on the University Private Support Program** for the period July 1, 2003 through June 30, 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.]

Senior Vice President Darling reported that, for the fifth consecutive year, the University had received more than $1 billion in private support. The total raised during 2003-04 represents an increase of 8.2 percent over 2002-03, indicating that there has been a turn around as the economy has improved. Three campuses are involved in $1 billion campaigns–UCLA, San Diego, and San Francisco–each of which is making rapid progress toward this goal. Other campuses are building on the momentum created over the past few years.

3. **PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COLLEGE OF HEALTH SCIENCES, IRVINE CAMPUS**

The President recommended that effective immediately, Section 11 of The Regents' provisions as covered under Standing Order 110.1 – Academic Units and Functions, Affiliated Institutions, and Related Activities of the University, be amended as follows:

**additions shown by underscoring, deletions by strikeout**

***

11. Academic Schools and Colleges at Irvine

(a) There are established at Irvine the following academic schools and colleges, with curricula based on two or more years of undergraduate work:

***

~~Colleg~~e School of Medicine, with curricula leading to the degree of Bachelor of Science, Master of Science, and Doctor of Medicine.

College of Health Sciences, with curricula leading to the degrees of Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science, Master of Arts, Master of Science, Doctor of Medicine, and Doctor of Philosophy.

The Committee was informed that the Irvine campuses proposes to rename the College of Medicine as the School of Medicine and to create an administrative unit, the College of Health Sciences, to house the School of Medicine and the Programs in Public Health and Pharmaceutical Sciences. These programs, which were established in 2003, report to the Office of the Executive Vice Chancellor. This reorganization responds to the growth at the Irvine campus in the health sciences, not all of which lies within the School of Medicine. The broader scope of a College of Health Sciences will enable UCI faculty to seek and obtain funding from a much wider range of government agencies, foundations, and private sources than are currently available, thereby enhancing the quality and visibility of scientific and scholarly research. The greater breadth and extent of the research will, in turn, support more and larger degree programs at the undergraduate and graduate levels in, for instance, biological sciences, chemistry, epidemiology, environmental health science, genetics, physics, physiology, and statistics. It is essential for the Irvine campus to maintain the quality of teaching and accommodate the rapid growth in undergraduate enrollment projected over the next ten years.

***Academic and Long-Range Development Plan***

Establishment of the College of Health Sciences at UC Irvine is consistent with the academic plan for the campus and essential to the long-range development of its educational programs. The health sciences constitute a genuinely multi-disciplinary field that will undergo rapid growth in many different disciplines over the next decade, so the exact size and nature of growth in the College of Health Sciences will therefore be determined as part of campuswide planning. To manage planning for growth in this field effectively, however, it is imperative that an umbrella unit be established capable of housing new programs as needed and overseeing the recruitment of faculty and development of new degrees in the health sciences across the campus as a whole. The College of Health Sciences will thus help the Irvine campus integrate existing research and educational programs and focus its resources in new forms that will define its scope as a mature research university.

***Programs in Public Health and in Pharmaceutical Sciences***

To guarantee a comprehensive, multi-disciplinary perspective on the development of health sciences on the Irvine campus, a Dean's Advisory Group for the College of Health Sciences has been created, consisting of the Deans of the School of Medicine, Biological Sciences, Physical Sciences, and Social Ecology. The Advisory Group will consult with the Dean of Health Sciences to coordinate hiring across these units and the development of degree programs for graduate and undergraduate students in these schools.

Initially the Irvine campus will offer undergraduate courses through existing degree programs leading to a B.S. in Pharmaceutical Sciences through the School of Biological Sciences and a B.S. in Public Health through the School of Social Ecology. The Programs in Public Health and in Pharmaceutical Sciences will develop their own undergraduate and graduate degree programs.

***Interdisciplinary Collaboration***

The School of Biological Sciences and the School of Physical Sciences will provide the training in chemical synthesis, pharmacology, genetics, computational chemistry, and biophysics for any undergraduate or graduate degree in pharmaceutical sciences. Such training will better suit the needs of the modern molecular and genetically based pharmaceutical industry.

*School of Biological Sciences*. The link between basic biology and clinical application has become stronger and more direct, and research collaborations have increased among faculty in the School of Biological Sciences and the College of Medicine. The need to maintain optimal health of the aging population of this country, as well as to combat emerging diseases at multiple levels, creates an immediate and compelling need for cross disciplinary research. Areas of interest include biostatistics, epidemiology, environmental health, biomedical sciences associated with public health, molecular pharmacology, systems

pharmacology, pharmaceutical technology, and pharmacogenomics in pharmaceutical sciences.

*Graduate School of Management.* Health care is one of the three major strategic foci of the Graduate School of Management (GSM), the first business school in the country to offer an Executive MBA program expressly designed for health care professionals. While other universities have copied the model, GSM's Health Care Executive MBA program remains highly regarded and attracts students nationally. GSM offers a joint degree program (MD/MBA) with the College of Medicine.

*School of Physical Sciences*. Much of the science taking place in the health sciences is at the molecular level, where physics and chemistry play essential roles. This is evidenced through the activities in the School of Physical Sciences research groups with those in the College of Medicine and the Cancer Center. One of the challenges facing modern medicine is the need for a more physical understanding of biological function, particularly the interactions of proteins. Modern physics tools are ideally suited to probing protein function at the level of single molecules or small complexes. By combining a variety of measurement techniques and studies of both proteins and membranes, findings lead to an understanding of the cell as a complex highly ordered machine. This advance is of fundamental scientific importance and will be directly applicable to medicine.

*School of Information and Computer Science*. The Department of Statistics has planned for interdisciplinary research with biological sciences, public health, and pharmaceutical sciences. Statistical theories could pertain to the evaluation of health care programs; epidemiological studies will identify risk factors for disease; and bioinformatics projects aimed at understanding the large amount of genomic, protein expression, and metabolite data that are being collected.

*School of Social Ecology*. The Department of Environmental Health Sciences and Policy will house the initial B.S. degree in Public Health. This new educational program will reflect a long-standing collaborative research partnership between Social Ecology and the College of Medicine in the Transdisciplinary Tobacco Use Research Center, which emphasizes the connection between physiological and social factors in smoking among adolescents and young adults; the Center for Community Health, which focuses on lead exposure risks, cancer, and cardiovascular disease prevention; and the program in Geriatrics, which focuses on the causes and prevention of abuse against elders and the disabled. The College of Health Sciences will enhance the visibility of this on-going interdisciplinary work and will support the development of graduate degrees in public health that combine the expertise of faculty in Social Ecology with that of faculty housed in the basic sciences and medical research.

***Reviews and Approvals***

The proposal to establish a College of Health Sciences at the Irvine campus and to change the name from the College to School of Medicine was approved unanimously by the Irvine Division of the Academic Senate and has received endorsement from the University of California Academic Council. The California Postsecondary Education Commission has reviewed the proposal and concurs with the recommendation.

***Resources***

The Dean of the School of Medicine will become the Dean of the College of Health Sciences and continue oversight of the School of Medicine. The College of Health Sciences will have a new position, Senior Associate Dean. The College will receive eight new faculty FTE to be divided equally between the programs in Public Health and in Pharmaceutical Sciences. Funding for these positions has been provided by the Executive Vice Chancellor at the Irvine campus, and the Dean of the College of Medicine has agreed to provide space and equipment. Changing the name from the College of Medicine to the School of Medicine will not require new administrative structures nor additional resources.

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

4. **ACADEMIC SENATE RECOMMENDATION REGARDING FRESHMAN ELIGIBILITY REQUIREMENTS**

The President recommended that, consistent with the recommendations of the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools adopted by the Assembly of the Academic Senate on June 30, 2004, the minimum grade point average required for students Eligible in the Statewide Context and Eligible in the Local Context shall be increased to 3.0 effective for freshmen entering the University in fall 2007.

Committee Chair Kozberg recalled that at the July meeting the Committee had approved the Academic Senate's recommendations pertaining to changes that will be implemented in fall 2005 and an increase in the minimum required grade point average (GPA) for implementation in fall 2007. The Committee then recommended that the Board approve only the rule changes proposed for fall 2005 and defer action on the proposed increase in the minimum GPA in order to allow for further analysis and consultation. Regent Kozberg emphasized that, in raising the GPA, the intention was not to affect anyone who is currently in high school.

President Dynes believed that the revised recommendation represents the solution that makes the most sense at this time. Restricting eligibility is a difficult choice to make; however, the University has a responsibility to adhere to the requirements of the Master Plan for Higher Education. He understood that the Master Plan anticipated the opportunity for every high

school graduate in the state to attend college. The mobility between the University of California, the California State University, and the community colleges is an important aspect of the Master Plan. It is important for the University to set clear standards for eligibility that are easily understood by students, parents, schools, advisors, and the public. The revised recommendation calls for a minimum GPA of 3.0, effective for freshmen entering the University in fall 2007. The recommendation contained in The Regents' agenda packets had indicated that the minimum GPA would be set "not to exceed" 3.1 for implementation in 2007. The President explained that, since July, additional discussion and analysis had underscored questions raised in the Senate's report about the difficulty of projecting precise eligibility rates, as well as the need for the University to provide potential applicants with maximum clarity about the University's eligibility requirements. He has recommended an increase in the minimum GPA from 2.8 to 3.0, rather than 3.1 or "up to" 3.1, in order to both provide increased clarity and to avoid the possibility that fewer students would be eligible than the percentage set by the Master Plan. He stressed that the overwhelming majority of eligible applicants achieve well above a GPA of 3.0. Given the rules changes that the Board approved for fall 2005, the changes to the University's testing requirements in fall 2006, and the error margins in the CPEC eligibility study, the current data do not allow precision in projecting eligibility rates. President Dynes stated his intention to request that, as data on the new tests and rule changes become available, BOARS conduct additional analyses and return with recommendations if needed in order to align the size of UC's eligibility pool to a figure consistent with the Master Plan.

Faculty Representative Blumenthal introduced Professor Michael Brown, the new chair of the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools.

Provost Greenwood presented background information on the Academic Senate's recommendation. She recalled that in May 2004, the California Postsecondary Education Commission had issued the findings of its most recent eligibility study, which indicated that 14.4 percent of 2003 graduates of California's public high schools met the University's eligibility requirements. Previous CPEC studies conducted over the past twenty-five years consistently found that fewer than 12.5 percent of California public high school graduates were eligible to attend the University. In fall 2003 BOARS began its deliberations on which criteria could be used to reduce the eligibility pool, if necessary. Provost Greenwood outlined six eligibility principles that were employed by the faculty:

- 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 in the future might 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.

In June 2004 the Academic Senate finalized its recommendations for the best way in which to adjust eligibility, and the procedural changes were adopted by The Regents in July. Provost Greenwood recalled that the intention of these procedural changes was to reduce the eligibility rate from 14.4 percent to 13 percent. The minimum GPA of 2.8 will remain in place until fall 2007; students with a 2.8 GPA are required to have test scores of 580 or above.

Faculty Representative Blumenthal stressed that it had been the conclusion of the faculty that the most effective and appropriate way to reduce the eligibility pool was to raise the minimum required grade point average. This solution will have the least adverse effect on the state's diverse populations.

In response to a question from Regent O'Connell, Provost Greenwood recalled that the CPEC eligibility study had relied upon electronic transcripts from 48 high schools that were believed to be a representative sample of the larger selection of schools used in the 1996 study. This methodology was selected by an independent consultant as a way of obtaining generally comparable demographic and economic samplings as the previous methodology did. Faculty Representative Blumenthal added that CPEC had re-analyzed its 1996 study using the new methodology and had obtained the same results. Data from the College Board on eligibility also confirmed the CPEC results.

Regent Moores raised the issue of the eligibility index and how the required minimum SAT score would be revised to correspond to the new minimum grade point average. Provost Greenwood anticipated that the score could be lowered from 580 to 525. In response to a question from Regent Moores concerning the percentage of high school graduates who would be UC eligible when the proposal is implemented, Provost Greenwood noted that it was anticipated to be 12.8 percent. Faculty Representative Blumenthal commented that, because the faculty cannot predict with certainty what effect the procedural changes will have on the eligibility pool, the intention is to create a cushion by not moving precisely to 12.5 percent. Regent Moores emphasized that it should be clear to the members of the Board what effect the adoption of the new minimum GPA would have. He questioned how a student with a C grade point average and below-average SAT scores could be in the top 12.5 percent of California's high school graduates. Provost Greenwood stressed that students

with this profile had been admitted to the University of California and that they had performed well.

In response to a question from Regent Anderson, Provost Greenwood noted that the margin of error in the 1996 CPEC Eligibility Study had been smaller than the margin of error in the most recent study. It would be possible to narrow the margin of error, but the probability of changing the mean by doing so is not high. Regent Anderson pointed out that the 1996 study had a confidence integral of approximately 10 to 11, while that of the 2004 study is 11 to 17.8, which is significantly larger. She expressed concern about making a decision based on data that lack the level of precision of the previous study. Provost Greenwood reiterated the fact that simulations that had been performed using the CPEC methodology on the previous CPEC database produced the same results.

Regent Núñez believed that the Board was being asked to adopt a policy without any concrete evidence as to what the consequences would be, particularly as data concerning the actions taken in July would not be available until the changes take effect for 2005-06. Senior Vice President Darling noted that President Dynes had determined not to bring forward the 3.1 average in order to permit further analyses. In response to a request from Regent Núñez, Provost Greenwood displayed a table of estimated UC eligibility by racial and ethnic group. There will be a reduction of between 4,600 and 4,900 in the total number of eligible students as a result of the procedural changes to be implemented in 2005. A further 700 to 750 students will be affected when the new GPA requirement is implemented in 2007. Provost Greenwood stressed that of the many solutions that were discussed by BOARS, increasing the minimum GPA to 3.0 had the least impact on ethnic groups, first-generation students, and low-income students. She displayed eligibility rates for ethnic groups and the effect of the 2005 and 2007 changes on those groups. In 2003, 6.3 percent of African-American California high school students were UC eligible. In 2005, this percentage will drop to 5.2 percent, and in 2007 it will be further reduced to 5 percent. Regent Núñez reported that his staff had performed an analysis that showed that there would be a 40 percent reduction in the number of African-American students enrolled at the University.

Senior Vice President Darling observed that BOARS had modeled a number of ways to achieve the desired reduction in the eligibility pool by looking at what the characteristics of the entering freshman class would be under each of the models. They examined factors such as family income, participation in school lunch programs, geography, and the racial and ethnic profile of students. As noted by Provost Greenwood, the BOARS' recommendation will have the least impact on underrepresented minority students. Provost Greenwood continued that the eligibility pool of African-American students would be reduced by 21 percent once the Academic Senate's recommendations have gone into effect.

At President Dynes' invitation, Ms. Jennifer Lilla, the President of the UC Student Association, spoke about the campaigns that the UCSA had chosen to undertake for the coming year. The first campaign, which is under way on all UC campuses, is to increase student voter registration. UCSA has set a goal of registering 25,000 students and increasing

student voter participation by five percent. The second campaign is to make higher education funding a State budget priority. The third campaign focuses on eligibility and admissions. UC students feel strongly that college access is critical to the quality of California higher education, and UCSA will be working this year toward a critical reevaluation of the Master Plan and what it means to the California of 2004 and beyond. In this context, the UCSA is asking that The Regents not approve a change to the minimum GPA requirement until further research confirms that such a change is necessary in order to comply with the Master Plan. Ms. Lilla compared the methodology used by CPEC in 1996 and the one used for the most current study and commented upon the higher margin of error in the 2004 report. She pointed out that the data presented by the Provost indicate that raising the minimum GPA would render approximately 750 students ineligible for admission, while faculty research shows that these students would persist as well as other eligible students. When compounded with changes in the verbal section of the SAT I next year, as well as planned changes in SAT II reporting on UC applications, and the untested consequences of the procedural changes approved in July, it is not possible to know at this point whether raising the minimum GPA to 3.0 will not result in an over-correction. She urged the Board not to go forward with the decision but rather to wait until it is known how the procedural changes translate into reality.

Regent Hopkinson pointed out that the data presented by Provost Greenwood had shown that the change in the minimum GPA would have more of an effect on White students than on underrepresented minorities. Regent Bustamante noted that the data had also shown that there could be as much as a 28 percent reduction in the numbers of African-American students who would be eligible.

Regent Lozano was concerned that the procedural changes adopted in July could produce the Master Plan target and asked why action on the grade point average was needed at this time. Provost Greenwood recalled that the Academic Senate had been asked to return to The Regents with a recommendation, using the data produced in the CPEC eligibility study, on how to meet the Master Plan objective of 12.5 percent. This recommendation includes raising the minimum GPA. Senior Vice President Darling continued that, if the recommendation results in the University's making eligible fewer than 12.5 percent of high school graduates, there are a variety of options that could be employed to return the eligibility pool to 12.5 percent, including lowering the required minimum GPA and SAT scores. A further option would be to increase the percentage of students accepted under the Eligibility in the Local Context program. President Dynes anticipated that the SAT requirements would most likely change if a correction is required.

Provost Greenwood confirmed for Regent Hopkinson that if too few students are made eligible, the GPA could be adjusted downward for the class entering the University in 2007. President Dynes reiterated the fact that the University would be relying on BOARS to stay up to date on eligibility issues.

Regent Marcus acknowledged the hundreds of hours of work that had been devoted by the faculty to crafting the best possible solution and urged the Regents to support the President's recommendation. He noted that, as a result of the Master Plan, there would be a place within higher education for every public high school graduate and that The California State University offers an excellent educational opportunity for those students who are not admitted to the University of California.

Senior Vice President Darling confirmed for Regent Bustamante that today's generation of students in California has greater access to higher education than had previous generations. Regent Bustamante pointed out that a report issued by the National Center for Public Policy in Higher Education had concluded that, for the first time since World War II, today's generation of students has less access to higher education than the one preceding it. Mr. Darling emphasized that, while this may be true for the nation as a whole, it does not apply to the State of California. A troubling fact, however, is the bifurcation in terms of the socioeconomic characteristic of those who go on to college. Regent Bustamante noted that the data have indicated that the students who will be affected by the new GPA requirement have the ability to succeed at the University of California. He pointed out that top private schools such as Yale, Princeton, and Stanford do not have any GPA requirements.

Senior Vice President Darling commented that the University of California has the highest percentage of low-income students of any comparable institution in the country, at about 33 percent as compared with 6 to 8 percent at the private universities cited by the Lieutenant Governor. The University of California has done a better job of providing an education to students who traditionally have not been able to go on to higher education. Provost Greenwood added that most selective universities in this country are not required to make a specified percentage of high school graduates eligible for admission. Top universities are able to take into consideration in their admissions decisions particular talents that students offer. Regent Bustamante added that they are able to use affirmative action when admitting the class.

Regent Ruiz stated that he was not in favor of raising the minimum grade point average. He observed that the goal of the University of California is to be the greatest public university in the world. Attainment of this goal is the responsibility of the Regents, the administration, and the faculty. He believed that it would be a strategic mistake to raise the GPA and thereby reduce the number of students who are eligible to attend UC. Regent Ruiz believed that growth was important to any organization, and he spoke in favor of increased access. He also felt the need for more time to evaluate the relevant data. The students most likely to be affected by a change in the GPA are those who have the least support at home and in the community. He emphasized that certain areas of California with high Hispanic populations would be particularly affected by this decision.

Regent Johnson observed that CPEC had acknowledged the margin of error in its eligibility study and cautioned against relying too heavily upon the data. She pointed out that a new campus would open soon in Merced to serve students in the Central Valley, where (a)-(g)

and Advanced Placement courses are not offered in the same quantity as they are in urban and suburban schools. She stated her intention to vote against the proposal because she felt strongly that the decision should not be made until the effects of the action taken in July are known.

Regent Hopkinson spoke of the success of the Master Plan for the State of California, and she emphasized the fact that it addresses the three segments of higher education in the state. She agreed that the California State University offers an excellent education. Due to population growth, in this decade the University of California faces the significant challenge of serving an additional 50,000 students. She believed that the State was putting the University in jeopardy due to its own fiscal crisis. Regent Hopkinson spoke of the contributions that the University, as the state's premiere research institution, makes to the state. She felt that it was unrealistic to assume that the State would be able to provide additional funding if the size of eligibility pool were increased. Speaking to the President's recommendation, she noted that the expectation that an eligible student would achieve at least a B average did not seem out of line. On the other hand, the University must focus on the lack of diversity in the student body. She encouraged the President to take a global look at the diversity challenge and address the issue of how more resources could be diverted to helping to solve this problem. Regent Hopkinson noted that the proposal would not affect the racial balance of the student body to any significant degree.

Regent Lansing agreed with the viewpoint expressed by Regent Hopkinson that funding was crucial to the issue being discussed. She stressed the need to maintain the quality of the University, which could be eroded if more students are admitted for whom funding is not provided by the State. Excellent educational opportunities are offered by campuses of the California State University and by the finest community colleges. She emphasized that a higher education system with three segments is unique to California. Regent Lansing suggested that attention should be drawn to making (a)-(g) courses available in all high schools in the state in order to provide equal opportunity to access.

Superintendent O'Connell recalled that at a previous meeting he had discussed with the Committee the need for a more rigorous curriculum in California's public schools. He noted that improvements that have been made in the high schools have resulted in more students becoming eligible to attend the University. He emphasized that all students should be prepared for entrance to higher education. Because high school education in the state is not equitable for all students, the Governor took the lead in negotiating a settlement filed four years ago by the American Civil Liberties Union in order to allow these inequities to be addressed. Regent O'Connell believed that the President's proposal to increase the minimum GPA would send a discouraging message to high schools students, particularly those located in areas that traditionally have not sent students to the University. He suggested that a visionary Board would be considering the development of an eleventh and twelfth campus in order to accommodate all students who wish to enroll. The State budget should not limit access.

Regent Núñez suggested that the Academic Senate be asked to return to the Board in 2006 with a specific recommendation regarding any change to the minimum GPA after the Senate has had time to analyze the effects of the new admissions test requirements and the effects of the eligibility changes adopted in July, which will reduce the eligibility pool from 14.4 percent to 13 percent. He pointed out that the State's economy in the 21st century requires a highly skilled workforce; today's economic conditions are far different from what they were in 1960, when the Master Plan was adopted. Regent Núñez acknowledged that the Legislature had not provided adequate funding to higher education and stated his commitment as a Regent to advocating for more resources for the University.

Regent Núñez offered the following substitute motion, which was seconded by Regent Lozano:

> That further action regarding freshman eligibility requirements be delayed until data are available with regard to the effects of the changes adopted in July 2004.

Regent Preuss stated that he would support the President's recommendation, with the proviso that the Regents would have the ability to make adjustments in the future as necessary.

Regent Ornellas supported the faculty's approach to bringing the University into compliance with the Master Plan, noting the sensitivity on the part of BOARS to the issue of access.

Regent Pattiz emphasized that while access to the University of California is of utmost importance, it is not the only issue. The members of the University community have equally pressing matters that the Regents will need to address, including salaries and infrastructure. The partnership between the State and the University of California has in the recent past been one-sided, with the State failing to provide adequate resources. Regent Pattiz believed that it would be irresponsible not to support the President's recommendation.

Regent Parsky noted that the Board welcomes the continued support of its elected officials. He assured Speaker Núñez that the Regents would support his desire to secure more resources for the University. Regent Parsky summarized the background for the President's recommendation, noting the importance of sending a message to the high school students who will be affected. The President has committed to proposing any necessary adjustments in 2006.

Secretary Trivette drew attention to the report of communications received pertaining to the item.

(For speakers' comments, see the minutes of the September 23, 2004 meeting of the Committee of the Whole.)

The substitute motion was put to a vote and defeated, Regents Anderson, Johnson, Lozano, Núñez, and O'Connell (5) voting "aye," and Regents Dynes, Hopkinson, Kozberg, Lansing, Marcus, Montoya, Moores, Novack, and Parsky (9) voting "no."

The Committee approved the President's recommendation and voted to present it to the Board, Regents Dynes, Hopkinson, Kozberg, Lansing, Lozano, Marcus, Montoya, Novack, and Parsky (9) voting "aye," Regents Anderson, Johnson, Núñez, and O'Connell (4) voting "no," and Regent Moores abstaining.

The meeting adjourned at 12:35 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary