

The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

September 19, 2007

The Committee on Educational Policy met on the above date at Mondavi Center, Davis campus.

Members present: Regents Allen, Blum, Dynes, Island, Johnson, Lansing, Lozano, Marcus, Parsky, and Varner; Advisory members Cole and Brown; Staff Advisors Brewer and Johansen

In attendance: Regents Brewer, Bugay, De La Peña, Gould, Hopkinson, Kozberg, Moores, Pattiz, Preuss, Schilling, and Wachter, Regents-designate Scorza and Shewmake, Faculty Representative Croughan, Secretary and Chief of Staff Griffiths, Associate Secretary Shaw, General Counsel Robinson, Chief Investment Officer Berggren, Provost Hume, Executive Vice Presidents Darling and Lapp, Vice Presidents Foley and Sakaki, Chancellors Bishop, Block, Drake, Fox, Kang, Vanderhoef, and Yang, Acting Chancellors Blumenthal and Grey, and Recording Secretary Smith

The meeting convened at 10:50 a.m. with Committee Chair Marcus presiding.

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

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of July 19, 2007 were approved.

2. **OVERVIEW REPORT OF THE STUDY GROUP ON UNIVERSITY DIVERSITY**

Regent Parsky recommended that the Committee on Educational Policy recommend that The Regents adopt three core recommendations:

Finding/Recommendation #1

Diversity among students, faculty, and staff, and campus climates that support this diversity, are critical to the mission and continued excellence of the University of California. The importance of diversity to our University is very well expressed in the Academic Senate's Diversity Statement, which reads in part, "the diversity of the people of California has been the source of innovative ideas and creative accomplishments throughout the state's history...[and is] a defining feature of California's past, present, and future...Because the core mission of the University...is to serve the interests of the State of California, it must seek to achieve diversity among its student bodies and...its employees."

Recommendation: *The Regents of the University of California should adopt as Regents Policy the University of California Diversity Statement adopted by the Assembly of the Academic Senate in May 2006 and endorsed by the President in June 2006.*

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA DIVERSITY STATEMENT

The diversity of the people of California has been the source of innovative ideas and creative accomplishments throughout the state's history into the present. Diversity – a defining feature of California's past, present, and future – refers to the variety of personal experiences, values, and worldviews that arise from differences of culture and circumstance. Such differences include race, ethnicity, gender, age, religion, language, abilities/disabilities, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, and geographic region, and more.

Because the core mission of the University of California is to serve the interests of the State of California, it must seek to achieve diversity among its student bodies and among its employees. The State of California has a compelling interest in making sure that people from all backgrounds perceive that access to the University is possible for talented students, staff, and faculty from all groups. The knowledge that the University of California is open to qualified students from all groups, and thus serves all parts of the community equitably, helps sustain the social fabric of the State.

Diversity should also be integral to the University's achievement of excellence. Diversity can enhance the ability of the University to accomplish its academic mission. Diversity aims to broaden and deepen both the educational experience and the scholarly environment, as students and faculty learn to interact effectively with each other, preparing them to participate in an increasingly complex and pluralistic society. Ideas, and practices based on those ideas, can be made richer by the process of being born and nurtured in a diverse community. The pluralistic university can model a process of proposing and testing ideas through respectful, civil communication. Educational excellence that truly incorporates diversity thus can promote mutual respect and make possible the full, effective use of the talents and abilities of all to foster innovation and train future leadership.

Therefore, the University of California renews its commitment to the full realization of its historic promise to recognize and nurture merit, talent, and achievement by supporting diversity and equal opportunity in its education, services, and administration, as well as research and creative activity. The University particularly acknowledges the acute need to

remove barriers to the recruitment, retention, and advancement of talented students, faculty, and staff from historically excluded populations who are currently underrepresented.

Finding/Recommendation #2

In reviewing data and research regarding the current status of diversity at the University of California, the Study Group found that – while there are many pockets of success and innovation in seeking and supporting diversity – overall, the University has not made sufficient progress in this area and needs to focus greater and sustained attention.

Recommendation: *The Regents of the University of California should affirm the finding of the Study Group on University Diversity that change is needed to achieve a level of diversity among students, faculty, and staff appropriate to our mission, as well as a climate on each of our campuses that is open and inclusive of individuals from all backgrounds. The reports of the Study Group’s work teams provide direction for this change.*

Finding/Recommendation #3

Clear, consistent, and regularly-produced data are necessary to “shine a light” on the University’s successes, as well as its weaknesses, with regard to increasing and supporting diversity and to hold University leaders accountable for progress in this area.

Recommendation: *The Regents of the University of California should require the President of the University, as a fundamental component of his or her responsibilities, to report annually to The Regents on the status of diversity at the University. This report should include consistent and clear metrics of diversity among students, faculty, and staff. It should (1) identify trends, including areas of progress or concern; (2) allow for meaningful comparisons among campuses and, where appropriate, among academic fields; and, (3) include appropriate contextual data that illuminate University performance (for example, demographic trends among California public high school graduates provide context for evaluating trends in the enrollment of new undergraduates). In addition, while issues of campus climate are not easily tracked using statistical data, the report should address climate issues each year – for example, by reporting the results of new surveys or qualitative research performed for the system as a whole or for individual campuses.*

It was recalled that at the July 2006 meeting, the Committee on Educational Policy discussed the proposal by Regents Ledesma and Ruiz that the Office of the President be asked to undertake a holistic study of the long-term impact of Proposition 209 on the University’s ability to serve the state and fulfill its mission as the leading public university in one of the nation’s most diverse states. The

Regents agreed on the need for a study of actions the University can take to increase diversity in undergraduate and graduate enrollment and faculty hiring and to foster a climate on every UC campus that is welcoming and inclusive. To address this need, President Dynes and then-Chair of The Regents Parsky appointed a Study Group on University Diversity. Regent Parsky and Provost Hume co-chaired this group and Regent Kozberg served as its Vice Chair.

The members of the Study Group, as well as four separate work teams formed to examine aspects of the issue in greater detail, met frequently over the past nine months. The full Study Group issued its overview report, the recommendations of which the Board was asked to adopt. The reports of the individual work teams, which include additional findings and recommendations, were to be released by the end of September. Recommendations from those reports, which are consistent with the overview report, will provide important and valued guidance to the President, the chancellors, and the Academic Senate as they seek the change the Study Group has identified as necessary throughout the University. Information on progress toward implementation of these recommendations should be included in the President's Annual Report on University Diversity (see recommendation #3, above).

Regent Parsky underscored the fact that this study looked across the full spectrum of diversity issues at the University. He also pointed out that the study groups sought to look beyond the numbers to issues of campus climate. Much more work is needed on campus climate, and he recognized that this area is difficult to analyze. Regent Parsky spoke of the importance of staff diversity and that, in order to avoid duplication of the work of the UC Staff Diversity Council, the results of that work would be incorporated into the findings of the Study Group on University Diversity.

Regent Parsky recalled that the membership of Study Group was very representative, with a mix of Regents, campus and Office of the President administrators, Academic Senate leaders, faculty, staff, and undergraduate and graduate students. The Study Group met for a total of at least 22 hours and the individual work teams each logged hundreds of hours.

Mr. Hume explained that the detailed recommendations of the work teams were not presented to The Regents, as these will be most effectively handled at the campus, Office of the President, and Academic Senate levels. He reviewed the core findings of the Study Group, as noted above. Sobering results revealed that at virtually every level of the institution, African-Americans, Native Americans, Chicano/Latinos, and, in many cases, women are not represented inside the University at the same level as they exist in the state. He pointed out several successes, however, including that the proportion of underrepresented medical students at UC now exceeds levels prior to Proposition 209. Several campuses, most notably UCLA in the last year, also have seen real progress in diversity at

the undergraduate level. On the other hand, progress in other areas is slow or nonexistent.

Additionally, Mr. Hume emphasized that structural diversity – the physical presence of diverse populations on campuses – is not enough. Programs that ensure academic and professional success for scholars of all backgrounds are needed, as well as the fostering of positive inter-group interactions, so the entire campus community receives the benefits that a diverse learning environment provides. There were some positive examples in this area as well; UC Riverside is making a major commitment to improve student outcomes, and is now recognized nationwide as a welcoming and supportive environment for students of diverse backgrounds.

Regent Parsky reviewed the recommendations, as detailed above, and Mr. Hume discussed next steps, which include the final reporting of the work groups, the posting of the reports on the University's web site, implementation regarding the specific findings of the work groups at the campus, Academic Senate, and Office of the President levels, and reporting progress to the Board as part of the President's annual report. To ensure that the work moves forward at an appropriate pace, on behalf of the President and in partnership with the chancellors and Academic Senate, Mr. Hume committed to creating a follow-up group to guide the continuation of the Study Group's efforts.

Regent Parsky acknowledged and thanked former Regent Ledesma, who made the effort a signature piece of her time on the Board. He also paid special thanks to Regents Ruiz and Kozberg; to Acting Chancellor Blumenthal, Faculty Representative Brown, and Vice Chancellor Basri who served as work group chairs; and to Ms. Nina Robinson who served as the principal staff person and scribe.

President Dynes called on the University of California Student Association (UCSA) President Oiyen Poon. Ms. Poon pointed out that several key points from the Study Group findings were analogous to the UCSA agenda items for the year. She urged that the University move forward on implementing the recommendations. Ms. Poon presented nine recommendations from UCSA to address diversity, highlighting the importance of setting benchmarks and ensuring affordability by increasing financial aid and adopting an equitable policy for student loans. She urged that student fees be frozen, since fee increases create significant barriers to access to the University.

Ms. Poon highlighted the disparities in A-G course offerings and GPA requirements in the state, noting that the average GPA and number of A-G courses of students accepted to the University is much higher than the requirements. Additionally, there are significant racial disparities in access to schools with A-G courses. Only 45 percent of all California public high schools meet the benchmark of having at least 60 percent of their courses satisfy A-G

course requirements, and in schools where the majority of students are African-American or Latino, the percentage is far lower.

Ms. Poon provided an update on UCSA Action Agenda items for the year. The financial aid policy campaign seeks to ensure that the student loan policy to be brought before The Regents is sufficiently strong. She voiced support for the Omnibus Scholarship Fund proposed by Chairman Blum. UCSA's California Dreaming campaign seeks to ensure that financial aid is provided to qualified AB 540 students, and that these students are also eligible for University-based funding and financial aid. UCSA also seeks to ensure that the Study Group on University Diversity report is not watered down and that students are involved in the implementation of the recommendations. Next steps for UCSA include additional student representation on the University restructuring work group, since many of the issues being addressed impact students' lives on a daily basis, and additional student representation on the committee to select a new University President.

A number of Regents commended the Study Group on University Diversity report, recognized and congratulated former Regent Ledesma for championing the initiative, and thanked Regent Parsky and Provost Hume for their work on the effort.

Regent Island underscored the serious racial and economic disparities that exist in the California educational system. He urged the Regents to maintain a focus on the metrics of change, the campuses to implement the recommendations, and the Academic Senate and the Office of the President to provide leadership on the issue.

Regent Núñez recognized that the report lays out a fundamental obligation and commitment of University to students of color. He pointed out that access to the University is limited to such students due to the paucity of A-G courses offered at California high schools. He stressed that the University needs to invest proactively and fully in academic preparation programs, and that the expectations of these programs need to be raised in terms of the recruitment of students of color. Regent Núñez also asked the Regents to write the Governor in support of a bill that would provide financial support to AB 540 students. In terms of recruitment, he maintained that the University needs to be much more proactive in working with K-12 institutions so that, in concert, more qualified students can be prepared for college.

Regent Lansing emphasized that there is a shortage of credentialed, qualified teachers in both the urban and rural areas, which is a major impediment to providing students with A-G courses. Since the California State University (CSU) system also requires A-G courses, she proposed that a partnership be formed with CSU, private industry, and others to develop a concrete action plan that addresses teacher recruitment. She believed that the University also needs to put more money into outreach programs. Committee Chair Marcus suggested that

Regent Lansing, in conjunction with himself and Mr. Hume, work to formulate an action plan. He also pointed out the innovative work done by Regent Lansing's foundation in this area, and asked that at some point she discuss innovative solutions that address this issue.

Regent Schilling believed that the Board of Education must be included in these discussions, and that the University should make the effort to assist the Board of Education in raising standards.

In response to a question from Regent Allen, Mr. Hume and Regent Parsky agreed that future reports on University diversity will be brought annually to the Committee on Educational Policy at the September meeting.

Regent Hopkinson requested that at a future meeting the Faculty Representative report to The Regents on the Academic Senate's review of admissions criteria, specifically in light of diversity, since the current admissions criteria results in large numbers of people being disenfranchised.

Regent Moores requested information on how many California high school students are not able to take A-G courses at their schools, noting that it is not a University issue in the sense that the University does not control such offerings. He also maintained that the University's admissions standards are already low. Regent Moores recalled that the G requirement – an arts requirement – was added most recently and wondered about the extent to which the availability of that course serves as an impediment to meeting the requirements of the University. If the University is truly interested in enhancing diversity, he argued that nothing should be off limits, including reviewing the necessity of each A-G course. Regent Moores recalled that the University is already accepting approximately 7,000 students above the target for the Master Plan for Higher Education; if it were to accept the 12.5 percent specified in the Master Plan, the number of non-Asian minority students accepted to the University would decrease further. He asserted that this situation is a huge problem for the University.

Regent Marcus pointed out that economic diversity must be considered as well in these discussions, given the situation in the rural parts of the state.

Regent-designate Scorza asserted that academic preparation programs need to be fully funded, including matching funds from the University, given their proven effectiveness. He inquired as to who will spearhead the implementation of the recommendations of the Study Group, and how relevant constituencies will be included. Mr. Hume stated that he will take responsibility as the University's chief academic officer to coordinate the work. He requested that he be invited to return to The Regents with a discussion of current and future projects that seek to address this issue of diversity at the University.

Chairman Blum stated that as the University is restructured and costs are monitored, it is important to set benchmarks and keep them up to date in order to view progress. He urged that the University needs to be in the forefront of lobbying for K-12 needs, as well as for preschools.

Regent Kozberg pointed out that currently there is a larger state dialog underway on the topic of education, including an achievement gap summit and two task forces looking at P-16, and stressed that the University should be part of these initiatives. The CSU system is also initiating some promising programs; the University should work with them and expand on their programs since less territory will be covered if the University continues to act on its own.

Regent Lozano asserted that a focused and deliberate effort that identifies accountability, ownership, and clear outcomes is required. She asked Mr. Hume to return to The Regents with ideas on how accountability can be included in efforts to improve University diversity in order to ensure action in an expeditious manner.

Faculty Representative Croughan put forth suggestions to guide Mr. Hume's work to develop an action plan regarding University diversity: 1) a review of then-Associate Dean for Admissions Drake's innovative solutions to minority recruitment at the UCSF Medical Center; and 2) loan forgiveness programs for minorities and other disadvantaged groups who come through the UC school system and seek faculty positions, in order to improve faculty diversity.

Faculty Representative Brown echoed the importance of ownership of responsibilities in this effort, and that this issue is ripe for collaboration with other education partners in the state. At the same time, the University has an individual responsibility to review its eligibility requirements. He pointed out that a proposal put forth by the UC Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools is currently being circulated through the University's Academic Senate system, and that hopefully something will come before the Regents for their consideration.

Regent De La Peña echoed the importance of working with the other segments of the California education system, since most of the problems begin at the K-12 level.

Regent Ruiz questioned the current value of the 12.5 percent admission set in the Master Plan and urged its rethinking.

President Dynes emphasized that faculty and staff diversity is extremely important, in addition to student diversity.

Staff Advisor Brewer encouraged partnership with staff who are delivering the outreach programs.

Regent Johnson noted that, in consideration of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act, K-12 problems are also congressional ones, and urged Regent Lansing to return to the Regents with an action plan that also includes the math and science initiative and the NCLB issue.

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

The meeting adjourned at 12:20 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff