

The Regents of the University of California

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

March 20, 2008

The Committee on Educational Policy met on the above date at UCSF–Mission Bay Community Center, San Francisco.

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

In attendance: Regents Brewer, Bugay, De La Peña, Gould, Hotchkis, Kozberg, Pattiz, 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, Chief Compliance and Audit Officer Vacca, Provost Hume, Executive Vice Presidents Darling and Lapp, Vice Presidents Beckwith, Dooley, Foley, and Sakaki, Chancellors Birgeneau, Block, Blumenthal, Fox, Kang, Vanderhoef, and Yang, Acting Chancellor Grey, and Recording Secretary Johns

The meeting convened at 8:55 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 January 16, 2008 were approved.

2. **REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA CAMPUS SECURITY TASK FORCE**

[Background material was mailed to Regents in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Executive Vice President Lapp began by observing that the University should be prepared to handle a wide range of critical incidents. She referred to recent shootings at Northern Illinois University and the incident involving explosives at the UC Davis dormitory. She recalled that, after the Virginia Tech tragedy in 2007, President Dynes commissioned a Campus Security Task Force to examine UC's preparedness and security, emergency notification, student mental health services, and general emergency preparedness. The Task Force was charged with developing recommendations on how campuses can enhance these areas. Its membership included University security, student affairs, and emergency preparedness experts.

UCLA Chief of Police Karl Ross informed the Committee that the Task Force surveyed the campuses' emergency communications capabilities, both internally with the campus community and externally with local law enforcement agencies. The Task Force recommends that campuses consider establishment of communication systems which would allow UC Police to radio every outside local law enforcement agency in their area. Local campus notification systems should be layered and redundant, because single systems can fail. All campuses have mass notification systems; some campus systems are enhanced. An outdoor mass notification system is being piloted in certain areas of the UCLA campus, which consists of a siren alert and a voice advisory.

The Task Force recommends that campuses carry out a gap analysis to identify and fix any gaps or weaknesses in their communication systems. Each campus should develop a crisis communications plan which defines the roles of campus officials and delegations and lines of authority, so that timely warnings and notifications can be rolled out smoothly. Mr. Ross maintained that campuses need specific plans, procedures, and training in emergency preparedness. He cited the National Standard on Disaster and Emergency Management, endorsed by the 9-11 Commission, Congress, and the Department of Homeland Security. Mr. Ross pointed out that UC is one of only a few higher education institutions in the nation that have adopted this stringent standard.

UC Police are fully compliant with all statewide mandated training standards. Many campuses offer training in tactical response to a variety of scenarios, including an active shooter. Mr. Ross noted that UC campuses have been proactive in preparing for such a scenario; they began preparations soon after the Columbine High School tragedy, and well before the Virginia Tech events. He indicated that UC campuses cannot be secured or locked down instantly due to their size, comparable to a small city, and their design as open and public places. UC Police departments should meet the daily demands of policing of a large, active community and be prepared for rare violent incidents such as homicides, active shooters, bombings, and terrorist activity.

Campus communities should receive training on what to do if a violent incident occurs: how to shelter in place or make a decision to evacuate. Regarding prevention and hazard mitigation, the Task Force fully endorses the 2005 Hazard and Vulnerability Assessment Report of the UC Safety, Security, and Anti-Terrorism Committee. The Task Force has further recommendations. Each campus should conduct active shooter response training as part of an emergency management exercise. This training should include mutual aid response agencies and the use of specialized equipment. The Task Force also recommends security surveys of all campus buildings to enhance their physical security. Design review of new buildings should include recommendations for security enhancements.

Vice President Sakaki recalled that Provost Hume appointed the UC Student Mental Health Committee two years ago to assess trends in student mental health and review campus programs and services. The Committee reported back to the Regents in September 2006. The Task Force fully endorses the Student Mental Health Committee's findings and recommendations.

Ms. Sakaki informed the Committee that the number of students using the campus counseling centers increased by 23 percent between 2000 and 2005, a figure consistent with national trends. The severity of problems has increased, while student access to psychiatrists and psychologists was found to be insufficient. This profoundly affects campus communities.

The Student Mental Health Committee proposed a comprehensive plan for strengthening core programs and services. The Vice Chancellors for Student Affairs collectively recommended \$41 million in permanent new funding to implement the most critical components of the plan. The Task Force's principal recommendation for student mental health is that the University fund this original Student Mental Health Committee recommendation. Ms. Sakaki observed that, as a first step toward this recommendation, the Regents in March 2007 approved a three percent increase in the Registration fee for campus student mental health needs. This generated approximately \$4.6 million in permanent new revenue. Campuses hired additional counseling center staff, augmented salaries to strengthen staff recruitment and retention, and implemented 24-hour access to counseling services. Students now have greater and more prompt access to services. Faculty and staff have a better understanding of mental health issues because of additional training that was offered.

Ms. Sakaki stated that securing an additional \$8 million in funding for student mental health for next year remains one of the Task Force's highest priorities. She emphasized that a robust, comprehensive network of student mental health services is the University's first and best line of defense in helping behaviorally distressed students.

The Task Force made three additional recommendations. Campus staff have expressed a need for additional clarification of student and patient privacy laws, to ensure that administrators and counselors know what information they can share, including with parents. The Task Force recommends that the University develop systemwide guidelines on sharing student information and conduct campus training sessions, that UC re-examine its own policies and State and federal privacy laws in order to improve information sharing while preserving an appropriate balance between individual rights and community needs, and that campuses reassess the capacity of their multi-disciplinary behavioral management teams to deal with behavioral threats.

Executive Vice President Lapp noted that the Task Force supports full funding for the recommendations of the Student Mental Health Committee. Provost Hume

has created a Student Mental Health Oversight Committee to monitor the progress in securing funding. Ms. Lapp reiterated that securing \$8 million for student mental health for next year is a priority. Regarding campus security, the Task Force has worked with the Risk Management department at the Office of the President to identify a new funding stream through an insurance program for campuses to carry out building security assessments. All campuses are encouraged to apply for that funding. The Task Force has also endeavored to secure support from the federal government, in particular Homeland Security funds, to support campus security efforts. Ms. Lapp reported that UCSF recently received a \$40,000 grant to develop security assessment software, customized for buildings and communities, which will help in identifying vulnerabilities. The University has not been as successful as desired in obtaining Homeland Security funds; most of this funding is granted to big city departments. Ms. Lapp noted another Task Force recommendation, which would require that chancellors periodically report to the President on campus safety efforts.

Regent Pattiz asked Chief Ross about his requirements and needs to be able to provide police services at a level he would find more satisfactory. Mr. Ross identified funding as the essential need. He noted that federal Homeland Security funding goes to large agencies in the state or local municipalities. The local municipalities do not see UC as their responsibility but rather look to the State. The State has its own priorities and its funding to UC Police departments is minimal. Mr. Ross stated that he would like an emphasis on increased federal and State funding for preparation in communication systems and training. He stressed the need for training and equipment. UC Police departments have done an excellent job with current resources, but they could do better.

Regent Pattiz asked how UC Police officers are trained. Mr. Ross responded that members of the UC Police are duly sworn peace officers in the state. They are required to attend a basic academy. In Los Angeles, the University uses the Los Angeles and Orange County Sheriffs' Academies. UC Police departments all have field training programs following Academy procedures that have been approved by the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training. Mr. Ross emphasized that UC Police officers are as well trained as any officer in any municipal, county, or State law enforcement agency. Regent Pattiz opined that UCLA law enforcement ranks as a target of opportunity in Southern California and deserves attention, as do the other campuses. He commended Chief Ross and the UC Police on their work.

Regent Garamendi pointed out the possibilities of using cell phones for notification. He suggested that the University engage the California Emergency Council for funding. He noted that, as a member of the Council, he could offer access. He suggested that an outside audit of emergency response systems would be helpful. Regent Garamendi also reported the availability of approximately \$1 billion in unused Proposition 63 funds, and that he would discuss strategies with Executive Vice President Lapp and Vice President Sakaki.

Regent Bugay referred to the unfortunate incident at UC Davis in which a student was found to have explosives in his room and which led to the evacuation of the dormitory. He cited this as a reasonable real-life example of a campus safety threat. He asked about procedure and protocol; what should happen in such a case, what did in fact happen, and what lessons were learned from this incident.

Chief Ross stated that the UC Davis Police handled the situation with the requisite skill and sensitivity. There are frequent criticisms about timely notification and what notification is made. In the situation at Davis, the student was known and the activity was localized to the dormitory. Officers and emergency personnel responded quickly when they became aware of the presence of explosives and quickly determined that the devices were hazardous but inert, lacked a triggering mechanism, and posed no immediate risk to student safety. Mr. Ross noted that an on-scene analysis like this one may take more than 30 minutes; proposed federal legislation on public safety includes a 30 minute limit for such determination. At Davis, emergency communication took place through cell phones sometime after a 30 minute period, notifying the campus that the situation was under control. Mr. Ross recalled that cell phones and text messaging offer only a limited field of information. This information should direct the receiver to another source, to a website, television, or radio, for more information. When the situation at the residence hall was under control, the hall was evacuated, the devices were removed, and students were allowed to return. Mr. Ross stated that follow-up and evaluation of the incident are still ongoing.

Vice President Sakaki emphasized that there are many cases of students on all campuses who need assistance and reiterated that the funding need is critical.

Regent Allen commended the Task Force on its work and asked about the timetable for full funding of the mental health programs. Provost Hume responded that the University anticipates full funding within less than five years. While this is not as soon as the University would like, it takes time to build a program, and Mr. Hume opined that five years is as fast as reasonably possible.

Faculty Representative Brown reported the faculty's concern about receiving guidance on appropriate involvement in the referral of troubled students, faculty, and staff, and about liability and privacy issues. Ms. Sakaki responded that training for faculty, staff, and students is one of the recommendations of the Student Mental Health Committee report. She stressed that this is training for people to know when and how to refer distressed individuals, not how to counsel. Most campuses have training programs, including on-line training, and training at orientation for new faculty.

Chief Ross remarked that there are committees on most UC campuses, with campus administration or faculty and staff membership, which provide training

and advice for dealing with troubled individuals, to ensure early identification and intervention and avoid crisis situations.

Regent Brewer asked about how funds authorized for student mental health in spring 2007 were spent. She asked if there were any obstacles other than money preventing implementation of the Task Force's recommendations. Vice President Sakaki responded that all authorized funds went to the campuses; they are being used according to campus needs. All previous funding has been accounted for. In response to Regent Brewer's second question, she stated that there is a need to raise awareness of this issue among students, faculty, and staff.

Regent Gould expressed concern about student wait times for urgent mental health care and requested that there be surveys and reports to the Regents on actual wait and response times. Ms. Sakaki responded that funding was used to increase staffing systemwide. There was an estimated immediate need for about 100 additional psychologists and psychiatrists; 30 were hired with the initial funding. Student wait times have been slightly reduced, but there is still a great need. Ms. Sakaki noted the work of the ongoing Student Mental Health Oversight Committee, co-chaired by UCSB Vice Chancellor Michael Young, and UCSD professor of psychiatry Joel Dimsdale. This Committee is continuing to monitor and survey the campuses and will report back.

Faculty Representative Croughan praised the linkage of the student mental health and the campus security task force reports, which were not previously combined. She suggested that faculty orientation and training should be repeated every two years, citing the large number of compliance issues faculty are required to be aware of. She reported that she and Faculty Representative Brown have spoken with colleagues at the California State University and the California Community Colleges to explore the possibility of joint federal grant or funding applications, and that the academic leadership of all three segments are interested in this possibility.

Regent De La Peña asked about the screening process for a student who wishes to see a psychologist or psychiatrist. Ms. Sakaki explained that intake counselors at many campuses perform this screening process, but clarified that no student is screened out from services. Regent De La Peña suggested that an investment in the screening process might provide savings or reduce the numbers of needed psychologists and psychiatrists. Ms. Sakaki explained that the psychologist or psychiatrist does not perform intake counseling.

Committee Chair Marcus observed that there are drawbacks in the use of technology in serious emergencies. He informed the Committee of a charitable nonprofit organization, InSTEDD, founded by Google, which develops technology for global responses to disease and disaster. He said he would provide information on this organization to Executive Vice President Lapp.

### 3. **PRESENTATION ON THE CALIFORNIA COUNCIL ON SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY**

Regent Garamendi began by noting that this year is the twentieth anniversary of the establishment of the California Council on Science and Technology (CCST), which plays a key role by assisting research in California and informing the Legislature. Congressman Sam Farr and Lieutenant Governor Garamendi were instrumental in the creation of CCST, responding to policymakers' lack of a point of access to science and research in previous decisions that came before the Legislature. The idea was to replicate the National Academy of Sciences in California. Regent Garamendi described CCST as an important but little known asset to the state. He introduced Karl Pister, former Dean of the UCB College of Engineering, UCSC Chancellor Emeritus, former Vice President for Educational Outreach at the Office of the President, and current Chair of CCST. He also introduced Susan Hackwood, founding Dean of the UCR School of Engineering, professor of engineering at UCR, and currently Executive Director of CCST.

CCST Chair Pister observed that the work of the Council is instrumental in service to the State. UC has played an important role by statute and through its support and leadership. CCST is dedicated to sustaining California's leadership role by assisting policymakers to make the best decisions that support science and technology, and by providing policy advice to policymakers as they address increasingly complex challenges. Mr. Pister observed that most significant public policy issues have a basis in science and technology. He quoted from the enabling legislation which charged CCST to "respond appropriately to the Governor, the Legislature, and other relevant entities on public policy issues significantly related to science and technology."

CCST Executive Director Hackwood began her presentation by thanking the UC system for its support and emphasized that, through CCST, UC has served in a very important capacity in advising the State. She recalled the founding of CCST in 1988, which recognized the need and opportunity to engage the University in activity to aid the State. UC was given a special role in the legislation to assume the principal responsibility of founding the Council, and UC faculty and leaders are involved in every aspect of CCST's work. Ms. Hackwood provided a brief overview of CCST. It has a governing board of 16 members drawn from higher education and industry, and a council of 30 members representing higher education, industry, and the federal laboratories. CCST also has over 100 fellows and an advisory council of 12 practicing math and science teachers. CCST's approximately 150 members represent California's top talent in science and technology, including Nobel Laureates, National Academy members, and recipients of the National Medals of Science and Technology.

Besides UC, the sustaining institutions for CCST are the California State University (CSU) and the California Community Colleges (CCC), Stanford, the University of Southern California (USC), and the California Institute of

Technology (Caltech). CCST affiliate members include Lawrence Berkeley and Lawrence Livermore laboratories, Sandia, the Stanford Linear Accelerator, NASA Ames, and the NASA Jet Propulsion Laboratory.

CCST is unique in the U.S. as the only organization providing this level of advice to state policymakers. It is formally teamed with the National Academies. Other states are now forming similar organizations; the Royal Society of the U.K. is also interested in CCST.

Ms. Hackwood emphasized that CCST operates on a modest overall budget of approximately \$1 million. Forty-five percent of CCST funding, about \$644,000, comes from its sustaining institutions. The UC system contributes about 45 percent of this amount, or \$286,000. CSU, CCC, Stanford, USC, and Caltech each contribute \$71,000. The contributions of the sustaining institutions are matched by contributions from the laboratory affiliates and by project funding.

Ms. Hackwood discussed examples of recent CCST accomplishments, pointing out that UC faculty are involved in all its projects. CCST has been performing a systematic review of the Public Interest Energy Research Program (PIER), one of the largest State-funded research and development programs. CCST derived the intellectual property rules used as a framework for the California Institute for Regenerative Medicine. CCST has assisted in clarifying the economic and workforce footprint of the federal laboratories in California. CCST assists UC in securing support for major projects. Last year, CCST helped UC obtain a \$22 million award from the Federal Communications Commission for a project on telemedicine capabilities in rural areas.

CCST carries out major analyses, encompassing data from systems which usually do not communicate with one another. Ms. Hackwood discussed a number of examples. The 1999 “California Report on the Environment for Science and Technology” (CREST) revealed that California effectively produces new ideas and experts, but fails in its K-12 system. In 2002, CCST released its “Critical Path Analysis” of the education system, which identified as an essential goal the production and retention of enough qualified science and math teachers. This was the essential focus of the 2007 “Critical Path Analysis of California’s Science and Mathematics Teacher Preparation System.”

The Governor asked CCST to respond to a November 2005 report of the National Academies, with a focus on issues of importance to California. This led to the 2006 report “Shaping the Future: California’s Response to ‘Rising Above the Gathering Storm.’” This report included participation by industry-led groups and input from the University. The report provided a set of recommendations which have been used by the Governor.

Currently, CCST is supporting the California Institute for Climate Solutions (CICS) and may be involved in the external review of CICS. For the last

two years, CCST has been examining the state's physical infrastructure, health care information technology, the effect of climate change on the oceans, the nexus of water and energy, California's energy future, the transportation infrastructure, regional climate change, land stewardship and climate change, and science and math education. Each of these projects engages the CCST sustaining institutions and UC faculty.

Ms. Hackwood concluded by stating that the University's 20 years of support for CCST have enabled the Council to develop the maturity and respectability within the State Legislature and executive offices to respond to state needs. UC provides a reservoir of talent for providing objective advice to the Legislature and executive agencies. The awareness of the need for this advice is growing, and CCST receives more requests for assistance than it can respond to, and its advice is put into practice.

Regent Kozberg asked how CCST might be more effective in engaging public policymakers and effecting change. Ms. Hackwood responded that term limits in Sacramento result in the repeated need for the Council to convey the same message to different legislators. Without a relevant legislative committee, there is no obvious focal point or point of contact within the legislative and executive branches. CCST can provide a conduit to talent if there is an appropriate State organization in place with which it can partner. Ms. Hackwood then noted a new program, anticipated for next year, which will place Ph.D. graduates in key legislative offices, similar to the American Association for the Advancement of Science Congressional Fellows Program. California currently has no such program; this program would place young talent in key legislative offices to assist in policymaking. Ms. Hackwood observed that the State probably could not pay for the quality of work that has been done pro bono through CCST. She cited the intellectual property rules developed for the California Institute for Regenerative Medicine as an example.

Committee Chair Marcus requested examples of two CCST projects which have had the greatest influence in the last 20 years. Ms. Hackwood observed that the Council's 1999 CREST report recommended the creation of what became the California Institutes for Science and Innovation. CCST pointed out how little the State supported research and development, other than direct support for the University. CCST continues to convey that message and is quick to support initiatives from California institutions. Ms. Hackwood then discussed an impact that might not be obvious in the Council's reports. CCST works behind the scenes and sometimes prevents undesirable developments. As an example, Ms. Hackwood cited a talk by a UC Berkeley professor on software licensing, attended by staff from the Governor's office. After the talk, the Governor's staff members told her they would advise the Governor to do the opposite of what they originally intended. Mr. Pister concurred that advice not to do something is sometimes significant. He noted that CCST and others cautioned against too hasty development of the Hydrogen Highway network.

Faculty Representative Brown asked about CCST's policy regarding sustained involvement in projects it sponsors or with which it is involved. Ms. Hackwood responded that it is difficult to expect policymakers to consider long-term strategies. In its twenty-year history, the Council has experienced "feed and starve" cycles. CCST is well aware of the importance of sustainability. Its last report on science and math teachers pointed out that the longevity of State-supported teacher professional development programs has never exceeded three years. Mr. Pister described this as the negative side of term limits in Sacramento. The horizon for legislators does not reach as far as it previously did.

4. **REPORT OF THE GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL SCHOOL STUDENT WORK TEAM OF THE STUDY GROUP ON UNIVERSITY DIVERSITY**

[Background material was mailed to Regents in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Provost Hume recalled the origin and development of the Study Group on University Diversity, and its recommendations that the Regents adopt the faculty statement on the value of diversity and that the President be required to report on the status of diversity at the University annually. The Study Group included four work teams. UCSC Chancellor Blumenthal volunteered to chair the Work Team on Graduate and Professional School Diversity. His presentation demonstrates the profound pipeline effects of the University's graduate and postdoctoral students on the institution. Mr. Hume opined that this is one area in which UC has been most successful in influencing the future.

Chancellor Blumenthal began by observing that this presentation is part of the follow-up to the Overview Report of the Study Group on University Diversity presented in September 2007 and the report on faculty diversity presented in January 2008. UC graduate programs produce more Ph.D.s than any other U.S. university; thus UC is uniquely situated to affect faculty diversity at UC and throughout the country. Chancellor Blumenthal stated that graduate diversity at UC has implications far beyond academia. By increasing graduate diversity, UC produces leaders and researchers whose technological and cultural advances will effect change in California, the U.S., and the world.

Chancellor Blumenthal presented a list of members of the Work Team on Graduate and Professional School Diversity. The Work Team was guided by the Academic Senate Statement on Diversity and focused on three aspects of diversity – race and ethnicity, gender, and citizenship and national origin. Chancellor Blumenthal stressed the importance of international students at the graduate and postdoctoral levels, who provide a global perspective and ensure that UC attracts the best and brightest students.

Chancellor Blumenthal began a presentation of key findings with a chart displaying the proportion of underrepresented minorities (URMs) at UC. URMs include African American, Chicano/Latino, and Native American students. The percentage of URMs was calculated relative to the total number of U.S. citizens and permanent residents, excluding international students. If enrollments of international students were factored in, the fraction of URMs would be lower. While this would make little difference for undergraduates or faculty, it would affect the outcome at the graduate and postdoctoral levels. Thirteen percent of new UC graduate students are international, as well as a quarter of UC Ph.D.s and half of UC postdoctoral scholars.

The proportion of URMs at UC is small overall, especially compared to the approximately 50 percent of URMs among California high school graduates, and Chancellor Blumenthal observed that this proportion decreases at every step in the academic ladder. The proportion for postdoctoral scholars is slightly different; it is lower than that for new faculty hires because most postdoctoral scholars are in science and engineering fields and thus represent a different population. But in general, as one moves up the academic ladder, there are fewer and fewer URMs.

Next Chancellor Blumenthal discussed national trends. In academic graduate programs, the fraction of URMs among Ph.D. recipients has been increasing slowly but steadily over the last 18 years. In recent years, the number of women URM Ph.D. recipients has increased more than the number of men. Graduate diversity has been increasing nationally.

Chancellor Blumenthal observed a slightly different trend in graduate diversity over time at UC. There was progress in graduate diversity on all campuses and in all fields between 1987 and 1994, but improvement has stalled since that time.

There are significant variations in graduate diversity at UC for different fields. Chancellor Blumenthal discussed a chart displaying proportions of URM graduates in three divisions: engineering, social science, and physical sciences and math. Systemwide URM diversity varies by more than a factor of two. URMs are especially underrepresented in science, technology, engineering, and math – the STEM fields – particularly when compared to the social sciences. There are also significant variations within academic divisions, among academic departments. Chancellor Blumenthal stressed that the actual number of URM graduate students in some fields is very small.

Next Chancellor Blumenthal compared graduate diversity at UC with eight comparison institutions. Overall, UC has a slightly higher enrollment of URM academic graduate students. In particular, UC has a higher proportion of Chicano/Latino students, but a lower proportion of African American students. The diversity of the California population gives UC a “home field” advantage in attracting Latino students. Thirty-nine percent of California high school graduates are Latino, compared to a national average of 16 percent. UC has a

comparative disadvantage regarding African American students. About 7 percent of California high school graduates are African American, compared to a national average of 14 percent. This is one reason UC has a lower percentage of African American graduate students.

Just under half of UC's graduate students come from colleges in California. The majority of graduate URM enrollments, 69 percent, graduated from California colleges and universities. UC provides a more diverse cohort of graduate students to UC than all other universities combined. Chancellor Blumenthal stressed that UC is its own best source of diverse graduate students.

Chancellor Blumenthal then considered financial factors. URM doctoral students are consistently more likely to borrow money to complete their studies, and borrow more money on average than others. The availability of financial aid and employment during graduate studies are key elements for attracting and retaining a more diverse graduate student body.

The proportion of URM new enrollments in all three UC professional school programs – business, law, and medicine – showed a sharp decline after 1995. URM enrollments in UC's MBA programs fell in 1995 and remain low. The percentage of new URM enrollments in those programs has not changed since 1999. By contrast, UC's medical and law programs have shown some improvement. UCSF's entering cohort in medicine for 2008 includes more than 30 percent URMs. Chancellor Blumenthal praised the San Francisco campus for achieving this and ascribed it to UCSF's new Program in Medical Education for the Urban Underserved (PRIME-US), combined with alumni outreach efforts. The medical schools may serve as a model and provide lessons for increasing graduate minority enrollment. One such lesson is that a multitude of programs are needed to effect change. For the medical schools, these programs include post-baccalaureate reapplicant programs, systemwide pipeline programs such as Leadership Excellence through Advanced Degrees (UC LEADS) and the Alliance for Graduate Education and the Professoriate (UC AGEP), summer research programs, PRIME programs, and outreach to community colleges, California State University (CSU), and K-12 schools. Students and alumni should be involved in that outreach.

Chancellor Blumenthal then discussed the percentage of women in various UC graduate cohorts. While women are well represented at the baccalaureate level, they comprise only 38 percent of postdoctoral scholars, 35 percent of new faculty hires, and 29 percent of ladder-rank faculty. There are significant variations among academic divisions and departments, so that, while women represent almost half of UC's new graduate enrollments, enrollments of women are particularly low in the STEM fields and in business. There are also variations by discipline within academic divisions. There are greater proportions of women in chemical engineering than in mechanical engineering departments. Particularly high proportions of women are found in some health sciences. Women account

for more than three-quarters of all new enrollments in nursing, veterinary medicine, and pharmacy. UC is not using the available pool of women in some disciplines.

The Work Team made more than 30 recommendations for graduate and professional diversity, and these intentionally parallel the recommendations of the Work Team on Faculty Diversity. The Work Team considers strong leadership essential to increasing diversity, and UC can provide leadership nationally in making diversity a part of national rankings. Success in improving diversity should be a factor in how UC evaluates administrators. Diversity must be incorporated into academic planning. Adequate funding is crucial for pipeline programs and diversity fellowships. Raising graduate financial support levels for all students will help diversity efforts, and increased funding will have a greater effect on URMs than on others. Campuses and departments can do more to promote a competitive, diverse pool of applicants and to retain matriculated students. Given the diversity available in California's undergraduate population, UC must maximize its "inreach" recruitment efforts to UC, CSU, and other California universities. Increased accountability at campuses, in divisions, and in departments is a key component to increasing graduate and professional school diversity.

Chancellor Blumenthal recalled the three findings of the Study Group on University Diversity, approved by the Regents in September 2007. Diversity is fundamental to UC's mission, and diversity in UC's graduate, professional, and postdoctoral populations is essential to prepare future leaders. California's challenges include the need to develop leaders with multicultural competency in a global economy. UC must provide an opportunity for all students not only to receive an education, but to gain access to the highest levels of academia. Change is needed to seek diversity more effectively. The data in this presentation demonstrate that UC has not achieved the graduate and professional school diversity it should have. Clear, consistent, and regularly produced data are needed to assess progress. The Work Team's experience reinforces the importance of the data collection process. The data now collected will serve as a baseline to provide a starting point and direction for UC leadership to advance this important priority.

Regent Garamendi asked about the pipeline of graduate students to UC. He noted that about 60 percent of UC's URM graduate students come from UC and CSU, and asked if there had been an analysis of URMs in both systems at the undergraduate level. Chancellor Blumenthal referred to a chart displaying the source of UC undergraduate URMs. He observed that undergraduate diversity is generally greater at CSU than at UC.

Regent Garamendi stated that the numbers of undergraduate URMs at CSU and UC are lower than their proportion in the population, and significantly lower at UC. Since most URM graduate students come from either UC or CSU, unless

there is a radical change in the other sources of graduate students from out-of-state and private schools, the solution lies in increasing the number of URM students in the undergraduate population. Chancellor Blumenthal concurred that this would have a beneficial effect and referred to the undergraduate Work Team report, to be presented in May.

Regent Garamendi observed that CSU has relevant programs that show great potential, such as a strong outreach program, and recommended them to the UC system. He then discussed accountability. He recalled diversity efforts at the U.S. Department of the Interior, where change was effected by holding hiring managers responsible. The Regents routinely approve merit increases and other compensation for meritorious work. He suggested that, if the Regents enforced this issue with regard to merit increases, change might occur quickly. He advocated enforcing accountability throughout the system, top to bottom, and stated that this can be done legally. Regent Garamendi then asked what caused the enrollment declines in 1995. Chancellor Blumenthal responded that the Regents adopted a policy prohibiting affirmative action; the next year, California voters approved Proposition 209.

Regent Garamendi asked if the University has found a way to achieve Regental diversity goals within the constraints of the law. Chancellor Blumenthal recalled that the Regents have rescinded the policies prohibiting affirmative action, but Proposition 209 is still the law of the state. UC has made many efforts to address diversity through programs that comply with Proposition 209. These efforts have had a positive effect, including at the graduate level, and need to be expanded.

Regent Garamendi asked about the effect of substantial graduate fee increases. Chancellor Blumenthal responded that fees have had an adverse effect on graduate education at UC and on total and UMR enrollments. He observed that UC is forced to compete with other universities for the best graduate students, and that many of these other universities can cover the fees. Regent Garamendi noted what he saw as an inconsistency in the University's policy to increase graduate enrollment while increasing fees.

Faculty Representative Croughan discussed the pipeline issue, which is relevant for undergraduates and faculty as well. She believed that the eligibility reform proposed by the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools will improve the pool of URM high school graduates for admission to UC. She noted that many undergraduates are recruited to other universities by fellowships and housing allowances. UC does not recruit its own graduates into graduate programs as effectively as desired because these students now graduate with a higher debt burden. UC does not attempt to ease that debt burden for graduate students. Professor Croughan pointed out that other universities offer to pay off undergraduate student loans for URM Ph.D. students. UC should make an effort to recruit its own URM graduate students as faculty, and should consider loan forgiveness and payback programs for recruited URM faculty.

Regent-designate Scorza asked how Human Resources Information Systems (HRIS) will interface with the need to collect data on diversity. Provost Hume responded that improvements in HRIS could be beneficial to capture data and streamline much of the laborious work that has been done recently.

Regent-designate Scorza requested more data on low-income white rural students, citing the population of the San Joaquin Valley. Chancellor Blumenthal responded that data on this population would appear in the undergraduate Work Team report. Provost Hume stated that he has seen such data, based on geographic origin of UC entering students rather than family income, and that he would provide it. President Dynes noted that the University has a significant amount of data available on undergraduate family income and student demographics.

Regent Kozberg asked if UC had ever considered a kind of dual-admit program which would target talented upperclassmen before they begin to look for graduate programs. Chancellor Blumenthal responded that this issue is discussed in the report. UC has programs for junior and senior undergraduates to participate in programs at other campuses or in other departments and to spend the summer on research with a faculty member. This serves as a bridge for students to be admitted to UC graduate programs. Chancellor Blumenthal answered Regent Kozberg's question in the affirmative, but added that graduate student admission is handled by individual departments. Programs like this are offered to students by individual departments, not systemwide.

Regent Island observed that the Study Group and Work Teams have achieved a rigorous collection of data and have proposed a way forward. He cautioned that the University's diversity efforts will fail if it does not enforce accountability in promoting administrators. Regent Island emphasized that change is expected and asked UC faculty and administrators to live up to UC's core value of diversity. He noted that diversity accounts in part for UC's status as a public research university and urged the University to invigorate its efforts in this area. Regent Island stated that he will ask the President about progress every year and demand accountability of the administration.

Regent Brewer underscored the importance of alumni involvement in key issues. She observed that the UCLA Alumni Association provides approximately \$1 million in scholarship funds every year, but none of it to graduate students. The alumni became aware of this need, and of the strategic importance of supporting graduate students, from the work of a previous chancellor's task force, albeit a task force which did not involve the alumni. Regent Brewer pointed out that it was a UCLA alumnus who raised funds for recruitment of African American students. She informed the Committee that she has brought to the Regents a strategic plan to involve alumni at every level. She stressed that alumni are part of the solution and need to be involved and informed of developments.

Chancellor Blumenthal observed that alumni involvement is important not only for fundraising but for recruitment as well. He ascribed UCSF's recent success in recruiting URM medical students to the personal efforts of alumni.

Faculty Representative Brown noted that the entire UC community must be part of the effort to change the profile of UC. He recalled the different URM enrollment pattern for MBA students relative to law and medical students, and asked what accounts for this pattern and what a possible solution might be.

Chancellor Blumenthal shared his impression that the medical schools have been more active in URM recruitment over the last decade than have the business schools. This situation may now be changing, and the current efforts of UC's business schools may bear fruit in the coming years.

Chairman Blum shared Regent Island's concern about the need for progress. He stated that administrators should be thinking of diversity when they interview candidates. He referred to Faculty Representative Croughan's comments on the financial burdens for graduate students in science and medicine and maintained that UC must know what its competitor institutions are offering their students in order to level the playing field.

Faculty Representative Croughan responded that this information has been gathered at UCSF, and that housing allowances and loan forgiveness programs are being considered in UCSF strategic planning. She discussed the high debt load of medical school graduates, sometimes over \$200,000. It is particularly difficult for students to consider pursuing a career in academic medicine because it requires another five to ten years of training with an annual income of only \$35,000 to \$50,000, which would make it difficult to pay back loans, purchase a home, or start a family.

Provost Hume referred to his administrative experience at UCLA. While the medical school admissions process was designed to build a class to meet the health care needs of the state, the law and business schools did not have this criterion as part of their admissions process.

Regent Gould described UC as a symbol of opportunity for the people of California. He suggested that the University should track lower-income students at the graduate and postdoctoral levels, as it already does for undergraduate Pell Grant recipients.

Committee Chair Marcus opined that creativity, progress, and innovation are connected with diversity. He stressed the importance of graduate students to the quality of UC and the desirability of reducing the burden of graduate student fees.

5. **QUARTERLY REPORT ON PRIVATE SUPPORT, SECOND QUARTER  
OCTOBER 1 – DECEMBER 31, 2007**

[Background material was mailed to Regents in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Executive Vice President Darling presented a positive report on private support for UC for the first six months of the current fiscal year, measured in cash and payments on pledges. Cash available for academic programs increased 32 percent over the same period last year. On an accrual basis, new gifts and pledges increased by 68 percent, or \$423 million, over the same period last year. Actual cash received for endowments totaled \$195 million, an increase over the same period last year of \$117 million. Mr. Darling praised chancellors and campus staff for the superb job they have done of engaging donors in the life and aspirations of campuses.

Committee Chair Marcus asked about the contribution alumni have made to this support, both in participation and in financial contributions. Regents Brewer and Bugay did not have specific figures. Regent Bugay stated that he would share this information in a subsequent report. He believed that the University could improve its alumni contributions. Mr. Darling confirmed that this is an area of opportunity for growth in which the University has been underperforming. Each campus has made this a priority and it is a key element of the alumni associations' strategic plan. He noted that the Office of the President is providing \$3 million in incentive funding to the campuses, which the campuses are matching annually with \$6 million, to build the capacity to strengthen alumni giving programs. It is still too early to state what the results of this investment will be, but Mr. Darling anticipated that the administration will have some insight by the end of this fiscal year.

Regent Bugay emphasized that UC's population of 1.5 million alumni represent an enormous resource and tremendous potential which UC needs to engage more productively. He looked forward to a more robust level of funding for this effort as an investment that will pay certain dividends.

Mr. Darling observed that alumni giving may be underreported. Many alumni have created family foundations, and their gifts are recorded as foundation gifts. The administration is examining how these data are aggregated. Mr. Darling cited the outstanding \$100 million gift from the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation to UC Davis for a new nursing school. This gift is recorded as a foundation gift even though Mr. Moore is an alumnus of UC Berkeley.

Regent Schilling stated that the University should redouble its efforts to build relationships with alumni, for both financial and political reasons. If 20 percent of alumni contacted their elected representatives to support UC, this would be a large number. Regent Schilling stressed that this is an important issue she would

continue to monitor, and that the University will be compelled to rely on alumni when the State is an unreliable partner.

Chairman Blum concurred with the emphasis on the necessity of developing a base of alumni support. He discussed another strategy, that of asking graduating seniors to contribute, even if only a modest amount; these alumni might increase their contributions in the future. Chairman Blum noted recent significant donations to UCLA.

Mr. Darling specified that these recent donations to UCLA included two \$10 million gifts from the Easton family, a \$10 million gift from the Annenberg Foundation, and a \$20 million gift from the Gonda family. Gifts to UCM, UCSB, and UCSF also increased significantly. Mr. Darling also recalled the Hewlett Foundation gift to UCB of \$113 million and the \$100 million gift from the Moore Foundation to UCD. He thanked Chairman Blum for providing incentive funds for graduating seniors. All the campuses are now working with donors to provide similar matches. Mr. Darling suggested that this effort could begin with students even earlier, during their undergraduate years, and involve parents as well.

Committee Chair Marcus cautioned that the University will decline without sufficient resources and world-class graduate students. Mr. Darling acknowledged the important role and commitment of the chancellors and their colleagues.

Regent Garamendi discussed the Governor's Troops to College program, the anticipated number of veterans returning to California, and UC's responsibility to these men and women. Campus programs are under way but more can be done. He emphasized the coordinating effort that must take place in counseling offices to direct veterans to appropriate federal, State, and private programs and resources.

President Dynes reported that all elements of higher education are involved in this effort. He observed that returning veterans are often counseled in their local community and directed to the local community college and to the transfer mechanism to the California State University (CSU) and UC. UC is working in harmony with the community colleges and CSU on this effort, and all the campuses are committed to it.

The meeting adjourned at 11:15 a.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff