The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY
May 15, 2008

The Committee on Educational Policy met on the above date at Covel Commons, Los Angeles campus.

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

In attendance: Regents Brewer, Bugay, De La Peña, Gould, Hotchkis, Kozberg, Pattiz, Reiss, and Schilling, 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 Beckwith, Lenz, and Sakaki, Chancellors Block, Blumenthal, Drake, Fox, Kang, Vanderhoef, and Yang, Acting Chancellor Grey, and Recording Secretary Smith

The meeting convened at 10:10 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 March 20, 2008 were approved.

2. **REPORT ON DISPARATE IMPACT AND REPORT OF THE UNDERGRADUATE WORK TEAM OF THE STUDY GROUP ON UNIVERSITY DIVERSITY**

Provost Hume stated that this report continues the work of the Study Group on University Diversity, recalling that at the January meeting Vice Chancellor Basri presented the report on faculty diversity and at the March meeting Chancellor Blumenthal reported on graduate student diversity; this report on undergraduate diversity will be presented by Academic Senate Chair Brown. Before his report, General Counsel Robinson and Vice President Sakaki will provide a short informational presentation on the legal concept of discrimination based on disparate impact.

Mr. Robinson stated that disparate impact is an outgrowth of federal and State law antidiscrimination regulations. It is a recognition that even seemingly neutral or benign practices can have unintended consequences that are harmful. For that

reason, discriminatory intent is not required, but it is also the case that a mere numerical disparity does not mean that there is a violation of the law.

The legal sources for the principle of disparate impact include Title VII governing employment practices, Title VI governing federal funding, Title IX governing federal funding and gender equity issues, and California Government Code section 11135. Regulators and courts use a three-part test to determine whether or not there is a disparate impact that would be prohibited under law. The first part of the test requires that one determine whether or not the practice results in a substantial disparate outcome. If yes, the second part of the test is to determine whether or not the practice is educationally justified. If no, the third part of the test is to determine whether or not there are alternative practices that would meet the same objectives but would have less impact. If yes, the alternative practice must be substituted.

In terms of determining whether or not substantial disparity is present, one must examine what universe is being considered; for example, is one considering all high school students or only those who qualify for the University. It also must be determined if the practice in question is causing the disparity, and if the disparity is substantial. The courts have adopted a four-fifths, or 80 percent, test in determining whether an impact is substantial. For example, if 80 percent of one group would be selected as compared with another group, that would be considered a substantial disparity.

In terms of educational justification, one needs to show both a legitimate objective that is trying to be achieved and also to demonstrate that the particular practice at issue bears some manifest relationship to that legitimate objective. Mr. Robinson explained that the courts typically afford universities discretion in determining their own educational goals as well as demonstrating that there is a close fit between the challenged practice and the objective.

In terms of alternatives with less impact, the proposed alternatives must meet the objectives equally well. Feasibility is a factor in determining whether or not there is an alternative; cost and administrative burdens are legitimate factors to consider. Again, the courts afford educational institutions substantial deference because of the courts' lack of expertise in the area.

The question of whether or not Proposition 209 has had an impact on disparate impact analysis is undetermined given that the impact is not fully defined by the courts. There are conclusions that can be drawn from the court cases, including that the three-part test is still viable under State law, and Mr. Robinson opined that it is mandatory under federal law. Under State law, it is appropriate to continue to gather data on race and gender with the aim to understand impacts of certain practices and whether or not there are alternatives. One must exhaust all race- or sex-neutral practices or remedies before considering or moving to explicit race- or gender-based practices. Mr. Robinson underscored the importance of the

work being done by the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) and the Regents in this regard.

Vice President Sakaki explained that in areas like scholarships and admissions, the legal issues described by Mr. Robinson have an impact on and are intertwined with decisions about what is best for the University as a matter of educational policy. In addition, the undergraduate work team report calls on the University to proactively evaluate whether there are equally effective, but less discriminatory, alternatives that it has yet to adopt. Ms. Sakaki presented two cases that illustrated lessons learned at the University of California regarding applying the three-part test to its practices.

In 2005, concerns were raised by UC faculty and administrators about the University's funding partnership with the National Merit Scholarship Program, in which selection for a scholarship is based largely on students' PSAT scores. The faculty's Academic Council, which was chaired by Chancellor Blumenthal at the time, passed a resolution stating that there were insufficient grounds for UC to continue to support this program. As a result, the chancellors decided to discontinue funding for this program, and instead provide additional funding to the Regents' and Chancellors' scholarships. Part of the disparate impact test involved the educational justification of the practice. Ms. Sakaki explained that, in this case, Regents' and Chancellors' scholarships were a better fit with the goals of the University and its broader definition of merit, which take into account multiple factors so that student achievement is understood in its proper context. In addition, it was more costly to participate in the National Merit Scholarship Program, which had high overhead and retained the interest that accrued on funds collected from UC. Also, the evidence showed that Regents' and Chancellors' scholarships had less of a disparate impact on African-Americans and Latinos, and on women students.

The second case study discussed by Ms. Sakaki was the UC Berkeley School of Law; this case was selected due to an actual disparate impact compliance review by the Office for Civil Rights in 1997. Dean Edley welcomed the case study and reviewed the report. The UC Berkeley School of Law is highly selective, and received intense national media attention in 1997 when the first class admitted without affirmative action included only 1 African-American student, no American Indians, no Filipinos, and 14 Latino students, out of 268 entering students. The three-part test requires identification of specific practices responsible for disparity. An example of such a practice is how the law school sorted applicants into four categories based solely on LSAT scores and college grade point averages. Among applicants in the "A" "B" and "C" ranges, 53.1 percent were offered admission. Far fewer applicants in the "D" range enjoyed the full benefits of review by the faculty admissions committee, and only 2.5 percent of applicants were offered admission. This practice contributed to a substantial disparity in that 9 out of 10 underrepresented minority applicants fell into the "D" category, compared to 6 out of 10 white and Asian-American

applicants. Ms. Sakaki explained that when evaluating the educational justification of an admission practice, professional standards come into play. In this case, the law school admissions council specifically cautioned against overreliance on LSAT and grade point average (GPA) index scores when applicants are separated into groups. In the aftermath of the 1997 admitted class, the law school scrutinized its admissions practices, including use of the index score, and looked for better ways to honor their educational goals. The results indicate that the UC Berkeley School of Law has been able to find workable alternatives that result in improving African-American and Latino enrollment.

Faculty Representative and Academic Council Chair Brown then presented the undergraduate work team report. Mr. Brown pointed out that the report contains 14 evidence-based recommendations, many of which will be highlighted in the presentation and all of which are fully described and explained in the report. Under federal law, the University has an affirmative duty to be self-scrutinizing about policies and practices that may have an unwarranted disparate impact and to evaluate proactively whether there are equally effective but less discriminatory alternatives. Given this, Mr. Brown stated that recommendation #14 of the work team is that disparate impact must be eliminated by all appropriate means.

Mr. Brown explained that, relative to students in general, the University loses underrepresented minority students at every stage of the admissions process. This loss occurs particularly with respect to two features of UC's eligibility requirements: fulfilling the a-g requirements and completing the University's unusual test-taking requirements. He showed a graph illustrating that 37 percent of California high school graduates complete the University's a-g requirements, but only 16 percent of underrepresented minorities do so, primarily due to the lack of availability of such courses in their high schools. Based on studies conducted from 1983 through 2003, very few underrepresented minorities were eligible for UC in comparison with whites and Asian-Americans. Furthermore, while the numbers of underrepresented minorities are increasing as a proportion of California high school graduates, their numbers were decreasing as a proportion of enrolled UC freshmen, especially between 1995 and 1998, the years associated with the University Policy Ensuring Equal Treatment – Admissions, also referred to as "SP-1," and Proposition 209. Mr. Brown showed a slide of campus admissions across racial groups, highlighting that underrepresented minority students evidenced low admissions rates at all campuses, with African-Americans being the lowest at all campuses.

Mr. Brown turned to the reasons for the disparities. School inequalities are among the chief reasons, but he recognized that while K-12 is broken, it is not broken equally for everyone. Studies consistently and unambiguously show that disparities in access to UC strongly reflect patterns of socioeconomic, racial/ethnic, and geographic inequality among the state's high schools. Some California high schools offer students virtually no chance of generating a UC admissions offer, while conversely high schools producing only 20 percent of

California's high school graduates received 49 percent of UC freshman admission offers. Underrepresented minorities demonstrate much lower a-g course completion rates than members of other groups. Advanced placement course offerings also show disparate availability, in that three times more of these courses were offered at high schools where few students received free or reduced-cost lunches.

Mr. Brown pointed out that these data are based on the California Basic Education Data System (CBEDS), which estimates course availability based on the information entered by high school officials. Evidence indicates, however, that this data source likely underestimates the real extent of school-based inequalities. In a sample of 60 disadvantaged high schools, the average a-g completion rates reported in CBEDS were twice as high in comparison with verified a-g rates using the University's Transcript Evaluation Service (TES) data. Mr. Brown explained that TES data are not yet available for all California high schools in the way that CBEDS data are, which is the reason that CBEDS data must be used despite its overreporting.

College preparatory course material also varies regionally; students from rural areas have fewer UC approved honors courses and a-g courses available. The California Postsecondary Education Commission reports that some counties, such as Santa Clara and Alameda counties, have UC entrance rates three or four times higher than other large California counties, like Fresno or Kern. Another example of resource insufficiencies includes student-to-counselor ratios, which stand at a ratio of 460:1 for California secondary schools, compared with the national average of 246:1 and the recommended ratio of 200:1.

Mr. Brown summarized the work team's findings that unequal educational opportunities characterize the educational landscape in California. Educational disparities are severe, extensive, of long standing – predating Proposition 209 – and are associated with racial, ethnic, gender, and socioeconomic inequality. Further, the work team concluded that the will and resources to remedy educational inequality have been insufficient for the task, both prior to and since Proposition 209. UC has not sustained the effort to mount a strong, stable, and steadfast commitment to academic preparation programs. In the years immediately after Proposition 209 and SP-1, Mr. Brown pointed out that investment was increased for academic preparation programs, but such investment has waned in the years since; for every year since 2001, these programs have been slated for either cuts or total elimination. Yet, the available research shows that academic preparation programs are effective in spite of the context of diminished support.

Mr. Brown asserted that UC bears some responsibility for the dire situation of the California educational system as well; UC cannot continue to achieve excellence and diversity goals by waiting for the schools to repair themselves. Recommendation #2 of the undergraduate work team was that UC needs a

comprehensive education pipeline repair plan, one that leverages partnerships with the other higher education segments and the State. For example, expanding the transcript evaluation service, which would provide accurate data for what is available in the schools and what is not, is too large a task for UC alone. Recommendation #3 is that California needs more qualified school and community college counselors; partnership with CSU and community colleges would be helpful in exploring the need and feasibility of establishing school and college counselor training programs.

The work team concluded that it is wrong to ignore the facts of educational inequalities informing and implementing UC admissions policy. Therefore, recommendation #5 is that UC should rethink how it determines UC eligibility, including to assess a fuller range of achievement in context and to evaluate the necessity of UC's unusual test requirement pattern, particularly the additional SAT subject tests.

Recommendation #8 of the work team is that transfer admissions is a necessary part of a comprehensive repair plan; yet, Mr. Brown stated that it should be recognized that it is not an easier path into UC, nor will it solve all of the diversity challenges facing UC. The ability to transfer to UC from community colleges is also affected by the same resource disparities that affect high school preparation, and the community colleges are unevenly resourced themselves.

Beyond the challenges facing UC in eligibility and admissions, Mr. Brown stated that UC faces challenges recruiting underrepresented minorities that do surmount those barriers and are accepted. Recommendation #9 is that UC should better compete for the best and brightest from California's diverse communities. While the majority of students who are extended a UC admissions offer accept the offer, the perceived attractiveness of UC compared with other higher educational opportunities varies. African-Americans take UC offers to a lesser degree, particularly among the top-third in terms of grades and test scores. UC also loses Chicano-Latinos to community colleges for a number of reasons. The ability to finance an education is a significant concern for moderate and low-income families and those of underrepresented minority students. Mr. Brown explained how UC is triple disadvantaged in recruiting such students: first, those students are more likely to borrow, and borrow more heavily, than non-underrepresented minority students. This may be due to wealth disparities that are not accounted for in forming financial aid packages, including the availability of non-liquid assets. Second, low-income and underrepresented minority students show greater price sensitivity. Mr. Brown asserted that it is difficult to negotiate the complexities of acquiring financial aid support, and typically such students do not look to the same outcomes from their education as other students. Both of these factors feed into the "sticker shock" of the cost of an education; high-fee high-aid models differentially impact the low-income and underrepresented minority student. Third, UC's overall net cost advantage is narrowest for underrepresented minority students. In particular, private universities are able to target their aid for

underrepresented minority students to meet non-fee costs, while UC cannot. Recommendation #11 is that UC's financial aid and scholarship packages should be more competitive for underrepresented minority students. This would require a rethinking of how need is determined to better account for wealth disparities and to encourage and support non-UC community-based organizations to raise funds for scholarships and aid. Mr. Brown mentioned former Regent Peter Taylor, who is part of a larger scholarship program targeting students at UCLA that has been vital in that campus' success in competing for African-American students. Echoing Chancellor Birgeneau's workgroup on affordability presentation at the January Regents' meeting, it is vital to keep the self-help segment of the financial aid package – that is, the work and loan expectations – to manageable levels. Best practices should also be adopted in awarding scholarships, including individualized student review, assessing achievement in context, and focusing awards on high schools with low UC-going rates.

Mr. Brown stressed that the 14 recommendations offered by the work team in its report merit serious consideration for the sake of the vitality of democracy, global competitiveness of the U.S., and the future excellence with which UC serves the citizens of California. He stated that UC can achieve greater diversity, but it will take vision, bold leadership, and collective effort with accountability. A representative body of UC undergraduates powerfully inculcates in every Californian the sense that the University of California is "my University of California." Mr. Brown concluded that, perhaps most importantly, UC cannot afford to leave talent fields lying fallow.

Regent Ruiz commented on the importance of the diversity work team reports to clear away excuses for not making progress in achieving greater diversity at UC. He emphasized that achieving greater diversity is a leadership issue that must start at the top, with the Regents as well as with the administration and faculty, noting that it is impossible to reflect diversity unless it is reflected at leadership levels. Regent Ruiz asserted that greater diversity must be achieved at UC, and called for specific targets, timelines, accountability, and regular updates.

Regent Reiss asked for more information about the practice of comprehensive review. Provost Hume explained that the Regents have historically delegated authority to the faculty – the community of scholars – the task of determining who is admitted to the University. The Regents have at the same time paid close attention to admission, and that of undergraduates in particular. Mr. Brown stated that there is a policy of comprehensive review, which articulates that a wide range of factors must be considered in reaching a decision to admit a student. All campuses use comprehensive review in their admissions process, but the specific practices for comprehensive review vary widely from campus to campus. UC honors local campus autonomy in terms of achieving their desired admissions results. The work team concluded that there is room for improvement in the campus implementation of comprehensive review, and urged that best practices be used. Some examples include the proper use of test scores, in that a single cut

off point should not eliminate a student, or the use of multiple factors that are actually overlapping, such as considering GPA, honors courses, and test scores as multiple factors when in fact they are overlapping in terms of the decision outcome. Further, Mr. Brown pointed out that comprehensive review applies only to those students who have already achieved eligibility. He explained that BOARS is looking to create capacity in the eligibility determination for an assessment of context; for example, the availability of a-g courses to some students.

Regent Kozberg pointed out that one initiative that might be considered low-hanging fruit is the 11th grade educational assessment exam that the California State University (CSU) has implemented and for which it is receiving national acclaim. The initiative, which appears to be cost effective and broadly based, provides information on whether a student has completed all the necessary courses and what additional testing is needed to be eligible for either CSU or UC. She asked that UC and CSU work together quickly on this effort.

Regent Lozano noted that since her first meeting as a Regent in 2001, it was recognized that the University needed to improve its diversity; she echoed the impatience of other Regents and stressed the urgency to act. Comprehensive review sought to address the issue of admissions; now, it is vital to look at eligibility in the same way. She believed that there are simple things that UC could do, including strongly advocating to bring a-g courses to every high school in California. Regent Lozano stated the importance of coming forth with a plan that does more than define the problem, but that provides a work plan that takes UC toward success, with priorities, deadlines, and people who are responsible.

Regent Schilling stressed that any changes made to the way in which UC applications are reviewed must be transparent and adequate notice must be given to families, who prepare their children for college many years in advance and choose courses accordingly.

Regent Garamendi stated his belief that it is time for the Regents to take specific action on this issue. He made others aware of his intent to propose four specific action resolutions at the next meeting of the Regents, offering to work with other Regents who care to participate. First, action must be taken on the early assessment program, likely in conjunction with CSU. Second, each chancellor will be held responsible and accountable to address diversity in the appropriate and legal way; and if they fail to do so, their annual review will be noted and hopefully diminished. Third, each campus will be required to develop a direct relationship with the community colleges where a large portion of their students are being educated, and to put in place an articulation mechanism. Fourth, the Academic Senate will be informed that if the BOARS eligibility review is not completed, Regents will take the issue upon themselves.

Regent Blum requested that this subject be discussed at future Regents meetings. He expressed his belief that requiring students to take a-g courses for UC eligibility that may not even be available to them is unconscionable. He requested that UC make greater effort to lobby in Sacramento that every school teach those courses and demand from the Legislature a program for how it will be accomplished.

Regent Island asserted that the findings of the work team are an indictment of the University and its Board. He expressed his view that the faculty have failed to lead the necessary change, noting that despite the awareness that admissions requirements lead to disparities, it continues to stand behind such requirements. He agreed with Regent Garamendi that if the faculty are unwilling to make the changes, it is up to the Board to take on the issue itself. He urged the faculty to address the problem as soon as possible. He believed the work team report should be viewed as a manifesto for change and not be ignored. Regent Island stated that a President must be not only committed to the issue of diversity but must back that commitment with the necessary energy and effort. He expressed his expectation that President-designate Yudof is skilled and prepared to work on this issue, but he emphasized that the Regents must hold him accountable. Regents should not directly intrude in the President's ability to manage and supervise chancellors, but if the President does not hold the chancellors responsible, the Regents will hold the President responsible. He asked the Board to embrace the passion he has for this issue, with the awareness of how strongly it figures in his life.

Regent Lansing agreed with Regents Ruiz and Lozano, noting her frustration that diversity has been an issue throughout her tenure on the Board. She expressed her view that it is time the Regents took control of the issue in specific ways. Regent Lansing noted that it is important to embrace diversity in all ways, not just in terms of race. Along with authorizing comprehensive review, Regents have to ensure that campuses are adhering to comprehensive review and that Regents understand what the campuses are doing. She pointed out that CSU requires a-g courses as well, and asserted that all California students should have access to a-g courses. More teachers, and teachers of the highest quality, are needed. She suggested that each chancellor be held responsible and accountable for coming to the Regents with 10 ways to increase diversity on his or her campus. Regent Lansing put forth three ideas of her own to address these issues. First, each UC and CSU campus should adopt a large number of California schools and help to provide a-g courses on site. She reported observing through her work with K-12 that such partnerships are welcomed. Second, she suggested that UC become more involved in teacher recruitment. Third, UC should work more closely with community colleges, given that students who attain a certain grade point average are automatically eligible for UC. She challenged the chancellors to come up with 20 ideas, and asked that at the next meeting, perhaps a joint meeting with CSU, chancellors report on the 10 to 20 things they are doing to increase diversity in all ways and ensure that every student has the opportunity to an equal

education. Ultimately, she hoped that the 10 UC campuses, partnered with CSU campuses, could take on initiatives to make a-g courses available. Regent Lansing stressed that she wants specific actions.

Regent Allen asked about the challenges of and limitations to offering a-g courses. From the vantage point of BOARS' analysis, Mr. Brown explained that if the eligibility construct is kept as it is today, and a-g courses are made more widely available – notwithstanding the quality of the courses and instruction, which is another huge issue – then more students will become eligible. The University is mandated by the Master Plan for Higher Education to admit from the top 12.5 percent of California's high school graduates. If more students become eligible, the University will be obligated to elevate its requirements and omit students, including possibly the populations that were just made eligible. From BOARS' vantage point, Mr. Brown explained the importance of flexibility in considering achievement in context as a part of the eligibility construct. Further, many California high schools are not preparing its students just for UC or CSU. High schools seek to prepare students for a variety of career and educational pursuits, and some have the view that a-g availability is a threat to other kinds of preparation that should be provided, such as career and technical preparation. There are movements to try to marry those two thrusts; that a career technical preparation is not necessarily antithetical to a-g preparation and vice versa, but it is a movement that is still evolving.

Regent Lansing also noted that two tracks can be made available, so that a student who does not wish to take a-g courses can pursue a technical field instead. Mr. Brown agreed, but reiterated that these are complex issues. The availability of dual tracks in schools also generates the problem of unintentional tracking and narrowing of career pursuits. He emphasized that, based on the analysis of BOARS, within-school tracking is almost as large a problem as between-school inequalities. He stressed that the issues the University is grappling with are huge, which is another reason why BOARS is saying that even with high school reforms, there needs to be flexibility to examine the real opportunities students have to become eligible and to look at their achievements in the broadest way, against what was available, in the spirit of comprehensive review. No faculty member would ever recommend taking an eye off achievement.

Regent Brewer expressed concern that the chancellors and faculty are viewed as the source of the problem, recalling that Regents' actions of previous years have contributed to the problem as well. She stressed the importance of chancellors and faculty working with the Board, and that currently the Board is sending the message of diversity and inclusion, which should not be attached to blame. It should be sent with the understanding that the previous message sent by Regents was the opposite of the current one.

Faculty Representative Croughan indicated that Faculty Representative Brown hopes to bring to the Board at the July meeting a proposal from the Academic

Senate on eligibility reform. Extensive work has been done on such reform for multiple years, and the difficult iterative review process by faculty and admissions counselors is nearly complete. She recognized, however, that a lot of work has been done to counter the effects of SP-1, SP-2 (Policy Concerning Equal Treatment – Employment and Contracting), and Proposition 209 through outreach programs, and praised the efforts of the faculty, staff, and the Office of the President, particularly Student Affairs. In response to Regent Lansing's suggestion, Ms. Croughan emphasized that faculty do volunteer extensively in public schools. She expressed concern that the Math and Science initiative approved by the Regents is no longer funded, advocating that such initiatives that seek to increase the number of teachers should be carefully considered when looking at budget priorities. Ms. Croughan observed that outreach programs also have been creative and very effective, but are also subject to being cut from the budget virtually every year. Further, she maintained that financial aid programs need a complete overhaul to become more user-friendly and clearly explained to students at high school level through outreach in order to address the issue of "sticker shock." In terms of the restructuring effort involving Student Affairs, Ms. Croughan cautioned that those elements expressed by Regents as a priority are set to be cut. She expressed her hope that a joint UC and CSU meeting will take place and that it will include a presentation of what has been done in the past to address these issues, what it cost, its effectiveness, what is currently being done, what will remain, and what will be cut. Such information will allow Regents to clarify their priorities and allocate funds.

Committee Chair Marcus noted the complexity of all of the recommendations put forth by the work team. He expressed caution about the Regents moving into the purview of the faculty. The Regents need more and better information and specific actions that are realistic, and he urged seizing on what can be done at the Regental and UC level.

Regent Bugay remarked on the multifaceted nature of the issues involved, and called attention to one of the most discrete components, which is the a-g requirement. While recognizing that schools do not make these requirements available, despite best intentions the University will not be able to fix the deficiency on its own; it is not its purview. Regent Bugay suggested, as a specific action, that the University ask Superintendent and Regent O'Connell why a-g courses are not offered in all schools, what it would take to fix the deficiencies, and for a plan to restore offerings to a satisfactory level that meets the needs of the University of California entrance requirements. He stated that such a request would be a reasonable starting point for the discussion on this particular facet of the problem and it would frame the discussion going forward in terms of what is feasible. He felt it important to put that request to the authority that has purview over the issue on the public record.

Regent-designate Scorza expressed his gratitude for the discussion. Noting the complexities involved in this issue, he asserted that it will be important to define

clearly what the UC student that the University wants to see looks like; such a definition will make it possible to move forward. Mr. Scorza commented on a letter he sent to Board members asking for support in the creation of a diversity implementation team to address the issue of diversity comprehensively. He maintained that without a comprehensive approach and action plan, there will not be a guiding document to push the effort forward. Such a document would also serve as a device to hold chancellors and the University accountable in a comprehensive way. He asked Provost Hume where the effort to create a diversity implementation team stands at present. Provost Hume responded that President-designate Yudof welcomes the reports and the responsibility that he will carry, and has given Provost Hume advice regarding where staff needs to be placed as the University works to downsize and reorganize the Office of the President. The President-designate wants to be directly involved in decisions about structure and support of the programs that he feels he needs to hold dear. The President-designate will make the final decisions regarding the implementation team; Provost Hume assured the Regents that it is an active part of the restructuring effort.

Provost Hume also emphasized that support has not been cut for programs that are supporting diversity. He clarified that the Math and Science Initiative is funded, but with UC funds and donor funds rather than State funds.

Regent Reiss provided an update to Regents on efforts to increase a-g courses. Due to the Williams lawsuit filed by the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), the State already requires that a-g courses be made available. Because many high schools are not offering a-g courses, the lawyers from the ACLU sat down with Superintendent O'Connell to develop a plan to offer a-g. The effort was not successful, and a lawsuit was filed against Mr. O'Connell and the State for not offering the courses.

Committee Chair Marcus reiterated the complexity of the issues, and put forth the hope that the University is seeking to condense and simplify the issues so as to allow it to do something specific.

Faculty Representative Brown stressed that the power and commitment of the message that the Regents are sending regarding diversity are vitally important to the faculty and others at the University. He asked that the Regents also be receptive to faculty proposals on these issues, and that such proposals be viewed with both careful scrutiny and the trust that the faculty has done its work. The faculty is doing everything in its power to embrace the diversity statement that was adopted by the Regents, and seeks to be a partner with the Regents in achieving the ends that everyone embraces.

Regent Ruiz asked for a commitment regarding what will be brought forth at the July meeting. Committee Chair Marcus noted that committee structures are

reforming, but that the next Chair of the Committee on Educational Policy will surely consider the issue in collaboration with the Provost and others.

3. **PRESENTATION ON THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRANSFER FUNCTION WITHIN THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

Provost Hume stated that, at Regent Allen's request, Vice President Sakaki will provide an update on the University's work in community college transfer. Community college transfer is a critical part of the University's service to the state, its commitment to the Master Plan, and its diversity efforts.

Vice President Sakaki began the presentation by reporting that the Osher Foundation had pledged $70 million to endow scholarships at California Community Colleges (CCC) and to promote transfer to the University of California and the California State University (CSU). Four of UCs campuses – Irvine, Merced, San Diego, and Santa Barbara – are receiving funding from this initiative, which is in addition to the other campuses that are already receiving Osher funds.

Ms. Sakaki stated that approximately 90 percent of the University's transfer students come from CCCs, and that the University has offered over 18,000 transfer students admission to the fall 2008 term, which is a record number. Four training events have also been completed with CCC counselors around the state at the University's counselor institutes. Counselors have praised UCs efforts to streamline the transfer process. Nevertheless, there are many challenges to improving transfer rates, including the academic, financial, and personal obstacles that students face as they attempt to negotiate the transfer pathway.

Two of the University's biggest challenges are preparing transfer students to apply to UC and enabling them to finance a UC education. Almost three in four Californians who access postsecondary education do so at CCCs; such students have lower average household incomes, are more likely to be over 25 years of age, and are more ethnically diverse than UC's incoming freshmen. Latinos constitute 29 percent of the community college population and African-Americans constitute 7 percent. While most CCC students express an interest in transferring to a four-year college, only about 25 percent actually do so. Community college students face many hurdles, including not being prepared for university-level work. Such students need high quality academic support, access to student services, and opportunities to understand transfer requirements and the four-year university experience.

Ms. Sakaki recalled that the California Master Plan for Higher Education requires UC to accept all eligible CCC transfer students, including students who were eligible when they graduated from high school as well as students who were not eligible upon graduation but who have satisfactorily completed a lower-division transfer curriculum at the community college. The latter "second chance" route is

key to the access promise of the Master Plan. To ensure that adequate upper-division spaces are available for CCC transfer students, the Master Plan also specifies that UC maintain a ratio of 60 percent upper-division students to 40 percent lower-division students; UC has been successful at maintaining this ratio.

In 1997, the University signed a memorandum of understanding with CCCs to increase the number of transfers to UC. Since that time, UC has made steady progress, increasing the number of transfers in almost every year. However, a slight dip occurred in the most recent year, when the number of transfer students enrolling at UC declined slightly. Ms. Sakaki observed that these numbers were not surprising since slightly fewer transfer applications were received and enrollments are tied closely to application numbers. Applications for the fall 2008 semester from transfer students increased by 8.1 percent.

Ms Sakaki stated that UC has ambitious plans to increase its transfer student population. UC's recently released long range enrollment plan projects that transfer students will increase at twice the rate of freshman over the next decade. She affirmed that increasing the proportion of transfer students should have a positive outcome in UC's student diversity since community colleges enroll a high proportion of first-generation, low-income, minority, and immigrant students. Last year, approximately one quarter of transfer students were members of an underrepresented minority group, and she expects that proportion to rise in the coming years.

Community college transfer students enter UC with an average GPA of 3.35 in college-level classes, and over 85 percent persist and graduate from UC within four years, most doing so in half that time. One in three students who are to graduate in spring of 2008 will have begun their higher education at a community college.

In spite of the success transfer students achieve at UC, Ms. Sakaki recognized that there are still significant challenges in attracting and admitting transfer students. Although 600,000 students entered a community college in 2004, many of those students never seriously consider transferring to the University. Only one in five had taken transferable math and English classes by 2006, and even among students who take these classes, as few as one in four complete a full transfer curriculum and apply to UC. Campuses have developed activities to reach out to potential transfer students, encouraging them to take higher level coursework and apply to UC, but this has proved UC's greatest challenge. There are many initiatives to address this challenge; Ms. Sakaki noted that the University will have to consider staffing needs to meet these goals.

Ms. Sakaki concluded by noting several UC initiatives that seek to increase transfer student numbers. The University is seeking to provide more advisors to CCCs because of their effectiveness, especially in schools where there are sizable

populations of educationally disadvantaged students and low transfer rates. The Mathematics Engineering Science Achievement (MESA) and Puente Projects are two UC programs that this year reached out to over 34,000 transfer students.

4. **ADOPTION OF RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF ALUMNI RELATIONS EFFORTS**

Regent Bugay recommended that the following resolution in support of alumni relations efforts be adopted:

WHEREAS, the worldwide UC alumni population of 1.5 million is the largest of any public research university system and will double to 3 million in 20 years, and

WHEREAS, the continued erosion in State funding for the University of California has intensified the need for greater philanthropy for the University, including alumni giving, and

WHEREAS, UC students (our future alumni) would benefit from greater financial support from alumni to help defray the costs of their UC education, and

WHEREAS, the potential for expanded alumni support and advocacy for the University of California is enormous and untapped, and

WHEREAS, alumni support is widely considered to be a benchmark of a university's stature, and UC's alumni support should rise to the level of the University's world-class renown, and

WHEREAS, the Alumni Associations of the University of California have just begun implementation of a first-ever, five-year strategic plan for strengthening alumni engagement to build alumni philanthropy and advocacy;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the UC Board of Regents, recognizing the pressing need for greater University support for the campus alumni relations programs and the clear benefits to the University of increased investment in alumni, the Board urges the Office of the President to ensure through policy and action enhanced systemwide support of financial and other resources to the campus alumni relations programs.

Recognizing the constraints of time, Chairman Blum asked Regents Bugay and Brewer to return to the Regents at the July meeting in order to discuss this important topic.

Regent Bugay expressed his appreciation for the Regents' support of alumni.

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

The meeting adjourned at 12:05 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff