

The Regents of the University of California

**COMMITTEE ON LONG RANGE PLANNING  
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY**

November 18, 2009

The Committees on Long Range Planning and Educational Policy met jointly on the above date at Covell Commons, Los Angeles campus.

Members present:     Representing the Committee on Long Range Planning: Regents Bernal, Kieffer, Kozberg, Marcus, Nunn Gorman, Reiss, and Schilling; Ex officio members Blum, Gould, and Yudof; Advisory members DeFreece and Simmons; Staff Advisors Abeyta and Martinez  
Representing the Committee on Educational Policy: Regents Island, Lansing, Lozano, Marcus, and Reiss; Ex officio members Blum, Gould, Yudof, and Zettel; Advisory members Cheng and Powell; Staff Advisors Abeyta and Martinez

In attendance:       Regents De La Peña, Makarechian, Pattiz, Ruiz, Stovitz, and Varner, Regent-designate Hime, Secretary and Chief of Staff Griffiths, Associate Secretary Shaw, General Counsel Robinson, Chief Investment Officer Berggren, Chief Compliance and Audit Officer Vacca, Interim Provost Pitts, Executive Vice Presidents Darling and Taylor, Interim Executive Vice President Brostrom, Senior Vice Presidents Dooley and Stobo, Vice Presidents Beckwith, Duckett, Lenz, and Sakaki, Chancellors Birgeneau, Block, Blumenthal, Desmond-Hellmann, Drake, Fox, Kang, Katehi, White, and Yang, and Recording Secretary Harms

The meeting convened at 2:35 p.m. with Committee on Long Range Planning Chair Kozberg presiding.

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

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of the Committee on Long Range Planning of July 15, 2009 were approved.

**2. ANNUAL ACCOUNTABILITY SUB-REPORT ON DIVERSITY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

[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.]

Interim Provost Pitts explained that this presentation responds to the Regents' request for an annual report on diversity in the University as well as the request of the Committee on Long Range Planning for sub-reports on accountability. He began with remarks on staff diversity. The UC staff is richly diverse, but this diversity diminishes at the manager,

senior professional, and senior manager levels. This must continue to be addressed in UC's diversity efforts. There is a large percentage of women in the professional and support staff. Over half of UC managers and senior professionals are women, but this percentage diminishes in the Senior Management Group. Dr. Pitts noted that while the University has not yet achieved its goals in gender representation in all segments, it is much further along in this effort than a decade to 15 years ago.

Diversity is included as a specific discussion item in the President's annual review of chancellors. There are specific actions taking place on the campuses, such as the "Dining University" professional skills curriculum for staff at UC Santa Cruz. For all executive searches at the Office of the President, specific requirements provided to search firms include emphasis on diversity issues.

Next Dr. Pitts presented a chart showing percentages of UC ladder-rank hiring of underrepresented minorities (URMs) relative to national availability of Ph.D. graduates. While the University has done reasonably well in this area for new appointments of assistant professors in the science, technology, engineering, and math fields, in the professional schools, the percentage of UC URM hires is still below the national availability. The Academic Senate has added a requirement to the Academic Personnel Manual for a specific affirmative action plan for each department throughout the University. At UCLA, the chairs of all faculty search committees are required to have training in diversity issues in order to improve the diversity of the pool of candidates. Another effort under way at the five southern campuses, "Leading through Diversity," a program funded by the National Science Foundation (NSF), is intended to increase the number of women and URMs in the science, technology, engineering, and math fields.

Dr. Pitts discussed a chart which compared the diversity of UC's undergraduate, graduate, and professional school student populations. The undergraduate population is fairly diverse, more so than at UC's comparison institutions. Diversity diminishes somewhat at the graduate academic level, although there are a large number of international graduate students. The diversity pool is slightly greater among professional degree students. Among UC Ph.D. graduates, the most diverse pool is in the arts and humanities; there is somewhat less diversity in the physical sciences. This last factor deserves continuing attention, given the University's desire to recruit a diverse professoriate in the science, technology, engineering, and math fields, and given the fact that these Ph.D. graduates are future faculty members. The professional schools have a reasonably diverse population of graduates in education, law, and medicine. Private medical schools in California have about 16 percent or less URM student representation; 21 percent of UC medical school students are URMs. At UC San Francisco, about 30 percent of the 2008 entering class are URMs. In law, the national average for private and public institutions is about 10 percent to 17 percent of URMs; these are also the figures for UC law schools. URM student representation in the business schools is not as robust. The UC business programs will begin focused efforts to improve the diversity of their M.B.A. enrollments.

All the campuses are involved in a graduate education program funded by the NSF which attempts to increase diversity. The San Diego campus has implemented a tribal membership initiative and enrolled four students last year through this initiative. UC Berkeley has established extensive diversity objectives for the next decade.

Dr. Pitts then addressed campus climate. Unfortunately there is a paucity of data on this issue. He cited figures from the UC Undergraduate Experience (UCUE) survey which indicate that most undergraduate students feel there is reasonable tolerance on the campuses. The University wishes to develop more data on this topic over time. There is a critical need for a University-wide survey of campus climate issues. Dr. Pitts anticipated that this will be undertaken when more funds are available. He noted a “Safe Zone” program for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender faculty, students, and staff at UC Irvine and an award program for “Champions of Diversity” at UCSF.

The undergraduate student body is more diverse than the graduate and professional school student populations. Dr. Pitts discussed a chart displaying the “gap analysis,” or difference between the percentage of California URM public high school graduates, now close to 50 percent, including Native American, Chicano/Latino, and African American students, and the percentage of URM entering freshmen at UC from California public high schools, now about 25 percent. He then considered these data in a somewhat different light, comparing UC freshman URM enrollments with California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) studies of the numbers of college-eligible URM high school graduates in California. The University has fairly effectively matched its URM enrollment with the pool of eligible URM students. There is still an enormous amount of work to be done with the pipeline, improving K-12 education so that an increasing number of high school graduates are UC-eligible. Dr. Pitts observed that the University can have influence in this area, but that it is beyond the University’s ability to solve this problem.

The University will be embarking on the “Entitled to Review” process in 2012. While this process is not designed to increase diversity or URM representation on UC campuses, it will open the admissions review process to thousands of additional students in all populations and may have a beneficial effect on diversity. The University’s joint transfer initiative with the California State University and the community colleges may also contribute to this effort. Dr. Pitts noted that UC Riverside has been designated as a Hispanic-Serving Institution, since more than 25 percent of the undergraduate population is Hispanic. Former UC Davis Chancellor Vanderhoef conducted “Education Sunday” visits to African American congregations to talk about education and work opportunities at the University. These visits were well received.

Next steps include the addition of more diversity indicators – geographic, socioeconomic, and for LGBT and disability populations; a climate survey; and process measures which will show which processes lead to a more diverse UC community. The University will discuss diversity strategies with its intersegmental partners. Dr. Pitts stated that there has been progress on diversity in 2009, although he described it as painfully slow. Diversity is a primary concern of the President, the Senior Management Group, and the Regents.

Chancellor Block discussed efforts at UCLA to increase representation of African American and Latino undergraduates. There has been positive news, but there are troubling signs for continued improvement due to the current financial outlook. After a 30-year low in 2006, when about only 100 African American freshmen were enrolled, over the last three years, the campus has doubled the number of entering African American freshmen. There has been a steady increase in the enrollment of Latino freshmen from 641 in 2005 to 764 in 2009. During this period, the number of enrolled white and Asian American students has remained fairly constant. In total, for 2009 there were 980 URM freshmen in a class of 4,472. African American and Latino students are being accepted and enrolling at UCLA in percentages roughly matching their representation in the UC eligibility pool. In 2007, African American students represented 3.4 percent of the UC eligibility pool and 4.5 percent of UCLA entering California freshmen. Latino students represented 18.6 percent of the UC eligibility pool and 15 percent of enrolled California freshmen. An obvious challenge is the size of the eligibility pool, in large part due to underperformance by K-12 schools.

Significant numbers of African American students offered admission accept the offer to enroll at UCLA. In 2009, this “yield rate” was 48 percent for African American students and 46.5 percent for Latino students. Yield rates for URMs are higher than for the admitted pool at large; Chancellor Block stated that he sees this as a sign that UCLA’s efforts to encourage enrollment at UCLA are effective. These recent gains in admission have been assisted by a many-sided approach, including a holistic review process which allows the campus to identify talented students achieving in low-performing schools and overcoming other life challenges. This recent success has required prodigious work by alumni, community organizations, current students, and administrative leadership. Unfortunately, UCLA’s ability to consistently enroll admitted African American students from the highest holistic ranks has fallen short of expectations. For fall 2009, of the African American students admitted who fell into the campus’ highest three holistic ranks, none were enrolled from the highest holistic rank, only 7.1 percent from the second rank, and 12.2 percent from the third rank. In numbers, this means that out of 75 African American students in the three highest holistic categories, only seven chose to come to UCLA. Historically, UCLA has enjoyed more success in enrolling Latino students in the highest holistic ranks.

Survey information from admitted students who chose not to enroll revealed that the University’s ability to provide scholarship support, which lowers the total cost of attending UCLA, was not competitive with other institutions. For most of these students, the most serious competition for UCLA is presented by highly ranked private colleges and universities, which are not constrained by Proposition 209 and can offer significant race-based scholarships. In that regard, UCLA’s recent improvements in African American admissions have benefited from the work of the California Community Foundation, which receives donations for scholarship grants specifically for African American students choosing to enroll at UCLA. Many long-term, generous donors have responded to the challenge. The campus has recently benefited from the efforts of the UCLA Black Alumni Association, which has organized many fundraising events

throughout Los Angeles. Nevertheless, the financial needs are great, and these organizations are finding it difficult to raise sufficient funds to make UCLA truly competitive for the most sought-after students.

Chancellor Block expressed his concern that, as a result of reductions in enrollment targets which the campuses anticipate in the next few years, UCLA's inability to enroll African American students from the highest holistic ranks will mean that more diversity is attained at lower holistic ranks, where reductions in admissions will have the most profound effect. This will make it more difficult for the campus to move beyond the progress already attained. UCLA will not cease to enroll outstanding students from URM groups, but the overall reductions in the number of undergraduates will work against the campus. The campus recognizes that, to increase its yield rate, it can still improve campus climate. It is working to attract a diverse group of transfer students and to raise additional scholarship support through the recently launched \$500 million Bruin Scholars Initiative. However, reductions in State support and reductions in the freshman class size will threaten UCLA's fragile gains.

UCLA needs to enlarge the pool of UC-eligible students from URM groups. Earlier this fall, the campus initiated a bold new experiment – a public school run as a partnership between UCLA, the Los Angeles Unified School District, and the local community. The school, located at the site of the former Ambassador Hotel, serves one of the most densely populated regions of Los Angeles with a large Latino population. Unlike UCLA's laboratory school, this is a public partnership school now open at the K-5 levels and opening to K-12 in a few years. Chancellor Block stated that it is his dream that this will be only the first of a number of schools to be established throughout Los Angeles, schools that will ensure that inner-city children receive the benefits of a first-rate education and become UC-eligible. The campus believes that significant gains in UCLA student diversity will require that it intervene directly in K-12 education. Chancellor Block displayed a map of the greater Los Angeles area, indicating all those schools where UCLA has a working presence. While recognizing that the coming years will be challenging, the campus will continue its efforts toward access and inclusion and do everything possible to maintain the momentum that has been created.

Chancellor White noted that racial disparities in educational attainment are a serious concern for the U.S. For UC Riverside, closing this gap is a defining feature of its core commitment to excellence through diversity. Data for the last five years indicate that the campus' Chicano and Latino freshmen graduated at a rate only 1.5 percent behind white students. The graduation rate for African American students is only one percent behind that of white students. The graduation rate for white students is 2.5 percent behind that of Asian American/Pacific Islander students. These racial gaps are among the smallest in the nation. Overall, at U.S. doctoral universities, African American students are 17 percent behind white students, and Latino students are 10 percent behind; white students are behind Asian American/Pacific Islander students by 7.5 percent. Nevertheless, Chancellor White stated that he is not satisfied with UCR's overall graduation rate percentage. One of the campus' strategic goals is to increase this percentage consistently until no gaps remain.

In terms of undergraduate access, UC Riverside has been ranked fifth in the nation in ethnic diversity and 13th in socioeconomic diversity by *U.S. News and World Report*, and 16th overall among universities by the *Washington Monthly*. Many factors contributed to UCR's ranking by the *Washington Monthly*, but the value added by graduation rates well ahead of expectations based on academic preparation and socioeconomic status was a major factor. UC Riverside is the UC campus with the highest percentage of Pell Grant recipients, above 44 percent. The percentage of first-generation college students is somewhat above 50; students who grew up speaking two languages at home are 40 percent. Eighteen percent of UCR students grew up in other-language-only homes. Conversely, UCR has the smallest percentage, only 40 percent, of students who grew up in English-language-only homes.

Chancellor White observed that a diverse student body is only a starting point. Promoting the success of all students, especially URMs and first-generation students, also requires an unfailing institutional commitment. UCR measures its success with key outcome data. A few years ago, the campus created "learning communities," a cohort model for freshmen in large gateway courses, to provide them with a more tight-knit set of academic and social experiences with a small group of classmates through the year. Over the last four years, student participation in these learning communities has risen from 33 percent to about 45 percent. The data are encouraging: after controlling for high school grade point average, SAT scores, and other factors, participation in learning communities boosts freshman student retention by four percentage points. For Latino students, the boost is twice that amount, up to ten points. Results from the campus' academic colleges were not all equally encouraging; the campus examines the circumstances when colleges are not meeting expectations.

Chancellor White reported that the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC) completed a site visit to the campus a few weeks previously. WASC provided two commendations during the exit interview: first, that the campus has indeed internalized a commitment to diversity and to the retention and support of minority and female faculty; second, that UCR has an excellent collaboration between its student affairs and academic affairs offices on a variety of initiatives, and especially in the area of first-year transition programs and the learning communities mentioned earlier. In response to a question asked in the UC Undergraduate Experience survey, 91 percent of UCR undergraduates indicated that diversity is important on their campus, the highest percentage at UC; the percentage of positive responses to this survey question at the campuses ranged from 74 percent to 91 percent. In response to another question, 82 percent of UCR undergraduates stated that they felt they belong on their campus. Eighty-two percent of African American students answered "yes" to this question as well; 86.5 percent of Mexican-American/Chicano students and 84 percent of Latino students answered "yes." The questions of campus climate and culture have permeated UCR and its aspirations.

In order to reap the benefits of diversity, campus faculty and staff must be supported with appropriate training tools. UCR has initiated a program titled "Making Excellence

Inclusive,” which includes an intensive five-month training certificate program for staff and a targeted workshop series to meet the varied needs of department chairs, senior administrators, and students. The workshops address topics such as disability awareness, graduate student recruitment, weaving diversity into performance evaluations, and workplace stereotype awareness, and have enjoyed a positive response from participants.

Achieving diverse enrollment at the graduate student level is more challenging than at the undergraduate level. The Riverside campus has been working on this challenge, and Chancellor White was proud to report that both new and overall African American graduate student enrollment has more than doubled over the last six years. Diversifying the faculty is also among the campus’ most important challenges, because the pool of available candidates reflects the cumulative impact of opportunity differences in the educational pipeline. There is a relatively low percentage of women among tenured faculty in the science, technology, engineering, and math fields and the social science fields. Last year, while only one-fifth of UCR’s tenured faculty in these fields were women, among tenure-track faculty, newly hired assistant professors, two-fifths were women.

UC Riverside is a Hispanic-Serving Institution. This allows the campus to compete for Title V grants from the U.S. Department of Education. Eligibility requirements for this status are that at least one-quarter of undergraduates are Hispanic, and that at least half of all students are eligible for need-based Title IV aid. Last year, UCR won a \$3.3 million federal grant over two years to bring more Hispanic and low-income transfer students into the science, technology, engineering, and math fields. This is the first time a UC campus has received a Hispanic-Serving Institution grant from the federal government. The grant supports partnership with six local community colleges, including a summer bridge program, paid research internships, workshops, and other academic support activities.

Chancellor White concluded his remarks with a quote from Assistant Professor of English Vorris Nunley which expressed how the diverse backgrounds and experiences of Mr. Nunley’s students have caused him to change his approach to teaching and to his own work in rhetorical and critical theory. It is this critical diversity which drew him to the Riverside campus. Chancellor White hoped that the Board would have a sense of the achievements, opportunities, and challenges related to diversity at UC Riverside.

Dr. Pitts observed that any of the UC chancellors could have given a presentation on diversity, and that all would have been stellar. He described the diversity effort as a Sisyphian task, work that will continue indefinitely, and that has shown some slow gains.

Committee on Long Range Planning Chair Kozberg praised the narrative materials provided by all the campuses which were included in the background material for this item.

Regent Zettel asked Chancellor Block if the school he mentioned in his presentation is a charter school. Chancellor Block responded in the negative. The school is a pilot school,

created through the Los Angeles Unified School District. It is a cooperative activity which involves the teachers' union, the neighborhood, the District, and UC. He expressed optimism about this project and hoped that it could be extended to other communities.

Regent Zettel referred to the Preuss School at UCSD, which is a charter school. Ninety-four percent of its students go on to college. She noted the remarks made earlier about the University's need to engage with K-12 education and called attention to a State Senate bill, SBX5 1, which may be heard soon in the State Assembly. The bill focuses on President Obama's and Secretary of Education Arne Duncan's commitment to reform education, "Race to the Top." Currently, California is not eligible to apply for Race to the Top funding, competitive grants of \$4.35 billion. Regent Zettel emphasized the importance of SBX5 1 and the ability to apply for these federal grants. The application deadline is in mid-January, but California is ineligible because its Education Code lacks the requisite reform legislation. Dr. Pitts noted that the University is addressing this matter.

Committee on Educational Policy Chair Island observed that, based on this report, the University still has much work to do. It is important that UC continue to focus daily and with some rigor on the core value of diversity. It is helpful that problems and difficulties are examined. Focus on a problem leads to a deeper understanding of it and to a re-commitment to the diversity goal. Committee Chair Island stated that he would like to see regular presentations for all the campuses like the presentation by Chancellor Block, in order to compare them and to see where the most progress is being made. This could lead to focus on best practices to be shared systemwide. He described the presentations as a good beginning for sharing information with the Regents, and hoped that these reports will continue, at the least on an annual basis.

Regent Bernal expressed concern about a decline in NSF funding for graduate student diversity through the Alliance for Graduate Education and the Professoriate (AGEP) program. Dr. Pitts responded that the University will continue its strong effort to apply to NSF for these funds; it cannot control the amount of funding that NSF makes available. The successes that UC is enjoying in diversity put the University in a favorable position for obtaining the funding that NSF provides.

Regent Bernal asked if UC has taken proactive measures to ensure that AGEP funding continues, both for UC and other institutions. Dr. Pitts responded that UC reports to NSF on the success of its efforts and seeks continuing funding. UC has not joined with other institutions to try to increase funding in this area, but it has been active in pursuing what funding is available.

Faculty Representative Powell referred to the holistic rankings of admitted students at UCLA. He recalled that no African American students in the highest holistic rank were enrolled and asked where these students are going. Chancellor Block responded that most of these students in the highest holistic ranks who do not enroll at UCLA, and for whom information is available, have enrolled at elite private institutions such as Stanford and the Ivy League universities. There should be no embarrassment about losing students to

such prestigious institutions, but it is frustrating. With better financial offers, UCLA would be more competitive. Chancellor Block reported that he has personally spoken with admitted students to ask them about their feelings about UCLA. Several have said that, if there were sufficient support, they would attend UCLA. In part, the challenge is to secure adequate funding.

President Yudof thanked the chancellors for their efforts on behalf of diversity. He echoed Regent Island's statements about the importance of these efforts. He recalled that the chancellors' performance reviews include a discussion of diversity, during which data are examined to determine areas for further improvement. He hoped that the Blue and Gold Opportunity Plan would increase the University's yield of URMs, not by taking race or ethnicity into account, but because, unfortunately, URM groups tend to be overrepresented among low-income students. President Yudof also expressed hope for the comprehensive review process in admissions, a less mechanical and more holistic system. There is a great deal of speculation about this new system. He emphasized that the primary purpose of the process is to ensure fairness, but it may also increase diversity. He reported that, the previous day, he and Dr. Pitts had a constructive meeting with members of the Alliance for Equal Opportunity in Education. UCLA is a model for the development of financial aid packages which are attractive to URM students; other campuses could look to UCLA and determine whether this model can be adapted to their circumstances.

Committee Chair Kozberg referred to the impact of limiting enrollment on UCLA student diversity. She asked if there are concerns about the campus' ability to hire new faculty. Chancellor Block answered in the affirmative. Students are aware when faculty growth is stagnant. Faculty vitality, and the ability recruit faculty, is important. He reiterated that his immediate concern is that, as the numbers of students admitted are reduced, there will be a disproportionate effect on URM groups. UCLA has been gentle in its enrollment reductions and its diversity has benefited from large enrollments. Chancellor Blumenthal observed that, at any campus, there is greater diversity among younger assistant professors than among the senior faculty. The fact that campuses have not been able to hire recently has had an adverse effect on their ability to increase faculty diversity. It is hard to imagine progress on faculty diversity if the University is not hiring.

Regent Ruiz thanked the chancellors and the Office of the President for their diversity efforts. Diversity is a key to the success of the UC system, and an important part of the University's message to legislators in Sacramento. He expressed his concern about the impact of the student fee increase on diversity. He referred to reports which show that, historically, UC makes progress on diversity until a setback like Proposition 209. He expressed appreciation for the chancellors' enthusiasm, attitude, and leadership.

Committee Chair Kozberg thanked President Yudof for making diversity a clear priority from the senior administration down.

Regent-designate Cheng stated his view that diversity is protected under the Blue and Gold Opportunity Plan. He called attention to programs mentioned in the campus

narratives, such as the Summer Multicultural Leadership Institute at UC Irvine. Many of these programs are facing funding cuts. Budget reductions thus affect not only student populations but also programs which retain and support students. The University's advocacy in Sacramento should emphasize diversity not only in retaining students, but in programs that enrich and enhance the campuses.

Chancellor Drake recalled that, as a faculty member, he made a presentation 15 years previously to the Regents on diversity in the health sciences. He recalled the effect of the Regents' actions in the mid-1990s on diversity. There was a profound downturn in what had been a positive trend. The downward trend ultimately was reversed, but beginning at a lower level. The University lost many years of progress. Chancellor Drake emphasized that the Regents' actions affect the ability of the campuses to recruit faculty. Continued focus and support by the Board are helpful in these efforts. He stated that the discussion today was much more positive than it was 15 years ago.

The meeting adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff