The Regents of the University of California

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON STUDENT LIFE
AND ALUMNI AFFAIRS
June 15, 2010

The Special Committee on Student Life and Alumni Affairs met on the above date by teleconference at the following locations: 1111 Franklin Street, Room 11326, Oakland; James West Alumni Center, Los Angeles Campus; 2220 Lodgepole Circle, Modesto; 1121 L Street, Suite 809, Sacramento.

Members present: Regents Bernal, Johnson, Nunn Gorman, and Stovitz; Advisory members Cheng, DeFfreece, Hime, and Powell

In attendance: Faculty Representative Simmons, Secretary and Chief of Staff Griffiths, Associate Secretary Shaw, General Counsel Robinson, Provost Pitts, Vice President Sakaki, and Recording Secretary Johns

The meeting convened at 9:00 a.m. with Special Committee Chair Bernal presiding.

1. UNMET NEEDS OF UNDOCUMENTED STUDENTS AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

[Background material was mailed to the Special Committee in advance of the meeting, and a copy is on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Vice President Sakaki began her presentation by informing the Special Committee that most undocumented students at UC are either Latino or Asian. Most are undergraduates and enter the University with strong academic records. The average high school grade point average for undocumented students is 3.84, compared to 3.78 for all freshmen. Undocumented students typically arrive in the U.S. when they are very young and grow up attending California schools. Most come from low-income families, and some learn of their undocumented status only later, when they are teenagers.

Undocumented students have always been able to enroll at UC. From 1985 to 1991, they were able to enroll as California residents and receive both State and UC financial aid. In 1991, the courts ruled that undocumented students could not establish California residency. At this point they were charged nonresident tuition, but were still eligible for financial aid. In 1996, a new federal law precluded undocumented students from receiving both State and UC financial aid. Consequently, they had to cover all costs, including nonresident tuition, with their own resources or with private scholarship funds.

Some relief was provided in 2002 when UC implemented Assembly Bill 540. Consistent with this law, nonresident students who have attended a California high school for at least three years and have graduated are exempt from paying nonresident tuition at California public colleges and universities. Currently approximately 70 percent of undocumented
students at UC pay in-state fees. Nonresident undergraduates at UC who do not meet the requirements of AB 540 will be charged about $23,000 in additional tuition and fees in the coming academic year.

Despite California’s AB 540, undocumented students face significant financial barriers. They are ineligible for federal, State, or UC financial aid and cannot receive commercial loans. In contrast, needy documented students receive on average over $16,000 in aid annually. Undocumented students currently do not qualify for UC grants, grants funded in part by fees which undocumented students pay.

In addition, these students are legally restricted from formal paid employment, including work-study. In order to pay for schooling and meet other living expenses, undocumented students must rely on scarce private scholarships that do not require a Social Security number or U.S. citizenship. Many rely on support from extended families and on donations from private individuals. Some of these students work at low-paying jobs. These typically informal types of employment include babysitting, lawn-mowing, and housekeeping. The UC vice chancellors for student affairs feel strongly that the University must find a way to support these students. Some campuses have established “food closets” with donations from faculty and staff, who see these students’ daily struggle to survive. Some chancellors have lamented the fact that they currently may not accept gifts designated to help these students.

Ms. Sakaki next discussed some of the practical challenges faced by undocumented students. Because they may not obtain driver licenses, many travel hours daily by public transportation to attend classes. The UCLA student organization Improving Dreams, Equality, Access and Success (IDEAS), recipient of the President’s Award for Outstanding Student Leadership, has addressed this situation by arranging carpools for undocumented students who live far from campus. Without government-issued identification, undocumented students encounter difficulties in making financial transactions or in checking books out from public libraries. Although they have been legitimately admitted to UC campuses, and irrespective of their accomplishments or the length of their stay in California, undocumented students are still subject to arrest and removal. As a result of these pressures, they often face depression and isolation, which can hinder academic progress.

While undocumented students across the U.S. face similar challenges, those who live in New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas receive important additional support. They benefit not only from in-state tuition initiatives similar to California’s AB 540, but also qualify for State and university aid. Six other states – Illinois, Kansas, Nebraska, New York, Utah, and Washington – are like California in that they allow undocumented students to pay in-state tuition, but do not allow them to receive financial aid.

Ms. Sakaki then introduced an undocumented student currently in her second year at a UC campus. She stated that this young woman is an outstanding scholar, athlete, and leader, and graduated in the top four percent of her high school class.
The young woman identified herself as an AB 540 student who was born in Oaxaca, Mexico and moved to California at the age of nine. Without immigration reform, there is little hope for her and two of her siblings of attaining legal status in the U.S. In spite of financial and other challenges, she learned two languages, excelled in school, and was admitted to UC. She is the first in her family to attend a university. With no financial aid, no loans, and no monetary support from her family, she is forced to depend on a limited number of private scholarships. The relatively few available scholarships are not sufficient to fund the approximately 65,000 undocumented students who graduate from high schools every year. Competition for these scholarships is intense; many students are unable to collect sufficient funds to pay for college and drop out. She informed the Special Committee that she spends 25 to 30 hours weekly searching for scholarships and doing small jobs. She is often forced to choose between studying for a test and applying for a scholarship. While she has succeeded in securing a small amount in scholarship awards, she must borrow course books from friends or the library, which limits her study time.

The young woman expressed frustration at the fact that many people are unaware of the struggles faced by undocumented students. Some students go hungry because they must choose between food and other necessities. She stated that she feels invisible and insignificant on campus due to the opportunities not available to her, including opportunities to prepare for graduate school. She urged the University to recognize the aspirations and struggles of undocumented students and to allow them to receive institutional financial aid, to which they contribute but from which they cannot benefit.

Ms. Sakaki continued by stating that the University would have much to gain from the passage of the Development, Relief and Education for Alien Minors (DREAM) Act at the federal and State levels. The University has consistently expressed support for this proposed legislation. If passed, the California DREAM Act would allow undocumented students who are eligible for the AB 540 exemption to receive State and University financial aid; however, it would not change the documentation status of these students. Passage of the federal DREAM Act would provide undocumented high school graduates with a legal basis for employment and would provide a road map toward permanent legal residency for individuals who meet certain requirements.

Ms. Sakaki remarked that undocumented students are trapped in a legal paradox. Under current U.S. law, they have the right to primary and secondary education and are allowed to go on to college, but their economic and social mobility are severely restricted due to their immigration status.

Regent-designate DeFreece asked if there are any undocumented students who do not face the financial challenges referred to in the discussion. Director of Student Financial Support Kate Jeffery responded that the University does not have complete information on the financial situation of these students because they are ineligible for and do not apply for financial aid. The University estimates that they are needier than the student population on average.
Regent-designate Defreeze asked how much undocumented students are paying into the University’s financial aid program. Ms. Jeffery estimated that, if they were eligible to receive aid, these students would receive $2 million to $3 million. Special Committee Chair Bernal added that 33 percent of student fees are directed to financial aid.

Regent-designate Defreeze noted that there are 600 to 800 undocumented students at UC, or about 0.003 percent of the UC student body. He raised the question of why they are contributing to a financial aid program from which they cannot benefit. The University endeavors to distribute student aid funding evenly. In the context of UC’s entire financial aid program, 0.003 percent of students is not a meaningful number. He asked why the University charges these students the 33 percent from which they cannot benefit. He suggested that this might represent an immediate opportunity to help these students.

Special Committee Chair Bernal asked if the University has considered reducing this return-to-aid charge for undocumented students. Ms. Jeffery stated that the University would be prohibited from doing so. General Counsel Robinson observed that a key question is whether or not this benefit would be based on residency. If this benefit were provided to AB 540 students, the law would require that UC provide the same benefit to all students without respect to residency. One can argue that these students should receive relief because they are not eligible for financial aid; but their ineligibility for financial aid is based on residency. Mr. Robinson remarked that this legal issue needs to be examined further. Senior Counsel Margaret Wu added that federal law currently prohibits provision of any benefit to undocumented students, whether based on residency or any other criteria, unless specifically enacted by State law. She stated that it is not clear whether the Regents can take action on this matter or whether relevant legislation must be enacted by the California Legislature.

In response to a question asked by Regent-designate Hime, Special Committee Chair Bernal observed that the proposed federal DREAM Act mirrors the State DREAM Act in making undocumented students eligible for Pell Grants. Ms. Jeffery outlined two provisions of the proposed federal law not found in the proposed State law: the federal DREAM Act would provide a path for certain categories of individuals, including college students and military personnel, to establish permanent residency; and while on this path and granted conditional residency, students could receive certain kinds of federal financial aid. The State would need to allow provision of State and institutional financial aid.

Regent-designate Defreeze asked that Mr. Robinson provide the Special Committee with an analysis and further background information on fees charged to undocumented students that are directed to UC’s financial aid program. Mr. Robinson stated that his office has done research on this question. There may or may not be actions the University can take.

Regent-designate Defreeze described the Achievement Award Program at UC Berkeley, a need-based scholarship which is provided to over 80 students on the campus. There are
thousands of applicants for this program. The UCB Alumni Association established this program to address diversity and the needs of special populations of students. Equity scholarships at UC Berkeley and UCLA also address these issues. He urged the University to increase its efforts in this area and cited President Yudof’s support for these programs. Mr. Robinson recalled that legal constraints are imposed on the University as a State entity. Private efforts are not constrained in this manner.

Faculty Representative Powell referred to the legal grounds for considering financial aid a benefit. He asked if undocumented students are not in fact being discriminated against in being denied access to this benefit. Mr. Robinson responded that, in this case, federal law distinguishes among different classes of individuals and determines their eligibility for certain benefits. Ms. Wu added that courts have upheld the determination that the federal government can distinguish between citizens and non-citizens.

Faculty Representative Simmons suggested that the University might legitimately be able to establish a separate fee schedule for students otherwise not eligible for financial aid. It may be appropriate for the University to do what is right when the law is ambiguous. Mr. Robinson observed that how far the University should press certain legal issues is a matter of policy for the Regents and the President to decide. He recalled that the University is providing a waiver of out-of-state tuition for these students.

Mr. Simmons noted that a lawsuit concerning this matter would take four or five years to make its way through the courts. He asked if the University has a list of charitable agencies that provide support to undocumented students. Ms. Sakaki stated that this information is provided at campus financial aid offices. Mr. Simmons suggested that this information be centrally compiled and made readily available.

In response to a question asked by Regent-designate Cheng, Ms. Jeffery responded that she believed that both the federal and State DREAM Acts might need to be enacted for the University to offer institutional aid to undocumented students.

Regent-designate Cheng asked what kinds of student support or services the University provides to AB 540 students. He asked if they receive student identification cards. Ms. Sakaki responded that undocumented students do receive UC identification cards. She was not aware of student services specifically designated for undocumented students.

The undocumented student who spoke earlier stated that there are individuals on campus who are aware of these students’ needs and who assist them, but there is no designated office where undocumented students can go for help. Ms. Sakaki concurred that there are individuals on the campuses who work with and assist these students.

Regent-designate Cheng suggested that the University could provide educational training for staff members to become advocates for AB 540 students and to make staff more aware of issues affecting AB 540 students.
Special Committee Chair Bernal suggested that the student population of a campus might support financial aid for undocumented students or other students ineligible for financial aid. He asked if, in such a case, the campus student body could vote for a campus-based fee to provide that aid. Mr. Robinson responded that this would depend on the details of the arrangement. He cited the constraints on UC as a State entity. In the case of a campus organization providing such aid, it would be important to consider their relationship to UC, for example, whether or not their funds are commingled with UC accounts. He expressed his view that it might be possible for a campus-based organization to be structured in a way sufficiently separate from UC that it could legally provide financial aid.

2. UPDATE ON STUDENT MENTAL HEALTH ISSUES

Dr. Patricia Robertson, a professor of obstetrics, gynecology, and reproductive sciences at UCSF, informed the Special Committee that she and UC Santa Barbara Vice Chancellor Michael Young have been working on UC student mental health issues for the past five years. She recalled that the UC Student Mental Health Committee was formed following the suicide of a UC Davis student, Adam Ojakian. Mr. Ojakian’s parents urged the University to assess its student mental health resources systemwide. The Student Mental Health Committee carried out research during 2005-06 and produced an extensive report to the Regents.

The report showed that student mental health is a concern nationwide, and that the situation today is very different than it was ten or twenty years previously. More UC students are now taking psychotropic medications as teenagers and sometimes discontinuing medication when they begin college. The report examined the relationship between student mental health and campus disturbances, including violence and crime. Certain student populations have increased mental health needs – students of color, lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) students, veterans, graduate students, and international students. The report also examined the relationship of mental health to academic performance and campuses’ liability for provision of mental health services. Dr. Robertson referred to a case involving the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and a failure to provide adequate mental health services; that case was settled outside the court system.

There has been an increase in psychiatric admissions and suicidal behavior at UC campuses. There are significant waiting lists for treatment at the campuses. Dr. Robertson noted one instance of an eight-week wait time between the first phone call by a student in distress and the time when he or she was finally seen. She emphasized that this is unacceptable, especially at campuses on the quarter system.

Dr. Robertson presented a three-tier model of student mental health. The Student Mental Health Committee directed its first efforts at the Tier One area of critical mental health needs and crisis response services. It made an effort to secure increased funding to hire more psychologists, psychiatrists, and other mental health workers. With funding from the Student Services Fee (formerly Registration Fee), the University has successfully
reduced the wait list time. Funding has not been sufficient to continue efforts in Tier Two, targeted interventions, and Tier Three, creation of healthy learning environments. The Student Mental Health Committee is now assessing the effect of recent budget cuts on the relevant infrastructure and on the progress the University made during the first two years of this endeavor.

Dr. Robertson observed that data collection has been an important challenge. Earlier, the University did not have an overview of the number of suicides, attempted suicides, and hospitalizations involving UC students. The Student Mental Health Committee is comparing the current numbers of FTE mental health professionals at the campuses with numbers five years previously, and ensuring that these data are regularly reported and tracked. The data will help identify trends and indicate where intervention is necessary.

Vice Chancellor Young reported that campuses are experiencing a new problem with various kinds of substance abuse, including the use of substances combined with alcohol. Some students in distress are self-medicating. There were five drug-related deaths at UCSB in the previous year; these cases included mental health concerns. There are growing needs for certain segments of the campus’ population, such as transgender students, veterans, graduate students, and international graduate students. Campuses continue to see a large number of students in distress, and their ability to respond to student needs is challenged.

Mr. Young communicated his impression that the Santa Barbara campus and perhaps other campuses are receiving an increasing number of referrals from faculty. Many of these referrals concern legitimate cases of students in distress. He concluded by noting that the Tier Two and Tier Three areas of the three-tier model of student mental health were seen as critical by the Student Mental Health Committee to providing a healthy academic environment.

Dr. Robertson then commented on the relationship of diversity to student mental health. Some students have communicated their feeling of lack of support on campus with the reduction of outreach programs due to budget cuts. Lack of adequate diversity and a negative campus climate can erode student mental health, although this is difficult to measure.

Every three years UC carries out a survey of students' perception of mental health services. In the 2008 survey, 17 percent of students reported that the wait list for services was too long. Many students do not know that campus services are available. Dr. Robertson reported that some professors have included information on student mental health center services in their course syllabi. Professors can serve as positive role models in encouraging students to take care of their mental health, and more work could be done with the Academic Senate on training faculty. Faculty can serve as a conduit for information, especially for students who live off campus. Dr. Robertson concluded by emphasizing that student mental health affects academic performance; UC efforts on mental health are integrally related to the University’s mission.
Faculty Representative Simmons asked if there were data indicating that underrepresented minority students, relative to their numbers in the population, experienced a higher degree of mental health issues. Dr. Robinson responded that in general there is a higher incidence of depression in the African American and LGBT populations. Data from the 2008 survey on the use of UC mental health services by various student groups show that use of these services has increased more for Chicano/Latino and African American students than for other groups. The fact that students are using counseling services is a positive development. The students’ rating of the services provided was high in the 2008 data.

Mr. Simmons asked if the University knows what percentage of entering students use prescribed psychotropic medications. Vice President Sakaki responded that the University is not allowed to ask students about this, although it appears to be the case that more and more entering students are using medication. In some cases, when students move into residence halls they stop taking their medication. Mr. Young reported that approximately 25 to 30 percent of entering students may be taking psychotropic medication.

Faculty Representative Powell asked about how data on student trauma is gathered and expressed. He noted that the Academic Senate was interested in data as well as a narrative description regarding this matter. Dr. Robertson responded that assembling this research data would be a worthwhile project.

Regent Johnson asked that data in the reports being prepared for the Regents by the Student Mental Health Committee be broken down by campus. Dr. Robertson responded that the data would be presented with this breakdown.

Regent Stovitz asked about students’ current wait time for an appointment with a clinician. Dr. Robertson responded that wait time at UCSF has been reduced to one week. Each campus has its own approach; best practices will be shared. As an example, UC Berkeley uses a phone triage system. There are varied levels of peer counseling. The majority of suicides on campus are individuals who have not been seen at counseling centers, so peer groups are important. One reason for student academic underperformance is time spent counseling friends in trouble. Students need to be trained to know when it is appropriate to take a friend to a counseling center. Mr. Young added that in emergency cases, students on all campuses are seen immediately. In non-emergency cases at UCSB, the wait time has been reduced to 11 to 12 business days for psychological services, and to approximately three weeks for psychiatric services.

Dr. Powell stated that students who put their own academic performance at risk to help their peers are special people and suggested that the University could recognize the service they provide. He asked if their actions come to the attention of academic officers. Dr. Robertson responded that these students are unsung heroes.

Special Committee Chair Bernal asked about the status of funding for student mental health services. Ms. Sakaki responded that specially designated monies support these
services. While funding has continued, student need surpasses the amount of funding. Mr. Young reported that the campuses received $4.6 million in 2007 and $8 million in 2008-09 to be allocated for student mental health services. He hoped that the next data survey would provide information on the impact of budget cuts on these services. At UCSB there were significant reductions, including approximately $240,000 in permanent cuts to the counseling services budget.

Special Committee Chair Bernal asked about the apparent increase in student mental health issues and suggested that the University might consider outreach to high school students. Dr. Robertson observed that, without the medications now available, some of UC’s students would not have been able to attend college in the past. Mr. Young reported that the number of students with documented psychiatric disabilities has quadrupled at UCSB over the last decade.

Special Committee Chair Bernal asked if, in addition to the Student Services Fee (formerly Registration Fee) funding, the University has considered its insurance programs as a source of funding for student mental health services. Mr. Young responded that the University has examined this matter. At present it is not a major factor in providing services at UCSB.

Regent-designate DeFreece asked to what extent mental health services are integrated across campuses. Mr. Young responded that he believed that all campuses currently had a 24-hour hotline staffed by professional psychologists. This service is provided on a campus-by-campus basis. Emergency referrals can be made to the campus police or to campus psychological services staff who are on call. Student peers are not involved in this service.

Regent-designate DeFreece asked about the cost of the hotline service and asked if service could be improved if it were provided in an integrated, systemwide manner, rather than campus by campus. Mr. Young responded that the cost is fairly low. Campus vice chancellors have discussed the possibility of joint purchasing for a lower rate for the 24-hour hotline, especially since all campuses now use the same service.

Regent-designate Cheng asked why there was no new funding for student mental health services in 2009-10, and if the University could expect new funding in the future. Mr. Young responded that both the allocations he mentioned earlier were permanent funding. A matter of concern is how to keep up with inflation and growing student need. He expressed hope that there would be reasonable and predictable increases in the Student Services Fee which would allow UC to provide not only Tier One services, but also Tier Two and Tier Three services for healthy campus environments. Dr. Robertson added that the initial cost estimate for implementation of all tiers in the three-tier model was $42 million; the budget is now $12 million. More funding is needed for various programs to make progress.

Special Committee Chair Bernal asked if some campuses are more challenged by limited resources than others. Dr. Robertson responded that there was variance among campuses
in student wait times. The campuses deploy their resources differently. One common complaint by students is that they are limited to ten mental health visits per year. This is a point which should be negotiated with insurance companies. Some campuses bill out for mental health services; others do not.

Special Committee Chair Bernal noted that there were student concerns about use of the Student Services Fee. He suggested that revenues from this fee could be used in a targeted manner for specific needs at a particular campus. Regent-designate Cheng added that the different health insurance plans for graduate students should also be taken into account.

Mr. Simmons asked how the funding increase from 2007-08 to 2008-09, $4.6 million to $8 million, was allocated. Dr. Robertson responded that the additional funding was used to increase the number of mental health professionals available and to decrease wait times. She emphasized that Tier Two and Tier Three services are still not funded, noting that some campuses may seek to locate wellness services somewhere other than a health center; graduate students who instruct undergraduates may not wish to be seen going to a counseling center.

In response to a question by Mr. Simmons, Dr. Robertson confirmed that staffing in counseling centers was increased. She added that many primary care physicians are now being asked to address the overflow of mental health patients. Many of them are prescribing anti-depressant medications. It is difficult to track which patient visits coded for general practice are in fact related to mental health.

Mr. Simmons asked if there were reasons related to insurance that would cause a student to seek out a primary care physician for anti-depressant medication rather than a mental health professional. Dr. Robertson responded in the negative. Mr. Young observed that, earlier, many campuses did not have enough psychiatrists to meet student demand. Primary care physicians had to take on much of the psychiatric workload. He recalled that, before the two funding increases in 2007-08 and 2008-09, there had been almost no increase in support for these services for two decades. An accepted ratio of psychologists to students is one to 1,000-1,500. The ratio in the UC system was one to 2,300, far behind the minimum standard. Campuses have hired additional psychologists, psychiatrists, social workers, psychiatric nurses, and others, depending on their particular needs. Most of the new funds were used for crisis response services.

Regent Johnson stated that this was an eye-opening update. She requested a report for the full Board on student mental health, a broad comprehensive review covering all the campuses. She asked that the report show how increased Student Services Fee revenues for student mental health in 2007-08 were spent, and what the current needs are. Provost Pitts recalled that a report was made to the Regents in March 2009. At that time, a few campuses had unexpended funds. Dr. Robertson stated that the flow of funds at certain campuses was slow, and that in some cases there were not plans in place. Expanded data points were now being collected; work on a report would take six months. Dr. Pitts
suggested that a full report might best be presented to the Regents in 2011. Regent Johnson agreed.

Regent-designate DeFreece suggested that, as an enhancement to that report, General Counsel Robinson show how the University’s student mental health programs serve as a risk mitigation tool, with information on liability faced in the past compared with liability the University believes it has prevented.

Dr. Pitts recalled that he had asked the Student Mental Health Committee to consider what an appropriate benchmark would be for optimum risk mitigation in student mental health. Dr. Robertson responded that this work is proceeding. The University cannot prevent all suicides, but it can make progress. Dr. Pitts asked about data that would produce specific benchmark numbers. Dr. Robertson responded that the Student Mental Health Committee would address this question.

3. UPDATE ON CAMPUS RESPONSE TO INTOLERANCE INCIDENTS AT THE SAN DIEGO CAMPUS

UC San Diego Vice Chancellor – Student Affairs Penny Rue expressed her personal dismay at incidents which occurred on the San Diego campus. Student well-being is a high priority. She presented UCSD’s campus climate website, which is frequently updated.

When incidents of intolerance occurred, the campus moved quickly to deploy its counseling and psychological services resources. It provided safe space; educated students about the psychological impact of racism and micro-aggression; and supported students who were rallying by providing counseling. Campus psychologists also consulted with staff on teach-ins and diversity training.

The campus also moved immediately to provide safe space housing. While the campus did not anticipate violence, it recognized that students felt unsafe and opened up space for students who were affected to live together. The campus heightened its safety response by increasing police patrols and residential security officers. Special course withdrawals were authorized for affected students. The campus’ undergraduate colleges processed 206 petitions for that option.

During the initial response period, Chancellor Fox and her leadership team met to establish priorities. Students had presented a list of demands, which were quickly turned into common goals and administrative commitments. These commitments include the hiring of a director of development who would focus on raising funds for diversity programs and initiatives, such as academic programs, the campus’ Summer Bridge program, and campus artwork showcasing underrepresented communities. Other administrative commitments focus on academics, such as faculty hires that advance diversity, funding for an African American studies minor and a Chicano/Latino arts and humanities minor, financial support for student-initiated outreach and retention, and
financial support for overnight programs for prospective students who have been admitted.

Provost Pitts asked if, in addition to new faculty hires to advance diversity, any steps were taken with existing faculty. He emphasized that all faculty should be engaged in discussions on this matter. Ms. Rue responded that the Committee on Diversity and Equity of the San Diego division of the Academic Senate has made a presentation to the Representative Assembly on these issues. A task force on faculty equity advisors has been formed. Faculty were given the opportunity to propose hires throughout the curriculum.

Ms. Rue discussed the success of the overnight program, a student-initiated effort. She quoted one student who wrote, “If I hadn’t participated in the Black Student Union overnight program at the University of California, San Diego, this past Thursday through Saturday, I wouldn’t be the same person as I am right now.” The overnight program is also a leadership opportunity for the students who participate as hosts and planners. Of 24 admitted students who participated in the overnight program, 16 submitted Statements of Intent to Register.

Faculty Representative Simmons asked if students self-select for the overnight programs and if the program is sponsored by the Black Student Union. He asked if the campus was concerned about Proposition 209 issues in offering these programs. Ms. Rue responded that student organization programs are targeted. There is another overnight program with a broader focus which targets fourth and fifth quintile high school students. Student organizations work through their own networks.

Mr. Simmons asked if the student organization creates its own invitation list for the program. Ms. Rue responded that the campus assists the student organization. Because this program involves admitted students, Proposition 209 would not present a concern. This overnight program is one of many activities focused on student yield.

Ms. Rue then presented a chart showing preliminary freshmen acceptance numbers for fall 2010, compared with the previous year. In spite of the campus incidents, there was a 36 percent increase in African American students. Among transfer students, there was an overall increase of 53 percent for underrepresented minorities, including an 89 percent increase for African American students.

Among other administrative commitments, the campus is considering the development of student resource centers for Native American, African American, and Chicano/Latino students. Provosts of the UCSD colleges have formed a work group to develop a general education diversity requirement. In concert with the Office of the President, the campus is establishing an advisory council on campus climate, equity, and inclusion. Faculty are discussing a center or organized research unit focused on African American, Chicano/Latino and Native American indigenous communities. The campus is reviewing the building naming process, creating opportunities for more culturally representative
names. The campus is promoting its principles of community through orientation programs and in the student application process.

Ms. Rue then discussed administrative commitments beyond those made in March. For the second year, the campus is holding a five-day intensive training program for Student Affairs staff on social justice. It is developing student organization leader training. Following a model developed at UCLA, the campus is exploring the possibility of funding by the UC San Diego Foundation for legal, race-based scholarships. Community members have expressed interest and the campus has secured a matching grant from the Irvine Foundation. The Student Affairs office has created an online map which highlights UCSD's outreach efforts in high schools in San Diego and Imperial counties. A special partnership has been established between the Scripps Institution of Oceanography and Compton High School. Twenty high school juniors will participate in a three-week program in July to study marine sciences and will have a residential college experience. The campus is enhancing and centralizing its bias reporting system. It has created its first-ever theme housing program, the Multicultural Living-Learning Community for upperclass students who wish to explore issues of diversity and multiculturalism. The campus will develop postdoctoral fellowships focused on diversity issues. The UCSD department of Human Resources is developing a Culturally Competent Management Program, to be implemented in the current year. All managers will have a structured diversity education program.

Special Committee Chair Bernal asked about the safe space housing provided after the incidents. He asked if this involved students living off campus or on campus and emphasized that all UC housing should be a safe space. He expressed concern that use of the term "safe space" could create the impression that other campus housing was not safe. Ms. Rue responded that UCSD housing is safe, but that in this instance the perception of safety was lacking. Students who were already living in residence halls were allowed to live together. She recalled that, because of UCSD's college-based system, it has not had theme housing in the past. The Multicultural Living-Learning Community is a new development for UCSD which will begin in the fall quarter. In response to a question by Vice President Sakaki, Ms. Rue confirmed that students from any UCSD college can live in the Multicultural Living-Learning Community.

Faculty Representative Powell asked if the duties of the new director of development position would include development of scholarship opportunities. Ms. Rue responded that this position was critical for UCSD. The incumbent will be able to raise money for scholarships, but not for race-based scholarships, which must be developed outside UC. The University can, however, direct potential donors to the UC San Diego Foundation. Ms. Rue expressed the hope that the campus would receive twinned gifts, with funds for both UCSD scholarships and for race-based scholarships through the Foundation.

Dr. Powell asked if the UC San Diego Foundation is the independent entity involved with the program to raise scholarship funds. Ms. Rue responded in the affirmative. The office of Student Affairs has a strong relationship with the Foundation. The Foundation is not subject to strictures imposed by Proposition 209.
Regent-designate Cheng noted that the Assistant Vice Chancellor – Admissions had agreed to meet with the Black Student Union. He asked about work being done on the admissions process. Ms. Rue responded that the Chair of the systemwide Academic Senate’s Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools has discussed holistic review with the campus’ Committee on Admissions. UCSD faculty are examining this matter and considering a policy decision. Dr. Pitts added that he would soon visit the campus to discuss this topic.

4. CAREER PLACEMENT SERVICES FOR STUDENTS AND ALUMNI

UC Davis Assistant Vice Chancellor – Alumni Relations Richard Engel began the presentation by emphasizing the importance of the marketability of a UC degree. In a time of budget reductions, it was a challenge to help not only recent graduates in finding a first job, but also to help alumni who were beginning a second or third career.

UC Davis Career Recruiting Program Manager Christine Dito explained that she brings employers to the campus to hire students for both internships and career-track positions. UCD generally holds four career fairs during the year, with 125 to 180 employers represented. Student attendance ranges from 1,500 to 3,000. There are also on-campus recruiting programs which allow students to interview with potential employers. The campus offers workshops on resume writing and interviewing. Students today wish to have online access to career services. The campus has an online database of internship and career postings, with thousands of employers, available to current students and alumni. The campus has also created “webshops,” offering career counseling advice in three-minute online video segments. Based on a UC Irvine model, the webshops have been well received. Students can access career services through social networking media such as Twitter and Facebook. The campus has been forced to limit its one-on-one counseling services for alumni. Career counseling staff have been reduced from 30 to fewer than 20 employees.

Mr. Engel noted a change in focus in career counseling for alumni, from career placement to networking, an effort to help alumni create their own networks. UC Davis has decided to deploy its resources in regional programming, focusing on the Bay Area and Southern California, and has increased its activities in these two geographical areas tenfold. Many alumni have attended events; when surveyed, most responded that they attended events for the purpose of career networking. At one point the campus hosted events specifically identified as career networking events. These events were not successful, and Mr. Engel suggested that alumni who were seeking employees were uneasy about receiving an overwhelming amount of applicant interest. He outlined some of the online approaches used to assist alumni with counseling and networking.

UC San Diego Assistant Vice Chancellor – Alumni Affairs Armin Afsahi emphasized that campus career centers are funded primarily by Student Services Fee revenue, and students are their priority. Providing services to students as well as alumni is an ongoing challenge.
In 2008, the Office of the President funded a research study on young alumni. This topic is especially relevant for the San Diego campus because 70 percent of its alumni are under the age of 35. Mr. Afsahi described the results of the survey, carried out by an outside firm, as a wake-up call. Of 3,200 young alumni who responded, 67 percent stated that their single greatest expectation in being part of an alumni community concerned career development, networking, and job placement. The greatest area of dissatisfaction for young alumni was career development and job placement. The University was underperforming in delivery of the services young alumni want the most. During the two years since the survey, the University has engaged in an effort on all campuses to develop programs in professional networking.

Like other campuses, UC San Diego is seeking creative ways to harness the power of the University’s community of 1.5 million alumni. One way to bring together job seekers and employers is through social networking media such as LinkedIn. Currently there are over 8,000 UCSD alumni actively recruiting on LinkedIn, and 42 percent of them have designated themselves as hiring managers. Multiplied by all the UC campuses, this represents an enormous potential base of both demand and supply. The UCSD Career Services Center is working to improve programs in an environment of scarce funding.

Regent-designate Cheng reported the view expressed by some information and computer science students at UC Irvine that existing alumni networks do not mentor or benefit current students. He asked about current efforts to meet this need and about how alumni are assisting current students. Mr. Afsahi observed that mentorship programs have a high likelihood of failure, because there must be a facilitator for the mentoring relationship. The mentor must be trained in being an effective mentor. Mentoring relationships often fall apart due to time and other constraints. UCSD has launched the Alumni Discovery Program, which has 35 students on its staff who seek out alumni for face-to-face interviews in an effort to engage alumni. Mr. Afsahi reported that this program has led to job placements and mentoring relationships that have developed naturally. It may be possible to promote mentorship without the usual infrastructure. The Alumni Discovery Program has been popular with students. More than 50 universities in the U.S. have this type of program, in which the University provides systems, but does not broker the mentoring relationship. Ms. Dito reported that UC Davis places over 6,000 students in internships annually, but the campus career center does not have a formal mentorship program. Mr. Engel briefly described some of UC Davis’ programs which bring together current students and alumni for the purpose of career development. Mr. Afsahi added that UC’s business and engineering schools have strong corporate programs, which provide internship opportunities and mentoring.

Regent-designate Cheng stated that a next step for the University would be to link students to current alumni networks. As a goal for future, the University should consider how students can become grateful alumni.

Regent Stovitz observed that campus alumni associations have received funding from the Office of the President for precisely this purpose, to engage students with alumni during their freshman and sophomore years. UC Riverside has been able to use a small amount
of this funding to enhance mentoring services, including student-alumni dinners and matching up students and alumni with a shared subject matter interest. This is accomplished through online registration of alumni, who indicate their areas of expertise. There is growing interest in these programs and more alumni are registering. Regent Stovitz concurred with Mr. Afsahi that these mentoring relationships need to be supported.

Regent-designate DeFreece stated his view that the University does a good job of converting students to alumni. The current moment is a critical time because the University has asked its alumni population for support, given budget reductions. He emphasized that the University must offer something in return. He praised the work being done by the presenters but stated that the University must broaden the scope of this work and its efforts to help alumni network and secure employment. Mr. Afsahi observed that the University has outstanding alumni who serve as executives in major companies. He suggested that there could be a campaign for visibility and awareness of these individuals as UC alumni and that the University could benefit from showcasing the fact that it has generated chief executive officers and directors.

Special Committee Chair Bernal asked if there are efforts to target alumni who work for UC as faculty, administrators, or staff for mentorship or advising. Ms. Dito responded that this would be a worthwhile goal, but that it was difficult, given the size of the alumni database. Mr. Afsahi responded that the San Diego campus is aware of alumni now working on campus. He observed that a large percentage of UC alumni attend graduate school, which means that they are not on the job market for two to seven years. Sixty percent of UCSD alumni are in graduate school within five years of graduating. Ms. Dito described the current challenges for campus career centers. Their services have never been more needed, but campuses can provide less than ever. She stressed that an alumnus or alumna will always be grateful to UC if the University helps him or her secure employment. Mr. Afsahi recalled that the previous year, UCSD Vice Chancellor – Student Affairs Penny Rue extended career services to graduating seniors for six months. While this was a costly service for the campus to deliver, it was a profound gift to graduating seniors. If the University can continue to provide such services it will earn more gratitude from alumni, and this will benefit the University in the long term.

The meeting adjourned at 11:10 a.m.
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Secretary and Chief of Staff