

The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

January 21, 2015

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

Members present: Regents Engelhorn, Gould, Island, Kieffer, Lansing, Leong Clancy, Lozano, Newsom, Reiss, and Saifuddin; Ex officio members Napolitano and Varner; Advisory members Davis, Gilly, and Oved; Staff Advisors Acker and Coyne

In attendance: Regents Atkins, De La Peña, Elliott, Makarechian, Pattiz, Pérez, Ruiz, Wachter, and Zettel, Faculty Representative Hare, Secretary and Chief of Staff Shaw, General Counsel Robinson, Chief Compliance and Audit Officer Vacca, Chief Investment Officer Bachher, Provost Dorr, Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer Brostrom, Senior Vice President Stobo, Vice Presidents Brown, Budil, Duckett, and Sakaki, Chancellors Block, Blumenthal, Gillman, Hawgood, Katehi, Leland, Wilcox, and Yang, and Recording Secretary McCarthy

The meeting convened at 9:30 a.m. with Committee Chair Reiss presiding.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of November 19, 2014 were approved.

2. UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA EDUCATOR PREPARATION PROGRAMS

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

Committee Chair Reiss expressed appreciation for the bold goals set by Governor Brown to continue California's leadership in addressing climate change, renewable energy, and sustainable building. She expressed pride in UC's important role in these efforts and the leadership of UC students in sustainability.

Provost Dorr acknowledged Vice Provost Yvette Gullatt, who had been appointed Vice Provost for Diversity and Engagement as of February 1.

Provost Dorr stated that this presentation would highlight the many elements of UC's engagement with K-12 education and teacher development. The California Master Plan for Higher Education (Master Plan) was explicit that teacher education was a responsibility of both California State University (CSU) and UC as the state's premier

research university. High-quality K-12 education for all California students regardless of their backgrounds was a boon to the state and to UC. UC's engagement with education could contribute much to California and its people, since UC brought special attributes to K-12 teacher education.

Vice Provost Gullatt said there was growing interest in ways in which higher education could support K-12 teachers in implementing the Common Core State Standards, Next Generation Science Standards, and new standards-aligned assessments. UC has a real stake in how K-12 teachers were prepared, including in methods to teach diverse students, many of whom would be UC's future undergraduates.

While UC produces only seven percent of California credential candidates in comparison with CSU's and independent private colleges' approximately 50 percent and 40 percent respectively, UC fulfills a unique role in the state as the primary State-supported academic agency for research. Through its doctoral education programs, UC prepares a majority of teacher education faculty for all segments of California public higher education, with a large effect on teacher quality and educator leadership that in turn reaches large numbers of California children. All UC undergraduate campuses except UC Merced offers an array of undergraduate teacher education programs, preparing students to teach in the most challenging schools.

CalTeach, the University's undergraduate science and mathematics teacher initiative, recruits and prepares students in these majors for future teaching careers by providing special coursework and field experiences in K-12 schools while students complete their undergraduate degrees. CalTeach has an effect on the quality and diversity of science and mathematics teachers in the state. CalTeach graduates currently account for 40 percent of all mathematics and science credentials awarded to UC baccalaureates and reflect the growing diversity of California's K-12 students.

UC's fifth-year post-baccalaureate teacher credential programs emphasize preparing teachers for schools that serve English language learners, students of color, and students living in poverty. Nearly half of UC's credential candidates were from traditionally underrepresented groups.

UC campuses also provide leadership preparation and ongoing support to teachers. Principal Leadership Institutes at UCLA and UC Berkeley prepare school leaders who are highly recognized, well-prepared, and strongly committed to playing leadership roles in high-need urban schools. More than 900 Institute graduates were currently serving in that capacity in the state. UC also leads professional development through the California Subject Matter Project that provides professional learning support to teachers over the course of their careers in their work to help students meet rigorous standards, with more than 30,000 teachers from nearly 6,000 schools participating in the past year.

Harold Levine, Dean of UC Davis' School of Education, discussed ways in which UC prepares teachers for success in challenging school environments. He stated that by too many measures the quality of California K-12 education had slipped from the 1990s to

the current day. The University had an essential role to play in both identifying the causes and fixing this problem. Factors such as the effects of poverty, language and cultural differences, learning disabilities, and other personal differences were some of the complicated reasons that had been studied at UC to determine why all children did not have the same opportunity to learn. More than one in four California children lives in poverty, and the rate is even higher for Latino and African-American children; over ten percent have identified disabilities; nearly 25 percent are English language learners. Cultural and ethnic differences can be profound.

California has almost 300,000 public school teachers who instruct 6.2 million students. Roughly one-third of these teachers were expected to retire or leave the profession in the upcoming several years. Teachers in California have nearly six times the attrition of other State workers, with a greater than 30 percent turnover during the first five years. The average salary of a California teacher is \$69,324; a new teacher's salary is approximately \$40,000 to \$43,000. In sum, teaching is a difficult job for low pay and California would be in great need of new teachers.

UC teacher education programs help teachers navigate the multiple challenges of today's diverse classrooms. Many of the best teacher candidates enrolled at UC campuses. Applicants to UC's fifth-year post-baccalaureate credential programs must meet the same minimum requirements as other UC graduate students, including a minimum grade point average (GPA) of 3.0; in fact, UC credential candidates collectively have an average undergraduate GPA of 3.3 to 3.4. Roughly 20 percent of UC's teacher candidates are from underrepresented minorities and 44 percent are non-white, increasingly reflecting the diversity of California's classrooms.

The curricula in UC's teacher education programs are broad and rigorous, aligned with the Common Core Standards, emphasizing teaching methods for English language learners and supervised field experience. UC programs' field experience is closely integrated with classroom learning, with the same UC professionals conducting University courses, onsite field observations, and evaluations of credential candidates. California teachers are also supported by the extensive research on teaching and learning conducted by UC faculty and researchers. UC faculty had been instrumental in developing new ways to assess teacher candidates.

Tine Sloan, Director of UC Santa Barbara's Teacher Education Program, discussed measuring outcomes of UC's educator preparation programs. UC collects systemwide data on new teachers entering the field, such as CalTeach graduates, and information about the positive effects of Subject Matter Projects on the professional development of thousands of California teachers, including preparation for teaching the Common Core State Standards and the Next Generation Science Standards. Survey results show that employers have a high degree of satisfaction with UC-trained teachers, in particular with respect to subject-matter knowledge, application of research to teaching practice, use of a variety of instructional strategies, and, most importantly, analyzing student learning to inform next steps in instruction. UC teaching preparation programs require among the highest number of student teaching hours of California programs and with extensive

supervision. On the standardized teaching performance assessment required for licensure, 97 percent of UC-trained teacher candidates pass, compared with 74 percent nationwide.

UC strives to understand which elements of its teacher preparation programs are most effective, in order to inform other teacher preparation programs throughout California. Since its educator preparation programs are housed in research institutions, researchers work side by side with teaching practitioners, giving UC the ability to continually examine its teacher preparation programs. Its small and nimble programs could be changed to take advantage of what was learned through research. UC's strong systemwide network allows changes to have larger effects than single campus contributions. A systemwide data platform was being developed among all eight UC campuses that prepare teachers to enable sharing of data linking K-12 student outcomes to teacher practices.

Each UC campus teacher preparation program is carrying out unique innovative practices that are expected to be important for the next generation of California teachers. For example, some campuses are exploring collaborative teaching models, education in an urban or rural context, or seeking international partners to inform teacher preparation. UC recently started student teacher exchanges with Singapore, Denmark, and Switzerland.

Committee Chair Reiss noted that in response to former Governors Davis' and Schwarzenegger's requests that UC increase its teacher preparation programs, the CalTeach program, originally called One Thousand Teachers, One Million Minds, was created as part of UC's public mission.

Regent Saifuddin expressed support for UC's teacher preparation programs, particularly the CalTeach program.

Regent Ruiz expressed hope that teacher education programs could continue to reach practicing teachers. He asked if it was possible to obtain data about how many students attended UC from individual high schools throughout the state, as a way of measuring meaningful outcomes related to teacher preparation. He expressed his view that it would be valuable for UC teacher educators to visit each California public K-12 school each year.

Regent-designate Davis commented on the importance of having a research university such as UC committed to teacher education and innovation. UC-educated teachers often became involved in innovative initiatives and leadership within the educational community. Noting Mr. Levine's comment that teaching was a relatively low-paying job, Regent-designate Davis supported the President of the University's having the discretion to differentiate between tuition increases for teacher education programs and other professional schools, such as law and medicine.

Regent Zettel expressed concern about the high rate of turnover of new teachers and asked whether data were available about retention of graduates of UC teacher preparation programs five years after graduation. Mr. Levine agreed that retention was an issue of

concern and great interest to UC teacher education programs. However, the State did not have data that would allow tracking of UC-educated teachers. UC campuses survey their graduates, but without a State data system, tracking teachers was very difficult. The University recently reached an agreement with the California State Teachers' Retirement System that would allow UC to receive some ongoing data on its teacher education program graduates. On a systemwide basis, a vendor was hired to develop a system to coordinate data on UC-educated teachers.

Regent Leong Clancy observed that UC's teacher education programs extend the reach of the University. These teachers who work in diverse classrooms would enlarge the pool of future UC students. UC-trained educators' assuming leadership positions also multiplied the University's effect. She supported UC's efforts to train teachers to have a more global perspective. She asked about capacity to expand UC's teacher education programs. Mr. Levine stated that the administrations of Governors Davis and Schwarzenegger had asked UC to double the capacity of its teacher education programs and the University had accomplished that. Some UC campuses would like to expand their teacher education programs further, but that would depend on funding.

Regent Lansing expressed support for UC's involvement in teacher preparation, particularly for mathematics and science teachers in underprivileged areas. She asked whether there were loan forgiveness programs for teachers in underserved areas. Ms. Sloan responded that the federal Teacher Education Assistance for College and Higher Education (TEACH) Grant provided \$4,000 per year in tuition assistance to teacher candidates who agreed to teach in a high-need content area in a high-need school four years within an eight-year period. While the State Assumption Program of Loans for Education (APLE) had been able to provide a higher level of tuition assistance than the TEACH Grant program to students in the past, APLE had not provided any funding to students for the past two years, which had a large effect on UC's teacher candidates, many of whom had relied on APLE funding. Regent Lansing encouraged marketing of UC's teacher education programs and the TEACH Grant program, particularly to potential science and mathematics professionals who might pursue teaching as a second career.

3. **PRESIDENT'S TASK FORCE ON PREVENTING AND RESPONDING TO SEXUAL VIOLENCE AND SEXUAL ASSAULT, PHASE II**

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

Chief Compliance and Audit Officer Vacca, who served as Chair of the President's Task Force on Preventing and Responding to Sexual Violence and Sexual Assault (Task Force), recalled that the goal of the Task Force was to ensure that UC best serves all students by providing comprehensive prevention programming and services for students in response to sexual violence and sexual assault. Its objectives were to identify gaps and steps to improve the University's current processes, develop recommendations, and implement systemwide strategies, the current phase. The Task Force approached its

January milestones through the integrated efforts of many functional groups in the University and with the important participation of students.

Mr. Rishi Ahuja, fourth-year UC Berkeley student, stated that it would be key to incorporate student feedback throughout the policy-making process. To support that priority, 53 students had been added to the Task Force and Working Groups. Students supported development of survivor advocate offices on all UC campuses to ensure that survivors had a safe place to voice their concerns in a confidential and privileged environment, where information they share would be shielded from litigation. The legal complexities of such a resource were being explored. These survivor advocate offices would not push survivors to move forward in an adjudication process, but would only elucidate available options, provide access to needed resources, and serve a lead communication function. Students had also played a key role in other areas, such as ensuring consistency across UC campuses and that data would be collected to evaluate the root causes of the problem at the various UC campuses and other locations. It would be important in the future to use the data to help evaluate the best ways to provide necessary resources.

Regent Saifuddin, a member of the Task Force, stated that student feedback had been solicited at every step of the Task Force's work. Integration of the student perspective would be valuable in building community to provide basic safety to UC students. She expressed students' support for the work of the Task Force and its incorporation of their input. Regent Saifuddin reported that students favored use of in-person rather than online training about sexual violence and sexual assault. Adequate funding would be needed to implement the Task Force's recommendations fully.

Ms. Vacca discussed the Task Force's January 2015 milestones. Implementing Task Force Recommendation 1, every campus would have a Case Management Team (CMT) and a common charter with a common name across the system. The CMT would manage all complaints of sexual assault and sexual misconduct, would ensure a collaborative approach for the complainant and the respondent, and that the campus provided a trauma-informed, effective, and timely response. The Task Force was moving toward having an electronic data management system to track and identify themes for areas of improvement across the UC system. Each campus also has a second response team, a Coordinated Community Review Team for Sexual and Gender-Based Violence and Sexual Misconduct (CCRT), which would focus on policy, education, and prevention, working with the UC community and the local community.

Another January 2015 milestone related to Task Force Recommendation 5 and considered very important by UC students, was that every UC campus would have a dedicated, full-time, on-campus student advocate who was privileged and confidential in the sexual assault area, and independent from reporting and investigation functions. Services from trained personnel would be available 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Ms. Vacca noted that many services have been offered throughout the UC system and in some cases these services would be augmented; on other campuses these full-time,

dedicated services would be offered for the first time. An electronic database system would be established.

Turning to Task Force Recommendations 4 and 6 relating to communications, Ms. Vacca emphasized the importance of communicating the same message systemwide, while maintaining the branding of individual campuses. A communication plan and a website had been established with feedback from various audiences across the system. This would be an evolving process, reflecting the dynamic nature of communication around these processes to UC students, faculty, and staff. Ms. Vacca displayed the UC Sexual Violence Prevention and Response website, with a common url systemwide, and sections on how to get help, how to file a report, education and training, frequently asked questions, policies, and resources. It was key that every campus have the same message using common definitions; students would be able to access detailed information relating to resources at their particular campuses. The website also contained information for students accused of sexual assault or sexual violence. An eighth Task Force recommendation to President Napolitano was that services would be offered fairly and objectively to the complainant and the respondent. A January 2015 rollout of the systemwide website would involve students and student leadership, and various faculty and staff groups to increase awareness.

Ms. Vacca said the Task Force's July 2015 milestones included adopting systemwide, standard investigation and adjudication standards, including sanctions, developing a comprehensive training and education plan, developing a systemwide standard data collection system, and the new recommendation of providing a fair and equal level of services to respondents. Metrics were being developed for all recommendations, and would begin in March for the January milestones. Long-term metrics would be established after the July milestones were in place.

Mr. Ahuja reiterated students' appreciation of their involvement in the Task Force process. Implementation of upcoming milestones dealing with adjudication and equity for respondents, and ensuring implementation on all UC campuses would be challenging. Students would be encouraged to participate in implementation and to submit feedback about the status of implementation at each campus. Mr. Ahuja emphasized that financial support to implement the Task Force's goals would be crucial. One survivor advocate for 30,000 UC Berkeley students was insufficient. As services were introduced, more survivors would likely come forward and there must be sufficient funding to provide increased services if necessary.

Committee Chair Reiss thanked the Task Force for its excellent work, and Ms. Vacca, President Napolitano, Chairman Varner, UC chancellors, and courageous student survivors for their leadership. She emphasized the University's commitment to providing a safe environment for its students.

Staff Advisor Acker, a Task Force member, suggested that the in-person training have an assessment component to evaluate its effectiveness.

Regent Pérez recalled that Regent and Speaker of the Assembly Atkins authorized a special hearing at UCLA of the State Assembly Committee on Higher Education to discuss many of these issues. Those discussions indicated that campus orientation sessions had made a real difference in creating a safe atmosphere for student survivors to come forward. Numbers of reported incidents of sexual assault or sexual violence could increase because survivors would be more comfortable coming forward, and then decrease over time. Chancellor Block's message to students that UCLA would have zero tolerance for sexual assault was crucial. Regent Pérez expressed his view that an area for improvement was in communication of the consequences for perpetrators of sexual assaults. Respect for due process for those accused of sexual violence should not preclude campuses from publicizing the number of students who had been expelled for being found to be perpetrators of sexual assault. Regent Pérez expressed concern about data that showed that a high proportion of assaults against students happen during their first term on campus, and suggested exploring the dynamics around this problem. He also advocated not publicizing the limit of ten appointments in an academic year for campus mental health services, since it might discourage survivors from coming forward. It would be better to first engage students who might need services, since the number of visits can be increased if clinical circumstances warrant.

Chairman Varner commended President Napolitano for her leadership in establishing the Task Force, and engaging students and administration in this effort. UC's efforts would set a national example.

Regent Atkins expressed appreciation for student survivors who courageously raised this critical issue and President Napolitano for her quick response. She noted that the State Assembly Committee on Higher Education had a series of roundtables on this subject. She stressed the importance of the work of the Task Force, particularly in its upcoming development of consistent sanctions systemwide.

Regent Saifuddin commented that it would be beneficial for the Coordinated Community Review Teams to bring together various stakeholders in reviewing why a high proportion of sexual assaults occur against students in their first months on campus. It would be important to communicate with new students, fraternities, and sororities about safety at parties. Rules regarding alcohol use should be reviewed to determine if they could be improved. Bystander intervention training was also an important part of education of students coming to campus for the first time.

Mr. Ahuja expressed his view that strong disciplinary action should be taken against perpetrators, and just expulsion from UC may be insufficient. Committee Chair Reiss added that changing the cultures on UC campuses would be an important goal.

4. **REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP ON COACHES/ATHLETIC DIRECTORS COMPENSATION AND STUDENT-ATHLETE ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE**

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

Committee Chair Reiss said that an action item would be considered the following day by the Committee on Compensation that would include guidelines that would be discussed in this item.

Provost Dorr stated that this item concerns the academic success of UC student-athletes. Coaches and athletic directors can make a huge difference in their student-athletes' academic performance and they have a recognized responsibility to do so. The recommendations of the Working Group on Coaches/Athletic Directors Compensation and Student-Athlete Performance (Working Group) to be discussed were intended to ensure that the importance of student-athletes' academic performance would be recognized in a variety of ways, including being reflected in the contracts of coaches and athletic directors, and the personnel practices that apply to them. The recommendations have been crafted to fit the needs and circumstances of all UC undergraduate campuses, despite the significant differences in their athletic programs.

Vice President Duckett, co-chair of the Working Group, recalled that at the September 2014 meeting President Napolitano announced the establishment of the Working Group to determine how UC could best align contracts for its coaches and athletic directors with measures of student-athlete academic achievement. Applying a baseline aligned with the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Academic Progress Rate (APR) across all UC campuses would be an important aspect. The President established the Working Group to reinforce the importance of academic performance of student-athletes and to increase the accountability of coaches and athletic directors for the progress of their student-athletes, including the overall management of the total student experience in these programs. The Working Group consisted of UCLA's and UC Berkeley's athletic directors, representatives from UC faculty, the Academic Senate, the UC Office of the President, the Office of the General Counsel, Ethics, Compliance and Audit Services, UC Department of Human Resources, the President's direct staff, and other representatives from across UC campuses.

The Working Group conducted a detailed review of contracts for UC athletic coaches and athletic directors, a number of elements of other Pac-12 Conference coaches' contracts, and publicly available contract information for other NCAA Division I public universities to better understand how comparable institutions structure coaching contracts to reflect the importance of academic performance and the athletic department culture. The Working Group communicated with athletic directors at other Pac-12 universities noted for their excellence with regard to the student-athlete experience. The Working Group also evaluated existing UC Presidential and personnel policies for staff members to determine how policies should apply to coaches and athletic directors and be expressed

contractually. The Working Group then examined how best to implement changes to policies and contracts across the UC system.

The Working Group found that there are many programs in place at UC that support and emphasize the academic experience of its student-athletes. UCLA's Bruin Life Skills Program coordinates educational, personal growth, leadership, professional development, and community service elements. Tutoring and mentoring programs provide academic support to student-athletes; other programs facilitate the reentry of student-athletes who leave school before graduating and later return to complete their education.

In December, the Working Group submitted its recommendations to the President and received her approval. The recommendations were designed to give University leadership an early warning of potential problems, and were comprised of requirements that must be met and additional options that campuses could apply to focus coaches and athletic directors on their student-athletes' continued academic progress. These recommendations would require that student-athletes meet academic performance metrics before the coach can receive any incentive payment, whether based on academic or athletic performance. The effect of this requirement could be significant. The recommendations would also require that coaches and athletic directors receive a comprehensive performance evaluation each year that would include athletic and academic performance, student conduct, and other elements relating to the overall management of the particular athletic program. Additional options for academic measurement by the campus would be provided that campuses could incorporate into their coaches' and athletic directors' contracts, based on the specific objectives of a particular campus and/or program. The recommendations called for the creation of an Office of the President-based award program to recognize teams that demonstrate exemplary performance in academics, student conduct, and/or public service under the leadership of their coaches and athletic directors. Reporting lines of athletic directors would be changed to have them report directly to the chancellors. Authority for setting appropriate compensation and oversight for coaches and athletic directors would be delegated to the President of the University in consultation with the Chair of the Committee on Compensation. In certain circumstances for coaches and athletic directors paid below a certain level, primary responsibility would lie with the chancellors who would be fully accountable for these decisions. A separate item proposing these delegations would be considered at this meeting by the Committee on Compensation. These recommendations would be implemented on a systemwide basis for new contracts and/or existing contracts as they were renewed or revised.

Committee Chair Reiss expressed the Regents' commitment to the education of UC's student-athletes. The action item to be considered by the Committee on Compensation regarding delegation of certain authority in this area to the President was initiated by some Regents. Chairman Varner added that several Regents felt it was unrealistic to require Regents' approval for athletic coaches' contracts that sometimes had to be approved quickly in a very competitive market; delegation to the President and ultimately to the chancellors would be appropriate with the correct guidelines and prompt reporting to the Regents. The current discussion involved the academic standards. Regent Newsom was unable to attend this meeting, and had submitted a letter questioning whether the

academic standards were high enough and the appropriateness of the delegation of authority. Committee Chair Reiss added that the proposed delegation would require consultation with the Chair of the Committee on Compensation. Regent Kieffer clarified that this discussion involved the academic standards rather than the delegation of authority.

Committee Chair Reiss asked how the proposed academic standards compared with other universities' academic standards for their student-athletes. Mr. Duckett replied that the proposed 930 APR threshold was the NCAA national standard for Division I programs. The Working Group arrived at that standard for UC, but with an important distinction from other universities with which it was familiar, with the exception of the University of Maryland. The 930 APR would be a threshold that UC coaches and athletic directors would have to meet before any incentives could be paid. At other universities, the 930 APR was an incentive, but did not disqualify the coach from receiving other performance incentives.

Regent Atkins expressed her view that academic performance metrics were critically important and it was appropriate to discuss setting performance goals that would be sufficiently challenging. She would not support the proposed delegation of authority to the President and chancellors because of the importance of maintaining transparency about compensation, but acknowledged that the process of hiring coaches must meet time demands.

Committee Chair Reiss asked UC Berkeley Interim Director of Athletics H. Michael Williams for more information about the proposal to delegate authority for these contracts. Mr. Williams stated that the hiring of coaches and athletic directors could be very competitive. A desired coach was likely to be recruited by other institutions and the University must be in a position to move quickly. If a contract offer could not be assembled quickly, talented coaches would be lost.

Regent Leong Clancy expressed agreement with the proposed academic performance standards, since most athletes would want to have their degrees when they leave the University to be able to succeed following their athletic careers. She asked how the calculation of the APR score was affected by athletes who leave programs prior to graduation to pursue professional athletic careers. Mr. Williams said the APR would be affected, since it was based on two factors, one of which was retention. UC Berkeley and other campuses have degree completion programs to assist athletes who return to UC to complete their studies after professional sports careers. When these students complete their degrees, the campus would regain the APR point.

Regent Lozano asked for clarification of the minimum academic standards that would be consistently applied systemwide and those that would be optional, since the Working Group's report stated that campuses would have the option to apply different performance standards depending on campus circumstances. Mr. Duckett responded that campuses would have the flexibility to establish more stringent academic performance standards above the baseline requirements of an APR 930 and overall satisfactory

performance rating in the coach's annual review. Regent Lozano asked if the Working Group considered the APR 930 to be the most relevant indicator of academic success. Mr. Williams responded that the APR score was considered the most consistent indicator, across all college sports. He noted that at UC Berkeley, currently 25 of the 27 teams that report APR were above 945. He stated that the coach of a team with a high APR would not be permitted to let the team's academic performance slip.

Regent Lozano asked if the use of optional metrics by different campuses could result in coaches in similar positions being rewarded differently at various campuses. Mr. Duckett responded that representative UC campuses with varying athletic programs participated in the Working Group and were comfortable that they would be provided with sufficient flexibility. Some campuses' athletic programs already had very high academic performance and the standards for those coaches would be to maintain or exceed that performance. Mr. Williams added that the APR applied only to student-athletes who receive grants. An athletic program with a small number of scholarships could have high volatility in its APR. The APR score of 930 was used because it is the NCAA criterion for eligibility for postseason play. UC Berkeley currently had eight athletic teams with APR scores of 1,000 or above.

Committee Chair Reiss asked if the APR score referred to individual athletes or entire teams. Mr. Williams said it applied to athletic teams and was based only on athletes receiving scholarships. Committee Chair Reiss asked how the University would ensure it met its responsibility to individual student-athletes. Mr. Williams commented that the athletic department monitors the academic progress of each student-athlete each semester. Committee Chair Reiss expressed some Regents' concerns that these standards were not high enough and did not address the academic progress of each student-athlete. Mr. Duckett responded that individual contracts could contain higher performance standards. UC's athletic directors have expressed their intention to require coaches to maintain or improve existing APR scores. There were a number of programs to assist individual student-athletes. The coaches would be concerned with the performance of individual student-athletes so that the team APR score did not fall.

Regent Zettel thanked the Working Group for its efforts. Noting the concern of some Regents about the proposed delegation of authority, she suggested an annual report of these contracts to the Regents.

Regent Pattiz stated that while these performance standards would affect a small number of students, they were important primarily because of the publicity connected with UC's largest football programs. In order to be competitive in Division I football, these UC campuses needed to move quickly in contract negotiations and be provided with maximum flexibility. Student-athletes were given academic opportunities that would not otherwise be available to them.

Regent Kieffer stated that he thought the Pac-12 operated under higher academic standards than some other conferences. He asked if UC had different admission standards for its elite athletes from schools in, for example, the Southeastern Conference. He also

asked whether meeting the APR 930 at UC would be different from meeting that standard at another university with overall lower academic standards. Mr. Williams affirmed that UC admissions standards for student-athletes are different from some other universities'. At UC Berkeley, 84 percent of its student-athletes were UC-eligible; 77 percent of freshman student-athletes entering in fall 2014 were UC-eligible. Given UC Berkeley's overall academic rigor, Mr. Williams expressed his view that a student-athlete who would choose to attend UC Berkeley would be willing to tackle Berkeley's more rigorous academics. Regent Kieffer expressed his understanding that UC Berkeley and UCLA had the ability to suspend their normal admission requirements for a small group of elite athletes and asked whether UC's standards for admission of this group of students were different from other universities'. Mr. Williams responded that UC Berkeley had a large support system for a student-athlete who needed extra academic help to provide skills necessary for that student to graduate. UC Berkeley did not recruit or admit a student-athlete who the campus felt was incapable of graduating. Chancellor Block added that UCLA made certain that student-athletes admitted under special acceptances could graduate if given sufficient academic support, which was demonstrated by the fact that the prior year UCLA's football team had a six-year graduation rate of 82 percent. UCLA's graduation rates were high relative to other schools in the Pac-12, which had high graduation rates relative to other conferences. He added that a student-athlete experiencing academic difficulty did not serve the team well, for instance by possibly becoming ineligible. Overall, there were many student-athletes who would not be admitted by UCLA, but who were admitted by other universities.

Regent Pérez expressed concern that the proposed academic performance standards were too low, since UC teams largely already met the proposed academic standards. He asked how many UC Berkeley teams currently met the APR 930 proposed standard. Mr. Williams replied that all UC Berkeley teams exceed that standard. Executive Director Dennis Larsen confirmed that the only UC team systemwide that did not currently meet the APR 930 standard was the UC Riverside men's basketball team, currently with an APR of 900. Regent Pérez stated that the proposed standard would be appropriate only if the Regents were satisfied with the status quo. It would be important to differentiate between standards for teams and for individual student-athletes. Even though student-athletes receiving scholarships were a small proportion of the student body, they might be a larger proportion of certain underrepresented minority groups, making their academic performance even more significant. He advocated setting academic performance standards that would encourage improvement.

Regent-designate Davis asked if there were any provisions that would prevent the threshold academic performance standard from being an incentive for some coaches to cut academically struggling students from their teams. Mr. Williams observed that cutting a student-athlete would result in a lower APR score. The APR score rewards retention of student-athletes with eligibility.

Regent Engelhorn asked if using a weighted average of individual student-athlete academic performance might be preferable. Mr. Larsen pointed out that using the APR 930 as a threshold would be a new concept; the University of Maryland was the only

other institution using this threshold standard. A number of options were available for UC campuses to create higher academic performance goals that could be based on improving teams' already high APRs. If the threshold was not met, all contract incentives would be unpaid. For the current football coach at UCLA, for example, \$930,000 would be at risk; for the current UC Berkeley football coach, more than \$300,000 would be at risk. The other part of the proposal is an incentive to improve the APR. For example, UC Berkeley football coach Sonny Dykes could earn an annual incentive of \$69,000 if the team's grade point average increased. Addressing concerns about transparency, Mr. Larsen stated that the proposed change to have the athletic directors report directly to the chancellors would allow chancellors to engage directly with their athletic directors to hold coaches accountable during their annual performance evaluations. Reports to the Regents would continue to be required on coaches' transactions above \$300,000. In addition, a publicly available annual report to the Regents of executive compensation would continue to be required and would capture all details of coaches' contracts. There would be no reduction of transparency under these proposals.

Regent Island expressed his view that athleticism had societal value and should be appreciated as part of a great university. Athletic achievement was a goal for many young people, including some African Americans and Latinos, whose may come to UC for an opportunity to play sports for a great university.

5. **STATUS OF FORTHCOMING PRESENTATIONS ON UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION, CURRICULUM, AND THE MEANING OF THE DEGREE**

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

Provost Dorr stated that this item addressed goals that Regent Kieffer had long espoused, and expressed her commitment to working with Regent Kieffer, Faculty Representatives Gilly and Hare, and others to successfully develop the proposed presentation.

Regent Kieffer noted the importance of graduate education to a public research institution such as UC and to its undergraduate education. Research was a formal charge to UC and critical to the state and the world. He stated that Committee Chair Reiss had agreed to put a review of UC research and graduate education on the agenda of a future Committee meeting.

Regarding undergraduate education, Regent Kieffer cited a recent report urging university trustees to learn about the undergraduate academic enterprise. Forthcoming presentations would enable a better understanding of undergraduate education at UC and in general. He noted recent calls for more online learning, shorter times to degree, and more efficient delivery methods for bachelor's degrees. The underlying question involved the purpose and meaning of an undergraduate degree, the authority for which had been quite properly delegated to the faculty of the University through a delegation of the curriculum. This delegation and the constitutional independence of the Regents were

widely credited with contributing to the creation of the greatest public research university system in the world.

Regent Kieffer expressed his view that, as representatives of the people of California, the Regents should ask the faculty to elucidate the goal of UC undergraduate education, the means or curriculum to meet that goal, their method of deciding these matters, and whether the University was successful in meeting its goal. The Regents should also educate themselves more deeply regarding the history of movements and debates about undergraduate education in the nation and world today to provide perspective and context to the Regents' role. While the authority for setting curriculum was properly delegated to the faculty, that delegation did not relieve the Regents of the ultimate responsibility to students and the people of California for the health of undergraduate education. This was reflected in the 1980 adoption of Regents Policy 2107: Undergraduate Educational Policy, strongly affirming the delegation of responsibility for curriculum to the faculty, but also requiring reports to the Regents regarding the status of undergraduate education. The meaning of being an educated person had changed dramatically over time. Regents and the University faculty must balance the needs of students with the needs of society.

It was important to reexamine these questions at the current time of declining State funding, increases in tuition, rising student debt, changes in demographics, and increasing availability of information. The public research university was only one of many means of obtaining a post-secondary education and it was worthwhile to ask whether UC was meeting its educational goals.

Regent Kieffer, after discussions with President Napolitano, Provost Dorr, and Faculty Representative Gilly, envisioned a series of presentations and written materials to provide some history, summarize the national debate, and cover the process by which goals and curricula were decided by the faculty, the means by which goals were met and quality was defined, assessed, and ensured. The first presentation at a future Committee meeting would be organized by Chancellor Dirks and the Chair of the Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate in coordination with others. This effort would be primarily organized by faculty through the campus provosts.

Regent Kieffer acknowledged that the meaning of the undergraduate degree varied for different disciplines and was often decided at the department level. Campuses review curricula on a regular basis, although perhaps not always in a fully integrated way. He expressed his view that the Regents, as the recognized, formal connection between society and the University, had a responsibility to ask these questions. It would be a serious mistake for the Regents to become involved in curriculum decisions and that was not the intention of this effort. The Regents however were continuing founders of the University and should hold accountable those who were delegated with responsibility. He acknowledged concern that it might be impossible to gain a complete understanding of disciplinary pressures and campus politics when so much of curriculum was delegated to departments and pursued separately at each campus.

Faculty Representative Gilly expressed the willingness of the Academic Senate to work with Regent Kieffer on this project, as it saw value in the Regents' learning about and engaging in the debate about undergraduate education, and understanding the process through which curriculum decisions were made by the UC faculty.

6. **UPDATE ON PROPOSED FEDERAL COLLEGE RATING SYSTEM**

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

President Napolitano recalled that in 2013 President Obama directed the U.S. Department of Education to publish a new college rating system to be in effect by the 2015-16 school year. At the end of the prior year, the Department of Education released a draft framework on which it requested comment within the upcoming few weeks. The goal of the rating system was to provide students and their families with information about access, affordability, and outcomes in an easily understandable, transparent way. In the draft framework, schools were divided into predominantly four-year or two-year, and would be rated as high-, middle-, or low-performing. UC supported the overall goal of transparency. Much of the information was already in the hands of the Department of Education. The President said the University would submit comments supporting a rating system, but suggesting some adjustments to accurately reflect the distinctions among four-year schools' missions and student populations.

The meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff