The Regents of the University of California

ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
July 18, 2018

The Academic and Student Affairs Committee met on the above date at UCSF–Mission Bay Conference Center, San Francisco.

Members present: Regents Elliott, Graves, Lansing, Morimoto, Newsom, Ortiz Oakley, Pérez, Tauscher, and Zettel; Ex officio members Kieffer and Napolitano; Advisory members Valdry and White; Chancellors Block, Christ, Leland, Wilcox, and Yang

In attendance: Regent-designate Weddle, Faculty Representative May, Secretary and Chief of Staff Shaw, General Counsel Robinson, Vice Presidents Brown, Budil, Ellis, and Holmes-Sullivan, and Recording Secretary McCarthy

The meeting convened at 1:45 p.m. with Committee Chair Pérez presiding.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of May 23, 2018 were approved.

2. THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS AT 125

[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.]

Vice Provost Susan Carlson introduced University of California (UC) Press Executive Director Timothy Sullivan, who had assumed that position five months prior after holding positions at the Harvard Business Review Press and the Princeton University Press, among others. Mr. Sullivan and his colleagues would shape an exciting future for the UC Press, which was celebrating its 125th anniversary.

Mr. Sullivan observed that UC Press is widely regarded as a storied publisher of great scholarly books. UC Press began in 1893 with a $1,000 grant from The Regents to cover the costs of printing UC faculty’s scientific monographs. The Press was envisioned by then-UC President Martin Kellogg as an outlet for UC faculty’s specialized publications, since he realized that UC research and its dissemination beyond the University was key to UC’s future. The focus on research and publishing motivated faculty and introduced the still-new University of California to the wider university world.

From those beginnings, UC Press has grown into a modern, largely self-supporting publishing enterprise with a highly professional staff. Its books range from those delving into the core of a discipline to those broadly reviewed in outlets such as the New York...
UC Press partners closely with UC faculty from across the system, supporting UC research with its specialized publications, supporting teaching by publishing books used in UC classes, and supporting public service by transmitting scholarly knowledge to a broader audience. About 25 percent of its authors are UC faculty.

UC faculty are also a key part of the governance of UC Press. Its editorial committee, which approves each UC Press publication and oversees its peer-review process, is comprised of 20 UC faculty members and currently has representation from each UC campus. Committee members are appointed by the Academic Senate to five-year terms. Several faculty members serve on the UC Press Board of Directors, assisting Provost Brown in his capacity as chair of the Board of Directors. UC Press also advises UC faculty on publishing in general. UC Press staff give highly attended workshops on UC campuses to graduate students and faculty to educate them about publishing options.

UC Press is by far the largest press associated with a public university and the most prestigious among the more than 140 members of the Association of University Presses, which includes the presses of Princeton, Harvard, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Columbia, and Yale. UC Press’ voice and approach are representative of the public and diverse University of California. It is dedicated inclusivity in academic disciplines and actively seeks out new authors from underrepresented communities.

Mr. Sullivan highlighted some books published by UC Press, such as the 2010 “Autobiography of Mark Twain,” and the papers of Martin Luther King, Jr. and Marcus Garvey. UC Press’ recent publication “Healing from Hate” by Michael Kimmel, a study of how young men get into and out of white supremacist hate groups, was positively reviewed by the New York Times. Jason De Leon’s “The Land of Open Graves: Living and Dying on the Migrant Trail” won six awards in Latin American Studies and Anthropology fields, and helped the author be named a MacArthur Fellow and win a Guggenheim Fellowship. UC Press publishes art history and more specialized scholarly works, often with paperback editions used in UC classes.

Mr. Sullivan said UC Press planned to continue to publish works in emerging fields and interdisciplinary works, to invest in newer, online programs, and to pursue new initiatives that change the funding structure of specialized book publishing. Commercial publishers were consolidating, looking for bigger hits and more market power against Amazon, leaving a space for presses like UC Press to publish crossover books, rooted in scholarship, but written in a way that communicates to a broad, general audience. Mr. Sullivan affirmed UC Press’ commitment to the University’s missions of supporting cutting-edge research, high-quality teaching, and public service.

Chair Kieffer asked about UC Press’ current budget and its future prospects. Mr. Sullivan responded that 75 percent of UC Press’ total $18 million revenue comes from its book publishing program, and 25 percent from journal publishing. In addition, UC Press receives about $1 million from the University through the Academic Senate to support UC faculty books, interest of $2.5 million, plus earnings of about $800,000 annually from a 501(c)3 foundation. Mr. Sullivan anticipated growth in UC Press’ traditional journals and
books program, and in new efforts that could communicate knowledge in larger bundles to libraries and larger institutions. UC Press’ total budget was about $21 million, of which $3.5 million comes from the University.

Chair Kieffer asked if Mr. Sullivan anticipated difficulty for UC Press because of trends in publishing. Mr. Sullivan observed that evidence suggests that the turn toward online reading had peaked and readers were returning to paper books. Only ten percent of UC Press sales are through digital reading. Libraries prefer digital content, which UC Press is able to provide; that trend would likely continue. He was less concerned about trends in digital publishing than about finding the optimal mix of books that fulfil the Press’ mission as a scholarly publisher and books that have a role in the marketplace. Chair Kieffer stressed the centrality of UC Press to the University.

Regent Ortiz Oakley affirmed that UC Press is an asset of the University and asked how that asset could be maximized, how UC Press could differentiate itself from other university publishers, and how UC faculty could be assured of having access to UC press. UC Press Editorial Director Kim Robinson commented that UC Press was differentiated by its commitment to issues that reflect its California perspective, such as Asian studies, Latin American studies, immigration, race, and inequality. In addition UC Press is committed to expressing diverse voices and publishing young scholars.

Regent Ortiz Oakley asked how UC Press would increase dissemination of its publications beyond the University to areas of society that have traditionally lacked access. Also, he asked how UC students who want to become scholars were being educated about accessing UC Press or other publishers for their research. Mr. Sullivan said that UC students have access through classroom access, since UC Press publishes affordable paperback editions of its books. UC students could see themselves in the works that UC Press publishes. In addition, UC Press’ Open Access program, through which libraries or other institutions fund the publication of the material, is open to students or members of the public in more remote areas.

Regent Lansing expressed her strong support for UC Press and its impressive array of publications. Her only concern was that UC Press was not well known enough and she suggested that the Regents could help with its promotion.

Regent Pérez asked what was being done to publicize UC Press and whether its 125th anniversary would be used to promote awareness. UC Press Director of Sales and Marketing Elena McAnespie responded that UC Press had undertaken a campaign to publicize its 125th anniversary, including outreach to reviewers and fundraising events organized by the UC Press Foundation. A sales and marketing team regularly promotes UC Press. She welcomed any suggestions for further promotion.

Student Advisor Huang asked if the Open Access publishing model was commonly used by other university presses. Mr. Sullivan said that UC press was at the forefront of treating the Open Access model as a part of its business model, rather than as a repository for books that were not chosen for publication, as some other university presses do. Some other
presses put only their older titles into an Open Access model. Ms. Carlson added that UC was a leader in Open Access in other areas as well.

Regent Zettel complimented UC Press on its engaging website. Mr. Sullivan noted that the website had recently been re-designed.

Chair Kieffer asked hypothetically how UC Press would use additional funding. Mr. Sullivan said additional funding would be welcome as it would increase UC Press’ independence. While being part of the UC Office of the President was appropriate in that UC Press represents the whole UC system, it involves bureaucracy that can inhibit UC Press’ ability to be nimble as a business operating in the marketplace. Mr. Sullivan said that additional revenue, if available, would likely be spent on marketing and sales.

3. A DAY IN THE LIFE OF A UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SCHOLAR

[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.]

Vice President Ellis observed that UC is distinguished among research universities by its reputation for conducting world-class scholarship, which in turn attracts new scholars and students from around the world. Time is needed by UC faculty for the creative processes required to push the frontiers of knowledge in their fields. Time is also needed for faculty to present their ideas to other experts. UC has been a leader in Open Access publishing through which faculty research is freely available online to the public through UC’s eScholarship repository. UC campuses provide substantial administrative support to their scholars, for instance with support for securing funding from external sources, for technology transfer, or for research compliance requirements. Through prudent investments and creation of a culture of academic excellence, UC campuses have succeeded individually and collectively in establishing themselves as destinations of choice for many of the world’s leading scholars.

UC Santa Cruz Vice Chancellor Scott Brandt discussed the infrastructure that supports UC’s researchers: the facilities, resources, and services needed for faculty, students, and postdoctoral scholars to conduct top-level research, including laboratories, equipment, supplies, materials, and administrative support. UC support for its researchers also involves navigation of federal, State, local, and UC rules and regulations governing every aspect of how money is spent and research is conducted. Research infrastructure also involves administration of human resources, budgets, facilities, contracts and grants, intellectual property, and much more. Researchers are freed from these concerns so they can focus on important problems, while educating the next generation of thinkers. Unlike industry, where investment is guided by near-term commercial interests, academic researchers can pursue whatever important problems they encounter, often preceding industry by years and occasionally leading to whole new sectors of commercial research and development.

Mr. Brandt cited the example of the Human Genome Project, conceived in May 1985 by then-UC Santa Cruz Chancellor Robert Sinsheimer, with his radical proposal to determine
the complete DNA sequence of the human genome. Five years later the Human Genome Project was launched with funding from the U.S. Department of Energy and the National Institutes of Health. In 1999, Project leaders asked UC Santa Cruz Professor David Haussler to help with the analysis of the genome, starting with the assembly of about 600,000 DNA fragments generated by the Project’s sequencing laboratory. This daunting task was accomplished by his graduate student James Kent, who wrote a program run on a network of 100 computer workstations. In parallel, a for-profit company was working on the same problem with the goal of turning the genome into privately held intellectual property. Professor Haussler’s team won the race by three days and quickly posted the first human genome on the internet, ensuring its public availability. Four days later this remarkable achievement was hailed at a White House press conference.

In many cases, such research can be pursued only by academia, because the likelihood of success is too low or the financial benefits too far off for commercial investment. In this case, the benefits were obvious and a single company nearly controlled access to the human genome, inhibiting the enormous wealth of research currently transforming the field of medicine that has followed that initial discovery. That fundamental contribution to science and humanity came from the University of California because of its deep commitment to advancing the state of human knowledge. Mr. Brandt cited the world-changing research of other UC faculty, who came to UC because of its research infrastructure and opportunities.

Mr. Brandt reported that UC Santa Cruz was in the process of developing a new strategic academic plan to guide campus infrastructure investment over the upcoming five years. As part of that process, faculty proposals were solicited for new research clusters. In the near term, the progress of these efforts would be tracked by key indicators such as the number of outstanding researchers who join UCSC to work in these areas, the publications produced and the citations they receive, and the number and dollar value of the research proposals submitted and awards received.

UC Santa Barbara Professor Kim Yasuda stated that her research in the arts was shaped by the community surrounding the campus, in her case the student community of Isla Vista. This unique community provided a rich backdrop for her research in housing, land use, and gentrification. As a public artist at a public university, she is interested in the role the arts can play in activating the community. Following the 2014 Isla Vista street riots and tragic student deaths, Professor Yasuda and her students developed late night arts and cultural programs, which took advantage of LED lighting developed by UCSB Professor Shuji Nakamura, who won the 2014 Nobel Prize in Physics for his innovations in solid state LED lighting. These programs addressed the immediate safety concerns of UCSB students by using artistic lighting to bridge the campus and the Isla Vista community. The dynamics between the campus and the community shifted. Professor Yasuda described other public art events in Isla Vista. UCSB media arts faculty created a permanent sensor-based LED installation that tracks pedestrians’ and cyclists’ movements, a beautiful connection between the campus and the community. These projects led to new opportunities for arts research, including a grant from the California Arts Council that funded the commissioning of new works by 12 California artists. These public installations by professional artists were featured alongside those of UCSB undergraduate and graduate students through two
Professor Yasuda planned to consider ways to track and quantify these collective efforts to demonstrate how the arts might have contributed to the documented crime reduction over the past four years and many other important civic developments that are reshaping the future of Isla Vista.

Professor Yasuda said the impact of the more than 650 faculty and 1,500 graduate artists in the UC system and their research partnerships draws attention to UC’s research enterprise and creates greater meaning in the lives of the California public. She expressed hope that support and advocacy for UC artists and their vital contributions would be deepened.

UC Berkeley Professor Amy Herr, a bioengineer, explained that her research group is developing new tools to understand individual differences in molecules and cells to advance precision medicine. Chip manufacturing technologies are being adapted to route biomolecules and cells to gain understanding of individual differences in disease development and the most effective treatment for individuals and for different types of tumors. Professor Herr said she works with a group of outstanding graduate student and postdoctoral scholars, clinical collaborators, and colleagues to understand measurements needed and to apply tools that her laboratory is developing. This work is funded by federal agencies, foundations, and industry partners. Almost all members of her research group are recipients of competitive, prestigious federal fellowships that drive innovation in the United States, including from the National Science Foundation. Professor Herr stated that UC Berkeley is the first choice for top graduate students, who are recipients of these highly competitive fellowships.

Professor Herr cited an example of UC support for an entrepreneurial startup enterprise founded by a former doctoral student using technology developed in her laboratory and licensed from UC. This company was launched quickly and acquired in 2016 by a top life science company; its product is sold around the world. Licensing fees and royalties flow back to UC from these efforts. UC research groups launch graduate researchers into successful careers and ventures that deliver much-needed products. UC Berkeley is considered a top university for future entrepreneurs. UC Berkeley’s rich intellectual environment is combined with its interest in making an impact in society. Many upper division undergraduates work in laboratories in apprenticeships with UC faculty and graduate students, using their fundamental knowledge to tackle real world problems.

UC faculty also perform public service. Professor Herr developed a platform for other faculty and students to engage internationally in rigorous discussions of their scholarship. She spends a good deal of time advocating to the public and to policymakers about the essential role of higher education, public universities, research universities, and entrepreneurship.
Regent Zettel asked if Professor Herr’s research was linked to research in Clustered Regularly Interspaced Short Palindromic Repeats (CRISPR). Professor Herr confirmed that her research group interacted with the CRISPR group.

Regent Morimoto asked how UC helped facilitate research systemwide. Mr. Ellis said monthly meetings of the Council of Vice Chancellors for Research from each campus and the three UC-affiliated National Laboratories consider proposals for collaborations among UC campuses. Mr. Brandt added that UC faculty researchers routinely collaborate across campuses. The Council of Vice Chancellors discusses research collaboration opportunities that could spread throughout the UC system, common issues that develop, and new national programs and opportunities. Professor Herr cited the example of the UC Berkeley Bioengineering Department, which had been working jointly with UCSF for 34 years, sharing the same pool of students. The Department holds a systemwide retreat each year for all UC bioengineering students and faculty. In addition, the California Institute for Quantitative Biosciences (QB3), housed at UCSF’s Mission Bay campus, is a collaboration among UCSF, UC Berkeley, and UC Santa Cruz. Professor Yasuda commented that UC currently had no multi-campus research network for the arts, since the UC Institute for Research in the Arts had not been re-funded. She urged funding of a collaborative mechanism for UC faculty in the arts.

4. NONRESIDENT UNDERGRADUATES AND THEIR UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA EXPERIENCE

[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.]

Vice President Homes-Sullivan recalled that former student Regent Monge had requested discussions about the life and experience of various groups of UC students and student data about academic support, challenges, and opportunities. This was the first such update, focusing on characteristics, trends, programs, and services for UC’s undergraduate nonresident students, both domestic and international.

UC was still well below its Association of American Universities (AAU) public institution peers in its level of undergraduate nonresident enrollment. Approximately 25 percent of nonresident international students were the first in their families to attend college. Approximately 70 percent of domestic nonresident students who enroll at UC as freshmen graduate within four years. Nonresident students are more likely to pursue degrees in fields of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) and increasing numbers of nonresident students, currently 45 percent, both domestic and international, choose to remain in California to work.

Chancellor Christ reported that in the prior academic year UC Berkeley had 22,503 California undergraduates, 3,711 domestic nonresident undergraduates, and 3,463 international undergraduates, totaling 76 percent in-state students and 24 percent nonresident students. She cited four primary reasons that nonresident students were an important part of UC Berkeley’s student mix. First and foremost, in this global and diverse
world, it is important for UC Berkeley’s resident students to interact with students who are not from California. It was important that Berkeley students experience diversity in California students and in students from outside of the state. Only 20 percent of UC Berkeley’s California students study abroad, so it was particularly important for the 80 percent who remain on campus for their entire undergraduate experience to have some international exposure by interacting with students from other countries.

Chancellor Christ affirmed that UC Berkeley’s nonresident undergraduates compare favorably with its California undergraduates by every measure, in admissions and outcome data, including retention, time-to-degree, and graduation rates. In the most recent year for which data were available, the admission rate for California residents was 18.3 percent, compared with 12.9 percent for domestic nonresidents, and 7.3 percent for international students. Average grade point averages (GPAs) and admission test scores were higher for accepted domestic and international nonresident students than for resident students. Time to degree of 3.8 years for entering freshmen was virtually the same for domestic and international nonresident students and California students. One-year retention rates for freshmen moving on to their sophomore years were 98 percent for California students, 97 percent for international, and 95 percent for domestic nonresident students, which Chancellor Christ thought had more to do with cost than with academic performance. The six-year graduation rate showed some difference, at 93 percent for California students, 87 percent for domestic nonresident students, and 89 percent for international students.

The second reason UC Berkeley nonresident students are important to the campus is the tuition they pay. Nonresident students pay almost three times the tuition and fees of California students. Since one-third of tuition is return-to-aid, every nonresident student provides full tuition for a California student. Those return-to-aid funds are distributed across the system in proportion to need, so the nonresident tuition benefits students at all UC undergraduate campuses.

Third, California benefits from the talent that UC Berkeley nonresident students bring to the state. About 45 percent of UC Berkeley’s domestic nonresident students and 55 percent of international students stay in California after their graduation, benefitting the state in numerous ways, particularly by contributing to the educated workforce that the state’s economy requires.

Finally, Chancellor Christ pointed out that UC was an outlier in its proportion of nonresident students. UC nonresident undergraduates currently constitute 17 percent of its total undergraduate population systemwide, compared with an average of 28 percent for public AAU institutions. Many public universities have much larger percentages of out-of-state students. Among major flagship universities, including the Universities of Michigan, Oregon, Iowa, and South Carolina, 11 currently have more than 50 percent nonresident students, reflecting the changing financial model for public universities.

Chancellor Christ affirmed that UC Berkeley was continuing to fulfil its mission of educating the students of California, while also providing a rich educational experience. The partnership with the State of California to adequately fund UC campuses needs to be
expansion so that UC could continue this mission. UC Berkeley would also like to provide financial aid for all needy students, but currently does not provide aid to out-of-state students. She looked forward to continued discussion of this issue with the Regents.

Chancellor Christ noted that many of UC Berkeley’s student leaders are nonresident students. She introduced Rigel Robinson, recent UC Berkeley graduate and former external affairs vice president of the Associated Students of UC (ASUC). Mr. Robinson played an instrumental role in UC advocacy efforts with the California Legislature and he was currently running for a seat on the Berkeley City Council. Mr. Robinson, who grew up in St. Louis, Missouri, said, like many nonresident students, he came to UC to pursue his education, but found his future. He considered himself fortunate, noting that his great-grandmother was the first woman to graduate from UC Berkeley’s College of Agriculture, his grandmother and grandfather graduated from UC Berkeley, and his father attended UCLA.

However, Mr. Robinson stated that UC policies around nonresident enrollment had changed over even the past four years. Since Mr. Robinson had been at UC Berkeley, UC phased out financial aid for nonresident students to fund resident student enrollment increases. UC also enacted a cap on nonresident undergraduate enrollment. These actions caused UC’s nonresident students to feel unwelcome, and that the University sees only the revenue that they can generate. He noted that, while UC was reversing course significantly, thanks to the advocacy of UC Berkeley students, there was little relief or aid in sight for those UC nonresident students who were struggling. Many nonresident students’ families have gone to great lengths to fund their students’ education. With no financial aid available for needy nonresident students, they must be either sufficiently wealthy or be willing to take on very large amounts of student debt to enroll at UC. Financial aid for needy nonresident students must become a centerpiece of UC budget advocacy.

Chancellor Block said UCLA’s perspective on nonresident students was similar to that of UC Berkeley. He emphasized that UCLA’s domestic and international nonresident students are extraordinary and compare very favorably with UCLA’s California students. He expressed confidence that UCLA was meeting the spirit of undergraduate admission policy regarding nonresident students, who add immeasurably to the campus. Being exposed to the diversity of students from other parts of the United States and from other countries was an invaluable part of the education of California students.

Chancellor Block introduced Ashraf Beshay, a fourth-year UCLA international undergraduate from Egypt, a first-generation college student majoring in biology with a minor in biomedical research. Mr. Beshay was currently conducting research in the cardiology department, was appointed by the President of the Undergraduate Student Council to serve as the undergraduate representative on the Student Fee Advisory Committee, and co-founded the International Student Leadership Coalition in 2017.

Mr. Beshay, whose father started his working life as a peddler on the streets of Cairo, Egypt, described his inspiration in arriving on the storied and welcoming UCLA campus. Mr. Beshay organized some events on campus showcasing Egyptian culture and dispelling
myths about Arab culture. As Chair of the Student Fee Advisory Committee, he had the opportunity to interact with administrators and students from many diverse backgrounds. The International Student Leadership Coalition board members represent 18 different cultures and the vast majority of UCLA international students. Mr. Beshay organized a job fair for international students, since a major concern is finding employment. Mr. Beshay cited challenges facing him and other international students, such as increasing nonresident supplemental tuition, homesickness, and unfamiliarity with U.S. cultural norms. As an aspiring thoracic surgeon, Mr. Beshay described his rewarding research experience in the UCLA cardiology department. He would apply to medical schools in the upcoming summer and expressed optimism about his future prospects.

Regent Graves commented that the student presenters were fine examples of UC’s nonresident students and their contributions to the University and the state. He asked if there were staff on each UC campus designated to work with international students, how support services for international students differ among UC campuses, and how the campuses were coming together to discuss best practices to support international students.

Chancellor Block responded that UCLA’s Dashew Center for International Students and Scholars provides an extensive variety of services specifically focused on the needs of international students. Chancellor Christ added that UC Berkeley had a similar center. Ms. Holmes-Sullivan confirmed that UC Office of the President Student Affairs regularly convened campus offices providing services to international students to share best practices and to share issues that apply specifically to this population.

Regent Ortiz Oakley commented that there was no dispute about the tremendous value of having international students attend UC campuses, although there were policy considerations regarding the optimal level of their enrollment. Comparisons with public universities in other states were valid, but there were varying reasons for states to increase enrollment of international students. Some states have less demand from their resident students than UC does. UC has experienced tremendous increase in demand from California students. Regent Ortiz Oakley suggested that the Regents have an in-depth discussion about the implications of UC’s policy regarding enrollment of international students. He expressed his view that the current policy was not perfect and had some unintended consequences.

Regent Ortiz Oakley asked about the effect of the lack of financial aid for nonresident students on the income diversity of international students. Chancellor Christ agreed that this was an important question, as it would not be desirable to have wide economic diversity among UC’s California students, but much less economic diversity among its international students. She added that it was important to have a sufficient number of international students so they do not feel isolated and to achieve representation of a broad range of countries. She noted that some families of international students place such a high value on higher education that they use their limited resources to send their children to UC, resulting in more diversity than one might imagine among UC Berkeley’s international students. Chancellor Christ expressed her view that the prohibition on using State funds for
financial aid for nonresident students was a major problem, as it resulted in less economic diversity among that group than is desirable.

Regent Ortiz Oakley expressed appreciation for this presentation. While the necessity and value of having international students at UC was undeniable, the interests of California students must also be protected at a time of huge demand for a UC education among California students. He expressed doubt that the current policy achieved this goal and said the Regents should reconsider it.

Committee Chair Pérez recalled that when the Regents considered tuition increases, they held off on increases for California students but approved an increase for nonresident students. Former Regent Monge requested this session to consider the effects of tuition increases on nonresident students and other groups disproportionately affected by the increases. Committee Chair Pérez agreed that it was important to consider the effects on California students, domestic nonresident students, and international students. It would also be important to consider the distribution of nonresident students across UC campuses, as their presence benefits California students. UC policies do not help attract domestic and international students to all UC campuses. Frustrations caused by fiscal limitations brought external limitations on the numbers of nonresident students that could be enrolled at certain UC campuses, but did nothing to encourage their enrollment at UC campuses that have few nonresident students.

Regent Lansing expressed great admiration for the international students who spoke at this meeting, but concern about California students who were not being admitted to UC in spite of outstanding qualifications. The University’s primary mission is to serve California students. The percentages of nonresident students were increased to expand diversity, but also because the University had a tremendous, persistent economic need. She said it would be important to learn how current policies were affecting qualified California students and the California Master Plan for Higher Education. Regent Lansing said it would be important to determine the optimum number of nonresident students in times of a healthy State budget.

Chancellor Christ commented that six of UC’s nine undergraduate campuses had more than 100,000 applicants. She saw the larger issue as the capacity of the University.

Committee Chair Pérez commented that California students not admitted to UC’s most competitive campuses could blame nonresident students, as other groups had been blamed in the past. The challenge to the Regents was to determine the best way to fulfil the University’s mission of public service, how nonresident and resident students should be balanced, and how they should be distributed across the system. He suggested that nonresident applicants who were not admitted to UC’s most competitive campuses could be redirected to other UC campuses.

Chair Kieffer agreed that it would be valuable for the full Board to review this complicated area of policy, although he cautioned against any hasty changes, as the current policy had
been at the request of the Legislature. There were competing educational and financial interests at play.

Faculty Representative White reminded the Committee that funding per student had not been restored to its pre-recession level. He noted that nonresident students provide funding that can be used to support California students. Chancellor Christ agreed.

Regent Elliott appreciated the candor of this discussion. He added that racial and ethnic diversity must also be considered and admitting more domestic nonresident students only decreased the ethnic diversity of UC’s most competitive campuses. He stressed the importance of admitting international students from a variety of countries, while current data indicated that a large portion of UC’s international students are from China.

Chancellor Leland said the academic benefits of having international and domestic nonresident students should be considered in an atmosphere not rushed by fiscal circumstances or other external forces, but rather from an educational point of view for California students and nonresident students. Chancellor Leland added that the inability of some UC campuses to attract nonresident students and the extra tuition they generate must be considered. Those campuses that have the fewest nonresident students also have the most low-income, first-generation, and underrepresented California students, and lack the capacity to fund those California students through enrollment of nonresident students. UC Merced was built primarily to serve in-state students.

Committee Chair Pérez concluded by stating that this productive discussion would set the stage for future proactive consideration of policy related to enrollment of nonresident students. He asked Mr. Robinson and Mr. Beshay if they had any further comments about what should be considered in future discussions.

Mr. Robinson commented that the timing of prior increases in nonresident enrollment coincided with State cuts to UC funding. The current healthy California economy presents an opportunity to consider nonresident enrollment policy thoughtfully. Mr. Beshay noted that UC competes with other top-flight universities to admit talented international students. Potential students around the world pay attention to UC’s discussions regarding admission of international students. Regarding the economic diversity of international students, Mr. Beshay related that his family’s ability to fund his UC education was greatly affected by the 60 percent devaluation of the Egyptian currency, causing his tuition to more than double. He could no longer afford to pay for a full-time education at UC and was currently a part-time student. He expressed his view that it was important for the University to consider the individual circumstances of international students and offer need-based financial aid to students in dire circumstances because of economic changes beyond their control in their native countries.

5. COMMITTEE PRIORITIES AND ITEMS FOR THE UPCOMING YEAR

[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 Pérez stated that nonresident enrollment policy, as discussed in the prior item, would be considered more deeply in the upcoming year. Regent Lansing suggested devoting an entire Committee meeting to that subject, given its complexity and importance.

Committee Chair Pérez stated that Committee members could submit items for future consideration to either Secretary and Chief of Staff Shaw or him.

Regent Graves asked that the Committee consider faculty diversity. For the past two years, UC had received State funding to increase faculty diversity.

The meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff