

Report of the Work Team on Graduate and Professional School Diversity

*A subcommittee of the
University of California Regents
Study Group on University Diversity*

September 2007

Work Team Members

George R. Blumenthal, Work Team Chair; Acting Chancellor and Professor of Astronomy and Astrophysics, UC Santa Cruz
Benjamin Allen, UC Student Regent and UC Berkeley Law Student
Eleanor V. Brewer, UC Alumni Regent
Na'Shaun L. Neal, UC Los Angeles Law Student
John B. Oakley, Chair, UC Academic Senate and Professor of Law, UC Davis
Lawrence H. Pitts, Professor of Neurosurgery, UC San Francisco
Peter Preuss, UC Regent

Primary Staff Support

Susanne Kauer, Coordinator, Graduate Diversity, UC Office of the President
Patti Hiramoto, Director, Equal Employment Opportunity and Affirmative Action, UC Santa Cruz

Acknowledgements

The work team particularly wishes to thank James Litrownik for his assistance with student data. The work team also wishes to thank the following people who have been instrumental in providing data, advice, expertise, and/or project coordination: David Alcocer, Sarah Dempsey, Chris Furgiuele, Kate Jeffery, Kamran Nayeri, Sheila O'Rourke, Sharon Washington, Mark Westlye and Ami Zusman.

Executive Summary

Work Team on Graduate and Professional School Student Diversity

This executive summary represents the findings and recommendations of the Work Team on Graduate and Professional School Diversity, a subcommittee of the UC Regents Study Group on University Diversity. The work team has also been charged with considering postdoctoral scholar diversity.

What do we mean by diversity?

The work team endorses the definition of diversity outlined in the UC Academic Senate Statement on Diversity. This statement underscores the responsibility of the University of California to serve the interests of the state, and highlights the relationship between diversity and excellence. By enrolling a diverse student body, UC will renew its commitment to equal opportunity while further enhancing the quality and excellence of the University of California.

Key Findings

- The proportion of underrepresented minorities (URMs) at UC decreases steadily with successive levels of the **academic community** (e.g., from high school graduates to undergraduate students to graduate/professional students, to postdocs, to faculty).
- Despite overall enrollment growth, proportions of URMs enrolled in UC's **graduate academic** degree programs have changed little over the course of the decade.
- In particular, **African American/black** graduate students at UC are represented at proportions lower than those at our comparable competitor institutions.
- Within UC's graduate academic disciplines **proportions of URMs vary**. For example, low proportions of URMs are found in the science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) disciplines. However, aggregated numbers mask disparities in representation.
- URMs are more **financially needy** than non-URM students. In order to meet educational expenses, URM students in both graduate and professional programs tend to borrow more, have a higher frequency of borrowing and borrow slightly higher amounts, on average, than do non-URM students.
- Enrollments of URMs in UC **professional school programs** substantially declined following SP-1 and Proposition 209. While in UC's medical schools the downward trend has been reversed, URMs have still not attained pre-209 levels. UC's business and law programs have shown little progress in URM enrollment rates since the mid-1990s.
- In UC's professional schools, **cumulative debt** for all students has risen substantially in recent years. Cumulative debt is particularly high in UC's medical schools.
- **Women**, although represented at virtually equal proportions to men in new graduate academic enrollments, are represented in decreasing proportions at higher academic levels. Enrollments of women vary by discipline, with particularly low proportions of women found in the STEM fields (both graduate and postdoctoral levels) and in UC's MBA programs. Particularly high proportions of women are found in some of UC's health science programs (i.e., nursing, veterinary medicine and pharmacy).

- At the **postdoctoral level**, trends in underrepresentation are similar to that in graduate programs, but underrepresentation is more acute.
- One-half of UC's postdoctoral scholars are **international scholars**.

To what participation rate should UC aspire for graduate academic, professional school and postdoctoral programs?

Absent discrimination, we believe the demographic profile of UC students generally will reflect the gender, racial and ethnic profile of the pools from which UC recruits and selects students. UC participation rates should reflect the demography of these pools. This aspiration stems from our belief in the necessity of educational opportunity and achievement for all.

Recommendations of the Work Team

A. LEADERSHIP — Strong UC leadership is critical to increasing diversity at the post-baccalaureate levels.

- UC's senior administrators must take proactive steps to maintain **academic excellence** and equal opportunity by ensuring the enrollment of a diverse graduate and professional student body. Implicit in this role is supporting the faculty and administrators who work toward achieving these goals.
- UC leaders should leverage UC's influence with organizations that **rank** or assess university academic programs (e.g. NRC, U.S. News, AAU) to include metrics on diversity/climate.
- UC's Diversity Statement underscores the university's commitment to underrepresented students. Federal and state laws require that UC not discriminate in educational practices. Both the statement and the laws support UC's commitment to identifying and eliminating the barriers preventing the full participation of URM students and scholars in higher education. UC's leaders must play an active role in **conveying this message** to the UC community, including faculty, staff and students.

B. ACADEMIC PLANNING — Diversity will not thrive unless it is incorporated into academic planning at the graduate, professional and postdoctoral levels.

- All plans for **enrollment growth** must incorporate diversity objectives.
- **Academic planning** should encourage programs that will attract diverse scholars. Particular attention should be given to disciplines in which groups have been historically excluded and/or who are currently underrepresented, such as business and STEM fields.

C. RESOURCE ALLOCATION AND ASSESSMENT OF DEPARTMENTS AND SCHOOLS — Resource allocation is essential to influence departmental behavior and demonstrate the University's commitment to diversity.

- **Adequate funding must be ensured** for diversity programs, leadership success and accountability. Since diversity is often regarded as ancillary to the University’s mission, programs and initiatives designed to improve diversity remain underfunded, or suffer when resources intended to foster diversity are diverted to fund other competing priorities.
- The Regents, chancellors and deans should require **action plans** from departments/ schools/units still needing to improve diversity. The extent to which action plans are successful should be one factor in the overall evaluation of the unit and its appropriate level of support. For schools and departments that fail to attract and enroll diverse students, working groups (including faculty, students and alums) should formulate a way to rapidly correct **this failure**. Departmental plans should not include strict numerical quotas.

D. RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION — Campuses and departments can do more to promote a competitive, diverse pool of applicants and to retain matriculated students.

- The Regents must consider the **financial barriers** that impact students’ graduate and professional school aspirations, and consider strategies to reduce these barriers. Based on the correlation between URMs and financial need, the “sticker shock” of high fees, particularly in the professional schools, is one notable barrier. Therefore any proposed increases in fees should be paired with a credible plan for addressing diversity in that program.
- At each level of academia (i.e., undergraduate, graduate/professional, postdoctoral, faculty), UC must establish or reinforce **academic preparation programs** that will attract URMs, build upon the skills/competitiveness of diverse students and encourage/facilitate URMs to continue on to the next academic level. UC should expand or replicate successful academic preparation programs (with a focus on attracting URM students) at the pregraduate and preprofessional school level.
- UC’s graduate academic programs and professional schools must maximize **“in-reach” efforts** to UC and CSU undergraduates to provide a diverse pool from which UC can draw. These efforts should include the pool of diverse master’s degree students at CSU.

E. ACCOUNTABILITY — Increased accountability at the campus, division and departmental levels is a key component to increasing graduate and professional student diversity.

- The Regents should receive an **annual report from the president** assessing the diversity within all segments of our educational system, from undergraduates through faculty. Each level of administration should be involved: departments should annually report to deans, deans to chancellors, chancellors to the provost, the provost to the president and president to the Regents. For graduate and professional students, each department should include diversity **metrics as a way of measuring progress** and as a way to be compared to similar units. While these metrics should not be used to establish quotas, they are nonetheless useful as part

of the overall evaluation of the department. The collection of metrics over time can help departments identify areas of success as well as areas needing improvement.

- Academic administrators responsible for diversity progress should be evaluated on this as part of the normal performance evaluation compensation processes. **Evaluation of diversity outcomes** should be considered in the same manner as other performance measures such as academic rankings or fund-raising, with corresponding benefits or consequences.

Study Group on University Diversity
Work Team on Graduate and Professional School Student Diversity

This outline represents the observations and recommendations of the Work Team on Graduate and Professional School Diversity. The Work Team has also been charged with considering postdoctoral scholar diversity.

(Blue=finding, Red=recommendation)

Outline for the Work Team on Graduate and Professional School Student Diversity

1. What do we mean by diversity?
 - A. UC Academic Senate Statement
 - B. Diversity Foci
 1. Race/Ethnicity
 2. Gender
 3. Citizenship/National Origin
2. Where are we now? [Includes data by university (systemwide) profile; trends over time; and variation by discipline; student financial aid]
 - A. A Snapshot of Diversity at UC
 - B. Graduate Academic Programs
 - C. Professional School Programs
 - D. Postdoctoral Appointments
3. To what participation rate should UC aspire for graduate academic, professional school, and postdoctoral programs?
 - A. Philosophy
 - B. Determining Participation Rates
4. What strategies do we recommend to increase diversity?
 - A. Leadership
 - B. Academic Planning
 - C. Resource Allocation and Assessment of Departments and Schools
 - D. Recruitment and Retention
 - E. Accountability
5. What are our conclusions?

1. What do we mean by diversity?

A. UC ACADEMIC SENATE STATEMENT ON DIVERSITY

The Work Team endorses the UC Academic Senate Statement on Diversity¹ and recommends that the full Study Group and Regents endorse this statement, which reads:

The diversity of the people of California has been the source of innovative ideas and creative accomplishments throughout the state's history into the present. Diversity—a defining feature of California's past, present, and future—refers to the variety of personal experiences, values, and worldviews that arise from differences of culture and circumstance. Such differences include race, ethnicity, gender, age, religion, language, abilities/disabilities, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, and geographic region, and more.

Because the core mission of the University of California is to serve the interests of the State of California, it must seek to achieve diversity among its student bodies and among its employees. The State of California has a compelling interest in making sure that people from all backgrounds perceive that access to the University is possible for talented students, staff, and faculty from all groups. The knowledge that the University of California is open to qualified students from all groups, and thus serves all parts of the community equitably, helps sustain the social fabric of the State.

Diversity should also be integral to the University's achievement of excellence. Diversity can enhance the ability of the University to accomplish its academic mission. Diversity aims to broaden and deepen both the educational experience and the scholarly environment, as students and faculty learn to interact effectively with each other, preparing them to participate in an increasingly complex and pluralistic society. Ideas, and practices based on those ideas, can be made richer by the process of being born and nurtured in a diverse community. The pluralistic university can model a process of proposing and testing ideas through respectful, civil communication. Educational excellence that truly incorporates diversity thus can promote mutual respect and make possible the full, effective use of the talents and abilities of all to foster innovation and train future leadership.

Therefore, the University of California renews its commitment to the full realization of its historic promise to recognize and nurture merit, talent and achievement by supporting diversity and equal opportunity in its education, services, and administration, as well as research and creative activity. The University particularly acknowledges the acute need to remove barriers to the recruitment, retention, and advancement of talented students, faculty and staff from historically excluded populations who are currently underrepresented.

B. PARTICULAR DIVERSITY FOCI

As guided by the UC Academic Senate Statement on Diversity, the Work Team has chosen to focus our report on race/ethnicity, gender and citizenship/national origin. The latter is included because international students at the graduate and postdoctoral levels (and also at the faculty level) provide key global connections and ensure that UC attracts the very best and brightest in the world. In this document, underrepresented minorities (URMs) include domestic African Americans/blacks, Chicano/Latinos and Native Americans.

¹ From the *University of California Diversity Statement*, adopted by the Assembly of the Academic Senate May 10, 2006; endorsed by the President of the University of California June 20, 2006.

2. Where are we now?


UC's graduate academic, professional school and postdoctoral student/scholar populations experience very different realities and challenges in terms of diversity. In order to adequately address these realities, each population will be examined as a separate entity.

A. A SNAPSHOT OF DIVERSITY AT UC

Underrepresented Minorities (URMs)

The proportion of URMs decreases steadily with successive levels of the academic community (e.g., from high school graduates to undergraduate students to graduate/professional students, to postdocs, to faculty). Examining UC today, the largest proportion of URMs are found at the undergraduate level, while the smallest proportion of URMs are found at the ladder-rank faculty level (figure 1). There is an immediate loss of potentially qualified undergraduate degree holders (17 percent URM)² to enrolled graduate and professional program students (12 percent URM), with the fraction of URMs steadily decreasing at later academic stages.

Figure 1 - Percent of URMs in UC's Academic Community
(U.S. Citizens and Permanent Residents Only)




*Most postdocs are in science and engineering fields where percentages of URMs are especially low. Unlike students and faculty, 50% of postdocs are international.

Includes postdocs in medicine.

² All student data in this report, unless otherwise noted, has been extracted from the University of California Office of the President's Corporate Data System for fall 2005, and compiled by UCOP Academic Advancement.

Low proportions of URM students enrolled in UC's graduate and professional school programs is a systemwide phenomenon (figure 2).

Figure 2 - Distribution of New UC Graduate & Professional School Enrollments* (Percent), Fall 2005




*U.S. citizens and permanent residents only.

**2005 was the first year Merced enrolled graduate students; race/ethnicity data was not collected from most students for that year. Race/ethnicity will be collected for subsequent cohorts.

UC draws a large proportion of its URM graduate students from California. While one-half of all new graduate students come to UC from California colleges and universities, 69 percent of new URM graduate students hail from California's colleges and universities (figure 3). This high percentage suggests that many undergraduate students choose to stay in California for their graduate work, and California itself is an even more important source of UC's URM graduate students than it is for other graduate students. Institutions of origin within the state include UC (from which 43 percent of new URM graduate students hail), the California State University (16 percent) and other California colleges and universities (10 percent).

Figure 3 - California's Role in the Pipeline:
New Graduate & Professional Enrollments by Undergrad
Institution Attended, Fall 2005



*Undergraduate institution was reported for 84% of new graduate and professional enrollees; numbers and percentages are based on reported totals.
**U.S. citizens and permanent residents only.

Women

Women, although well represented at the baccalaureate level (i.e., 56 percent of bachelor's degree recipients, 53 percent of new graduate enrollments), are less well represented at the higher levels of academia at UC. Women represent only 37 percent of scholars at the postdoctoral level, account for 36 percent of new faculty hires and comprise only 27 percent of total ladder faculty. In some academic disciplines and in some professional school programs women are severely underrepresented (e.g., only 14 percent of postdoctoral scholars in engineering and computer science are women).

International Students/Scholars/Faculty

International students comprise a small fraction (2 percent) of the undergraduate student population, 13 percent of new graduate enrollments, nearly one-quarter (24 percent) of Ph.D.'s awarded and half (50 percent) of postdoctoral scholars. A large proportion (over 20 percent) of UC faculty are known to have been foreign-born. However, we cannot simply compare international faculty to students, because virtually all UC tenure-track faculty have U.S. citizenship or permanent residency status. About 20 percent of UC tenure-track faculty are permanent residents, and an additional unknown percentage of UC faculty are naturalized citizens (i.e., were permanent residents previously).

B. GRADUATE ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

University (Systemwide) Profile

Graduate enrollment of URMs at the University of California is notably low. URMs make up only 13 percent of UC's total graduate academic enrollment and 11 percent of Ph.D.'s awarded.

This representation falls significantly short of any measure of baccalaureate production in U.S. higher education (e.g., the California URM high school graduation rate of 43 percent,³ or UC baccalaureate degrees awarded to URMs at 17 percent). This clearly illustrates the “leaks” in the URM pipeline at UC.

Women accounted for just over half (53 percent) of new graduate academic enrollments in fall 2005.

International students accounted for 20 percent of UC's total graduate academic enrollments in fall 2005 and 24 percent of UC Ph.D. recipients.

Time-to-Degree Rates⁴

Overall, URM doctoral students at UC took approximately half a year longer total time (i.e., elapsed time) than white and Asian American students to complete their degrees. (However, registered time-to-degree rates were similar for URMs, Asian American and white students.) Some of the difference in total time-to-degree rates is due to minority groups' greater concentration in humanities and social science fields, which tend to have longer times to degree.

Disaggregating by broad discipline, total time and registered time-to-degree rates are similar for URMs, whites and Asian Americans in the humanities, social sciences, physical sciences and engineering. However, in the life sciences URMs took half a year longer (total time) to complete their doctoral degree.

Overall, women took about one-half year longer than men to complete the Ph.D., for both total time and registered time-to-degree. The gender gap is less evident in most science, engineering and professional fields.

International students took an average of one year less to complete their doctoral programs than domestic students. This was true both for total time-to-degree and for registered time-to-degree.


³ Source: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education. 2004. *Knocking at the College Door: Projections of High School Graduates by State, Income, and Race/Ethnicity*. Boulder: WICHE.

⁴ Data on time-to-degree is for students receiving academic doctoral degrees in 2000-01, 2001-02 and 2002-03 (combined). Source: Compiled by UCOP Academic Planning & Budget, with data provided by UC Campus Graduate Divisions.

Trends Over Time

Over the last 10 years, there has been little change in the proportion of domestic URM graduate academic applicants, admits and new enrollees (figure 4). After the passage of Proposition 209,⁵ a slight drop in URM applicant and enrollment rates occurred.


Figure 4 - Percent of URM New Enrollments in UC Graduate Academic Programs
(U.S. Citizens and Permanent Residents Only)



⁵ The fall 2007 entering cohort was the first one admitted under Proposition 209. Although SP-1 was approved by the UC Regents in July 2005 and Proposition 209 was passed by California voters in November 1996, the first cohort admitted under the new law was the fall 2007 cohort.

While the total number of URM applicants, admits and enrollments have risen over the course of the last 10 years (figure 5), the proportion of URMs within these populations has essentially remained flat (figure 4). Meanwhile, the state of California and the nation grew, and continue to grow, increasingly diverse.


Figure 5 - Number of New Enrollments in UC Graduate Academic Programs Over Time



*URM counts are included in the domestic fields.

Despite their small numbers, URM who apply to UC graduate programs are admitted and enroll at percentages consistent with their percentages in the applicant pools (figure 6). However, it is important to note that since many prospective students apply to more than one UC campus, and the UC system does not use a common graduate application, application and admit rates contain duplicated records. Therefore any direct comparison of systemwide applications to admits and admits to enrollments is imperfect.

Figure 6 - Percent of URM Applications*, Admits* and New Enrollments to UC Graduate Academic Programs (U.S. Citizens and Permanent Residents Only)




In graduate academic programs, the proportion of women has increased slightly over the last decade (from 50 percent in 1994, to 53 percent in 2004).

Variation by Discipline Block

Enrollments of URMs vary substantially across disciplines, with dramatically lower proportions of URMs in the science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) fields than at overall University levels (figure 7).

Figure 7 - Numbers of UC New Graduate Enrollments
by Discipline, Fall 2005
(All* New Enrollments as Compared to URM Students)




*All: Total domestic and international students.

**Other Prof: architecture, communications, education, interdisciplinary studies, library studies, public administration, and social welfare.
Domestic: U.S. citizens and permanent residents only.

There is variation in the proportion of URM within disciplines in the STEM fields. In 2005, URM represented 17 percent of new enrollments in the social sciences/psychology, 13 percent in arts and humanities, 11 percent in the life sciences, 9 percent in the physical sciences and math, and only 7 percent of new enrollments in engineering and computer science.

Figure 8 - URM as Percentage of UC Domestic Students, Scholars and Faculty in STEM* and Non-STEM Disciplines




*STEM fields include: science, technology, engineering and math. Non-STEM fields: arts, humanities, social science and professional disciplines.
 **There are relatively few (124/2713) postdocs in humanities and social science fields.

Most STEM fields also exhibit a lower proportion of women at the graduate and faculty levels. For example, in 2006, women comprised 33 percent of new graduate enrollments in the physical sciences, 25 percent in math, and 24 percent in engineering and computer science. Conversely, non-STEM fields exhibit higher enrollments of women (e.g., 54 percent in arts and humanities, 73 percent in education). The disciplines of life sciences (54 percent) and social sciences/psychology (51 percent) exhibit closer gender parity. These trends are similar to trends at the faculty level.

Proportions of international students in STEM fields are higher than proportions in non-STEM fields (figure 9). For example, in 2006, international students comprised 37 percent of new enrollments in engineering and computer science, 25 percent in math, 19 percent in the physical sciences and 14 percent in life sciences. In non-STEM fields, international students are less well represented (e.g., 15 percent in social sciences and psychology, 12 percent in the arts and humanities, and 2 percent in education). This trend is true at the faculty level as well.

Figure 9 - Relative Proportion of UC Domestic and International New Graduate Enrollments, Fall 2005




*Other Prof: architecture, communications, education, interdisciplinary studies, library studies, public administration, and social welfare.

Financial Aid for Graduate Academic Students⁶

In UC graduate academic doctoral programs, URM students tend to borrow more than white and Asian American students in order to meet educational expenses. They have a higher frequency of borrowing and borrow slightly higher amounts, on average, than do other students (figure 10). (This pattern is similar to borrowing patterns at the national level, where URMs are also more likely to sustain high levels of education-related debt.)⁷ This is true despite comparable net stipends provided to URM and other students.

Figure 10 - Percent Borrowing Among UC Academic Doctoral Students (All Disciplines)




Unlike gift aid in professional school programs, doctoral support is not very sensitive to financial need. In addition, URM students tend to enroll disproportionately in disciplines with relatively lower net stipends. This may partially explain the higher borrowing on the part of URMs in doctoral programs.

⁶ Data on UC student financial aid provided by UCOP Student Financial Support.

⁷ Hoffer, T.B., V. Welch, Jr., K. Webber, K. Williams, B. Lisek, M. Hess, D. Loew, and I. Guzman-Barron. 2006. *Doctorate Recipients from United States Universities: Summary Report 2005*. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center. p.29.

URM students borrow more than other students, and the gap has increased slightly over time (figure 11). The trends in borrowing are consistent across all academic disciplines. Borrowing is highest in the humanities and social sciences, and lowest in the engineering and life sciences. However, in engineering and computer science URM students borrowed slightly less, on average, than other students.

Figure 11 - Average Annual Borrowing Among UC Academic Doctoral Students
All Disciplines (Constant 2005 Dollars)



What is less easy to measure is the effect of “sticker shock” (i.e., the numbers of students who are dissuaded from graduate study by the perceived high cost of graduate school) on prospective UC students. However, sticker shock is a significant factor in college choice for high-achieving Latino students.⁸ While one study shows that undergraduate debt has little impact on a student’s decision to attend graduate school, this study is dated and does not factor in the recent increases in graduate and professional school costs.⁹ Finally, the complexity of navigating the current federal financial aid system may serve as a further barrier to graduate school for needy students.

⁸ Santiago, Deborah A. 2007. *Choosing Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs): A Closer Look at Latino Students’ College Choices*. Excelencia in Education. Washington, DC.


⁹ Heller, Donald E. 2001. *Debts and Decisions: Student Loans and Their Relationship to Graduate School and Career Choice*. Lumina Foundation for Education. Indianapolis, IN.

C. PROFESSIONAL PROGRAMS

University (Systemwide) Profile

URM representation varies substantially by professional program. In fall 2005, URMs comprised 17 percent of new enrollments in medical programs,¹⁰ 12 percent of new enrollments in law programs¹¹ and only 4.5 percent of total new enrollments in UC business programs¹² (figure 12). Similarly, URMs are represented at varying levels in the health sciences.

Figure 12 - New Enrollment of URMs in Selected UC Professional Programs, Fall 2005
(U.S. Citizens and Permanent Residents Only)



Completion Rates¹³

In UC's MBA and J.D. programs, overall completion rates are very high. The rates do not differ between URMs and non-URMs. Although completion rates in UC's medical programs by ethnicity are not available, completion rates in these programs are very high overall.

¹⁰ Medical school metrics do not include partnership programs (e.g. UCLA-Drew University), which would raise figures 1-2 percent.


¹¹ Law school metrics include UC Berkeley, Davis, Hastings and Los Angeles.

¹² Includes international students. In the domestic population, URMs comprise 6.7 percent of new enrollments for fall 2005. Business School data, unless noted, does not include Executive MBA and Fully-Employed MBA programs.

¹³ Data on completion rates based on fall 1996, 1997 and 1998 master-entry cohorts. Source: UCOP Planning & Budget.

Women are represented in very high proportions in some health science schools (e.g., nursing, pharmacy) and are at parity with men in medicine and law, but women are poorly represented in business (figure 13).

Figure 13 - New Enrollment of Women in Selected UC Professional Programs, Fall 2005
(U.S. Citizens and Permanent Residents Only)




International students represent a substantial portion of UC MBA students, but generally do not enroll in other professional programs. This is partly due to large oversubscription of these programs (e.g., medicine and veterinary medicine) and partly due to lack of applicability of U.S.-based training and credentialing for students from other countries (e.g., law and pharmacy).

Trends Over Time

Even prior to SP-1 and Proposition 209 (i.e., prior to fall 1997), enrollments of URMs were low in UC professional schools. **Following SP-1 and Proposition 209, URM applications to and enrollments in UC professional schools declined dramatically (figure 14).**

Figure 14 - URMs as a Percentage of New Enrollments in UC's Three Largest Professional Programs* (U.S. Citizens and Permanent Residents Only)




*M.D. metrics do not include partnership programs (e.g. UCLA-Drew University), which would raise figures 1-2%.
 J.D. metrics include UC Hastings. If Hastings is not included, the % URMs increases (between 1-4% over 15 years).
 MBA metrics do not include Executive MBA and Fully-Employed MBA programs. If included, the % URMs decreases by less than 1%.
 MBA data not available for 1994.

However, trends since the mid-1990s vary substantially by program. Some professional programs are progressing toward URM participation rates similar to those prior to SP-1, while URM rates in other professional programs have continued to decline.

Financial Aid for Professional School Students

In professional school programs, the data suggest that URM students have fewer financial resources than other students and thus have greater need for financial support. Borrowing amounts in professional degree programs are significantly higher than in graduate academic programs.

Figure 15 - Percent of Professional Degree Program Students Who Borrow (All Disciplines)



URM students are more likely than white and Asian American students to receive gift aid and to borrow¹⁴ (especially in law and business), consistent with their greater need (figure 15). The data also suggest that the gift aid received by URM students compensates for their greater financial need. URM students receive more gift aid than other students, resulting in average borrowing levels comparable to those of white and Asian American borrowers.


Overall, URM borrowers have similar average annual loan amounts as other borrowers. They borrow slightly less each year in business and law and slightly more than other students in medicine. However, even adjusted for inflation, average annual borrowing has risen steadily for all students since 2000.

¹⁴ Gift aid includes both need-based grants and merit-based scholarships. For students in professional degree programs, gift aid is awarded largely on the basis of need. Borrowing amounts include all loans known to UC.

Of concern is the rise of cumulative debt levels for UC students over time. At UC, URM students borrow amounts similar to other students in law and business programs over the course of their professional degree programs. However, cumulative debt has risen substantially for all students in recent years. For example, in UC business programs, cumulative debt has risen from \$36,000 to over \$50,000 in the last five years. In UC law programs, cumulative debt has risen from \$50,000 to nearly \$70,000 in the same timeframe.

Cumulative debt in UC's medical schools is particularly high and is even higher for URM students, who borrow slightly more than white and Asian American students (figure 16).

Figure 16 - Average Cumulative Debt at Graduation for UC Medical Program Graduates
(Constant 2005 Dollars)




Variation by Professional School Program

Medical Programs

After a substantial drop in the rates of URM applicants, admits and new enrollments at UC M.D. programs following Proposition 209, the downward trend has been reversed, with proportions of URM enrollments nearly rebounding to levels prior to 209 (figure 17). However, rates of URM applicants and enrollments have not surpassed those of more than a decade ago.

URMs comprised 25 percent of UC's newly enrolled medical students in 1992; this rate dropped to 14 percent in 2000 and has rebounded slightly to 18 percent in 2005. However, the percentage of new enrollments by African Americans/blacks remains low. In 1993, 8 percent of new enrollees were African American/black; six years later that figure dropped by half (4 percent), and in 2005 only 4 percent of new enrollees are African American/black.

Figure 17 - Percent of URM Applications*, Admits* and New Enrollments to UC M.D. Programs
(U.S. Citizens and Permanent Residents Only)



*Individual student records across campuses are duplicated; individuals may apply to and be admitted to more than one campus.

If UC factors in collaborations with Drew University and other medical education programs, the numbers of African Americans/blacks increase slightly (by seven in 2005). However, these partnership programs are small, bringing a total of 15 URM to UC's medical programs in 2005.

Women represent just over half (52 percent) of new enrollments in UC medical programs, a consistent rate over the last four years. This proportion is also consistent with the national average (52 percent).¹⁵

International students are not typically admitted to UC medical programs and comprised only 1 percent of MD's awarded in the United States in 2003-04.


¹⁵ Data extracted from the American Association of Medical Colleges website, <http://www.aamc.org/data/facts/>, January 19, 2007.

Law Programs

Rates of URM applicants, admitted students and newly enrolled students at UC law schools dropped following Proposition 209 (figure 18). Applicant rates of URM have remained flat since that time, and admissions and enrollment rates have only improved very slightly.

URMs represented 23 percent of new enrollees in 1994; five years later this dropped to 10 percent and increased slightly to 12 percent in 2005. In terms of URM, UC Hastings is less diverse than the law programs on other UC campuses. If UC Hastings' enrollments are removed from the above metrics, data show that URM represented 28 percent of new UC enrollments in 1994, 9 percent five years later; the proportion increased slightly, to 13 percent, in 2005. However, this proportion remains lower than that of the national average for J.D.'s awarded (16 percent).¹⁶

Figure 18 - Percent of URM Applications*, Admits* and New Enrollments to UC J.D. Programs
(U.S. Citizens and Permanent Residents Only)



*Individual student records across campuses are duplicated; individuals may apply to and be admitted to more than one campus.

Women represent over half of new J.D. program enrollments, and they have experienced an upward trend in UC's law programs, with new enrollments in 2005 peaking at 56 percent, up from 47 percent in 1996. This proportion is higher than the national average (50 percent) for J.D. and LLB degrees awarded in 2003-04.

International students comprised less than 2 percent of LLB and J.D. recipients nationwide in 2003-04.


¹⁶ Data on national degree completion extracted from: *Minorities in Higher Education: Twenty-Second Annual Status Report (2006)*. Washington: American Council on Education.

Business Programs (Full-Time Two-Year MBA)

Rates of URM applicants to UC MBA programs dropped between 1996 and 1998 and remain low (figure 19). URM admission and enrollment rates in UC MBA programs fell dramatically since 1996 and remain low. URM applicants comprise 6.7 percent of new enrollments in UC's MBA programs for fall 2005. By contrast, URM applicants represent 15.6 percent of MBA recipients nationwide.

While the proportion of URM students throughout UC's MBA population remains extremely low, the number of enrolled African-American/black students in UC's two-year MBA programs is woefully low. For example, in 1995, nearly 300 African American/black students applied to UC MBA programs. Four years later, just over half this number (157) applied. In 2005, only 91 applied. This trend is even more dramatic at the new enrollment stage. In 1995, 27 new African American/black students enrolled in UC business programs. Four years later, this number fell to 17. In fall 2005, only eight new African American/black students enrolled in UC business programs, or 1 percent of UC's domestic MBAs. Nationally, African Americans/blacks received 12,625 of MBAs in 2003-04, or 10.5 percent of all domestic MBAs.

Figure 19 - Percent of URM Applications*, Admits* and New Enrollments to UC MBA Programs (U.S. Citizens and Permanent Residents Only)



*Individual student records across campuses are duplicated; individuals may apply to and be admitted to more than one campus.

The proportion of women in UC business programs remains markedly low. Women comprise 33 percent of new enrollments in UC's full-time MBA programs. This has been a fairly consistent trend over the last decade, and is consistent with trends for top-tier business programs

nationwide (approximately 30 percent).¹⁷ By contrast, women represent 42 percent of MBAs nationwide.

UC's executive MBA programs do not compensate for low proportions of underrepresented students in the full-time MBA programs. In 2006, UC Executive MBA (EMBA) and Fully Employed MBA (FEMBA) programs enrolled more than 2700 students. These programs have very low rates of URM's (similar to the full-time MBA rates), and even fewer women (27 percent) proportionally than the full-time MBA programs (33 percent).

International students in UC's full-time MBA programs have varied between one-quarter and 29 percent of the population in the last 10 years. As a comparison, international students made up 16 percent of MBA's awarded in the United States in 2003-04.


¹⁷ *Women and the MBA: Gateway to Opportunity*, 2000. New York: Catalyst.

Health Science (Non-medical) Programs

Trends in UC's health science programs vary by discipline, and in some cases between campuses in the same discipline.

Overall, in fall 2005, URMs represented 10 percent of domestic new enrollments in dentistry,¹⁸ 7 percent in pharmacy, 12 percent in veterinary medicine and 15 percent in nursing programs (figure 20). However, UC's nursing and pharmacy programs experienced different trends by campus. While one nursing campus enrolled 9 percent new URMs in 2005 and has experienced a slight downward trend in recent years, the other enrolled 21 percent new URMs and has experienced an upward trend in recent years. UC's two pharmacy schools have also experienced different enrollment patterns. While one pharmacy program consistently enrolled between 7 percent and 9 percent URMs, the other program enrolled 3 percent or fewer URM students each year since the inception of the program.


Figure 20 - Relative Proportion of URMs to Non-URMs in UC Health Science Programs, Fall 2005



¹⁸ While UC's dentistry school enrolled only 3 percent URM students in fall 2006, this low proportion appears to be an aberration. Over the last eight years, UCs dentistry schools have enrolled an average of 7 percent URMs.

Women are represented in very high proportions in some health science schools (i.e., 92 percent in nursing, 82 percent in veterinary medicine and 79 percent in pharmacy) and are closer to parity in UC's dentistry school (58 percent) (figure 21).

Figure 21 - Relative Proportion of Women to Men in UC Health Science Programs, Fall 2005



As mentioned previously, international students represent a very small proportion of UC's health science students. International students represent less than 3 percent of enrollments in UC's pharmacy, nursing and veterinary medicine programs.


D. POSTDOCTORAL SCHOLARS

University (Systemwide) Profile

International students comprise approximately half of the overall UC postdoctoral population (figure 22).

The proportions of URM^s at the postdoctoral level are strikingly low (figure 22). URM^s comprise 8 percent of the domestic postdoctoral population. The vast majority of domestic postdoctoral scholars (87 percent) are white or Asian American. Another 5 percent are unknown.


Figure 22 - UC Postdoctoral Scholar Population
by National Origin and Ethnicity, Fall 2005
N=5438



*Domestic: U.S. citizens and permanent residents.

Women comprise 37 percent of UC's postdoctoral population (figure 23). Although good national data on postdoctoral scholars does not exist, NSF has collected data on scholars in STEM fields. In 2004, women represented 31 percent of postdoctoral scholars in STEM fields in the United States.¹⁹

Figure 23 - UC Postdoctoral Scholar Population
by Gender, Fall 2005



Trends Over Time


Although there is anecdotal data available on postdoctoral populations at UC, it is not sufficiently uniform to allow us to assess trends in postdoctoral scholars over time.

¹⁹ National Science Foundation. *Women, Minorities and Persons with Disabilities in Science and Engineering: S&E Postdoctoral Fellows by Field and Sex: 1997-2004*. www.nsf.gov/statistics/wmpd/sex.htm#postdoc, April 16, 2007.

Variation by Discipline

At UC, the vast majority of postdoctoral scholars (over 90 percent) are in the STEM²⁰ disciplines (figure 24). **STEM fields at the postdoctoral level tend to have lower rates of URM and women than the general postdoctoral population.** In UC STEM disciplines, URM postdoctoral scholars comprise between 4 percent and 6 percent of the total postdoctoral population. These proportions are slightly lower than those of UC Ph.D. recipients in STEM disciplines (9 percent).

Figure 24 - Number of UC Postdoctoral Scholars by Discipline
Fall 2005
(Total Domestic & International Scholars as Compared to URM Scholars)




*Domestic: U.S. citizens and permanent residents.

²⁰ At the postdoctoral level, STEM students include scholars in medicine, engineering and computer science, physical sciences and math, life sciences, and other health sciences.

The proportions of women in postdoctoral appointments are highest in medicine (over 40 percent) and the life sciences (40 percent), lower in math and physical sciences (just over 20 percent), and lowest in engineering and computer sciences (14 percent) (figure 25). Women are represented at higher proportions in arts and humanities and social sciences, but the total numbers of postdoctoral scholars in these fields are few (n=204) in comparison to the overall postdoctoral population (n=5,438).

Figure 25 - Number of UC Postdoctoral Scholars by Discipline, Fall 2005
(Total Scholars as Compared to Women Scholars)



In engineering and computer science, nearly 70 percent of postdoctoral scholars are international; in the physical sciences and math over 60 percent are international; and in medicine approximately 45 percent are international.

3. To what participation rate should UC aspire for graduate academic, professional school and postdoctoral programs?

A. PHILOSOPHY

Absent discrimination, we believe the demographic profile of UC students and scholars generally will reflect the gender, racial and ethnic profile of the pools from which UC recruits and selects students. UC participation rates should reflect the demography of these pools. This aspiration reflects our belief in the necessity of educational opportunity and achievement for all. However, we do not advocate achieving participation rates through quotas or other preferences based on race or gender. Furthermore, we maintain that diversity is a core component of excellence, and as such will further enhance the quality and excellence of the University. A careful assessment of excellence would therefore yield a diverse graduate population.

At each stage of advancement at UC, URMs become increasingly underrepresented. This is generally true across all disciplines. (For example, URMs earn 17 percent of UC bachelor's degrees and this proportion decreases precipitously at each successive stage, with URMs representing only 8 percent of the domestic postdoctoral scholar population.) These low proportions necessitate increasing the desired participation rate and establishing a regular quantitative diagnostic analysis that measures progress.

Advocating a higher participation rate constitutes neither a finding nor an admission of discrimination. Participation rates are not quotas and should not be considered either ceilings or floors for the admission of particular groups. Progress toward desired participation rates should include action-oriented components that include specific, practical steps designed to address problem areas identified in diagnostic analyses. Increasing participation rates does not provide a justification to:

- extend a preference to any individual on the basis of gender, race or ethnicity;
- create set-asides for specific groups;
- supersede merit selection principles;
- or select a less qualified person in preference to a more qualified person.

B. DETERMINING PARTICIPATION RATES

The number of URMs declines at each stage of advancement in the academic community (both at UC and nationwide). Given this fact, it is valuable to consider what would be a desirable and attainable participation rate for URMs. This provides a means to measure recruitment, retention and placement efforts that help to define a program's viability and success. However, establishing a desired rate poses critical and extremely complex questions. These include:

- What are the possible pools from which the cohort may come?
- What level of diversity would be desirable for the cohort given the various constituents and venues it might serve?
- How many of the cohort drop out or choose not to pursue the next step in the academic pipeline?

Given the inherent differences and challenges faced by students/scholars in each of the populations studied by this work team (i.e., graduate academic students, professional school students and postdoctoral scholars), the desired participation rate may also need to be different for each population.

While these populations draw from national and international pools of students, considerations in establishing desired participation rates include:

- UC's role as a public institution and its responsibility to California residents;
- UC's bachelor's degree recipients (URMs comprise 17 percent);
- CSUs bachelor's degree recipients (URMs comprise 31 percent);²¹
- California public institutions' bachelor's degree recipients (URMs comprise ~25 percent);²²
- the nation's bachelor's degree recipients (URMs comprise 17 percent);²³
- UC's role in national Ph.D. production (UC produces 8-10 percent of the nation's research Ph.D.'s, and plays a significant role in producing faculty for the country);
- demographics of the faculty pipeline by discipline (with an emphasis on areas experiencing severe underrepresentation);
- demographics of non-academic constituencies likely to be served by the graduate academic students, professional school students, and postdoctoral scholars.

Furthermore, UC's desired participation rates should not remain static over time. Based upon projections of the academic pipeline growing more diverse, UC must continue to raise graduate academic and professional school participation rates.

²¹ Source: California State University website. www.calstate.edu/PA/info/degrees.shtml, July 20, 2007.

²² Source: California Public Education Consortium website. www.cpec.ca.gov/OnLineData/CAContext.asp, July 20, 2005.


²³ Source: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), <http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/pas/>, July 19, 2005.

Participation Rates for UC’s Graduate and Professional Schools

At minimum, UC’s graduate and professional school participation rates should be no less than the graduate enrollment rates of our comparison eight institutions.²⁴

Overall, URM graduate academic enrollments at UC’s comparison eight institutions are slightly lower than at UC (figure 26). UC has a total domestic URM graduate and professional enrollment of 11.9 percent, while our comparison eight institutions have a domestic overall URM enrollment of 9.8 percent. UC has higher proportions of Chicano/Latino students (8.0 percent at UC compared to 4.2 percent at comparison eight institutions), but lower proportions of African American/black students (3.1 percent) than our comparison eight institutions (5.2 percent).

Figure 26 - URMs as a Percentage of Graduate Students at UC and Comparison 8 Institutions,* Fall 2005



*Comparison institutions include: Privates - Harvard, Yale, MIT, Stanford; Publics - SUNY-Buffalo, University of Illinois, University of Michigan and University of Virginia.
 **URMs include African American/black, Chicano/Latino and Native American students.
 Source: Comparison 8 data from IPEDS.

²⁴ In the area of graduate academic education, UC has no defined comparison institutions. However, UC has defined eight peer institutions for faculty-level comparisons. We propose using these same eight institutions for comparisons at the graduate academic level. (These institutions include: Harvard University, Yale University, Stanford University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, University of Illinois-Urbana Champaign, University of Michigan-Ann Arbor, State University of New York-Buffalo, University of Virginia-Main Campus.) Source: IPEDS.

UC draws a higher proportion of URM students from California than it does from the national pool. This fact, combined with a “home field advantage” of a diverse state, somewhat tempers UC’s success in achieving higher diversity than our comparison eight institutions.

Participation Rates for UC's Postdoctoral Appointments

At UC, URMs comprise only 8 percent of the domestic postdoctoral population (Unfortunately, good comparison data on URM postdocs at the national level is not available). Women account for 37 percent of postdocs at UC.

One-half of UC's postdoctoral scholars are international (i.e., are not U.S. citizens or permanent residents). Their presence in academic departments adds a dimension of diversity that is unique and necessary. It is necessary not only for the growing world economy and increasing transnational research collaborations, but for an increasingly global society that requires cross-cultural communication. However, international diversity is vastly different from domestic diversity, particularly in light of the historical legacy of a lack of educational preparation and economic opportunities that many U.S.-born students continue to experience. Therefore, while international students and scholars are an important part of the UC community, they should not be considered a substitute for domestic diversity. This is in accord with the UC Academic Senate Statement on Diversity, which concludes, "*The University particularly acknowledges the acute need to remove barriers to the recruitment, retention and advancement of talented students, faculty and staff from historically excluded populations who are currently underrepresented.*"

When considering a desired participation rate for domestic postdoctoral scholars, the complexities noted previously at the graduate level become even more extreme. For example, in the STEM fields, a postdoctoral experience is often required to obtain a faculty position and therefore becomes a critical step in the academic pipeline. Over 90 percent of all postdoctoral fellows (international and domestic) are in STEM fields, and URMs comprise only 4-6 percent of this entire postdoctoral population. Therefore, participation rates of URMs at the postdoctoral level must be increased.

Considerations for determining a participation rate for UC's postdoctoral scholars should include:

- UC's role in preparing faculty for the UC and the nation;
- UC's Ph.D. recipients (both the rate of URMs and women in these pools and any possible connections between postdoctoral positions and new faculty hires);
- the nation's Ph.D. recipients;
- UC's needs at the faculty level.

Because UC draws from the national pool of Ph.D. recipients for its domestic postdoctoral scholars, **a reasonable participation rate for URMs would mirror the percentage of URM doctoral recipients nationwide** (currently at 12 percent).²⁵ This rate would apply to the total group of UC postdoctoral students, not just the domestic population.

Approximately 20 percent of UC's current postdoctoral scholars earned their doctoral degree at a UC campus. Within the domestic population, there was little variation by ethnic group, with Chicano/Latino postdocs being slightly more likely and African American/black postdocs slightly less likely to have earned their doctoral degree at UC.

²⁵ Hoffer, T.B., V. Welch, Jr., K. Webber, K. Williams, B. Lisek, M. Hess, D. Loew, and I. Guzman-Barron. 2006. *Doctorate Recipients from United States Universities: Summary Report 2005*. Chicago: National Opinion Research Center. p.49.

4. What strategies do we recommend to increase diversity?

UC is at a critical juncture in terms of fulfilling its promise to meet the educational and societal needs of the state. UC has an obligation to produce scholars and leaders capable of contending with the most challenging problems of society. However, as the data in this report demonstrate, UC can aspire to recruit and enroll a more diverse population. With the cultural competency and intellectual stimulation of a diverse student body, UC will improve our standing as a premier public institution. Educating a diverse citizenry is key to serving the needs of our state and nation.

(Note: the categories below are identical to those used in the recommendations from the report of the 2006 President's Task Force on Diversity. Also, many of the recommendations are parallel to those found in the 2005 University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity Report on Graduate/Professional School Admission and Diversity.)

A. LEADERSHIP

The work team observed that strong UC leadership, particularly in external collaborations, is critical to increasing diversity at the post-baccalaureate levels. The work team recommends that:

- UC leverage its influence with organizations that **rank** or assess university academic programs (e.g., NRC, US News and World Report, AAU) to include metrics on diversity/climate. The traditional ranking methodologies (e.g., standardized test scores, survey of university administrators, student/faculty ratio) have been shown to have an adverse effect on new enrollments of URM students,²⁶ but most academics agree that the rankings will continue to be widely used.²⁷ However, if new criteria that are more reflective of student learning and outcomes, as well as diversity (e.g., Washington Monthly's ranking),²⁸ are used, this could have the effect of increasing URM students at UC and nationwide.
- Departments and schools take the lead to **partner** with outside organizations that share goals for increasing diversity in the workforce and academia (e.g., industry, the federal government and private foundations).
- UC's Diversity Statement underscores the university's commitment to underrepresented students. Federal and state laws require that UC not discriminate in educational practices. Both the statement and the laws support UC's commitment to identifying and eliminating the barriers preventing the full participation of URM students and scholars in higher education. UC's leaders must play an active role in **conveying this message** to the UC community, including faculty, staff and students.

²⁶ Alon, Sigal and Tienda, Marta. Diversity, Opportunity and the Shifting Meritocracy in Higher Education. *American Sociological Review*. 72:487-511, 2007.

²⁷ Farrell, Elizabeth F. and Van der Werf, Martin. Playing the Rankings Game. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. May 25, 2007. <http://chronicle.com/temp/email2.php?id=KByhVYBzYqFFWZsTzc8sHfhthp5MnzHp>, August 6, 2007.

²⁸ The Washington Monthly's Annual College Rankings. *The Washington Monthly*. September 2006. <http://www.washingtonmonthly.com/features/2006/0609.collegeguide.html>, August 6, 2007.

- UC take a leadership role in highlighting the **need for better ethnic data** on postdoctoral scholars nationally.

B. ACADEMIC PLANNING

The work team observed that diversity will not thrive unless it is incorporated into academic planning at the graduate, professional and postdoctoral levels. The work team recommends that:

- All plans for **enrollment growth** incorporate diversity objectives. Increasing enrollments at UC has not always correlated with increasing diversity. For example, in 2002 and 2003, UC experienced an increase in the total number of graduate applications, and an increase in the numbers of URM applications, but experienced a decrease in the proportion of URM applications.
- **Academic planning** should encourage programs that will attract diverse scholars. Each proposal for new graduate programs and degrees should include a discussion on how the program can address diversity (e.g., include a research focus on poverty that correlates with diverse communities).
- Academic plans should include a discussion on the status of **women** in the discipline and their projected representation with each new proposal. Particular attention should be given to disciplines in which women have been historically and are currently underrepresented such as business and STEM fields.

C. RESOURCE ALLOCATION AND ASSESSMENT OF DEPARTMENTS AND SCHOOLS

The work team observed that resource allocation is essential to influence departmental behavior and demonstrate the University's commitment to diversity. The work team recommends that:

- **Adequate funding is ensured** for diversity programs, leadership success and accountability. Since diversity is often regarded as ancillary to the University's mission, programs and initiatives designed to improve diversity remain underfunded or suffer when resources intended to foster diversity are diverted to fund other competing priorities. New funding models for diversity could mirror the model for non-resident tuition (i.e., allocations based on matching funds).
- Diversity (including graduate and professional student diversity) should be used as one factor in **assessing success and resource allocation** for departments and schools. The inclusion of diversity as a part of departmental assessment is similar in concept to current academic personnel assessment practices which apply to department chairs, deans and provosts. Departments should not be assessed on strict numerical quotas, or extend a preference to any individual on the basis of gender, race or ethnicity.
- The Regents, chancellors, and deans require **action plans** from departments/schools/units still needing to improve diversity. The extent to which action plans are successful should be one factor in the overall evaluation of the department/school/unit.

- Schools and departments **replicate or adapt (as applicable) successful models** for increasing diversity to other disciplines. For example, best practices for URM recruitment, academic preparation and program design at the UC medical schools may be applicable to other UC professional schools.
- Working groups be formed to **address schools and departments that fail to attract and enroll diverse students**. For example, given the exceedingly low URM rates and numbers at UC's business schools, a special working group should be established to examine the problem and develop possible remedies (e.g., in the business schools, a prerequisite for admission is substantial work experience after college graduation. Given this requirement, and the difficulty of maintaining contact with students after graduation, UC needs to develop ways to identify and maintain URM business school candidates after they receive their bachelor's degrees.)

D. RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION

The work team observed that campuses and departments can do more to promote a competitive, diverse pool of applicants to and retain matriculated students. The work team recommends that:

- The Regents couple **fee increases** for domestic graduate and professional students with a credible plan for increasing student diversity. This recommendation is based on the correlation between URM and financial need, and the fact that the majority of URM graduate from professional school borrowing substantial amounts of money. A credible plan may include some of the strategies listed below.
- At each level of academia (i.e., undergraduate, graduate/professional, postdoctoral, faculty), UC establish **academic preparation programs** that will attract URM, build upon the skills/competitiveness of diverse students and encourage/facilitate URM to continue on to the next academic level. UC should expand or replicate successful academic preparation programs (with a focus on attracting URM students) at the pregraduate and preprofessional school level. Existing systemwide programs include: UC Leadership Excellence for Advanced DegreeS (UC LEADS), UC's Alliance for Graduate Education and the Professoriate (UC AGEP), UC's summer research programs, law school preparation programs and medical school post-baccalaureate reapplicant programs.
- UC acknowledge, emulate and support Graduate Divisions and professional schools that implement **recruitment and retention policies** that have a direct effect on diverse student populations (e.g., UC Berkeley is the first UC to adopt a childbirth policy for graduate students; UC Santa Barbara debuted the first UC graduate application for admission encouraging students to highlight their diversity record and research interests).
- UC's professional schools and graduate academic programs need to be cognizant of the **different needs of students** from the following groups: historically underrepresented students, international students and students who are recent immigrants.
- When establishing admissions criteria, departments and professional schools should take into consideration the latest research on bias in **standardized testing**.

- UC and campuses ensure **competitive funding packages** for graduate/professional students with particular attention to URM and international students. URM students are more likely to be financially needy and carry heavier undergraduate debt load than domestic non-URM students.
- A **broader definition of merit** be applied when awarding UC scholarships and gift aid. This could be modeled after the criteria recently adopted in the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) that considers contributions to diversity in research, teaching or service when evaluating faculty personnel actions.
- UC improve outreach and yield through innovative fellowship strategies. For example, UC could award **“UC-portable” teaching or research fellowships** to promising, diverse undergraduate seniors nationwide. These fellowships could be restricted for UC graduate or professional school use, and would allow the student to highlight the funding on their application for admission. This would send a signal to the admissions committee that the department would not need to provide funding.
- Successful **loan forgiveness programs** be replicated. UC should consider offering low-cost loans to students, irrespective of their origin, with liberal repayment options if they remain in the state of California.
- UC should maximize **“in-reach” efforts** to UC undergraduates to provide a diverse pool from which UC can draw.
- UC should capitalize on the **diversity of students in the CSU** and proactively outreach to qualified B.A. and M.A. students for UC graduate and professional school programs.
- A **graduate version of UCUES** or other survey tool be developed and funded to monitor graduate student climate on an ongoing basis. The survey tool should be designed in order to provide for longitudinal analyses.
- **Non-resident tuition** for international and non-resident graduate students in doctoral degree programs be eliminated or reduced.
- UC’s professional school programs involve **alumni and student organizations** as advisers for purposes of outreach and recruitment.
- UC harness the **“Power of 10” in recruitment efforts** (e.g. all UC law programs recruit together to optimize yield of outstanding students).

E. ACCOUNTABILITY

The work team observed that increased accountability at the campus, division and departmental levels is a key component to increasing graduate and professional student diversity. The work team recommends that:

- The Regents receive an **annual report from the president** assessing the diversity within all segments of our educational system, from undergraduates through faculty. Each level of administration should be involved: departments should annually report to deans, deans to chancellors, chancellors to the provost, the provost to the president, and president to the Regents. Campuses should be expected to conduct an annual assessment of the diversity in each academic unit, which will include progress made during the preceding year.
- For graduate and professional students, each department include diversity **metrics as a way of measuring progress** and as a way to be compared to similar units. While

these metrics should not be used to establish quotas, they are nonetheless useful as part of the overall evaluation of the department. The collection of metrics over time can help departments identify areas of success as well as areas needing improvement.

Metrics should:

- be reported at the department, discipline or school, and campus level;
 - include a comparison with comparable institutions;
 - include student demographics by gender, race/ethnicity and national origin;
 - include admissions and retention. More specifically, this should include:
 - the number of applications, admits and new enrollments;
 - time to degree (rate compared with norm for cohort);
 - attrition (1, 3, 6 [and eventually 9] years past);
 - a summary analysis of these trends.
-
- Academic administrators responsible for diversity progress be evaluated on this as part of the normal performance evaluation compensation processes. **Evaluation of diversity outcomes** should be considered in the same manner as other performance measures such as academic rankings or fund-raising, with corresponding benefits or consequences.

5. What are our conclusions?

Over the last 10 years, the overall data on the diversity of graduate and professional students and postdoctoral scholars show at best a steady state of participation for URMs in all fields, and for women in selected fields. Despite proven best practices and concerted efforts to increase participation, the gap between URM enrollments relative to the population continues to widen. UC must act quickly to close this gap. The decisions UC makes at the post-baccalaureate level regarding recruitment and retention affect the success of *all* of its students and the professions they aspire to join. Equally important is the influence UC's decisions have on other institutions of higher education who observe UC when deciding on their own educational equity policies. *UC must seize this opportunity to take the lead in serving as a national model for excellence in a post-209 environment.* No other institution is as well placed as UC in terms of its role in stimulating the economy by educating the diverse population of California.

As the world's premier public research university, *UC has the unique opportunity to achieve national prominence in its post-baccalaureate diversity practices. We can serve as a model for other institutions while at the same time fulfilling our mission.* The blueprint laid out in this report requires conscious and deliberate leadership. This would allow UC to assume a leading role nationally in providing outstanding graduate and professional education to a truly diverse student body.

“Therefore, the University of California renews its commitment to the full realization of its historic promise to recognize and nurture merit, talent and achievement by supporting diversity and equal opportunity in its education, services and administration, as well as research and creative activity.”²⁹

²⁹ From the *University of California Diversity Statement*, adopted by the Assembly of the Academic Senate May 10, 2006; endorsed by the President of the University of California June 20, 2006.