

The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

February 4, 2009

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

Members present: Regents Garamendi, Island, Johnson, Lansing, Lozano, Marcus, Reiss, Scorza, and Varner; Ex officio members Gould¹ and Yudof; Advisory members Powell and Stovitz; Staff Advisors Abeyta and Johansen

In attendance: Regents De La Peña, Hopkinson, Kozberg, Makarechian, Pattiz, Ruiz, Schilling, Shewmake, and Wachter, Regent-designate Bernal, Faculty Representative Croughan, Secretary and Chief of Staff Griffiths, Associate Secretary Shaw, General Counsel Robinson, Chief Investment Officer Berggren, Executive Vice President Lapp, Senior Vice President Stobo, Vice Presidents Beckwith, Dooley, Foley, Lenz, and Sakaki, Chancellors Birgeneau, Block, Blumenthal, Drake, Fox, Kang, Vanderhoef, White, and Yang, and Recording Secretary Johns

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

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of November 19, 2008 were approved.

2. STRATEGIC PLAN PRESENTATION, IRVINE CAMPUS

[Background material was mailed to Regents in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Committee Chair Island recalled that President Yudof had suggested that the individual campuses present strategic plans to the Regents. He invited Chancellor Drake to make the first such presentation for UC Irvine.

Chancellor Drake began by stating that the Irvine campus' strategic plan defines the campus, its goals, and the means by which it intends to achieve those goals. He recalled that the campus, which 45 years ago was ranchland, began to grow around a center of futuristic buildings, and the City of Irvine grew around it. Because the campus began with a 1,000-acre gift to the University and a 500-acre purchase by the Regents, it was of a size sufficient to accommodate adequate faculty housing, and housing has remained an important part of the growth plan. Most of the ladder-rank faculty live on campus in housing they have purchased from the University on land leased from the University. The

¹ In the absence of the Chairman of the Board

benefit for the faculty is that these houses cost about half of what they would on the open market. That is also an advantage with respect to recruitment. Growth has been marked. The campus began with 1,300 students 43 years ago; this fall there are 29,000.

The campus has had many noteworthy successes over the years. Faculty have been elected to the national academies, won Nobel Prizes, and written best-selling and Pulitzer Prize-winning books. The campus has won multiple national athletic championships, become a member of the Association of American Universities (AAU), and has seen its former Chancellor, Jack Peltason, become President of the University. The Department of Chemistry has been recognized for one of the top ten discoveries of the 20th century, the impact of chlorofluorocarbons on the ozone layer. The Nobel Prize was awarded to Sherwood Roland, a founding faculty member, but the prize given by the American Chemical Society was presented to the entire Chemistry department, which speaks to the quality of the founding faculty in those early years.

The strategic planning process began formally in 2004, with a collaborative set of deliberations among over 100 people that produced a draft document that was posted on the internet to give people on campus and in the community a chance to comment as it evolved. Chancellor Drake recalled that he arrived on campus as this process was finishing. The next step was to animate the plan and develop a strategy for achieving it.

Dr. Drake reported that the strategic plan called for the campus to increase its graduate and professional students from 14 percent to 25 percent of the campus population and to increase students housed on campus to about 50 percent by the middle of the next decade. Throughout its growth, the campus has been largely a commuter school, so there has been a push to increase the number of beds on campus and create a campus heart on the property. The plan calls for the addition of three programs in the health sciences, the establishment of a law school, and continued growth until the student population stabilizes at between 30,000 and 32,000, which fits the physical plan and Long Range Development Plan.

The campus is focused on ensuring that its growth is driven by a desire to achieve excellence rather than simply increase size. Growth must be considered broadly across the campus in the arts, humanities, sciences, and engineering, and those programs expanded where growth would enhance the campus' excellence. In 2005, an initiative started with a view to make UC Irvine a campus that used values-based decision-making for its programs and that rewarded people for living up to its stated values.

Dr. Drake reported that roughly half of new FTE are allocated to programs of excellence. In these programs, the faculty in a given discipline work collaboratively to make a specific, targeted investment in the group that will take it from being nearly the best to being the best in the country or the world. There are 80 to 90 programs applying for these FTE every year. An example of a program invested in three years ago is stem cell research, an investment that has paid off. It has received \$57 million in extramural funding and grants, and recently a product the program developed was licensed to Geron

Corporation, which received the first FDA approval for human embryonic stem-cell-derived therapy to be tested in humans, a milestone for human biology.

The values enumerated at the Irvine campus are respect, intellectual curiosity, integrity, commitment, empathy, appreciation, and fun, in every aspect of campus life. The Living Our Values awards were established to allow people on campus to nominate their peers who live according to those values. The awards are distributed to students, faculty, and staff. The most deserving contributors, selected from the 90 to 100 nominees, are given the privilege of designating some discretionary funds toward a project on campus they think worthwhile.

The campus continues to move toward having 50 percent of its students live on campus by 2015. Since 2005, 3,000 beds have been added and 1,700 more are under construction, which will result in an on-campus housing rate of 54 percent by 2010. There is also a push to enhance the attractiveness of the campus to undergraduate students. One way is by providing very attractive living spaces. The dormitory rooms are relatively spartan, but the facilities themselves are spectacular. Many of the current buildings are built with sustainability in mind, and new construction is planned so as to attain LEED Gold status.

Since the Regents approved a new school of health sciences five years ago, programs in pharmaceutical sciences, public health, and nursing science have been established. In November 2006, the Regents approved the school of law, which has accepted its first round of students.

In moving forward with the strategic plan, developing it from a wish list to something that will help to define the campus, time has been spent focusing on the campus' "soul," its people, and the characteristics that differentiate it from other UC campuses. Dr. Drake reported that, over a two-year span, meetings took place with deans, faculty, foundation members, community leaders, and staff which focused on developing a comprehensive strategy for moving forward. A description of the campus was developed that characterizes it as a community of creative, optimistic, and empowered people who are shaping the future in areas of global importance that affect humanity, but addressing issues that matter to people daily. It is through these efforts that the campus' position among the world's leading research universities and among its colleagues will be enhanced.

Next, Dr. Drake discussed the four themes used to focus the campaign segment of the strategy. About seven percent of campus expenditures are targeted toward specific areas where the campus can make a difference. Those areas are human health, energy and the environment, global cultures and economies, and training tomorrow's leaders. He gave a few examples of how the campus is moving forward in these areas. One priority is to shape the future with respect to human health. An example is the recent opening of the new University Hospital, which will result in an improvement in the quality of healthcare and therefore the general health of the community, and which is strategic in the training of new healthcare providers. Orange County has a population of three million, and UC is its only academic health center. The hospital, which was the largest building project in

the county, is the most advanced quaternary hospital the area has ever had. It was completed four months ahead of schedule and for about \$20 million under budget. Use of computer 3D modeling that ran ahead of the construction saved about 18 months and \$110 million in cost overruns by foreseeing complications at the desktop level rather than in the field.

Dr. Drake noted that, in June, the first class in Nursing Science will graduate and will be seeing patients soon thereafter. He recalled that UC Irvine was the first campus to establish a Program in Medical Education (PRIME), developed at the Office of the President to be established on all medical school campuses. Irvine's Program in Medical Education for the Latino Community (PRIME-LC), which started in 2004, has successfully trained physicians specifically for the health needs of underserved populations. Its curriculum is based on the needs of the target populations, and its students are chosen based on their commitment and ability to serve those populations uniquely.

Dr. Drake turned to the second part of the strategic plan – energy and the environment. He noted the work of UC Irvine's Department of Chemistry, which includes UCI Air and other projects. The campus maintains a hydrogen fuel pump station and the National Fuel Cell Research Center to help develop hydrogen fuel cell-powered hybrid cars that have zero emissions. The campus uses a 100 percent biofuel diesel bus system that saves about 39 million passenger miles of driving annually. The newest campus buildings have photovoltaic cells on their roofs that have been designed so as to fit well into the architecture and, where possible, campus buildings are LEED certified and use sustainable construction.

The campus has a number of programs, both on- and off-campus, in global cultures and economies. One that had a major impact this past year was the Olive Tree initiative, for which Jewish, Muslim, and Christian students raised money to spend two weeks touring Israel and the West Bank, meeting with government leaders and families and returning to set up symposia and deliver talks to educate the community. A Dalai Lama scholar program provides leadership on ethics and fosters peace and positive national relations. Also, the campus has formed a partnership with a nongovernmental organization in the community that builds wheelchairs for developing countries and distributes them around the world for free. The program works with the campus' Department of Engineering to value engineer the chairs, making them sturdier and stronger and more adaptable, while keeping the cost at under \$50 each.

Dr. Drake commented that UCI's final priority initiative is to educate tomorrow's leaders. Educating university students is the campus' normal daily business, but in addition, the campus offers a series of programs meant to broaden the education spectrum. Its efforts to help prepare K-12 students for university-level work include a transfer-student honors program and numerous programs in conjunction with the community colleges and K-12 in the district. A UCI alumnus started a program, in which the Irvine campus participates, that prepares students to become math and science teachers. A new program called Saturday Law Academy targets ninth-graders, teaching them the basics of legal writing.

The common theme of these programs aimed at training tomorrow's leaders is to encourage all students to learn by doing and to be pro-active participants while they are learning. These focused, discipline-based programs help to advance the discipline while at the same time improving the ability of their participants to pursue their future goals.

In his conclusion, Chancellor Drake acknowledged that the challenges the campus faces are shared by many – to strive continually to improve the quality of its programs and access to them, the diversity of its community, and the funding to allow its programs to thrive. He observed that universities are still the main sources of new knowledge and that having an educated populace is the best way forward. He characterized the UCI campus' strategic plan as one in which all efforts are focused on being able to develop and share that new knowledge, defining the campus as a community of energetic, entrepreneurial, high-performance people who are enabled, empowered, and inspired to make a difference in significant ways.

Regent Hopkinson commented that it was inspiring to see the changes at UCI, including the increase in academic quality and the growth in the number of students the campus has been able to accommodate in the physical plan. She expressed her admiration for the goal of increasing diversity and asked how it would be pursued. Chancellor Drake acknowledged that this was particularly challenging, given the demographics of the area. He believed that, foremost, in order to attract students, the quality of the general education offered must be high. That is something students from all backgrounds seek. Beyond that, the campus has programs, such as PRIME-LC, that are particularly attractive to students who are committed to serving underserved populations. The PRIME program has increased the diversity of the medical school dramatically by attracting students who are very competitive. The nursing and law schools have similarly focused programs. Also, the campus is active in the community, offering or participating in 105 programs within the county that connect the campus with K-12 and the community colleges. Consideration is given to providing programs that attract underrepresented students and hiring a diverse faculty who will expand the growth in specific, targeted areas.

Regent Lozano commented that the plan presented by Chancellor Drake expressed clear priorities and objectives and described the ways in which progress is tracked. She asked whether fundraising is a particular challenge, given current economic conditions. Dr. Drake noted that Orange County has a wealthy coastal area, but many low-income areas are located within 15 miles. He believed it was important to present the University to the funding community as an opportunity for investment; to show them that it has high-quality programs that will make a difference in shaping the future. The campus attempts to focus on projects the community is particularly interested in supporting. He reported that, three years ago, the campus' funding drive crested at \$100 million, which was 43 percent more than the year before. Two years ago, the figure had increased to \$120 million, and last year to \$130 million. The community is committed to supporting the University in greater numbers and to a greater extent than ever before in its history. Through the first six months of this fiscal year, the number of pledges is down, but the cash received exceeded this period last year, indicating that the funding base remains

strong. He noted that part of the long-term fundraising strategy is to publicize the new hospital more widely so as to increase its revenues. The new facility will appeal to a broader range of people than the old one did. This wider recognition will increase the number of people who see the value of supporting it.

Regent Pattiz commented that, in the midst of the major problems facing the University every day, it was refreshing to be reminded of the University's distinct value. He commended particularly the Irvine campus' program on the Middle East, which encouraged students to take a leadership position and turn a negative situation into a positive one.

Regent Scorza asked about ways in which alumni could become engaged in student support and could participate in campus life. Dr. Drake recalled that, when he arrived on campus, the average alumnus was 34 years old and alumni participation was about 8 percent. As the campus has grown, the average age has dropped slightly. Most alumni live in southern California. Being relatively young, they are not in a position to contribute heavily. The campus decided to work toward increasing the rate of alumni participation rather than the individual level of giving, and thereby has increased alumni participation in the past three years to over 12 percent. Its goal is to reach 20 percent by middle of the next decade. A series of programs has been developed that engage alumni and focus on issues in which young families are interested. With respect to student support broadly, he noted the four major initiatives in health, energy and the environment, global cultures and global economies, and training tomorrow's leaders. This last includes all efforts towards student scholarships, fellowships, and support. There are multiple opportunities for donors to support the arts and sciences and the like, and for donations for fellowships and scholarships for both undergraduate and graduate students.

Regent Marcus commented that one way to measure quality is to note the accomplishments of faculty. He asked how the campus is addressing the need to secure the best and brightest of the academic community. Chancellor Drake responded that, besides boasting a Nobel Laureate, the Irvine campus is home to more members of the National Academy of Sciences and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences than any other university. He noted that the members of the national academies meet quarterly to identify campus people whose application for membership they would support. More broadly, the programs of excellence on which the campus focuses are awarded extra FTE if they raise their status to the best nationally. So far, this honor has been achieved by about ten programs. The campus continues to push excellence forward.

Committee Chair Island stated that he had found great value in Chancellor Drake's presentation. He noted that the Chancellor had listed four main challenges for the campus. He proposed that future campus strategic plans include specific ways in which challenges will be addressed, particularly the challenge of increasing campus diversity.

3. **PROPOSAL ON ELIGIBILITY REFORM**

The President recommended that the Regents:

- A. Adopt changes to the Regents' Policy on Undergraduate Admissions Requirements as shown in Attachment 1, which are generally consistent with the recommendations of the Academic Senate originally presented to the Regents in July 2008.
- B. Rescind the existing Policy on Establishment of UC Freshman Eligibility in the Local Context (Attachment 2) because this policy will now be incorporated in the Undergraduate Admissions policy referenced above.

[Background was mailed to Regents in advance of the meeting, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

[Regents were provided with a packet of correspondence received regarding this item, and copies are on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

President Yudof reported that the proposal on eligibility reform has been four years in the making. The Academic Senate presented a draft for his review last July. Under Regent Island's leadership, there were three special meetings of this Committee to ensure that the Regents were fully informed and had ample time to raise questions and have them answered. The President reported that he had reanalyzed the proposal's impact using the most recent data released by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) in December. Six weeks ago, there was a briefing for legislative staff members. Chancellor Drake, faculty representatives, and others testified and received great support in the legislative hearing room.

President Yudof noted that slight modifications had been made to the proposal. It is his recommendation that the 3.0 GPA requirement, weighted and with a cap on additional points for honors-level coursework, be maintained as the minimum GPA students must achieve to be considered for admission. This recommendation is sensitive to any possible implication of lowered standards, as well as the need to reinforce the importance of taking rigorous coursework when it is available. While the faculty favored a minimum 2.8 unweighted GPA, they have assured him that there is little practical difference in terms of the pool of admitted students. The proposal increases both fairness in the system and opportunity for students, and it does so while maintaining the high standards that are the foundation of the University. It increases opportunity for all groups by opening the door for consideration for admission to a larger number of students who will have a chance to have their application considered by UC campuses. Not all these students will be admitted, but their files will undergo comprehensive review, not a mechanical one based only on numbers, which is what nearly all parents want for their children. It also eliminates unnecessary barriers to admission to UC, including the SAT subject test requirement, which, with careful analysis by the faculty, was determined to be an unnecessary barrier. SAT scores, writing scores, GPAs, and other indices were found to

be more than sufficient in yielding a strong admission pool, and subject matter tests, because they add additional obstacles and expense, reduced the pool in undesirable ways. The proposal maintains standards by preserving the current guarantee of admission for a smaller group of students whose GPA and SAT or ACT scores will be noticeably higher. It will bring the University into closer alignment with best practices around the country.

President Yudof commented that, while there is no perfect admissions system, the system recommended is very open, will treat all groups fairly, and will increase diversity. Although its outcome is hard to project exactly, this proposal removes unnecessary obstacles and is a positive step to make the University look more like the State of California in terms of diversity. He introduced Faculty Representative Croughan and her colleagues to present the details of the program and answer questions.

Ms. Croughan introduced her Academic Senate colleagues who were central to the development of the proposal, including Michael Brown, immediate past Chair of the Academic Senate and originator of the proposal with the Board on Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS); Mark Rashid, immediate past chair of BOARS and, with his BOARS colleagues, the primary developer of the proposal, and Sylvia Hurtado, current BOARS chair, who has been actively involved in further consideration and analysis of the proposal.

Ms. Croughan discussed the timeline and review of the proposal within the Academic Senate. She recalled that, in 2004, following an increase in the GPA requirement, BOARS began examining the effects of the current admissions policy on access to UC. Extensive analyses and discussions ensued for the next three years. In June 2007, the Academic Council received BOARS' proposal to reform UC's freshman eligibility policy. The proposal was sent to all campuses and the Senate divisions and committees for review, with a review and comment period from September to December 2007. In December 2007, the Academic Council reviewed the responses received and asked BOARS to modify the proposal accordingly. In February 2008, the Council received the revised proposal and BOARS' response. The revised proposal was sent out for a second systemwide review. In May 2008, the second round of systemwide review comments was discussed at the Academic Council, which adopted the existing proposal. In June 2008, the Academic Assembly, the Academic Senate's highest body, endorsed the Academic Council's recommendation of the proposal.

Ms. Croughan commented on the external hearings, briefings, and reviews that were held. She reported that in June 2007, Mr. Rashid met with staff members of the State Senate Education Committee; in November 2007, he met with legislative staff members from both houses; in January 2008, there was a briefing with Lieutenant Governor Garamendi; in February 2008, there was another briefing for staff from specific legislators' offices, as well as committee staff; in December 2008, she and Mr. Rashid briefed about 50 legislative staff. The previous week they held a legislative briefing for the Assembly Higher Education Committee and three caucuses.

Mr. Rashid provided a brief account of the proposed changes to UC's eligibility policy. He stated that the new policy would extend the benefit of a full, fair, and comprehensive review to all students who present appropriate college preparatory credentials. Actual admission to a specific campus will remain a matter of selection by comprehensive review, which has for many years been the policy of the University. The new eligibility policy in no way alters comprehensive review. It emphasizes academic success in the pre-college years and would have the effect of raising the academic standards for admission for all admitted students whether or not they earn a guarantee of admission by referral.

Mr. Rashid reported that the proposed policy would establish minimum academic criteria for an admission review. Applicants who satisfy these criteria would be considered "entitled to review," or ETR. The criteria include completion of 11 out of the 15 required a-g courses by the end of the 11th grade, with a GPA of 3.0 or better in those courses; up to eight semesters of honors bonus points can be counted toward that GPA. In addition, to earn the ETR status, students would be required to take either the ACT with writing component or the SAT core exam. Taking two SAT subject tests would no longer be a requirement for UC admission. He emphasized that the completion of the full a-g pattern of 15 year-long courses by graduation would be an expectation for final admission. The Academic Senate had originally proposed a 2.8 unweighted GPA minimum, whereas the President has recommended a 3.0 GPA, weighted and capped at eight semesters of honors points, as a minimum. Functionally, these two criteria are similar. Based on the 2007 CPEC study data, about 76,000 California high school graduates would have been eligible for review in 2007 if the proposed policy had been in effect, which is about 30,000 more students than were in the fully eligible pool that year.

Mr. Rashid emphasized that the criteria pertain only to what it takes to get a full review. Satisfying those criteria gives a student an opportunity to be admitted via comprehensive review; it does not, by itself, guarantee admission. Under the proposed policy, a subset of these students, about half of all ETR students, would enjoy a guarantee of admission via referral to a UC campus. ETR students ranking in the top nine percent of all graduates statewide or in the top nine percent of their high school graduating class would have a guarantee of admission by referral. There is significant overlap between those two nine-percent criteria, which together account for about ten percent of the state's graduating class. It is important to appreciate that this guarantee of admission is a guarantee somewhere in the system, not to the campus to which the applicant has actually applied. It is precisely the same guarantee that is currently enjoyed by all UC-eligible applicants. Those who are guaranteed admission but who are denied admission at all campuses to which they apply, are referred to a campus with remaining space, presently UC Riverside and UC Merced. It is also important to appreciate that relatively small numbers of students who receive these referral offers of admission actually accept them and come to UC. For the vast majority, denial by all UC campuses to which they apply results in their choosing to go elsewhere. Yet, there is still considerable value in maintaining a reward of guaranteed admission for students who stand out among their peers.

Mr. Rashid reiterated that admissions standards would rise under the proposed policy. First, the policy is expected to increase the size of the applicant pool by 12 percent to

17 percent, based on reasonable assumptions about applicant behavior. All campuses necessarily will be in a position to be more selective. This observation pertains to selection for admission offers from campuses to which a student applied. About half of the ETR pool will additionally be guaranteed admission via referral. The standards for attaining this guarantee will also increase beyond the current eligibility criteria. This is true for several reasons. First, fewer students would receive the guarantee than now do, by about a quarter. Second, because subject tests will no longer be required, a great many more California students will be visible to the GPA and test score criteria for the guarantee. Consequently, those criteria will have to be considerably higher to capture approximately ten percent of students eligible for the guarantee. Thus, the average GPA and test scores for the guarantee pool will rise. It is estimated, based on 2007 CPEC data, that the average GPA in the guarantee pool will increase by about 0.17 grade points, and that the average SAT score will increase by almost 20 points.

In summary, the proposed policy leaves intact the curriculum requirement of 15 a-g courses, and a core standardized exam – the ACT or SAT – will continue to be required, but the requirement that two SAT subject tests be taken will be eliminated. This latter recommendation is based on several observations. First, the scores in the subject tests do not contribute measurably to the quality of admissions decisions, and the requirement that these tests be taken results in excluding large numbers of college-going students. Students could still submit scores from one or more subject tests voluntarily, and, in fact, specific majors could even recommend particular subject tests for students who apply to those programs. Guaranteed admission via referral would remain a central feature of UC admissions but would apply to about 10 percent of California graduates instead of UC's full share of 12.5 percent. The academic criteria for the guarantee would be substantially higher than now. This special status of guaranteed admission would be reserved for those whose very high GPAs and test scores leave little doubt as to their ability to succeed at UC.

Mr. Rashid reported that it is the view of the Academic Senate that the proposed policy is superior to the existing policy in relation to both excellence and fairness. A large body of evidence supports this conclusion, but it still seems fair to ask if the new policy is sufficiently superior to justify the change. One effect of the existing policy is that some very accomplished students are discouraged from applying, and are placed at an insurmountable disadvantage when they do apply, for reasons that have little or nothing to do with their potential for success at UC. The presence of the subject test requirement among the eligibility requirements renders ineligible many thousands of strong students who will go to college. Its presence also constrains the number of students who cannot be eligible at all, such that the University has to set the actual performance required for eligibility GPA and test scores at a surprisingly modest level. The end result is that achieving UC eligibility has much more to do with jumping through certain hoops than with jumping through those hoops well. Further, thousands of ineligible and college-going students present academic credentials that are better than some of their fully eligible peers. This inversion was not intentional, but long and careful study has shown conclusively that it is a present reality. The Academic Senate maintains that UC can do better.

Mr. Brown discussed the specific impact of the subject test requirements. In the recently completed 2007 CPEC study, it is estimated that 22,000 high school graduates that year were ineligible solely because they did not take the subject tests. They completed the a-g requirements with a qualifying GPA and took a core exam, either the ACT with writing component or the SAT. A strong majority, had they taken the subject tests and earned scores at least as good as their SAT scores, would have been eligible. In fact, thousands of them would have been eligible with only the minimal score on the subject tests. This “ineligible by subject test” group contains high concentrations of certain groups that are currently underrepresented in the UC eligibility pool. In that set of 22,000 high school students, there are 1,100 African American students, 5,400 Chicano/Latinos, and 2,500 Asian Americans. There are also 8,000 students attending schools in the lowest Educator Preparation Institute (EPI) deciles in this currently ineligible pool. The subject test scores reveal little that is useful in making good admissions decisions, a finding that has withstood rigorous review by an external expert in statistical methods.

Ms. Hurtado discussed impacts the policy will have on diversity. She reported that the Senate feels strongly that all racial and ethnic groups would benefit if UC were to cast a wider net. Relative to the numbers now estimated to be eligible, the number of African Americans receiving comprehensive review would double, the number of Chicano/Latino students would nearly double, and the number of Native Americans, though small, would more than triple. White students also would have a net increase of 77 percent and Asian Americans of 26 percent.

Mr. Brown provided more specifics, noting that there are 30,000 students beyond those who are currently UC-eligible who would benefit from this broadening of the review; that is, 3,300 African Americans, over 16,000 Chicano/Latinos, over 300 Native Americans, over 19,000 Asians and Pacific Islanders, and over 14,000 students in the lowest EPI deciles.

Ms. Hurtado commented on admissions outcomes. An outstanding feature of the proposal is an expansion of the eligibility in the local context (ELC). Students in this category are informed in early fall, based on a review of their transcripts, that they have a guaranteed place at UC if they finish their coursework in their senior year and take the required test. It is estimated that about 87 percent of the high schools that were in the current CPEC study will at least double their ELC numbers, almost 99 percent in the CPEC study increasing their ELC numbers by one-and-a-half times their current numbers. Even in raising the standards for the guaranteed group, underrepresented groups are represented comparable to the current guaranteed group. Although admission outcomes are hard to predict, data indicate that the representation of students from disadvantaged high schools will increase.

Mr. Brown reiterated that white students have a net increase of 77 percent and Asians and Pacific Islanders about 26 percent in the number that will be considered for review. This is because a higher proportion of Asian Americans already meet current eligibility standards. There has been some concern that Asian Americans may lose ground in this

reform of eligibility, but in actual numbers more would receive comprehensive review. He noted that comprehensive review takes into account multiple factors that students' files bring to bear on the admissions decision. The guarantee is useful for students who are turned down at all the campuses to which they apply. About 94 percent of those students reject the referral offers they receive from other campuses; only 6 percent take those offers.

Mr. Rashid discussed the fiscal impact of the proposed policy. First, enrollment figures will not be affected by this policy. It will affect only the number of applications reviewed, not the number of students admitted. Enrollment will remain under the administrative control of the University, subject to budget negotiations with the State, as is current practice. The only fiscal consideration involves the cost of application processing. UC charges an application fee of \$60 per campus. About 85 percent of applicants pay that fee, and the rest receive a need-based fee waiver. This fee exceeds the cost directly attributable to application processing. That said, it is also true that other demands at the campus level are placed on this revenue stream and that campus admissions offices, which do heroic work every season, will have to move quickly to expand their processing capacity.

Mr. Brown reflected that students' profiles are undeniably complicated by many factors, including the kinds of unequal educational opportunity that influence performance on narrow criteria such as the eligibility index. The Academic Senate has devoted serious, long-term study to these matters, especially since 2004, when UC was compelled to raise GPA standards in order to admit the top 12.5 percent of high school graduates as provided in the Master Plan. As more students become college-prepared, a more careful look is required rather than simply raising the index, which often results in the exclusion of the very same students who are being made eligible through outreach and school improvement activities. This proposal is a move in the right direction. It specifies a robust but limited guaranteed pool, set to higher standards but on fairer grounds. It reduces a degree of overreliance on testing. It promises to reach every high school through expanded use of the ELC program. It encourages a careful, individual review of applicants to determine the top students. All of this is necessary to achieve broader access and to help UC fulfill its mission as an engine of opportunity. The proposal is consistent with legislative and other reviews of the California Master Plan, Regents' policy objectives, and legal mandates. It has the support of Chancellor Reed from the California State University system, from the UC Student Association, and from a broad array of UC's constituents. The proposal advances excellence and fairness in UC access.

President Yudof introduced Lucero Chavez, the president of the UC Student Association, for her remarks.

Ms. Chavez spoke about the UCSA student lobby conference, the proposal on freshman eligibility reform, and the Blue and Gold Opportunity Plan. She noted that research universities such as UC will be instrumental in improving the state's and the nation's economy. She commented that the freshman eligibility reform numbers demonstrate the disparity that exists among the state's public schools. Many only insufficiently offer

rigorous courses and few resources for students, which affects underrepresented communities disproportionately. While it is understood that access and diversity will continue to be issues for the University and that the eligibility reforms are not the entire answer to fixing K-12 education, they provide a good opportunity to move forward.

Regent Kozberg commented on the importance for her that President Yudof had carried out a thoughtful review of the proposal and had recommended it. She supported his changes to the original proposal. She was concerned, however, about deviation from the Master Plan and about the increased workload that will be caused by the review of the additional students, especially with diminishing campus resources. She asked also about the logic of increasing the ELC category by five percent.

Mr. Rashid responded that the Academic Senate believes that this proposal is in every way consistent with the spirit of the Master Plan. The original 1960 document instructs UC to select from among the top 12.5 percent of graduates in California. Subsequent practice and Regents' policy have been to accept everyone in the top 12.5 percent. The original plan and every subsequent legislative review have upheld the University's right to define the top 12.5 percent. This proposal takes the view that about 10 percent of that 12.5 percent can be determined based strictly on GPA and test scores. The proposal also embraces the view that, to determine the balance of the top 12.5 percent, information beyond GPA, test scores, and the courses and tests a student has taken is needed. The most recent legislative review of the Master Plan encouraged the University to look beyond test scores and GPA to determine who is in the top 12.5 percent. As to the effect of increased reviews, he acknowledged the hard work and diminishing resources of admissions staff, but he noted that the volume attributable to this policy will likely be between 12 percent and 15 percent, which is not astronomical. It is estimated that the cost of reading each application is less than the \$60 charged.

Mr. Rashid commented on the increase in the ELC category of from four percent to nine percent. Concerns had been expressed about dipping too deeply into the talent pool in some schools. He explained there is a natural safety mechanism in that, in order to be guaranteed admission via that nine percent, a student must first complete the a-g requirements, so it is not the case that nine percent in every school will be guaranteed admission to UC. For major feeder schools where 30 percent to 40 percent of the class is coming to UC, large numbers of students complete the a-g courses, and that full nine percent will be guaranteed admission, but there are schools in the state that have much smaller percentages of students completing the a-g courses. Some of them within that top nine percent, perhaps even half, will be guaranteed admission to UC under the ELC program. The rest, even though they have high GPAs, will not have completed the a-g courses. The Academic Senate feels that the ELC program is a valuable one because it increases the reach of UC into every school in the state. It gives counselors everywhere the ability to tell their highest-achieving students that if they finish these courses they will have a spot at UC.

In response to a request by Regent Lansing for further clarification about the increased ELC percentage, Mr. Rashid explained that the element of overriding importance in the

proposal is the establishment of the “entitled to review” (ETR) category for those with a minimum 3.0 GPA who complete 11 out of the 15 a-g courses by the end of 11th grade and take the SAT or ACT. Within that broader pool of ETR students, a subset will be guaranteed admission via referral by one of two pathways – being either in the top nine percent in their school or in the top nine percent statewide. It is easy to overestimate the importance of that guarantee. It does not lead to very many freshmen landing at UC who would not have otherwise. They are only guaranteed a spot somewhere in the system. There is some evidence that the four percent ELC program now does motivate many students to complete the a-g courses who would not have done so otherwise. It gives UC a presence in every high school. What four percent can do, nine percent can do better, knowing that going to nine percent in no way compromises the quality of the pool of students who will receive the guarantee. Overall, the pool under this “nine by nine” criterion has stronger GPA and test scores. Students who are in the four percent pool now almost certainly will be eligible under statewide criteria. The nine percent statewide, nine percent within a school provides a little better ballast.

Mr. Brown noted that high school rank is one of the strongest predictors of UC performance, stronger than GPA itself. By relying more on high school rank, the University will be functioning in a manner consistent with its research, which indicates the value of high school rank in predicting later UC performance. In addition, this approach creates a broader reach. Mr. Rashid added that students who want to go only to the campus of their choice, irrespective of any guarantee, have to gain that opportunity through a comprehensive review performed at their selected campus. In all cases, those selection processes involve test scores and not just GPA.

Regent Schilling raised the issue of communications received from Asian and Pacific Islander groups claiming they did not hear about the new policy. Ms. Croughan recalled that the proposal was discussed at a series of informative meetings that began in June 2007, first predominantly with legislative staff in Sacramento and subsequently with a blend of Assembly members. In July 2008, the proposal appeared as a discussion item on the Regents’ agenda. At that time, the President started to receive letters from legislators and other groups. One, dated July 11, 2008, was from Assembly member Nakanishi questioning issues with respect to Pacific Islanders. The President has provided an evidence-based response to every letter received. More recently, a briefing was held with three caucuses – the Latino Caucus, the Black Caucus, and the Asian Pacific Islander Caucus – and the Assembly’s Committee on Higher Education. The attendees stated at that time that their questions and concerns had been addressed satisfactorily. Assembly member Fong had expressed specific concerns as to the effect of the changes on Asian and Pacific Islander students and was informed that because so many of these students are already eligible for UC, they are not advantaged to the same degree as other ethnic or racial groups. In response to a question that had been asked by Assembly member Lieu, University representatives had reported that UC gathers Asian and Pacific Islander subgroup information. It is one of the few institutions of higher education that can distinguish among Chinese, Vietnamese, and other Asian groups. The University’s data, however, must be linked to CPEC data to conduct simulations on the ETR pool and the “admit” pool, and CPEC uses only the broad category of Asian and Pacific Islander,

which prevents the University from developing the preferred level of detail. Ms. Croughan expressed the hope that further information provided over the past week had addressed any related questions. She emphasized that the revised admissions criteria will not affect applicants until fall 2012. Education and public outreach will continue in the interim.

Ms. Hurtado addressed a second question asked by Regent Schilling about comprehensive review. She emphasized that the comprehensive review process incorporates quantitative measures. Every campus has a rubric that lists academic criteria in many areas, including those which cannot be determined from a simple index. Consideration is given to the quality and strength of the senior year program, the applicants' ranking within the high school, and the availability of courses within the high school, so as to ascertain whether students took the best courses they could compared to other applicants in the pool from the same high school. In a national context, comprehensive review is probably one of the leading initiatives with respect to assessing opportunity, context, and achievement.

Ms. Hurtado addressed the qualitative part of comprehensive review, which includes leadership, civic engagement, and motivation to achieve. Campuses construct rubrics for such characteristics in order to measure qualities an index cannot. Mr. Brown stressed that the comprehensive review process is rigorously controlled, monitored, and evaluated.

In response to a question asked by Regent Makarechian relative to the difference between the University's 12.5 percent allocation, as envisioned by the Master Plan, and the 10 percent who would be guaranteed admission, Mr. Rashid indicated that, under the new policy, the balance up to 12.5 percent would be determined by comprehensive review. Students who are selected by a campus but who were not guaranteed admission via ELC or the statewide criteria are those who successfully competed with others who applied to the same campus. These students will round out the top 12.5 percent of students. The University maintains a policy whereby up to six percent of the enrolled class is allowed to be admitted by exception, meaning they do not meet eligibility criteria. That little-used policy will remain in place. No campus uses the full six percent. The average is closer to two percent, because it is difficult to justify admitting a student who is ineligible over a student who is deemed to be eligible. The admission by exception policy or pathway would be used to admit students whom a campus desires to admit, for sound reason, who are not entitled to review by the criteria because they did not complete 11 of 15 a-g courses, or the right ones, by the end of the 11th grade, or because their GPA is below the 3.0 minimum. Mr. Brown emphasized that those students whom a campus wants to admit but who fall short of current eligibility standards may be admitted by exception, but that is beyond the proposal under consideration, which deals only with those students who, ultimately, will be fully eligible.

Regent Pattiz asked how what seems to be a very complex process will be explained to students and their parents. Mr. Rashid responded that, behind the complexity, there is only one thing that will be different in 2012 that students will have to know: no longer will they have to take SAT subject tests.

Regent Hopkinson commented that, while she wished to support the recommendation, she had significant reservations. She believed that the issues the policy change attempts to address can be addressed in a much more straightforward way. Part of her concern was her belief that this is a modification to the Master Plan. She noted that the Legislative Analyst characterizes it as an amendment. In reaching down to 21 percent of high school graduates, the University is redefining how those will become its 12.5 percent share. She believed that, if that is the intent, it should be stated plainly. She found the present criteria for the selection of the students under ETR to be less than transparent, and under the proposed new language, each campus may modify the criteria for determining who is eligible, which will make it almost impossible for California students to determine how they can become eligible in that category. She commented also that, while she supported increasing eligibility in the local context to some amount, she questioned the proposed nine percent. The proposal shows that, under those two categories, the University would be admitting 10.1 percent of the top students in California high schools; however, as has been seen with the current process, in which eligibility in the local context is four percent, over time everyone in the four percent became qualified in the 12.5 percent statewide context. She suspected that the nine percent eligible in the local context eventually will become part of the nine percent statewide. If that is true, then the percentage that would be eligible under the new procedure would be 3.5 percent of the University's 12.5 percent. She cautioned against the unintended consequences of this change. She continued that, while she supported changing the SAT requirement, it also could have unintended consequences. Further, the timing of the change is such that it will affect students who are now high school freshmen, so next year, as sophomores, they will be the first to whom this will apply. In the past, the University has directed any such modification to the incoming freshman classes.

Regent Hopkinson also expressed concern about the statistics that were used. Under the change, the new group of the 10.1 percent will have a higher GPA than the current 12.5 by 1.7 percent, but it is because the GPA of the top 80 percent will be recalculated without the bottom 20 percent rather than because they are more accomplished students. The process has been made overly complicated in order to address just a few issues – those of not completing a-g courses or not taking the SAT subject tests – that could be addressed much more simply. She concluded that a lack of transparency, the impact on students, and a modification to the Master Plan which seemed not to have been explored with the other institutions of higher learning to a great extent, were, in her mind, significant drawbacks.

Mr. Rashid responded first to Regent Hopkinson's question about the Master Plan. He reported that the Legislative Analyst raises the issue that ETR would identify about 21.5 percent of graduating high school seniors and therefore the University would be drawing from 21 percent and not 12.5 percent. Currently, the vast majority of students who complete the a-g courses and core exam requirements make themselves eligible simply by taking SAT subject tests. There are thousands of students with GPAs of 3.5 and above who, according to UC's definition, are not in the top 12.5 percent because they are ineligible. The current policy construct is supposed to identify, in some rational way,

the top 12.5 percent, but it cannot be said to be doing so. Based on strict quantitative measures of academic success, there are many students who are ineligible and therefore presumably not in the top 12.5 percent, because they did not take subject tests. The proposal tries to rectify that by considering students to be part of the top 12.5 percent if their GPA and test scores are sufficiently high. More information is required about other students in order to determine whether they are in the top 12.5 percent. In order to get that information, the benefit of a full review must be extended to more than 12.5 percent. The criteria proposed yield about 21 percent for that benefit of a review.

Mr. Brown added that, every three to seven years, CPEC reviews admissions, and with a more liberal view than what is being recommended. CPEC reviews the criteria of every graduate that year before identifying the top 12.5 percent. The University, on the other hand, proposes that it is reasonable to confine the pool to those who appear to be on track and to look at them more closely before determining the top 12.5 percent. The new process addresses who should be considered in order to determine the top 12.5 percent, and on what information that review should be based.

With respect to transparency, Mr. Rashid characterized the ETR construct as eligibility minus the requirement that the subject tests be taken and minus the eligibility index – the GPA test score index. In that sense, this proposal could be said to be more transparent and less complex than current policy. Regent Hopkinson asked whether there were a set of criteria to determine eligibility for that group. Ms. Croughan responded that the criteria are the 11 out of 15 a-g courses and the 3.0 GPA, weighted and capped. She disputed Regent Hopkinson's contention that each campus would be permitted to modify the criteria. Each campus would establish its own comprehensive review, as is current practice, and determine which top students will fill its enrollment numbers, but the criteria do not change. Regent Hopkinson observed that the 2.5 percent among the 20 percent meet the criteria but are not yet eligible to attend UC until the campus performs comprehensive review. Ms. Hurtado explained that they are eligible but they are not admitted; there is a difference. Students could be guaranteed a place somewhere in the system, but, essentially, the campus has to select them. Ms. Croughan believed that the confusion arises because the University currently equates eligibility with guarantee, and that is what it defines as the 12.5 percent. The change is that there would be a guaranteed pool of 10 percent, but there would be a zone outside that in which a review process could allow the additional students who meet the eligibility criteria to be reviewed and considered for admission.

President Yudof believed that having a discretionary zone did not equate to having differential standards. There is one guarantee zone. It is defined by the "nine by nine" that is no less clear than the current criteria. The standards for becoming eligible for review are the same systemwide and are not changing. The guarantee applies to 1,000 students who chose to go to the Merced or Riverside campuses. Over the past 50 years, the guarantee has been eviscerated because it applies to such a small number. Most students who do not get into their top three choices will go elsewhere. Concerning the Master Plan, the President stated that it is embodied in several different documents. His position differed from that of the faculty in that he believed the proposal was, indeed,

a modification of the Master Plan. There will be 10 percent of students in the guarantee zone compared to the previous 12.5 percent. The University's partner institutions, the Governor, and legislative leaders have accepted that the proposal does not violate the Master Plan.

Regent Marcus asked for clarification about guaranteeing admission for those eligible in the local context. Mr. Rashid responded that if a student were to apply to three campuses and be denied admission to all, his or her application would be referred to a campus with remaining space, and the student could expect to be admitted to one of these.

Regent Marcus expressed appreciation for the faculty's attempt to enhance fairness in the admission process, but he expressed concern about maintaining the quality of the institution. He believed that a public university has a public trust to operate with a high standard of transparency and objectivity. He strongly urged that the admissions process be sufficiently simple and straightforward to be readily understood by the public as providing fair, consistent, and objective treatment to applicants. Mr. Rashid responded that currently more than 98 percent of UC freshmen have been selected by a campus-based comprehensive review process. They fall within the 12.5 percent eligibility, which is objective, but they still must be selected by a campus to go to that campus. The other 1.5 or 2 percent are referred to UC Riverside and UC Merced by virtue of the fact that they are eligible. Only that small group of students could be said to have not passed through comprehensive review.

Ms. Croughan provided a further explanation. She emphasized that only those who were guaranteed admission now are provided a spot somewhere in the system, but only two percent of all students offered admission go to a campus to which they did not apply; the rest go somewhere other than UC. The only modification proposed is expansion of the pool of students who will be told they are eligible, entitled to a review and encouraged to apply to UC. The only group that will be guaranteed admission is the top nine percent statewide and the top nine percent eligible in the local context, who will receive a letter to that effect. This encourages more students to apply, with the understanding that they are guaranteed a spot, and those guarantees would increase from four percent to nine percent of the top students in their high schools.

In an attempt to clarify the process further, following a question asked by Regent Lansing, Mr. Rashid explained that every currently eligible applicant would be at least entitled to review under the proposed policy. For example, 40 percent of Davis Senior High School graduates are UC-eligible. Some of those applicants would no longer be guaranteed admission, but all would be entitled to review. The value of the guarantee for such students is minimal, as less than one percent of them accept referral offers. Students from good schools want to go where they applied, so they do not care about being guaranteed admission to other campuses.

Regent Reiss addressed concerns and criticisms that had been raised by the Legislative Analyst and political leaders. Her views with respect to the Master Plan differed from those of Regent Hopkinson and President Yudof. She noted that the Master Plan does not

specify that the top 12.5 percent should be defined by SAT I and SAT II scores. The President's proposal upholds the University's desire to continue taking the top 12.5 percent; it states only that the top 12.5 percent of graduating high school seniors in the state should not be measured by test scores alone. President Yudof has been informed by General Counsel that the proposed change is legal and has received the approval of the leaders of the other segments of higher education. She believed that all other issues that Regents and the Legislative Analyst have raised can be addressed between now and implementation. She was hopeful that the University's transparency and certainty would guide the way in which the proposal is presented to the public. She recommended that the process be explained clearly, particularly with respect to the ETR category and the campuses' comprehensive review process. Students, parents, and high school guidance counselors must be fully informed.

Regent Reiss asked about students who complete the 11-course a-g requirement and are informed before graduation that they have been approved for admission, but then are not able to complete the remainder of the a-g course requirement prior to graduation. Mr. Rashid responded that offers of admission from UC are always provisional, pending a final transcript and the completion of the requirements. Students list their senior year schedule on their applications. If their final transcript departs significantly from their proposed schedule, the admission offer may be cancelled, particularly for a student who loses eligibility because of a lack of completion of the a-g courses.

Regent Johnson recalled that, although the Regents have had opportunities to review and discuss the proposal at length, it appears so complex that some are still struggling to understand it fully. She agreed with Regents Pattiz and Reiss that the process must be explained to the public in straightforward terms in order to dispel any notion that the University is lowering standards, when, in fact, it is raising them. Regent Varner agreed. He believed that the existing freshman eligibility policy was developed at a time when there were certain assumptions, no longer applicable, about the availability and quality of the courses offered in high schools. He viewed the proposal as a courageous attempt to deal with discrepancies that have arisen. Parents and students need to be provided with a concise explanation that includes a discussion of the necessity of the change and what, if any, effects it might have on the California system of higher education. He also advocated showing the Legislature that the cost of implementation is within the University's means and will not burden the system additionally.

Regent Ruiz stated that, although he was always concerned about the possible adverse impact on minority students of any policy, he was confident in the analysis presented by the faculty and the President with respect to the recommendation.

Observing that SAT subject tests would no longer be required, Regent Shewmake asked whether those students who decided to take the tests in spite of this would benefit. Mr. Brown responded that any test results that students submitted would be considered as part of the comprehensive review process. The University wishes to encourage students to make their best case for admission.

Regent Hopkinson asked what led to choosing nine percent for both local and statewide eligibility criteria. Mr. Rashid commented that a deliberative process led to choosing both nine percent figures. Reams of data were studied using various combinations of ELC and statewide percentages. Consideration was given to geographic distribution, distribution among schools in the state, their Academic Performance Index (API) distribution, and other demographic indicators, such as ethnicity, in order to get a sense of the profile of students who would be identified and would be guaranteed admission under the options considered and thus encouraged to apply. The outcome was that “nine by nine” had a pleasing combination of characteristics, but first and foremost it resulted in a strong pool academically. It must be assured that those upon whom the University confers a guarantee of admission are proven to be the strongest students in the state by conventional measures. Care also had to be taken that the numbers chosen for those two pathways would not result in a guaranteed admission rate of 16 percent, because that would violate the spirit of the Master Plan. The faculty sought a combination of criteria that would provide an academically strong pool of students and offer guaranteed admission to approximately ten percent of the graduating class. Ms. Croughan elaborated further, noting that the iterative process was supported by analysis by the office of Student Affairs, which has extensive, detailed knowledge about admissions, and CPEC data. The five-year process represented a major collaborative effort between the University administration and BOARS. Ms. Hurtado emphasized that whenever a new CPEC eligibility study is released, BOARS performs analyses to determine whether changes in criteria should be proposed so as to meet admissions goals without surpassing them.

Regent Gould believed that it should be recognized that admissions is an imperfect science that will always present questions. The ultimate measure of whether a process is fair is whether it produces a pool of exceptional students from which the University may choose. Each campus must be relied upon to apply the admissions rules fairly, and BOARS must be relied upon to continue testing the process as it moves forward and determining whether the process is successful at providing fairness or whether it should be reshaped.

Regent-designate Stovitz requested more detail about the method of evaluating the program. Ms. Hurtado reported that, at the beginning of each year, BOARS examines all admissions results, questions every aspect, and conducts analyses. Along with the Office of the President, it constantly monitors what is happening systemwide and across every campus.

Mr. Brown commented that the success of the President’s proposal rests, to some degree, on those who conduct comprehensive review on the campuses. The process must be carried out with integrity.

Regent Lansing thanked the faculty and the President for their thorough analyses. She believed that there was ample time before implementation to generate an information campaign that will make the changes and the reasons for them clear to the public. She believed also that it was always worthwhile for the University to reevaluate itself and

