

**A REPORT TO THE WASC ACCREDITATION VISITING TEAM  
ON THE SPECIAL TOPIC OF DIVERSITY**

**Provided in Preparation for the June 1-2, 1998 Accreditation Site Visit**

## Table of Contents

I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. UCLA’S MAJOR NEW DIVERSITY-RELATED EFFORTS AND INITIATIVES OVER THE PAST YEAR.....	2
A. Complying With Proposition 209 .....	2
B. Post-Proposition 209 Efforts to Promote Diversity .....	5
C. Integrating Diversity into the Academic Core .....	7
1. Chancellor’s Meeting on Diversity.....	8
2. WASC Workgroup on Diversity Retreat .....	9
III. A PROFILE OF UCLA'S DIVERSITY .....	10
IV. CONCLUSION.....	16

### TABLES

1. UCLA Freshman Applicants and Admits .....	18
2. Ethnic Distribution of UCLA Undergraduates, 1983 and 1997 .....	19
3. Average High School Grades and Composite SAT Scores For Freshmen Entering UCLA in 1983 and 1997.....	20
4. Percentage of Freshmen Graduating Within Six Years: Comparisons by Ethnicity and Year of Entrance (1983 and 1991) .....	21

### APPENDICES

- A. Selected Communications on the Topic of Diversity
- B. Statement on Diversity

# **A REPORT TO THE WASC VISITING TEAM ON THE SPECIAL TOPIC OF DIVERSITY**

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

Diversity is one of three special topics on which UCLA is focusing as part of its WASC reaccreditation activities. UCLA's selection of this topic reflects the great value and importance it has long assigned to diversity.

While the members of the Accreditation Visiting Team acknowledged that "UCLA is known nationally for establishing a strong record on diversity," they also pointed to a number of diversity-related challenges facing the institution. The Team's comments during and after the March, 1998 site visit prompted considerable reflection and discussion among campus leaders. We realized that the intense, short-term pressures of responding to Proposition 209 had slowed our progress on the less urgent, but critically important tasks of long-range planning and coordination of campuswide efforts to promote diversity. Feedback from the Team stimulated UCLA to move forward more aggressively on these tasks.

It is difficult to overstate the implications of Proposition 209, which restricts the use of affirmative action, for our institution. While the Proposition's effects on student admissions have received the most attention, virtually every school and college as well as many of UCLA's administrative and academic support services were required to review their practices and, in many cases, institute changes to comply with the law. At the same time, our campus leaders have dedicated substantial time and energy to efforts to prevent, or at least reduce, the projected declines in representation of African American, Latino, and Native American students on our campus. A high level of public and media scrutiny has accompanied these efforts, attesting not only to the deep public divide about affirmative action but also to the greater Los Angeles community's pride in, and sense of "ownership" toward of UCLA.

These short-term demands slowed, but did not stop, UCLA's work on a broader set of diversity issues that spans research, education, and public service. The Visiting Team's observations have encouraged us to direct more attention to these issues and, in particular, to initiate a comprehensive, long-range diversity planning process.

Over the last three months, we have made substantial progress in designing the planning process. Our approach is based on a broad concept of diversity that extends beyond race, ethnicity, and other demographic factors to encompass intellectual, ideological, and cultural factors as well as the nature of UCLA's curriculum, research, and public service. As we move forward, we will reaffirm our long-standing commitments to diversity, clarify our goals and strategies, and more fully integrate diversity issues into established institutional planning and review processes.

This paper reports on UCLA's progress and reviews the challenges we face in promoting diversity. While its primary goal is to update the Visiting Team, it is also intended to help UCLA by providing a shared context for all those involved in planning

and decisionmaking related to diversity. The paper is organized into two major sections, as described below.

- First, it briefly describes UCLA’s major new diversity-related efforts and activities over the past year. These include: (a) steps taken to comply with the requirements of Proposition 209, which restricts use of affirmative action; (b) new programs and practices intended to promote diversity without use of affirmative action; and (c) the initiation of a comprehensive, long-range planning process to articulate UCLA’s diversity-related goals and propose strategies for achieving them.
- Second, it provides a profile of diversity at UCLA. This profile demonstrates that UCLA generally has achieved a high level of diversity and has many resources on which to draw in developing its programs, policies, and plans.

## **II. UCLA’S MAJOR NEW DIVERSITY-RELATED EFFORTS AND INITIATIVES OVER THE PAST YEAR**

Over the past year, UCLA has faced three important challenges: (1) how to implement and come into compliance with Proposition 209; (2) how to sustain racial and ethnic diversity without the use of affirmative action; and (3) how to nourish diversity in all its forms, including demographic, cultural, intellectual, and ideological diversity, while creating a still more academically vibrant and hospitable environment for all students, faculty, and staff. This section describes our responses to these challenges.

### **A. Complying With Proposition 209**

Approved by California voters in November, 1996 and implemented in August, 1997, Proposition 209 proscribes granting preferences to or discriminating against any individual or group based on race, ethnicity, national origin, color or gender. In effect, it forbids UCLA (and other public institutions in California) from using affirmative action to achieve diversity<sup>1</sup>.

Given the wide-ranging implications Proposition 209 carries for UCLA’s programs and activities, an important objective has been to promote a systematic approach to assessment and implementation, based on a common institutional interpretation of the law. Toward this end, UCLA’s Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs convened a Proposition 209 Task Force that met regularly between November, 1996 and August, 1997. While many issues were resolved informally in this setting, the Task Force also designed a more formal review process to be used as needed. This process includes several stages:

1. All campus managers were asked to conduct an “inventory” of programs, policies and activities that could be affected by Proposition 209.

---

<sup>1</sup> The only exceptions to this restriction are for reasonable gender distinctions and any actions that would jeopardize UC eligibility for federal funds.

2. Rather than make independent decisions about how to respond, the managers were asked to consult with the Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs.
3. A Policy Review Board was convened to provide further guidance as needed about how to address Proposition 209-sensitive situations.
4. Finally, for issues that could not or should not be resolved informally or through the Review Board (e.g., those with UC Systemwide implications), provision has been made to refer them to the Chancellor or to the UC Office of the President (UCOP)<sup>2</sup>.

To date, all issues have been resolved through informal campus and systemwide consultation. This is largely because the delayed implementation of the Proposition due to legal challenges provided time to plan and resolve foreseeable questions.

In implementing Proposition 209, UCLA has also worked closely with the Office of the President, which has provided general informational materials as well as implementation guidelines in the crucial areas of financial aid and outreach.

Some of the changes UCLA has implemented in response to Proposition 209 are described below.

- *Admissions.* As required by law, UCLA eliminated the use of race, ethnicity, national origin, color and gender as admissions criteria. As predicted, this led to declines in the numbers of African American and Latino students entering UCLA. Recently announced admissions decisions for UCLA's Fall, 1998 freshman class show a 43 percent drop in the number of African American students admitted and a 33 percent drop in Latino admissions (see Table 1). If, in the wake of Proposition 209, some students conclude that UCLA is unlikely to be a supportive or welcoming environment and decide to attend other colleges, the decline in minority student participation will be even larger. Any modifications to the UCLA admission selection process, should they occur, are likely to impact ethnic diversity results at the margin only. Given the high demand for admission to UCLA (over 30,000 students applied for Fall, 1998, admissions) and the strong qualifications of many applicants, gaining acceptance to UCLA is likely to become increasingly competitive for all students.
- *Outreach.* The most significant question about outreach activities that Proposition 209 raised is whether UC campuses can still engage in targeted outreach to members of underrepresented groups. UCOP guidelines suggest that some forms of targeted outreach are allowable (e.g., informational outreach and outreach to students who have already received offers of admission from UCLA). UCOP is in fact encouraging campuses to extend their outreach services and has made special funding available for this purpose.

---

<sup>2</sup> More information about this process was distributed to the Visiting Team prior to their March site visit.

- *Financial aid.* In past years, certain forms of financial aid, such as special grants, fellowships and scholarships, have been targeted to members of particular racial, ethnic or gender groups. These resources have been important tools for recruiting and supporting a diverse student body and also have increased the total pool of financial aid resources available for all UCLA students. Proposition 209 raised many questions about the legality of these restricted forms of aid. In the absence of regulations or judicial decisions that offer clear guidance, the UC Office of the President has adopted a set of guidelines. In brief, the University will no longer use race, ethnicity, national origin, color or gender in determining eligibility or selecting recipients for any award funded by the University or the State. It will however, fulfill specific commitments made prior to August 28, 1997 (when Proposition 209 was implemented) and will work closely with donors to ensure that their gifts do not violate Proposition 209.
- *Student services.* Several of UCLA's academic support services have reviewed and, in some cases, revised their eligibility criteria in response to Proposition 209. For example, the Academic Advancement Program (AAP) was designed to serve the academic needs of minority, low-income and first generation undergraduate students. Since passage of Proposition 209, the criteria for participation in AAP have been modified to emphasize academic preparation and personal background, not race or ethnicity.
- *Student extracurricular activities.* Among the activities that have been or will be modified in response to Proposition 209 are UCLA-supported graduation celebrations for students of particular ethnic or racial groups and programs that use University funds to provide peer counseling or tutoring to students of particular racial or ethnic groups. Many more questions have arisen about extracurricular activities, ranging from whether UCLA can host a chapter of a professional association for women in the sciences, to whether officially-recognized student organizations can hold special events to promote academic success among minority students. In each case, the decision has rested on judgments about whether the existence of the particular program or service provides preferential treatment, or whether its elimination would be a form of discrimination.
- *Employment.* Because Proposition 209 authorizes the University to take all necessary actions to maintain or achieve eligibility under federally funded programs, UCLA continues to be an affirmative action employer. Thus, the campus continues to maintain employment data concerning underrepresented minorities and women, and to engage in outreach to increase the applicant pools of underrepresented minority or gender groups. The Proposition does not, however, entitle the University to consider race, ethnicity, national origin, color or gender in actual employment decisions. The University continues to hire the most capable applicants, just as it continues its efforts to generate the largest and most diverse applicant pool.

It will take many years before the impacts of these changes in response to Proposition 209 can be fully understood. We will know substantially more about the short-term effects of the Proposition when the undergraduate admissions cycle is complete. Much longer time periods are needed, however, to discern the effects of the Proposition on student “pipelines” to undergraduate and graduate schools, on the choices students make about whether or where to attend college and on the campus intellectual and social environment.

## **B. Post-Proposition 209 Efforts to Promote Diversity**

UCLA has not only complied with the requirements of the Proposition but has also introduced new strategies for promoting racial and ethnic diversity, especially a substantial increase in outreach services for educationally disadvantaged students.

As directed by SP1, the University of California convened a broad-based task force to develop a comprehensive outreach plan (*New Directions for Outreach: Report of the University of California Outreach Task Force, 1997*; previously provided to the Visiting Team). The plan introduces the concept of “educational disadvantage” as a key concept in outreach activities, and emphasizes that outreach to the educationally disadvantaged is needed both to “contribute to the academic enrichment of UC campuses through a diverse student body” and to “improve opportunities for California students in disadvantaged circumstances to achieve eligibility and to enroll at UC campuses.”

The plan also outlines a basic strategy for outreach programs to follow, which includes: (1) School-centered partnerships, or intensive and long-term efforts to promote school reform and “address the underlying causes of low UC eligibility and enrollment rates among students in disadvantaged circumstances;” (2) Academic development programs, or the expansion of programs with a track record in promoting access to higher education among disadvantaged students; (3) Informational outreach, or short-term efforts to assure that students, families, teachers, and counselors have accurate and complete information about UC admissions and also understand that the institution remains strongly committed to diversity; and (4) Research and evaluation, to apply the expertise within the UC system to educational needs and problems.

In keeping with the guidelines presented in the UC plan, UCLA has initiated new outreach programs, greatly expanded yield activities to promote enrollment of underrepresented students, and initiated evaluation and research to support the outreach efforts. The goals of these initiatives include strengthening students’ academic skills and knowledge, motivating students to aspire to a higher education, providing students and their families with information about admissions requirements and processes, and encouraging talented students to consider and prepare for UCLA. Major new initiatives include the following:

- The “school-centered partnership” program, the Venice-Westchester/UCLA Partnership, is a long-term, systemic change/school reform effort involving UCLA and a nearby cluster of schools (i.e., two high schools and their feeder middle schools in the Los Angeles Unified School District). This past year was a planning year that led to the formation of several committees (communication and networking, grant-writing, parent/community outreach, professional development, research,

technology, and standards-based assessment) and the development of partnership goals (rigorous academic standards, parental involvement, higher teacher competence in all disciplines, and on-going research) intended to result in better schools and higher student achievement.

- UCLA's "academic development program" is the Career Based Outreach Program (CBOP), a student-centered program designed to meet the needs of two groups of students: (1) K-12 students from educationally disadvantaged circumstances with potential to become UC eligible and UCLA academically competitive; and (2) UCLA undergraduates from educationally disadvantaged circumstances who want to become more academically competitive for admission to UCLA graduate and professional school programs. CBOP was developed collaboratively by personnel from six UCLA professional schools, Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools, UCLA's Office of Student Affairs, and UCLA Extension and is based on the best practices that promote learning in each of those organizations. CBOP was piloted in eleven high schools this year and involved 100 undergraduates and 350 high school students. Next year five additional high schools will join the program, and the number of students should more than double.
- Increased "informational outreach," primarily through the Early Academic Outreach Program (EAOP), was a key aspect of recruiting students to apply for admission. These efforts were successful for overall applications, as UCLA received more applications than any university in the country.
- Yield activities, or activities specifically designed to convince students to enroll at UCLA, were increased this year to help obtain a racially and ethnically diverse entering freshman class. Normal yield activities were enlarged and enhanced, including special visits to UCLA and telephone calls to admitted students. For example, the Chancellor participated in two conferences for admitted students and in placing telephone calls to admitted students; increased alumni participation further extended the reach of telephone recruitment. New recruitment efforts included visits by the Chancellor and others to high schools; op-ed pieces placed in the Los Angeles Times by the Chancellor and former Los Angeles Mayor Tom Bradley; and special letters from the Speaker of the California Assembly, Antonio Villaraigosa (see Appendix A).
- A particularly noteworthy yield activity that will also promote academic success was the creation of a special \$2,000,000 "Blue and Gold" scholarship program. These need-based scholarships of up to \$5,000 per year, renewable for four years, are targeted to top students from schools identified as "educationally disadvantaged," including about 50 Los Angeles County schools. This year, scholarships were offered to 248 highly talented high school seniors, almost half of whom have already



accepted the scholarship and thereby signaled their intention to attend UCLA.

Another major step in the creation of a new outreach program at UCLA was the appointment of the UCLA Outreach Steering Committee and an executive officer responsible for the overall coordination of outreach activities on campus. The seventeen member committee is co-chaired by the Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs and the Dean of the Graduate School of Education and Information Studies, and its members represent faculty, administration, students, alumni, and the UCLA Foundation. In late June, the Outreach Steering Committee will hold a planning retreat involving approximately 100 representatives of various constituencies from UCLA, K-12, and the Los Angeles community.

In addition, the Chancellor and other high-level administrators are striving to reassure internal and external audiences that UCLA's commitment to diversity remains unchanged notwithstanding the constraints of Proposition 209. For example, the Chancellor spoke about the importance of diversity in his first address to the Academic Senate, during new student orientation, in meetings with various alumni groups and in his communications with media ranging from local public access television to the newspaper *La Opinion*. The Chancellor has also met with a variety of student groups and responded to student concerns in writing as well. Appendix A displays some of the Chancellor's recent communications on the subject of diversity.

### **C. Integrating Diversity into the Academic Core**

UCLA's response to Proposition 209 has been comprehensive, systematic, and innovative. Due to the need for immediate compliance with Proposition 209 and the pressures this created around the 1998 admissions cycle, institutional leaders assigned the highest priority to these issues. Comments from the WASC Visiting Team following its March site visit, however, emphasized the importance of long-term diversity planning. As a consequence, the WASC Workgroup on Diversity and other campus leaders have escalated the pace of their ongoing planning efforts.

The key to achieving specific goals for campus diversity is to place them at the center of academic planning and decisionmaking, both short-term and long-range. This means that diversity must be an essential part of admissions planning (both undergraduate and graduate), faculty and staff recruitment and retention, instructional and curricular development (again both undergraduate and graduate), research development, fundraising and other critical institutional activities.

UCLA has completed two major steps toward centralizing and prioritizing diversity concerns. These steps establish a firm foundation upon which we will build.

The first step was a meeting convened by the Chancellor and involving the provosts, selected deans, and other academic leaders to address the need for a diversity plan and to make key decisions regarding the initiation of the process for creating this plan. The second step was the development by the WASC Workgroup on Diversity of a set of diversity recommendations. These recommendations are comprehensive in scope, build on the self-study questions developed prior to the March accreditation site visit, and

reflect the efforts of the Council on Diversity. Each of these steps is discussed in more detail below.

Several other, more limited efforts are also helping to moving diversity into the institution's academic core. These include consideration of specific performance indicators for diversity as part of the efforts of the Workgroup on Data Resources for Academic Planning and the development of a pilot General Education cluster course (team taught by senior faculty) on "Interracial dynamics in American Literature, Culture and Society," which, in the 1998-99 academic year, will focus on relations between African Americans and Asian Americans.

**1. Chancellor's meeting on diversity.** Following the March, 1998 accreditation site visit, Chancellor Carnesale convened a special meeting of a small group of high-level academic leaders and vice chancellors to address initiation of a process for developing a comprehensive and coherent approach to diversity on the UCLA campus. Several important themes emerged from this far-ranging discussion including:

- Over the past two decades, many steps were taken to incorporate diversity into our teaching, research and public service programs. While recent efforts have focused on promoting demographic diversity of students, faculty, and staff, what is needed now is a coherent vision and an integrated approach to diversity.
- Diversity is one of UCLA's comparative advantages. Not only is UCLA itself more diverse than most other institutions, but we are located in one of the most diverse cities in the world. We are extremely well-positioned to study and address diversity in our educational programs, research, and public service activities.
- Diversity is one of the most important issues facing our nation, confronting us with great challenges and opportunities. We should use our intellectual resources to address these issues. To do so will require interdisciplinary efforts and coordination of a rich but fragmented array of ongoing programs and activities.
- Although many groups and individuals are working to promote diversity within UCLA, coordination of their efforts is essential, and central direction should be strengthened.

In response to these observations, the group agreed on the need to stimulate and coordinate attention to diversity issues through a comprehensive process. Chancellor Carnesale decided to take the following actions:

- The Executive Vice Chancellor will chair a committee of high-level campus leaders to coordinate and manage a comprehensive approach to diversity. The committee will be guided by a broad view of diversity that goes beyond demographics to incorporate the academic program. It will provide recommendations directly to the Chancellor. Its charge will include:

1. Developing a vision statement (incorporating a definition of diversity), a set of goals, and recommendations for achieving the goals;
2. Developing recommendations for effectively incorporating diversity matters into the campus' strategic planning process at all levels of the organization;
3. Implementing processes and assigning responsibilities to further the campus' diversity goals in a number of areas including but not limited to student, faculty, and staff recruitment and retention;
4. Developing recommendations for advancing the broadest possible understanding of and campus commitment to diversity;
5. Developing appropriate forums in which to engage the faculty on the issue of diversity in our teaching, research, and public service programs; and
6. Establishing mechanisms to ensure continuing assessment of progress and outcomes.

In pursuing these tasks, the Committee will establish, oversee, and coordinate the efforts of more broadly constituted and specialized task forces or subcommittees that will address particular topics on an in-depth basis.

- The WASC Workgroup on Diversity will draft a vision statement, a set of goals, and recommendations for achieving the goals for consideration by the Executive Vice Chancellor-designate and the diversity Committee.

**2. WASC Workgroup on Diversity retreat.** After developing its definition and statement on diversity (see Appendix B) the WASC Workgroup on Diversity sought to summarize and clarify its discussions by formulating a set of recommendations for the Executive Vice Chancellor. To do so, the Workgroup held a four-hour retreat in May, 1998.

In preparation for the retreat, Associate Vice Chancellor and Workgroup Chair Raymund Paredes circulated a draft set of recommendations culled from past discussions of the Workgroup and other reports on diversity, such as the report of the Council on Diversity (previously provided to the Visiting Team).

During the retreat, the Workgroup reviewed each recommendation to determine the level of agreement about: (a) whether, if implemented, it would promote diversity at UCLA; (b) whether, as written, it had members' full support; and (c) whether, if discussed or modified, it might gain members' the full support. The participants also identified additional areas for which recommendations are needed. In response to the discussion, the following steps will be taken:

- The recommendations are being revised, supplemented, and in some cases reorganized, with framing language added as needed;

- The Workgroup will clarify how the recommendations should be implemented, proposing the administrators or campus units that should have primary responsibility and any special processes (e.g., convening task groups or requesting data analyses or reports) that should be undertaken;
- The Workgroup will prepare a vision statement to accompany these recommendations, in accord with the action items emerging from Chancellor Carnesale's meeting on diversity; and
- The final set of recommendations, framing language, and vision statement will be forwarded to the incoming Executive Vice Chancellor, who will in turn ask the committee he will chair to review and, as appropriate, accept them.

Although it is premature to provide a complete set of recommendations endorsed by the WASC Workgroup, a few examples may provide greater insight into the process.

- (a) The recommendations initially addressed only: Campus Governance and Planning; Undergraduate and Graduate Admissions; Student Academic Success; Instructional and Curricular Issues; Faculty Diversity; Research; and Campus Climate. After discussion, the Workgroup decided that recommendations should be comprehensive. Sections will be added relating to Outreach, Staff Diversity, Fundraising and Development, and the Analysis and Dissemination of Data and Information.
- (b) In the category of campus planning and governance, participants agreed that diversity should be restored as a central priority in the Academic Senate's program review process. They also agreed that administrators and managers should be held responsible for appropriate diversity initiatives and activities within their units through the performance review process.
- (c) There was much discussion about the draft recommendations related to undergraduate admissions. Rather than address a variety of possible changes individually, some Workgroup members encouraged the development of a broader, more process-oriented recommendation that would focus on ensuring that UCLA has strong mechanisms for reviewing a wide range of potential admissions issues.
- (d) A general concern was to make sure the recommendations are formulated in a manner that will lead to real change. Some recommendations will become more specific and direct; attention will also be given to process; and framing language will be added to strengthen certain sections.

The second draft of the recommendations is now in preparation and will be forwarded to the Visiting Team shortly.

### **III. A PROFILE OF UCLA'S DIVERSITY**

UCLA is among the most diverse institutions in the nation. Our diversity includes but extends beyond demographic characteristics of students. It also incorporates our

faculty and staff, and our educational, research, and service activities. We believe that this diversity has contributed to our growing academic reputation and excellence. Understanding and valuing what we have accomplished is essential for continuing progress. Among our achievements are the following:

1. The ethnic and racial diversity of UCLA's student body has increased substantially over the last two decades. As shown in Table 2, undergraduate students of color (African American, Asian American, Latino, and Native American) enrolled at UCLA increased from 36 percent in 1983 to 64 percent in 1997. The percentage of graduate students rose from 25 to 40 percent over the same time period.
2. The preparation of UCLA's admitted students has risen over this same time period. For example, the Fall, 1997 freshman class had an average high school grade point average of 4.04, and an average composite SAT score of 1245. By comparison, the Fall, 1983 freshman class had an average high school GPA of 3.59, with composite SATs equivalent to 1135<sup>3</sup>. When these data are broken down by ethnicity, we find gains for students of all groups. Table 3 displays this information in more detail.
3. UCLA has also been successful in promoting academic success. As shown in Table 4, six-year graduation rates have increased for all students of all races and ethnicities, with the largest gains among students of color. Although white and Asian students still show higher graduation rates than African American and Latino students, the gap is closing.
4. UCLA is ranked at the top of American universities in conferring degrees to minority students. An analysis of 1994-95 IPEDS data for *Black Issues in Higher Education* found that UCLA awarded more bachelors degrees to students of color (African American, Asian, Latino, or Native American) than any other higher education institution in the nation. UCLA also ranked first for the number of doctoral degrees and sixth for the number of master's degrees awarded to students of color. (See <http://www.blackissues.com>.)
5. One in five (20 percent) of UCLA's ladder faculty is a minority (African American, Asian, Native American, or Latino), and 22 percent are women. Over half of the minority faculty (58 percent; N=193) are Asian, 25 percent are Chicano or Latino, 15 percent are African American, and 2 percent are Native American. A higher proportion of non-tenured faculty than tenured faculty are minorities and women<sup>4</sup>. The Academic Senate's Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity provides advice to University administration on policies and programs to advance faculty diversity, including the recruitment and retention of women and underrepresented

---

<sup>3</sup> The 1983 composite SAT has been adjusted upward to reflect recent changes in the way in which the tests are scored. The actual mean is lower, but cannot be compared to the 1997 mean scores.

<sup>4</sup> Source: Academic Personnel Office (October, 1997), *1997-98 UCLA Ladder-Rank Faculty Diversity Statistics*; Provided to the Visiting Team prior to their March, 1998 site visit.

minorities. Among the duties of this Committee is to advise the Chancellor on proposals for waivers of search for “targets of opportunity” (see <http://www.senate.ucla.edu>).

6. UCLA has an extremely diverse workforce. Between 1991 and 1997, the representation of minorities at all levels of the organization increased from 49 percent to 53 percent of career employees, while the representation of women remained steady at 64 percent. These increases were achieved through outreach recruitment, staff development and training, retention efforts, and mentoring by senior managers to increase the pipeline of competitive women and minority candidates. The campus still has the challenge of maintaining the representation of minorities at the senior level of campus management, where minority representation has remained fairly flat since 1991.
7. The curriculum, too, supports diversity. UCLA maintains Interdisciplinary Degree Programs in Afro-American Studies, Native American Studies, and Asian American Studies, which offer both Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees. A women’s studies IDP offers an undergraduate major. In addition, the Cesar Chavez Center for Interdisciplinary Instruction now has six permanent faculty FTE and offers undergraduates the opportunity to major in Chicana and Chicano studies. The institution also supports a number of area studies programs (e.g., African, Indo-European, Latin American) that offer undergraduate and graduate degrees. A minor in Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgendered Studies has also been introduced.
8. Beyond ethnic, area, and women’s studies programs, diversity issues have been integrated into other aspects of the curriculum. For example, a recent analysis of the English Department’s curriculum shows that the number of undergraduate English courses focusing on Asian American, African American, Chicano/Latino, Native American or women’s literature more than tripled between 1975 and 1995. Diversity is also finding its way into the General Education curriculum. For example, one of four new interdisciplinary cluster courses that will be offered in the 1998-99 academic year addresses “Interracial dynamics in American Literature, Culture and Society.” Furthermore, although we cannot quantify this, it is apparent that many instructors have modified the content of long-standing courses to incorporate diverse perspectives. A three-year Ford Grant (with additional institutional funding) was instrumental in involving university teachers more deeply in the teaching of diverse texts and concepts. (Additional information about diversity in the curriculum, including a timeline of campus initiatives, is contained in the accompanying report, *WASC Progress Report for General Education*.)
9. The Academic Senate has carefully considered whether UCLA should require undergraduates to complete an ethnic or gender studies course as a requirement for the Bachelor’s degree. After consideration of several

proposals, the Legislative Assembly of the Senate endorsed three proposals in May, 1993, that continue to guide curriculum and course development. These resolutions affirm the importance of multicultural studies and ensuring that students “develop the ability to analyze complex, multicultural issues from differing perspectives.” Rather than establish new requirements, the Senate urged the integration of multicultural issues into established or new courses. (The text of the resolutions, and additional discussion about Senate processes, is provided in the accompanying paper, *WASC Progress Report for General Education*.)

10. Moreover, research at UCLA also reflects attention to diversity issues. Between 1969 and 1984, UCLA established Organized Research Units in Native American Studies, Asian American Studies, Afro-American Studies, Women’s Studies, and Chicano Studies. Its area studies centers, whose interests complement those of the ethnic centers, date back even further, to the late 1950s. Clearly, UCLA has institutionalized research centers for scholarship on diversity issues. Such work is not confined to the ORUs, however, and is well-represented in every professional school as well as the College of Letters and Science. For example:
  - ◇ The UCLA Center for Healthier Children, Families, and Communities, affiliated with the School of Public Health and School of Medicine, conducts research about the needs of impoverished youth, including the 500,000 children in Los Angeles who live in poverty.
  - ◇ The Center for the Study of Urban Poverty conducts applied research on demographic subgroups that constitute a majority of those that are in concentrated poverty communities in the U.S. cities; and examines poverty/underclass issues in a broader institutional context, emphasizing the role of educational policies, health care policies, social welfare policies, and economic and industrial policies as either facilitative or prohibitive agents to the poor's entry into the mainstream of American society.
11. UCLA’s service activities are responsive to diversity issues both within UCLA and in the larger Los Angeles metropolitan area. Thousands of students are engaged in off-campus service each year, much of which involves diversity issues. As just one of many possible examples, the Office of Instructional Development’s Community Based Learning Program involves UCLA undergraduates as tutors and mentors to severely underserved and “at risk” youth enrolled in continuation or alternative high schools in Los Angeles. The Program introduces work experiences into the high school students’ academic studies to help them understand the connection between school and the world of work. The high school students also have the opportunity to study and work in a mentored context for several weeks during the summer at UCLA to gain exposure to an institution of higher education, and in particular the technology-related

learning options it can provide. Through this and many other programs, UCLA students strengthen their understanding of issues of class, race and ethnicity, link the urban environment to the campus, and help the Los Angeles community address some of the most pressing challenges our diverse society faces.

12. UCLA's Academic Advancement Program (AAP) provides academic and advisory support to students whose "academic profiles and personal backgrounds may affect their UCLA experience, their retention and graduation from UCLA, and their access to graduate education" (*AAP Web site*). AAP is a multi-racial and multi-cultural program composed of first-generation college and low income students of all races and ethnicities. About 6,500 students each year use AAP services. AAP encourages and promotes academic achievement and excellence by providing students with tutoring, academic, personal and career counseling, graduate mentoring, scholarships, research opportunities and stipends, opportunities to participate in innovative science programs, and a computer lab. AAP's Freshman and Transfer Summer Programs provide an academic transition into the University for entering students. AAP also has a federally-funded program – the Program Leading to Undergraduate Success (PLUS) operating under its umbrella. PLUS provides intensive personalized academic, advisory, and social services to 200 incoming freshmen who are first-generation college and low income students. In recognition of its effectiveness in promoting academic success, AAP received the 1997 Retention Excellence Award from the USA Group Noel-Levitz as the most "creative, successful, and innovative" retention program nationally.
13. Other academic support services also help students from diverse backgrounds to succeed. As just one example, the Center for Academic and Research Excellence (CARE), established in 1991, coordinates a variety of programs and services for undergraduate students majoring in the life and physical sciences. Programs within CARE include the California Alliance for Minority Participation, an NSF-funded program for underrepresented students in Science and Engineering; the Howard Hughes Undergraduate Program, offering summer research internships for highly achieving underrepresented students interested in the biomedical sciences; the Minority Access to Research Careers, funded by NIH to prepare underrepresented honor students for graduate education and careers in biomedical research; an NIH-funded Bridge program to help community college students transfer to universities and pursue science careers; and the Minority Scientist Development Program, also funded by NIH.
14. Non-academic support services also promote academic success and well-being among students. A Women's Resource Center; Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Resources Office; Office of International Students and Scholars and Tom Bradley International Center; and Office for Students with Disabilities are other examples of campus programs and services that support diversity. In addition, Student Psychological Services



offers support groups for women, students of color, and gay and lesbian students. Virtually all support services strive for a diverse staff trained in multicultural communications.

15. Dozens of student organizations address the interests and needs of students of color, women, and students of various nationalities. Such organizations provide social support for students, promote involvement in campus life, and often help students connect the classroom to the broader campus and Los Angeles communities.
16. Several recent activities have focused on the quality of the campus intellectual and social environment. Between 1991 and 1995, an Academic Senate Task Force sought to review the campus environment and “devise appropriate activities and mechanisms to sustain a fair and open environment” (*Final Report Academic Senate Task Force on a Fair and Open Academic Environment*, May 23, 1995). The Legislative Assembly of the Senate unanimously endorsed three Task Force recommendations. As a result, each academic unit on campus was asked to conduct a “frank and full assessment of its educational culture,” and an award for faculty, administrators or others “who are especially successful in responding to diversity” has been established. The third Task Force recommendation, that the Council on Diversity should issue an annual report, has not been implemented since the Council is not currently meeting (see item 19 below). In addition to the work of the Task Force, Professor Alexander Astin directed a comprehensive “campus climate” assessment in 1991, which included surveys of UCLA students and faculty and has served as a national model for such studies.
17. The area of arts' outreach further indicates UCLA's range of response to issues of diversity: Thousands of public school students from all over the region are brought onto campus by various public arts programs to participate in demonstration performances, master classes, and tours. For instance, Design for Sharing (in the Center for the Performing Arts) brings over 15,000 public school students to campus each year to performances, while the Fowler Museum and the UCLA/Hammer Museum work with high school teachers to prepare students for visits to exhibitions, festivals, and workshops (which themselves are often explorations of diversity, ethnicity, and cultural identity).
18. UCLA is creating forums for discussing current issues of campus diversity and addressing the educational implications of the recent changes in university and state policy. We have presented two national conferences addressing these issues. The first, “Rethinking Diversity in Higher Education: Proposition 209, Hopwood, and Beyond,” held on April 25, 1997, featured a keynote address by Christopher Edley (Professor, Harvard Law School, former special counsel to President Clinton and director of the White House review of affirmative action) and panels of scholars and policy analysts addressing these topics: “Defining Diversity,” “Academic

Merit and Access,” and “Diversity and the Transformation of American Higher Education.” The second, “Excellence and Diversity in Undergraduate Education,” held February 26 and 27, 1998, brought together faculty, administrators, program directors, and undergraduates from 22 major public research universities to address campuswide and programmatic change to improve the quality of undergraduate education and promote the participation and success of groups historically underrepresented on our campuses. On May 14, 1998, the University of California’s Latino Eligibility Task Force held a forum at UCLA on the topic, “Are the Doors Closing? Minority Student Eligibility and Participation in the University of California.” Additionally, in conjunction with President Clinton’s Initiative on Race, the Chancellor took part in the Campus Week of Dialogue, hosting a town hall meeting on April 8, 1998, focused on increasing diversity in entertainment and the arts, with a panel of speakers from these fields.

19. From 1987 to 1997 the Council on Diversity was UCLA’s vehicle for addressing issues of campus diversity. The Council was created following a two-day Chancellor’s retreat focused on diversity. Its membership included representatives of the central administration, schools and colleges, Academic Senate, undergraduate and graduate students, and staff. Diversity was understood to encompass student, faculty, and staff demographics; the academic program; and the campus environment. In its early years, the Council provided a valuable forum for campus diversity and worked closely with the Chancellor. Over time, however, the Council grew more distant from the channels of authority and decisionmaking, and its influence declined. Recognizing that change was needed, the Council chose to suspend meetings in 1997-98 pending a reconsideration of its role and the establishment of a campus agenda for diversity<sup>5</sup>. To promote just this kind of reconsideration, the campus selected diversity as one of the three themes for its WASC reaccreditation review and appointed a WASC Workgroup on Diversity. That Workgroup has met throughout this academic year, deliberating on how best to move forward and preparing for the Team’s June site visit. The results of its recent retreat are reported above.

#### **IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION**

Over the past two decades, UCLA has become one of the most diverse institutions in the world. These achievements are a source of justifiable pride to our community. UCLA has demonstrated that excellence and diversity are not only compatible but complementary.

---

<sup>5</sup> The Council on Diversity’s 1997 report was provided to the Visiting Team prior to their March, 1998 site visit.

At this time, UCLA is working to address three important challenges: (1) complying with Proposition 209; (b) sustaining racial and ethnic diversity despite restrictions on affirmative action; and (c) integrating diversity issues into the institution's academic core through a comprehensive diversity planning process.

UCLA has long been recognized as a national leader among research universities in promoting diversity in the fullest sense, and it should aspire--because of its character as a public land-grant institution located in one of the most heterogeneous cities in the world--not only to maintain but to enhance this position in the future. We believe that continuing to promote the essential linkage between diversity and academic excellence will significantly enhance UCLA's distinction.

Table 1:  
UCLA Freshman Applicants and Admits\*

	Fall '97		Fall '98		Change in Admits	
	Apps	Admits	Apps	Admits	Admits	% Change
African American	1,349	488	1,331	280	-208	-42.6
Asian-American	11,473	4,154	11,479	4,187	33	0.8
Chicano/Latino	3,711	1,497	4,063	1,001	-496	-33.1
Native American	157	81	194	46	-35	-43.2
White	9,610	3,383	9,488	3,209	-174	-5.1
Other	192	73	486	125	52	71.2
Unknown	1,326	569	4,264	1,463	894	157.1
<b>Total Domestic</b>	<b>27,818</b>	<b>10,245</b>	<b>31,305</b>	<b>10,311</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>0.6</b>
International	1,273	188	1,284	156	-32	-17.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>29,091</b>	<b>10,433</b>	<b>32,589</b>	<b>10,467</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>0.3</b>

\* Includes all applicants, regardless of UC eligibility

UNOFFICIAL Figures - accurate as of 3/23/98

Table 2A:  
Ethnic Distribution of UCLA Undergraduates, 1983 and 1997

Ethnic/Racial Group	1983 (N=22,410)	1997 (N=23,270)
African American	6%	6%
Asian American	18	35
Filipino	3	5
Chicano	5	12
Latino	3	5
Native American	1	1
White	63	35
Other	1	1
Total*	100	100

\*Domestic Students Only

Table 2B:  
Ethnic Distribution of UCLA Graduate Students, 1983 and 1997

Ethnic/Racial Group	1983 (N=8,515)	1997 (N=8,655)
African American	5%	6%
Asian American	11	21
Filipino	1	2
Chicano	5	6
Latino	2	4
Native American	1	1
White	74	57
Other	1	3
Total*	100	100

\*Domestic Students Only

Table 3:  
Average High School Grades and Composite SAT Scores  
For Freshmen Entering UCLA in 1983 and 1997\*

	1983 Freshman Class			1997 Freshman Class		
	Number	HS GPA	SAT- Total**	Number	HS GPA	SAT- Total
African American	308	3.28	970	221	3.74	1,101
Asian-American	705	3.71	1,120	1,294	4.12	1,287
Chicano	260	3.41	1,029	429	3.88	1,116
Filipino	157	3.54	1,047	173	4.17	1,225
Native American	23	3.36	1,061	39	3.89	1,218
Other Hispanic	173	3.43	1,061	143	3.95	1,150
White	1,970	3.64	1,195	1,243	4.04	1,275
Total	3,596	3.59	1,135	3,542	4.04	1,245

\* Students with unknown or other ethnicity and international students are excluded.

\*\* The 1983 SAT scores have been adjusted to control for differences in the way ETS scored the exam in 1983 and 1997. Without this adjustment, the 1983 scores would be lower.

Table 4:  
 Percentage of Freshmen Graduating Within Six Years:  
 Comparisons by Ethnicity and Year of Entrance (1983 and 1991)

<b>Race/ethnicity</b>	<b>1983 Freshmen</b>	<b>1991 Freshmen</b>	<b>Percentage Change</b>
African American	48%	63%	+31
Asian American/Pacific Islander	72	84	+17
Chicano/Latino	52	69	+33
Native American*	65	60	- 8
White	77	81	+ 5
Other/unknown	55	79	+44
Total	70	79	+13

\* Due to the small numbers of Native American students at UCLA, comparisons based on single years are unreliable. A review of graduation rates based on three-year averages shows an increase in six-year graduation rates for Native Americans from 56% for the 1983-1985 freshman classes to 69 percent for the 1989-1991 freshman classes.