



The topic of tonight's discussion concerned Core Values and Public Identity relating to admission policies.

Fellows questioned what distinguishes Berkeley among the preeminent institutions in the world in the modern era of a "public" university. Fellows reflected on the four defining principles of the Haas School of Business (question the status quo, confidence without attitude, students always, and beyond yourself) and how they are used to make admissions for the school's MBA program, but not for undergraduate admissions. Some Fellows questioned that if we are going to state or pride ourselves in any particular value, then why would we not act upon it fully, since such lack of action does not give much credibility to the value or institution.

Many Fellows examined the importance of whether to select students with those institutional values when they are admitted or to ensure that they graduate bearing those values. Some Fellows posited that it might be reasonable to expect these values from prospective graduate students at the time of their admission, but probably not undergraduates. Other Fellows suggested that students already look at institutional values when deciding which schools to apply to and try to align themselves with the universities that best fit their own values.

Some Fellows suggested that the number-focused admissions system ignore circumstances and greatly affects diversity at the University. Other Fellows postulated that receiving tutoring and additional help to boost numbers related to admissions decisions can have a lot to do with living in relatively affluent families. Though the University has tried to take a holistic admissions approach since the passage of Proposition 209, some Fellows stated that the existence of underrepresented groups at the University, including African-American and Filipino students, illustrates that we are not doing enough as a public university to serve those groups and the state as a whole. Fellows suggested that there is also not enough guidance for many transfer students to apply to the University and that financial transparency is more important than ever as tuition has become a greater source of revenue for the University. Fellows also questioned whether the review of every undergraduate applicant could be truly holistic given the great number of applications the University receives and the turnaround time to process all of them.

Some Fellows suggested it is important to focus the issue of the identity of a modern public university on the University of California system as a whole rather than just on the Berkeley campus. Fellows noted that the University of California is the only institution that has

created world-renowned campuses throughout a state separated greatly geographically, and that being parochial about a particular campus gives quite a narrow perspective on this issue. Many Fellows proposed that the California Master Plan for Higher Education of 1960 is outdated, as the University of California cannot guarantee a place for the top one-eighth of graduating high school seniors due to capacity. Some Fellows proposed that it may be time to develop a second Master Plan to not only the potential admission numbers desired but also the core principles of the state to use the University's great education to either get students ready for the workforce or develop values at the individual level, the latter of which could make the University quite unique.