

# UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, ACADEMIC SENATE

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

Mary Croughan  
Telephone: (510) 987-9303  
Fax: (510) 763-0309  
Email: [mary.croughan@ucop.edu](mailto:mary.croughan@ucop.edu)

*Chair of the Assembly and the Academic Council  
Faculty Representative to the Board of Regents  
University of California  
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor  
Oakland, California 94607-5200*

August 21, 2009

**PRESIDENT MARK YUDOF  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

**Re: Principles for Non-Resident Undergraduate Enrollment at the University of California**

Dear Mark:

At its July 29 meeting, the Academic Council unanimously endorsed the enclosed set of principles to help guide the University's decisions about the enrollment of domestic and international non-resident undergraduates. The Principles were originally proposed by the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) and underwent a systemwide Senate review in the spring and summer of 2009.

The Academic Council understands that you, Regent Gould's UC Commission on the Future, the Enrollment Management Council, and other University agencies will be considering the important question of whether to increase the enrollment of non-resident undergraduates as part of the solution to UC's fiscal crisis. As this question is being considered, we urge you to seek a balance between the potential fiscal benefits of such a move and the University's commitment to California residents, remembering that UC has historically served as an engine of social mobility that not only lifts the state economy, but also serves growing underrepresented populations who desire and deserve access to higher education.

For its part, BOARS remains committed to upholding the ideal of merit-based admissions through comprehensive review and the articulation of the University's commitment to California residents, even as fiscal pressures force campuses to consider increasing non-resident enrollment and admitting more tuition-bearing non-residents.

We look forward to working with you, the Enrollment Management Council, and the Commission on this issue. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Mary Croughan".

Mary Croughan  
Chair, Academic Council

Copy: Lawrence Pitts, Interim Provost and Executive Vice President of Academic Affairs  
Martha Winnacker, Academic Senate Executive Director  
Academic Council  
John Sandbrook, Interim Chief of Staff

Enclosure: 1

# **Principles for Non-Resident Undergraduate Enrollment at the University of California**

**Proposed by the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools  
and adopted by the Academic Council July 29, 2009**

## **Preamble: Balancing Objectives**

The University of California is a global educational presence, and so it is natural that UC campuses will attract and want to enroll students from many different parts of the United States and the world. At the same time, increases in California undergraduate applications show high demand for a UC education has grown over the years and will likely continue at high levels even in the wake of the decline of the college-age population in the state. Moreover, in February 2008, UC's internal budgeting processes were changed to distinguish between non-resident tuition (NRT) funds (collected and expended locally) from other general funds (distributed centrally). UCOP began assigning separate enrollment targets to campuses for state-supported and non-resident undergraduates, which allow campuses to determine the appropriate level of non-resident enrollment, and in accordance with campus priorities, to increase or reduce NRT revenue accordingly. UC's stricter adherence to the state enrollment target is clearly an attempt to align state support more closely with the number of California residents enrolled, as UC was over-enrolled by some 11,000 students systemwide in 2008-09. Whereas, the University and the state of California now faces an era of severe budget constraint, increases in the enrollment of international and non-resident students may become a partial solution to UC's fiscal crisis, and discussions about appropriate levels of non-resident enrollment will likely continue in the context of a broader discussion about how to return the University to a sound fiscal basis. UC must seek a balance between fiscal concerns, its goal of enrolling a broad range of undergraduates, and its commitment to serving California residents, particularly its role as an engine of social mobility to lift the state economy and serve underrepresented populations who continue to grow in number and who desire and deserve access to UC.

These principles were developed by BOARS in response to changes in February 2008, and discussed during 2008-09 as fiscal concerns heightened. A chief concern was the intent to uphold the ideal of merit through comprehensive review processes over fiscal pressures to select non-residents over qualified CA residents, and to continue to articulate UC's commitment to California residents through its decision-making processes even as we increase non-resident enrollment in the future. In April 2009, Academic Council referred the principles for systemwide campus Senate review in which campus-based and Senate committees indicated support for the guidelines and suggested revisions; some articulated the need for a potential cap or "reasonable limit" on non-resident enrollment. Such a significant policy change would require broader discussions about the future of UC, thus the current guidelines are intended to guide the selection and rationale for non-resident enrollment practices in a rapidly changing context. In July 2009, BOARS met with all admissions directors who also opined on the guidelines, and Academic Council suggested additional changes and subsequently approved the guidelines.

We submit the following set of principles to help guide decisions about the enrollment of international and domestic non-resident students:

1. Overall, UC's undergraduate enrollment decisions should strive to maximize educational quality and diversity, and to protect accessibility and affordability for California residents. At the same time, we should not enroll California residents for whom we do not have state funding.
2. Individual campuses should match enrollment to resources and consider carefully the impact of additional enrollment on educational quality before deciding to admit more non-resident students.
3. Enrolling a geographically diverse student body has a legitimate educational value, but non-resident enrollment should not be used exclusively as a revenue-producing strategy to the detriment of resident access and the loss of UC's character as a California university.
4. UC is committed to providing education to the citizens of California. Racial, ethnic and cultural diversity is now a defining part of the state's population. UC's enrollment policy should seek to increase representation of California's diverse demographic communities through the enrollment of California resident freshmen and transfer students; and the enrollment of international and non-resident domestic students should not obscure the extent to which this diverse representation of in-state residents is or is not achieved.
5. Fiscal considerations should not be a primary factor guiding the review of files or admissions decisions on individual cases at any UC campus.
6. Non-resident domestic and international students should demonstrate stronger admissions credentials than California resident students by generally being in the "upper half of those ordinarily eligible" as stated in the Master Plan.
7. Undergraduate NRT revenues should continue to fund undergraduate programs and students in ways that enhance, or at least maintain the availability and quality of courses and academic programs, student services, and financial aid for resident undergraduates. Campuses have flexibility in the use of NRT funds for other aspects of their budget, but we encourage its traditional use for academic areas as when it remained part of the general fund allocation.