Robert L. Powell
Telephone: (510) 987-0711
Fax: (510) 763-0309
Email: *Robert.Powell@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

April 11, 2013

AIMÉE DORR
PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT

NATHAN BROSTROM
EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, BUSINESS OPERATIONS

Dear Aimée and Nathan:

As you requested, a subset of Senate committees have discussed scenarios for funding student financial aid with Administrative Coordinator Kate Jeffery, and we invited all divisions to consider the scenarios in consultation with the same subset of their expert committees. All nine undergraduate campuses and the four expert committees (BOARS, UCAAD, UCEP, UCPB) responded, and the Academic Council discussed the options at its March meeting. Council noted that the governor's opposition to tuition increases for the next four years appears to mean that none of the options are viable in the short term. However, based on divisional and committee responses, Council offers qualified support for Option A, and requests an annual report to BOARS analyzing the impact of the new strategy if it is adopted.

Council notes that Option A would reduce the net cost of attending UC for both lower and middle income families. However, it would require more revenue, either from state support or tuition increases, and many respondents opined that tuition increases should not be driven by the need for financial aid. Nonetheless, most preferred the scenario in Option A to Option B, which would increase the net cost for lower income students. Such a policy choice is antithetical to UC's mission to provide the broadest possible access to a university education. Most respondents found Option C to be even less desirable, because it is revenue-driven and therefore unpredictable.

Divisions and committees expressed support for a policy-driven funding strategy. They also support the goals of UC's Education Finance Model, the development of a more accurate needs assessment methodology, and increasing corporate fundraising efforts. However, none of the proposed funding strategies will succeed absent state commitment to invest in higher education and/or its agreement not to hinder UC's efforts to provide access via tuition increases coupled with a generous return-to-aid policy. Without these shifts in Sacramento, UC will have to abandon its historic commitment to ensure that UC is financially accessible to all admitted students, regardless of income.

Sincerely,

R.L. Powell

Robert L. Powell, Chair
Academic Council

Cc: Kate Jeffery, Administrative Coordinator
Academic Council
Martha Winnacker, Senate Executive Director

ACADEMIC
SENATE
BERKELEY

320 STEPHENS HALL
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

March 20, 2013

ROBERT POWELL
Chair, Academic Council

Subject: Financial aid funding options

Dear Bob,

On March 11, 2013, the Divisional Council of the Berkeley Division discussed the proposed financial aid funding options, informed by reports of our divisional committees on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA); Student Affairs (STA); and Undergraduate Scholarships, Honors, and Financial Aid (CUSHFA).

There was no consensus among the reporting committees. DIVCO, however, was persuaded by the arguments put forth in the CAPRA report, which is appended in its entirety. We do want to underscore their final point. DIVCO strongly prefers a decentralized approach. We believe that each campus should have the flexibility to tailor financial aid funding to local circumstances, within broad parameters established at the systemwide level.

We are also concerned about the funding model underlying the proposals. In our view, proposing entitlement-based aid, in the absence of funding to support it, is unsustainable and counterproductive.

Sincerely,

Christina Maslach

Christina Maslach
Chair, Berkeley Division of the Academic Senate
Professor of Psychology

Encl.

Cc: Alexis Bell and Panos Papadopoulos, Co-chairs, Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation
David Presti, Chair, Committee on Student Affairs
Steven Botterill, Chair, Committee on Undergraduate Scholarships, Honors, and Financial Aid

Diane Sprouse, Senate Analyst, Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation
Cruz Grimaldo, Associate Director, Office of Financial Aid and Scholarships, staffing Committee on Undergraduate Scholarships, Honors, and Financial Aid

March 7, 2013

TO: CHRISTINA MASLACH, CHAIR
BERKELEY DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

RE: CAPRA COMMENTS on Financial Aid Funding Options

CAPRA reviewed and discussed the undergraduate financial aid funding options articulated in the UCOP documents dated 2/7/2013 and has the following comments:

- Overall, the numerical projections provided in the Executive Summary were difficult to evaluate because the underlying assumptions were not well justified for the population of students who will be eligible for this type of financial aid funding. The assumptions of concern include: the debt service capacity of this sub-population of UC graduates; the projected post graduation income levels for this sub-population of UC graduates; the importance and likelihood of substantial tuition increases at UC; and the apparent lack of adjustments for cost of living and other factors affecting the parents' financial situation in the determination of the ability-to-pay metrics.
- Options A and B appear to expose the system to a potentially unmanageable financial burden by creating a financial commitment which is independent of the generated tuition revenue. While this may be appropriate on aspirational grounds, it also entails difficult to assess financial risks.
- Option A appears to be more in line than Option B with the historical commitment of the University of California to lower and lower-middle class students.
- Options A and B rely crucially on the capacity of the system to raise tuition in order to meet the financial aid targets assessed by these options. This, in itself, appears to be an untenable condition, given the negative climate on further tuition increases in the short term.
- Option C is very similar to the currently used model except for an additional resource associated with UCOP-led corporate fundraising. It is debatable whether such fundraising activity would be effective at the systemwide rather than at the individual campus level.
- Berkeley's Middle Class Access Plan already addresses, at least in part, the disproportionate cost of attending UC for students from middle-class families, which is one of the main tenets of Option A.
- The enhanced assessment of parent sources included in all three proposed options is a welcome improvement over the current FAFSA data-based assessment, and should be implemented regardless of whether any of the options are adopted.

Overall, the proposed options are in line with the current system-centric set of policies on financial aid to undergraduates. Options A and B will likely introduce further financial uncertainties and potentially increased and unmanageable liabilities. CAPRA favors an altogether different approach which would delegate financial aid decisions (and the campus-generated return-to-aid income) to the individual campuses within a flexible framework of system-wide regulations.

OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
ONE SHIELDS AVENUE
DAVIS, CALIFORNIA 95616-8502
TELEPHONE: (530) 752-2231

March 22, 2013

ROBERT L. POWELL, CHAIR
University of California
Academic Council
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607

RE: UC Undergraduate Financial Aid Strategies and Policies

The proposal was forwarded to all Davis Division of the Academic Senate standing committees and Faculty Executive Committees within the schools and colleges for comment. Detailed responses were received from the Committees Admissions and Enrollment, and Planning and Budget, as well as the Faculty Executive Committee from the College of Letters and Science.

Generally, a majority support Option A. Option A reduces the net cost for middle-income students without disproportionately increasing the net cost for low-income students. In addition, Figure 1 indicates that the projected difference for a family with an income of $50,000 is almost $2,000 less under Option A than Option B, while Figure 2 projects the difference for a family with an income of $100,000 to be less than $100. The projected $2,000 difference represents a significant greater percentage of income for the family earning $50,000 a year.

One area of caution with Option A is that increasing the tuition burden of higher-income students, including international and national students, could make UC less attractive or financially inaccessible to them.

In addition, a majority do not support Option C, largely because it is unpredictable. We are highly supportive of an undergraduate financial aid plan with a higher degree of predictability, especially in funding sources.

A minority support Option B over Option A. By making UC somewhat less accessible, Option B could end up causing a reduction in percentages of enrolled students in the lower income range, which would reduce the need to use tuition revenue for financial aid.

A separate minority feels there is no basis for supporting any of the options presented because we are currently in a period where tuition increases are frozen. This minority expressed support for stronger financial aid to avoid restricting access to UC to the affluent, and urges reminding the State of California of their responsibility to ensure access to the UC for all qualified California students.

We are supportive of the following, independent of which option is implemented:

- Attempts to define manageable debt,
- Adopting the College Board's "Institutional Methodology" or a UC-specific methodology for obtaining more accurate information of family resources,
- A system-wide fundraising effort to augment the amount of available financial support for students on all campuses,
- The goal of increasing UC grant aid available to students with family incomes above $80,000.

Generally, we support efforts to make UC more affordable to students from all income levels. Most importantly, many feel that any options that assume annual increases in tuition will not be viable in the current and future political climate.

Sincerely,

Bruno Nachtergaele, Chair
Davis Division of the Academic Senate
Professor: Mathematics

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, IRVINE

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

Office of the Academic Senate
307 Aldrich Hall
Irvine, CA 92697-1325
(949) 824-2215 FAX

March 25, 2013

Robert Powell, Chair, Academic Council
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607-5200

RE: Systemwide Review of UC's Financial Aid Funding Policies and Strategies

At its meeting of March 19, 2013, the Irvine Division Academic Senate reviewed a set of three proposals for revising the method by which UC funds and allocates student financial aid. The following Councils commented on the proposal.

Board on Undergraduate Scholarships, Honors and Financial Aid

Option A: The Board unanimously voted to endorse Option A. Members felt this option provided the best solution for our financial aid strategy, offering a solution that sets a clear and fair benchmark for manageable debt, thus strongly benefitting low and middle income students. The board felt that the slightly higher "sticker price" paid by students from high-income families under this plan was still likely to remain cheaper than private schools and would be unlikely to have a significant negative impact on enrollment by students from this group.

Option B: The Board strongly opposed Option B. While this plan would decrease UC's expenditure on financial aid, leading to lower tuition, members felt that this option does not significantly benefit any group in particular and in fact penalizes students from lower income families through effectively increasing the amount of student loan debt they would incur.

Option C: The Board did not feel it could make a strong recommendation for Option C due to the uncertain implications of changing tuition fees. Members felt Option C was too closely aligned with the status-quo and is not an option that addresses issues such as the actual needs of families. While the plan is based on a somewhat arbitrary number (33%) that has worked historically, the funding level would vary from year to year, making it difficult for UC to plan ahead. While the status quo currently leads to lower student debt levels than UC's target, projections that these levels could increase substantially above the target in coming years are concerning.

Council on Undergraduate Admissions & Relations with Schools

- CUARS was supportive of option A but was concerned that the high increase in costs for upper-income families could drive some families to private institutions where they may well be eligible for financial aid and scholarships. This could result in fewer "full-payers" than is desirable; moreover it could even backfire and result in fewer full-payers than needed to achieve the stated financial goals. If the full cost of a UC education rises to the point where it is deemed overpriced, then this will harm the University's reputation, and impact efforts to recruit qualified out-of-state and international students.

- CUARS was less supportive of option B, as it may create too much of a burden on students who come from low-income families. This could result in low income families not having the opportunity to attend a UC. On the other hand, it may simply not be possible for UC to provide a generous financial aid package to all low income students while also providing relief to "middle income" families (Blue and Gold Light), given recent trends (some possibly driven in part by Admissions policies) that have led to an increase in the percentage of UC students who are low income.
- CUARS was concerned that option C was unsustainable.
- CUARS wondered why our opinion was being solicited on some choices (options A, B or C) but not others (Blue and Gold Light).
- CUARS is concerned about the possibility that tuition increases might be driven by the need to provide increasingly large amounts of financial aid.
- CUARS believes that the best way to meet the goal of financial accessibility for all eligible students, that addresses the entire cost of attendance without overly relying on student/parent borrowing, would be for UC and the California Legislature to work together to return to the Master Plan principle of affordable, high-quality education to residents of the state.

<u>Council on Educational Policy</u>

CEP concluded that of the three options, Option A is the is most appropriate financial aid option.

Option A provides the greatest amount of grant support to students from lower income families from tuition paid by higher income students. The other options, would not provide as much grant support to lower income students. Option A would set the benchmark for work at 13 hours a week while Option C calls for twenty hours of student work. CEP noted that studies have demonstrated that students are the most academically successful when they work 15 hours a week, as compared to twenty hours per week, where students demonstrated significantly less academic success.

Option A would allow students to avoid taking on more debt to pay for school while Option B calls for higher expectations for student borrowing by assuming a fifteen year repayment plan. Option B assumes higher debt levels and less aid from UC compared to option A.

<u>Council on Planning and Budget</u>

In 1994, the Regents established financial accessibility as UC's overarching goal for its undergraduate financial aid programs. The expected contributions from parents and students are expressed through UC's Education Financing Model (EFM).

UC has chosen to fund financial aid from tuition and fee revenue. This choice is not under discussion in the proposal under review. UC's University Student Aid Program (USAP) is presently augmented by a 33% return-to-aid from any new undergraduate systemwide tuition and fee revenue.

In recent years, this 33% return-to-aid practice has allowed UC to keep students' expected self-help at levels that are below what is given by the present EFM. This has raised questions about whether the 33% return-to-aid strategy has been "overfunding" UC's financial aid programs. Since this funding strategy is decoupled from the actual financial aid need, this approach could also lead to underfunding in the future.

The proposal also incorporates an expansion of the Blue and Gold program to middle class students, called Blue and Gold Light. Thus financial aid is based on the EFM and the Blue and Gold program. The proposal also calls for an improved assessment of parental resources.

Note: The present formulation of the called Blue and Gold Light seems flawed, since the commitment goes from 100% to 50% at the $80,000 threshold. We believe the Blue and Gold Light should be implemented on a sliding scale from $80,000 to an appropriate cutoff threshold.

The proposal lists three options: Option A is the higher tuition option; it sets tuition levels to generate the funding needed to achieve UC's financial aid commitment with the present EFM. Option B is the lower tuition option; it reformulates the EFM so the funding needed to achieve UC's financial aid commitment can be achieved with a lower tuition. Option C would continue a revenue-driven return-to-aid approach that is not directly tied to UC's financial accessibility goals; it is the status quo plus $5 million from UCOP fundraising.

It should be noted that the EFM is different for different campuses. UC Irvine has lower fees and lower costs, so UC Irvine is presently a net payer to the system. From this point of view Option B is clearly the better option for UC Irvine.

Option A would raise tuition the most, so it is more likely to raise a backlash against UC. Option C, basically the status quo, seems the most consistent with the original intent and philosophies of UC's student aid policies and therefore is an attractive option for the UC system's accessibility goals; it has the drawback that UC Irvine would remain a net payer. Option B would likely benefit the UC Irvine campus' unique situation of being a net payer to the system.

The Irvine Division appreciates the opportunity to comment.

Mary C. Gilly

Mary C. Gilly, Senate Chair

C: Martha Kendall Winnacker, Executive Director, Academic Senate

UCLA *Academic Senate*

March 25, 2013

Robert Powell
Chair, Academic Council

Re: Financial Aid Funding Options

Dear Bob,

Upon receipt of the proposed "University of California Financial Aid Funding Options" materials, I requested review by the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools (CUARS), the Undergraduate Council, and the Council on Planning and Budget. The Executive Board reviewed and discussed the responses from those committees along with the proposal. There is general consensus at UCLA that Option A is the best option.

Because Option A would engender improvements in the funding level for students from low-income families, improved access to the aid for students from middle-income families through the Blue and Gold "light" expansion, and a minimal increase for students coming from high-income families, this option appeared to best serve the needs of our students and address concerns of the faculty. We note, however, that the letter to the chancellors from Provost and Executive Vice President Dorr and Executive Vice President Brostrom indicates that in times of tuition freeze, the option selected would be suspended and the plan would default back to the status quo. This would result in the greatest penalty for students from low- and middle-income families. It was therefore suggested by the Council on Planning and Budget that if Option A is selected and if tuition remains frozen, the fallback position should not be the status quo, but rather Option C, which would result in a smaller penalty to students from low- and middle-income families than the status quo.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this matter. Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Linda Sarna

Linda Sarna
UCLA Academic Senate Chair

Cc: Martha Kendall Winnacker, Executive Director, Academic Senate
Jaime R. Balboa, Chief Administrative Officer, UCLA Academic Senate

U N I V E R S I T Y   O F   C A L I F O R N I A ,   M E R C E D

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO   SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
PEGGY O'DAY, CHAIR
senatechair@ucmerced.edu

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, MERCED
5200 NORTH LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95343
(209) 228-7930; fax (209) 228-7955

March 22, 2013

ACADEMIC COUNCIL CHAIR POWELL

RE: PROPOSED REVISION OF FINANCIAL AID FORMULA

The Merced Division solicited input from our Senate committees and School Senate Chairs regarding proposed revisions to undergraduate financial aid. Comments were received from the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA). The Division Council discussed the proposal and Chairs provided committee feedback at its March 20 meeting.

We agree with the principle of revising the financial aid formula to ensure the accessibility of a UC education to all qualified students. On the Merced campus in 2011-12, 80% of our undergraduate students were eligible for need-based financial aid and 58% were Pell grant recipients. Therefore, stable financial aid and manageable self-help are critical for our students.

In general, none of the options would negatively impact many students currently at Merced since the majority of them are eligible for full financial aid. We are more in favor of a policy-driven option, rather than a budget-driven option. We do not advocate options that would compel students to take on more self-help. Many of our students are first-generation college attendees and they often struggle with balancing the demands of coursework and employment. They typically come from families that are not capable of, or uneasy about, assuming large amounts of debt. On this basis, we favor Option A, which would direct more aid to lower income students.

Sincerely,

Peggy O'Day

Peggy O'Day
Chair, Merced Division of the Academic Senate

cc: Systemwide Academic Senate Executive Director Winnacker
Division Council
Senate Office

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED• RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCI *SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ*

CHAIR, ACADEMIC SENATE
RIVERSIDE DIVISION
UNIVERSITY OFFICE BUILDING, RM 225

JOSE WUDKA
PROFESSOR OF PHYSICS AND ASTRONOMY
RIVERSIDE, CA 92521-0217
TEL: (951) 827-5538
E-MAIL: JOSE.WUDKA@UCR.EDU

March 22, 2013

Robert Powell, Chair, Academic Council
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607-5200

Dear Bob:

RE: UC Undergraduate Financial Aid Funding Options

Executive Council discussed the UC Undergraduate financial aid document during its March 11 meeting, also discussed were the opinions of the Undergraduate Admissions Committee (UAC), the Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity (CODEO) and the Committee on Planning and Budget (P&B). The general consensus of all reviewers is that of the 3 options presented, option A would be best suited to the needs of our students and the goals of the institution. Option B was considered less desirable (UAC, P&B) or completely unworkable (CODEO); while option C was generally considered the worst of the three. P&B noted that the reliability of the evaluation of these options could be improved by providing data on the average student debt upon graduation and the expected loan default levels. In addition, UAC noted that the Blue-Gold Light program will require tuition increases, which needs to be emphasized in the document.

Sincerely yours,

Jose Wudka
Professor of Physics & Astronomy and Chair of the Riverside Division

CC: Martha Kendall Winnacker, Executive Director of the Academic Senate
Cynthia Palmer, Director of UCR Academic Senate office

UC RIVERSIDE | UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA | Academic Senate

March 3, 2013

TO: JOSE WUDKA, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FROM: BYRON ADAMS, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON DIVERSITY AND EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

RE: CODEO Response to the System-Wide Review of UC Undergraduate Financial Aid

The members of CODEO quickly reached a consensus that this document provides a useful review of undergraduate financial aid in the UC system. We believe further that this analysis is timely and, indeed, critical for the viability of our educational mission as a university. However, we also believe that the impact of the financial aid options must also be addressed and assessed for each individual campus. As one member noted aptly, “campuses with disparate lower-income and higher income students could be subject to advantages or disadvantages in overall funding, thus modifying socio-economic access to higher education.”

Without exception, the members of CODEO endorsed Option A, believing that this option will have the most substantial impact on ensuring accessibility to lower-income students. Access to education by lower-income students is of course a crucial part of our brief as a committee in the first place; as one committee member remarked, “Option A appears to the be best choice for maximizing UC accessibility to ethnically and economically diverse students.” Members of CODEO remarked that this option indicated that the cost to the University of California could be manageable with carefully planned and tuition increases. Another attractive facet of Option A is that the slightly higher cost for students with a higher income (one of the effects of this option) has not historically been shown to reduce their likelihood of attending the University of California.

Option B is considered as far less attractive and, indeed, less viable. As a committee, we fear that this option might well discourage applicants from lower-income families. Increasing the period over which loans would be repaid from ten to fifteen years will, in our opinion, discourage prospective students from less than affluent backgrounds – it may even dishearten them from attending college altogether. As one member of the committee observed, “Fifteen years is only slightly fewer years than that age of most of the applications to college. Fifteen years is a span that will loom large in their calculations.”

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
UC RIVERSIDE | Academic Senate

Committee on Planning & Budget

March 8, 2013

To: Jose Wudka
Chair, Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Jan Blacher
Chair, Committee on Planning and Budget

Re: UC Undergraduate Financial Aid Funding

In an attempt to make a UC education financially accessible to as many eligible students as possible, the Office of the President has circulated a statement of proposed financial aid funding options. These options have been based on a number of considerations, including (but not limited to):

a) benchmarks (e.g., cost of attending, parent contribution, student contribution)
b) funding levels (e.g., filling gaps not met by other grants; return-to-aid amount)
c) tuition revenue (e.g., increase, maintain)

Three possible outcome-driven options were presented (Option A, Option, B, Option C). In part because the impact of Option C is less predictable, P & B focused discussion on Options A and B, with somewhat more favorable response to Option A, for the following reasons:
(1) it assumes a 10-year loan repayment period for students, where the 15-year plan under Option B seemed too onerous;
(2) the cap placed on student self-help at 13 hours per week during the academic year seemed feasible;
(3) this option seems to best allow UC to mitigate costs to lower- and middle-income families by fully covering all those students from families who make less than $80,000, and half of any tuition increases for "middle income" families (between $80,000 and $120,000.)

Two issues raised by P & B, which did not seem to be addressed by the document circulated, were:
1) How much does the average student owe upon graduation from the UC, and
2) What is the level of loan default to be expected under each of the three scenarios

March 6, 2013

To: Jose Wudka, Chair
Riverside Division, Academic Senate

From: Mindy Marks, Chair
Undergraduate Admissions Committee

Re: Systemwide Review of UC Undergraduate Financial Aid Funding Options

The Undergraduate Admissions Committee supports the efforts to refine the expected parent contribution. However, the implementation of the Blue and Gold "light" plan is not supported by the Committee.

Implementation of the Blue and Gold "light" plan will require increased tuition. It will be a tough sell politically and perhaps ethically, to raise tuition to finance aid for households with incomes between 80,000 and 120,000 dollars (above the pay grade of most members of the university and well above median income in California). Additionally, the implementation of the Blue and Gold "light" plan will further reduce the tuition revenue collected by the university and deepen the financial aid hole and increase the need for higher tuition. According to page 12 of the report "The proportion of students with parent income above $123,000 (in constant dollars) enrolling at UC has remained at about 30% since 2003-04." Thus only 30% of students will remain in the pool to finance the other 70% - this seems untenable in the long run.

On page 14, there is a discussion about the justification for the Blue and Gold "light" plan where it is stated that the current contribution levels of 17% of household income is too demanding and that "Families cannot be expected to make contributions at this level just from current income. Rather, the contribution level presumes that middle-income families have either saved or will borrow to meet their children's educational expenses." Many families at this income level can finance tuition out of current income and it perfectly reasonable to expect that households with $100,000 of annual income can save or borrow to meet their children's educational expenses.

If the goal is to ensure affordability for upper-middle class families, the Committee might suggest indexing the Blue and Gold program cutoff of $80,000 to inflation and/or using a sliding scale. Something like households with income between 60,000 and 70,000 get a 75% discount on tuition while household with 70,000-80,000 get a 50% discount and household with 80,000-100,000 get a 25% discount.

With regards to Options A, B and C, the Committee does not support option C because "This option would allow self-help to fluctuate from year to year in recognition that UC's current policy standard for self-help is a range (page 7)" This means that a student's financial aid responsibility can vary in an unpredictable manner over their course of study. I find this to be a very unattractive feature.

The Committee supports option B. It will require the smallest increase in tuition (less aid from UC compared to Option A see page 6) and it reasonable to expect to student to pay student loans for 15 years (capped at 7% of income).

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO UCSD

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

9500 GILMAN DRIVE
LA JOLLA, CALIFORNIA 92093-0002
TELEPHONE: (858) 534-3640
FAX: (858) 534-4528

March 25, 2013

Professor Robert Powell
Chair, Academic Council
University of California
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, California 94607-5200

Subject: Undergraduate Financial Aid Funding Options

Dear Bob,

The Undergraduate Financial Aid Funding Options document was sent to the appropriate Divisional committees for comment; the Senate-Administration Council discussed the proposal on March 18, 2013.

Most Senate reviewers favored Option A; Option B was not favored at all. The San Diego campus administration and Financial Aid Office also strongly favors Option A. The Committee on Planning and Budget noted that the cut-offs in Option A are very abrupt and strongly suggests that a sliding scale be used rather than the cut-offs.

Sincerely,

T. Guy Masters, Chair
Academic Senate, San Diego Division

cc: Divisional Vice Chair Pogliano
Executive Director Winnacker

ACADEMIC SENATE
Santa Barbara Division
1233 Girvetz Hall
Santa Barbara, CA 93106-3050

senate.reception@senate.ucsb.edu
(805) 893-2885
http://www.senate.ucsb.edu

Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Chair
Deborah Karoff, Executive Director

March 21, 2013

Robert Powell, Chair
Academic Senate

RE: Financial Aid Funding Proposals

Dear Bob,

The Financial Aid Proposals were sent to the following councils for comment: Council on Planning and Budget (CPB), Undergraduate Council (UgC), Committee on Diversity and Equity, and the Faculty Executive Committees for the College of Letters and Science (L&S FEC), Engineering (Engr FEC) and College of Creative Studies (CCS FEC). I have received comments from the Council on Planning and Budget (CPB), Undergraduate Council (UgC), and the Faculty Executive Committee for the College of Letters and Science (L&S FEC). Of the options discussed in the proposal, CPB strongly favors Option A and UgC prefers Option A or B. None of the groups recommend that Option C be deployed.

CPB "recognizes the importance of making financial aid decisions based on solid policy models... From this perspective, options A and B are preferable to option C (and the status quo) in that these options would align UC's financial aid commitments to the Education Financial Model benchmark. This model provides clear expectations on education borrowing costs and facilitates a cost-benefits analysis by students and their families". CPB also states, that, in terms of "the choice between options A and B, the Council strongly recommends option A, as the alternative would result in an unacceptable increase in projected costs for low-income families, who should be the primary beneficiaries of UC's financial aid policy….This model provides clear expectations on education borrowing costs and facilitates a cost-benefits analysis by students and their families." CPB also recommends ongoing monitoring of the program to make sure that assumptions and projections continue to be valid and, asks that policy be adjusted in the event there are significant deviations from the proposed model.

Two members of UgC created Powerpoint slides to explain the different Options to its members. Some members supported Option A because they appreciated "its benefits for students from lower-income families" whilst other members supported Option B because they saw value in "in extending greater aid to students from middle-income families." As a group UgC was divided on which option is preferable, but did state that Option C was the "least favorable choice". UgC members also wondered if "sharp financial thresholds would be used to determine funding, as this would create inequities between families on either side of the threshold for any of the options chosen".

The L&S FEC did not speak directly to the proposed options. However they write, "(we) applaud the more comprehensive assessment of parental wealth but overall see these options as strategies to improve the accessibility of a UC education to low and middle income Californians in the current budget crisis. While such a goal is laudable, the FEC would hope to see commitment to a long-term vision in which access to a quality UC education is possible for all Californians, along with concrete plans for the ongoing viability of public education."

Given the feedback presented from the reviewing groups, the Division recommends that either Option A or B be utilized. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Kum-Kum Bhavnani.

Kum-Kum Bhavnani, Chair
UCSB Division

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA CRUZ

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

1156 HIGH STREET
SANTA CRUZ, CALIFORNIA 95064

Office of the Academic Senate
SANTA CRUZ DIVISION
125 CLARK KERR HALL
(831) 459 - 2086

March 19, 2013

Robert Powell, Chair
Academic Council

RE: UCSC Response to Financial Aid Options

Dear Bob,
The Santa Cruz Division has reviewed the proposed UC financial aid funding policy options (February 7, 2013). Due to the abbreviated review cycle, only the UCSC committees on Affirmative Action and Diversity (CAAD), Admissions and Financial Aid (CAFA), Educational Policy (CEP), and Planning & Budget (CPB) responded with comments as part of our campus review.

Our committees appreciate the principles that each of the three proposals provide: expanded commitment to students from middle-income families; a more comprehensive assessment of parental wealth designed to capture resources not recognized under the federal need analysis methodology currently used; and, the application of a UC Office of the President corporate fundraising effort to support the UC's commitment to financial aid. However, the committees unanimously voiced concern that the review timeline and lack of available background or forecast data severely curtailed the ability of faculty to speak knowledgeably about the actual impact of the three proposals.

CAFA had a technical concern in noting that the language in the proposals is ambiguous about the eligibility for aid. Seemingly it would apply to all undergraduate students, including non-residents. This language should be clarified before any proposal is selected. CAFA also strongly opposed increases to work expectations, finding that many students with real need find it hard to fulfill their work hours weighed against school, family and other obligations. However, it is clear that some students are ignoring this requirement and use unassessed family resources or other loan sources to fill this gap. It is not clear, based on any data presented, that an increase to this expectation is prudent. In like manner, we take issue with the assumption that UC alumni will receive annual income increases of 4% through cost of living adjustments and pay raises based on performance; the UC, one of California's largest employers, does not offer its own staff such increases and faculty do not receive cost of living adjustments. Moreover, the notion of a "manageable" repayment amount of $309 per month seems relatively steep and does not reflect the current reality of remuneration in California or the country. In addition, CAAD was alarmed to learn that African American and Chicano/Latino UC students are more likely to borrow than other students at equal family income levels, and the committee is supportive of the UC's plan to develop a more comprehensive methodology to increase equity across ethnic groups.

Several committees questioned the inclusion of Regental or UCOP fundraising efforts being embedded into any plan. If fundraising in an amount that can impact this fairly large system-wide budget is an achievable goal ($5M representing a mere fraction of one percent of the funds needed for financial aid in 2012-13, a number that is only expected to increase in the coming years), the Regents should engage fully in this laudable effort to support UC students and their families. That said, including fundraising targets as a budget line item, in the absence of any history in this area or data indicating their likely results, creates a huge risk for the system. Should they fall short of their target, the shortfall would need to be filled by either UCOP or campus operational funds, or a reduction to individual student aid. None of these alternatives are viable options given the financial strains for both constituencies.

We concur with the stated principles of expanding the aid commitment to students from middle-income families and a more accurate assessment of student need. The mechanism for evaluating need for aid must be implemented in such a way which is far more accurate than the FAFSA currently allows. Such tools already exist, and we urge that UC not "reinvent the wheel". Based on our consultations with the UCSC Financial Aid Office, the ability of staff to monitor submissions after the fact is limited, and a much more stringent tool should be utilized. Seemingly, much of the "savings" from distributing aid more appropriately will be directed to middle-income families through the new Blue and Gold "Light" program. This initiative could be seen as a response to rapid increases in tuition and an offset to those families who, under FAFSA's rather coarse standards, may have been eligible for the aid associated with a lower income band. We also note that California is amongst the top two states in the country for high cost of living. Middle-class families are being squeezed as never before.

The Santa Cruz Division does not support option "B": It relies on the University's ability to raise tuition, and the Governor and Legislature's current stance on this issue is not supportive of that presumption. We note that option "A" also relies on tuition increases. In addition, as stated above, we do not subscribe to the assumptions built into option "B" regarding starting salary and steady increases in pay for our graduates. Based on the currently negative prospects for steady tuition increases, moving to either "A" or "B" seems imprudent and could immediately backfire by underfunding student need. We also fear that moving to either option now, without a clear multi-year funding commitment from the State, undermines the Educational Finance Model (EFM). The EFM must be protected at all costs.

Beyond our conviction that option "B" is inappropriate, we did not reach consensus on a preference for any of the proposals. Given the task of evaluating the three options, there was split support for options A and C based on the commitment that low and middle income students should receive the financial aid necessary to permit them to attend UC.

Sincerely,

Joseph P Konopelski

Joe Konopelski, Chair
Academic Senate
Santa Cruz Division

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS (BOARS)
George Johnson, Chair
gjohnson@me.berkeley.edu

Assembly of the Academic Senate
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607-5200
Phone: (510) 987-9466
Fax: (510) 763-0309

March 21, 2013

ROBERT POWELL, CHAIR
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

Re: Undergraduate Financial Aid Funding Options

Dear Bob,

BOARS has reviewed and discussed the UC Undergraduate Financial Aid Funding Options for modifying UC's student financial aid funding and allocation methodology. As you know, BOARS had discussed an earlier draft of the options, their benefits, and trade-offs in November. Although BOARS did not vote to prefer any one option, we would like to weigh in on the pros and cons of each, and comment on other aspects of the plan.

Support for Financial Aid Goals

First, BOARS would like to express its strong support for the goals of the University's Education Finance Model (EFM), which seeks to ensure that UC is financially accessible to all admitted students, regardless of income, and that a student's family income does not affect choice of campus or educational experience. Over the years, the EFM has helped provide access to a UC education to a high percentage of low-income and first generation students, particularly compared to other selective institutions. The University should be very proud of this record. There is evidence that UC remains affordable for the majority of families from all income groups. Very few students drop out for financial reasons once they arrive, and controlling for academic preparation, students from different income groups perform equally well.[1]

In the proposal, UCOP makes several recommendations as part of the "common features" that are independent of any specific option. BOARS supports two of these recommendations, but is more concerned about the implications of the third. The two that received support were: (1) the development of an alternative needs analysis formula that would provide a more accurate view of parental resources than the current federal formula, and (2) a new systemwide corporate fundraising effort to supplement UC's grant commitment. BOARS has reservations about the cost of implementing the so-called "Blue and Gold Light" program.

[1] See Figures 1-22, 1-23, and 1-24 in Annual Report on Student Financial Support http://www.ucop.edu/student-affairs/_files/regents_1112.pdf

Support for Alternative Needs Analysis Formula and Fundraising Effort

BOARS members reported personal knowledge of students whose families have "gamed" the financial aid system in order to appear more needy than they really are. Adoption of the College Board's "Institutional Methodology" or a UC-specific methodology for obtaining more accurate information on family resources seems entirely appropriate, whether the financial aid funding model changes or not.

BOARS also supports a proposed systemwide fundraising effort that benefits students at all UC campuses, although members noted that campus development offices may be resistant to such an effort.

Middle-Class Access and the Blue and Gold Light

Each option presented would extend a version of the Blue and Gold Opportunity Plan further into the middle class. Currently, the Blue and Gold Opportunity Plan provides scholarships and grants to fully cover the Systemwide tuition and fees for all students with financial need who come from families with annual income less than $80,000. The proposed "Blue and Gold Light" plan would offer scholarships and grants to cover 50% of tuition and fees for students who have financial need and come from families earning between $80,000 and $120,000, thus reducing the net cost of a UC education for those families. BOARS supports efforts to make UC more affordable for the middle class, and we are concerned about an apparent trend toward increased debt as well as declining application and enrollment rates among middle-income students.

However, there was not broad support in BOARS for implementing the "Blue and Gold Light" proposal. Some members are concerned about the cost of the plan, and others are skeptical that UC should increase tuition to enhance affordability for families making as much as $120,000. This level of earnings is well above the median for all families in California, and as more of the middle class is supported by such a plan, more funding is needed from elsewhere – primarily the higher-income families who pay the full "sticker price" for UC. This necessitates higher tuition for those who can pay. Concern was also expressed that UC's high "sticker price" can act as a disincentive to lower income students, but that it may also cause students from all income groups to choose another institution that they perceive to be a better value.

In addition, BOARS members expressed concern that the sharp changes in aid that occur at the cutoffs for Blue and Gold Light ($80,000 and $120,000) are inherently unfair and prone to gaming. A sliding scale for the Blue and Gold Light Plan would be fairer and might encourage applicants to report income more accurately.

The Specific Options

Each option carries its own pros and cons and has different effects on various income groups. Option "A" would set return-to-aid at a level necessary to maintain self-help expectations at the midpoint of the current benchmarks for work and loans. It would reduce the net cost for lower- and middle income families, and increase the cost for higher income families. Option "B" would increase the net cost for lower income students by increasing the self-help loan repayment expectation from 10 to 15 years. Under Option "C," the self-help expectation would fluctuate annually depending on the revenue available to maintain the current 33% cap on return to aid. Option A requires a larger tuition increase than B to be viable. Option C is revenue dependent, and thus less predictable.

While BOARS did not take a vote on the options presented, Options A and B, at least compared to Option C, was felt to be a more rational financial aid funding strategy, because they base funding on the desired outcome rather than on how much revenue UC happens to have in a particular year.

Some BOARS members spoke in favor of Option B, noting that the current work/loan burden for low-income students is relatively modest; that middle and higher income households are already shouldering a heavy burden for the benefit of lower income families; and that there is a risk to the University if middle-income taxpayer perceive themselves as unfairly burdened or priced out of UC. Other members, on the other hand, believe that increasing the debt burden for all UC students could harm our commitment to financial accessibility for low-income and first generation students.

There was some criticism about the underlying premise that student costs will always go up, and that tuition increases as part of this overall increase are inevitable. The need for financial aid is not only to cover tuition and fees. It is also to cover the other costs of attending the University. The largest of these costs is for room and board, and for a student who lives on campus, this cost is considerably higher then if she lives off campus. There seems to have been no discussion of how such costs might be held down as a way of managing the financial aid burden on the system.

BOARS discussed the fact that each option depends to some extent on annual tuition increases, which seem untenable politically in the present moment. One potentially positive aspect about the Blue and Gold Light plan is that its positive message about affordability could likely help the University politically; although the increase in tuition necessary to implement it would not.

Finally, BOARS discussed the fact that the models for each of the options considered involve an immediate change from current practice to the new model from one year to the next. It was suggested that perhaps phasing the change in over several years to make the impact less severe in the short term might be advisable.

Deciding which of these three options is the “best” is, to some extent, contingent on the success of efforts to convince the state to support the university at a sustainable level to help offset those increases. In any event, financial aid should remain a major part of UC’s strategy for changing the public’s perception of the University.

Sincerely,

George Johnson
BOARS Chair

cc: BOARS
Senate Director Winnacker

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, ACADEMIC SENATE

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO | SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON AFFIRMATIVE ACTION AND DIVERSITY (UCAAD)
Manuela Martins-Green
manuela.martins@ucr.edu

ACADEMIC SENATE
University of California
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, California 94607-5200

March 20, 2013

ROBERT POWELL, CHAIR
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

Re: Proposal on Undergraduate Financial Aid Funding Options

Dear Bob:

Thank you for giving UCAAD the opportunity to comment on the UC Undergraduate Financial Aid Options proposal. We are pleased to see that UC continues its commitment to be accessible to undergraduates of every income level and that the strategy is to address the entire cost of attendance, not just the tuition. We understand that this will require contributions from parents, students (in the form of loans and work hours) and from grants from federal, state and institutional aid programs. We are also pleased to see that all three options provide for an expanded commitment to students from middle-income families by providing one-half of their UC tuition and fees as well as using a more comprehensive assessment of parental wealth that takes into account a wider range of financial resources based on much more extensive information collected on a form separate from the FAFSA. The committee believes that this more comprehensive assessment will lead to greater equity in the allocation of aid and greater accessibility to a UC education.

UCAAD discussed all three options described in the proposal. After much deliberation we decided that our recommendation is to adopt **Option A: Fund self-help at the midpoint of the current benchmark manageable range.** *Set UC's minimum grant commitment based on the amount needed to achieve a self-help level at the midpoint of the current "manageable" range.* We came to this conclusion because Option A is a plan that does not unduly burden lower-income families—who are for the most part underrepresented minorities—with additional work hours that would negatively impact their time to degree and with additional debt that would negatively impact their standard of living after graduation. Additional UCAAD concerns are detailed below but do not detract from our endorsement of Option A as the best plan for students who come from families with low income, a majority of which come from underrepresented backgrounds.

UCAAD's specific concerns about the Financial Aid Options are as follows:

1. Of particular concern to UCAAD is the definition of "manageable debt." We believe that as currently defined this expectation of "self-help" places an undue burden on low-income students and may encourage low-income families to seek out unregulated private loans. These families may lack the cultural background to fully understand the implications of increased borrowing and may already be disproportionately affected by predatory loan practices for instance in homeownership.

2. UCAAD also notes the need for disaggregation of the figures for post-graduation student self-help levels by discipline. The way it stands, students in disciplines with higher income potential such as business, engineering or computer science will not be as impacted as students graduating with a degree in the arts, humanities and social sciences. The projected post-graduation income levels are skewed by the higher earning potential of STEM majors, who are also disproportionately from non-minority backgrounds.

3. Members were also concerned with the implications for increased work burden on students who already work too much and the adverse impact on time-to-degree for at risk students.

4. Lastly, UCAAD members cited the need for the University to recalibrate its definition of "middle-income", in particular as it relates to determining access and affordability for the vast regional differences in the cost of living and family resources of all students who aspire to a UC-education.

Sincerely,

Manuela Martins-Green, Ph.D.
Chair, UCAAD

Copy: UCAAD
Committee Analyst Eric Zárate
Executive Director Martha Winnacker
Analyst Claire Sheridan

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY (UCEP)
John Yoder, Chair
jiyoder@ucdavis.edu

Assembly of the Academic Senate
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607-5200
Phone: (510) 987-9466
Fax: (510) 763-0309

March 22, 2013

Bob Powell, CHAIR
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

Re: UCEP Response to UC Financial Aid Funding Proposals

Dear Bob,

UCEP discussed the proposed UC financial aid funding options during its meeting on March 4, 2013.The members of UCEP generally endorse the aims of the proposals: that UC should fund, allocate, and award aid so that every UC undergraduate can address the entire cost of attendance—not just tuition—through a partnership involving fair contributions from parents, manageable student work and borrowing, and grants from federal, state, and institutional aid programs. UCEP members are also in agreement with the goal of minimizing the costs of a UC education—particularly for those at the lower end of the income spectrum. Unfortunately, beyond support from the guiding principles, no clear consensus has emerged. Some campuses thought Option A would be best, if tuition could be raised and we could implement it, and some thought Option C would be best, if only because it was the closest to the status quo. The only clear message is that there was little support for Option B, although one campus did find A and B equally attractive—largely because of the commitment to aid for middle-income families. Many campuses said they felt under informed and ill-equipped to make decisions in this area.

Most campuses had some support for Option A because of its emphasis on ensuring support for lower and middle-income families. Support for option C was divided: it was seen as very close to what is currently offered, and those suspicious of the changes proposed by the plan saw that as a good thing (and in any case, Option C is likely to be what we get for the near term).

Option B was treated warily: some campuses rejected the increased student debt on first principles, and for these, skepticism about projected employability and income across disciplines was common. Some campuses did not immediately reject Option B but had a few had questions about debt: Is there an analysis on loan default? Is there an analysis on loan default based on discipline? Are there any surveys on families and students with regard to manageable debt?

Members also raised concern about the plan to base “ability to pay” on a family’s assets rather than income. Some members spoke to the necessity of a more refined approach to which assets to include. For example, parents in the 40-50 year age range will have limited assets and lower incomes, but can expect both to increase, while parents in the 55-65 year age range (a not inconsiderable cohort) may have more assets but are also saving for retirement. To impose a greater burden on older parents amounts to a form of age discrimination. How does an unattractive tuition affect enrollment across financially different segments of the student population?

Are higher income families sending their children to a UC or to private institutions?

More questions were raised about the UC Educational Funding Model (EFM). The EFM assumes that students are available to work full time in the summer in order to contribute toward the cost of their education. Most students attend summer session at some point during their academic career. Not only will students who attend summer session not be able to work, but they also will need to pay tuition and expenses during summer session. Given the current trend of increasing enrollments without the prospect for augmenting faculty numbers and course offerings, students will increasingly need to use summer session to make timely progress toward their degrees.

Finally, members were interested in exploring alternative funding sources for financial aid. The commitment by the University of California to use fundraising to support financial aid is very welcome, but the fundraising plan could be more ambitious. The $5 million expected from fundraising would not affect present tuition levels and would ideally be raised substantially.

In summary, we are providing more questions than answers. We hope these views can be of help

Sincerely,

John Yoder, Chair
UCEP

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO   SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET (UCPB)
Jean-Bernard Minster, Chair
jbminster@ucsd.edu

Assembly of the Academic Senate
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607-5200
Phone: (510) 987-9466
Fax: (510) 763-0309

March 21, 2013

ROBERT POWELL, CHAIR
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

Re: Undergraduate Financial Aid Funding Options

Dear Bob,

The University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB) has reviewed the UC Undergraduate Financial Aid Funding Options for modifying UC's student financial aid funding and the system's allocation methodology.

Although UCPB did not reach a firm consensus on any of the three options presented, A, B, or C, UCPB has a clear preference for policy-driven solutions – Options A or B – over the revenue-driven solution, Option C. Furthermore, a majority of members prefer Option A over Option B. At the same time, from a budgetary point of view, UCPB recognizes that none of the options can be implemented comfortably in the absence of a substantial increase in State support or predictable tuition increases. Should new income sources not become available, Option C automatically becomes the most viable one, albeit at a level that would become a substantial burden on students and their families, and which therefore entails a significant political cost to the University.

UCPB would also like to comment further on the pros and cons of each option as well as other aspects of the plan.

We understand that the modeling of the options was prompted by questions about whether UC's undergraduate financial aid programs are funded at the appropriate level to maintain the policy goals of financial accessibility and manageable part-time work and borrowing (student self-help). There are also concerns about the continued sustainability of the program. Projections indicate that as costs increase and as more students qualify for aid, the 33% return to aid level will become inadequate.

In addition to the three options presented, there are three additional recommendations common to each option: developing an alternative needs analysis process and formula that provides a more accurate view of parental resources than the federal process and formula; instituting a systemwide corporate fundraising effort to relieve pressure on tuition revenue as a funding source; and expanding financial aid to more middle-income students (family income between

$80,000 and $120,000) with a "Blue and Gold Light" plan modeled on the Blue and Gold Opportunity Plan, which covers tuition for families making less than $80,000 annually.

Alternative Needs Analysis Formula and Systemwide Fundraising Effort

UCPB supports the proposal to develop a more accurate assessment of parental resources than the federal methodology collected on the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) to help make more financial aid funding available to the students who actually need it. UCPB believes that one viable alternative to FAFSA is the College Board's CSS/Financial Aid Profile. This entails both significant extra effort and also additional expense for an aid applicant, but provides a much more comprehensive analysis of family resources than the FAFSA. While all colleges are required to use the FAFSA to distribute federal sources of aid, many private colleges use the CSS to distribute institutional sources of aid. Consequently, some UC applicants will have already completed this form. UCPB is somewhat reluctant to endorse the recommendation that UC develop its own UC-specific financial aid application and supplement form. Assessment of total wealth is complex, and implementation may involve costs that outweigh any benefits.

Corporate Fundraising Effort

UCPB also supports the proposed fundraising effort. However, we note that individual campus development offices already raise funds for scholarship assistance for their students. A systemwide initiative to augment financial aid funds should account for these local efforts and will need to be approved by the Regents.

Blue and Gold Light

Each option presented assumes the implementation and funding of a "Blue and Gold Light" plan that would cover 50% of tuition and fees for students from families making between $80,000 and $120,000 annually. However, it is unclear to UCPB that the "Blue and Gold Light" should be a priority for the University at this time. The Blue and Gold Light plan would depend heavily on large tuition increases, which are politically risky, if not entirely unviable at the present moment. It would also provide additional financial aid for families making well above the median income in California, many of whom will have additional resources available to finance college costs. The primary goal of UC's financial aid system has been to provide financial accessibility for lower income students, and UCPB is not sure that it should be used to support more affluent students, particularly in an era of severe budget constraints. UCPB continues to support the Blue and Gold Opportunity Plan, which has helped UC achieve a strong record of access for low income students and also provides a positive public message about affordability and accessibility. If UCOP decides to go forward with this program, the UC system should require an alternative financial aid application such as the CSS Financial Profile.

Specific Options

Each option involves benefits and tradeoffs. Option "A" would set return-to-aid at a level necessary to maintain a self-help expectation at the midpoint of the current benchmark—13 hours of part time work per week, and a loan repayment schedule that does not exceed between 5% and 9% of post-graduation income over a ten-year period. Option A would reduce the net cost of education for lower- and middle income families and increase the cost for higher income families. Option B would increase the cost for lower income students by adjusting the self-help standard and basing loan repayment on a 15-year schedule instead of a 10-year schedule. Option B requires a smaller tuition increase than A to be viable. Options A and B are both policy driven options that fund return-to-aid to meet the desired outcomes. Conversely, Option C is revenue driven. It would adjust the self-help standard to match the aid funds generated by a fixed 33% return-to-aid. Currently this results in a self-help level below the midpoint of the current benchmark. Over time it is expected to raise net cost for low and middle income students but not to increase net cost for higher income students.

The majority of UCPB members favor Option A, noting that a policy-driven approach is attractive; it provides stability, clarity, and predictability for families and students; and raises tuition most for the families most able to pay. Option A would provide the greatest benefit to low-income families and improve access to aid for students from middle income families through the Blue and Gold Light. Others, however, expressed concern that UC's price point is not infinitely high, nor is the redistribution model infinitely sustainable. By asking a small number of high income families to provide large amounts of grant support for lower and middle income students, UC could drive families away to other institutions they perceive to be a better value.

The majority of UCPB members feel that Option B is less attractive than A, primarily because Option B would increase the amount of debt students would be asked to incur. UCPB is concerned that self-help levels are already quite high and increasing them further would further stress students and could impair the university's goal of improving time to degree. Other UCPB members, however, noted that it is reasonable for UC to ask students to take on a little more debt due to the high value of a UC education in terms of lifetime earnings.

Some members argued for Option C as a possible alternative that would require a smaller tuition increase than either A or B, and a lower self help expectation than B, although the year-to year unpredictability of C as a revenue-driven model, and a self-help expectation that could, as a result, rise much higher, were seen as negatives. It would mean that a student's financial aid responsibility could vary in unpredictable ways over their course of study.

UCPB recommends that UC campuses consider using a portion of the income obtained from nonresident tuition to supplement financial aid for residents.

Conclusion

UCPB supports efforts to increase the sustainability of the financial aid system, but we note that UC is facing a Catch-22 with regard to financial aid funding. Each of the options presented by UCOP depends to some extent on tuition increases, despite the extreme political pressure against them, or increased State support. And yet, the status quo is unsustainable over time if UC wants to achieve its current policy goals. UCPB supports a policy-driven approach to financial aid that recognizes the importance of UC's aid programs to providing access for low income students and to enhancing UC's public message. Care should be taken to ensure that whatever option is adopted is marketed and publicized broadly and in a way that enhances the public's perception of UC's access, affordability, and value. Moreover, it would be useful for UC to discuss these options and the current status of the financial aid system with the State to demonstrate the clear relationship and trade-off between State funding levels, tuition increases, and contributions from students and families.

Sincerely,

JB Minster

Jean-Bernard Minster
UCPB Chair

cc: UCPB

Martha Winnacker, Senate Executive Director