



Michael T. Brown
Telephone: (510) 987-0711
Fax: (510) 763-0309
Email: Michael.Brown@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*

March 14, 2008

**WYATT R. HUME
PROVOST AND CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER**

**Re: Request to form a Joint Senate/Administrative Committee to Establish a Funding Model
for Graduate Education**

Dear Rory:

On behalf of Academic Council, I respectfully request the formation of a joint Senate-Administrative committee to follow-up on the important work completed by the Graduate Student Support Advisory Committee (GSAC). Council endorsed this joint CCGA/UCPB request at its February 27, 2008 meeting. The original GSAC committee, which was requested by the Academic Council in fall 2005 to explore the status and prospects for graduate student support as well as the mitigation of non-resident tuition (NRT), produced a report in June 2006 that set forth goals for graduate enrollment, and, based on clearly-stated assumptions, evaluated the expense of restoring the competitiveness of UC's graduate student support and eliminating NRT for Ph.D. students. The aim of such a committee would be the development of a concrete funding model, guided by the original GSAC study, which would advance the cause of graduate education at UC.

The need for such a group is urgent. Indeed, Academic Council has made the health of the University's graduate enterprise one of its two stated priorities, besides faculty salaries. In recent years, the percentage of awarded Ph.D.s, as a percentage of total UC degrees, has fallen somewhat below that of its comparison public universities; UC Ph.D. production is below that of its comparison private institutions by more than a factor of two. There is also evidence to suggest that the University's attractiveness to graduate students is falling in the face of dwindling graduate support. For instance, a recent survey revealed that UC graduate support packages for admitted Ph.D. students are now approximately \$2000 behind that of these students' first-choice non-UC institution.¹ It should also be noted that the faculty took the unusual step of generating a Memorial to The Regents in May 2006, the most powerful and authoritative step the faculty can take, requesting the elimination of non-resident tuition for academic graduate students.²

¹ "Findings from the Graduate Student Support Survey: Trends in the Comparability of Graduate Student Stipends, 2004 and 2007," UCOP, November 2007 (http://www.ucop.edu/sas/sfs/docs/gradsurvey_2007.pdf)

² "For Transmittal to The Regents of the University of California: The Academic Senate Memorial to The Regents on Non-Resident Tuition for Graduate Students," May 2006.

The proposed charge of such a committee includes 1) an update of the GSAC study; 2) an examination of GSAC's conclusion that NRT mitigation is best restricted to Ph.D. students; 3) a determination of the relative impediments to principle investigators, programs and divisions, of enrolling international and non-resident graduate students; 4) the establishment of the points of diminishing returns in mitigating NRT and in closing the funding gap; 5) goal setting for the enrollment of graduate international students, mean support, and the mitigation of NRT; 6) a study of how the additional graduate support funds, which were allocated in 2007-2008, were used, as well as their impact; 7) the development of one or a small number of alternate graduate funding models; and 8) a consideration of the impact of graduate student fee increases. The details of the proposed charge are further laid out in the enclosed CCGA/UCPB joint letter.

We hope that the formation of this committee meets with similar support within the Administration and that its work can commence this spring. Please contact me with a response to this request.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michael", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Michael T. Brown, Chair
Academic Council

Copy: Academic Council
Executive Director Bertero-Barceló

Encl. 1



COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS (CCGA)
Bruce Schumm, CCGA Chair
schumm@scipp.ucsc.edu
UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET (UCPB)
Christopher Newfield, UCPB Chair
cnewf@english.ucsb.edu

The Assembly of the
Academic Senate
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607-5200
Phone: (510) 587-6138
Fax: (510) 763-0309

February 15, 2008

**MICHAEL T. BROWN, CHAIR
ACADEMIC COUNCIL**

**RE: Request for a Joint Senate/Administrative Task Force to Establish a Funding Model
for Graduate Education**

Dear Michael,

The education of graduate students is the most advanced component of the University of California's educational mission, and is the aspect of that mission that most clearly differentiates the University from the state's other higher education systems. More even than by its individual faculty, the prowess of a University is gauged by the quality of its knowledge-generation programs, and in these programs graduate students play a central role. As these students mature and develop, they increasingly contribute to the University's success at advancing our understanding of nature, society, and the arts, and provide great intellectual leverage for the ideas and talents of the faculty. Emerging from these programs with advanced skills and a greatly enhanced capability for independent inquiry, the recipients of graduate degrees represent an essential intellectual resource to the state, nation, and world.

The graduate enterprise is the life-blood of the greatest Universities in the world, and the University of California is no exception. Yet by many measures, this effort is both under-producing and threatened. In recent years, the fraction of UC degrees that are Ph.D.'s has fallen somewhat below that of its comparison public universities, and lies more than a factor of two below that of its comparison private institutions. Over the past decade approximately one quarter of UC degrees awarded have been graduate degrees, while graduate degrees have accounted to close to half of the degrees awarded by its comparison public institutions, and two thirds of the degrees awarded by its comparison private institutions. As a result, increasing the proportion of graduate students has been articulated as a leading priority of all three governance bodies of the University: the Academic Senate, the Office of the President, and The Regents.

The University's attractiveness to graduate students is beset by fiscal hardships that have arisen in the face of the state's dwindling support for the University. In particular, the University's offers of support for admitted Ph.D. students have fallen approximately \$2000 behind that of these students' first-choice non-UC institution.

The University's ability to draw students from the global pool of talent is also diminishing. As non-resident tuition has increased to offset deep cuts to the University's budgets, the enrollment of international graduate students has fallen sharply. In 2001-2002, international students comprised 30% of new academic graduate enrollment; by 2004-2005, the proportion had fallen to 19%.

The faculty, whose capacity to contribute to and benefit from the graduate enterprise is under-utilized, perceive the University's weakening stance with respect to graduate education to be a manifestation of both short-sighted funding priorities and structural configurations that impede the enrollment of the best graduate students. Some of these factors lie outside the direct control of the University, having to do with the state government's ever-decreasing support of the University, and its decreasing appreciation of the nature and value of graduate education. On the other hand, within this funding envelope, and within the legislative environment imposed by the state government, there is a great deal of latitude for the University to reconsider its own stance with regard to graduate education. While the University's administration and governing bodies should increase their efforts to enhance state and private-sector funding for graduate education, it is the Senate's interest in examining our internal priorities and policies that motivates this letter.

Assessing the sense of the 16,000 members of the University's faculty Senate is a cumbersome process, and necessarily provides sweeping statements of principle that can not offer a road-map that appropriately balances these principles against other University priorities, or addresses the myriad details needed to effect these principles. Yet the Senate's statements do provide clear gauges of faculty sentiment that the Senate leadership is mandated to champion, and that the administration and Regents are advised to take into account in their management and oversight of the University. In this vein, the faculty have made two clear statements that reflect its deep interest in and concern for the health of the University's graduate enterprise. Since 2004, enhancing the scope and quality of graduate study has been consistently put forth as one of the two top priorities of the Academic Senate.¹

In addition, in May 2006, the faculty took the unusual step of generating a Memorial to the Regents - in this case, requesting the elimination of non-resident tuition for academic graduate students.² This Memorial was supported by an 83% majority of the faculty.

In view of the Senate's clear interest in furthering the participation of graduate students in the University's education and research missions, in Fall 2005 the Academic Council requested that a committee be formed to explore the status of and prospects for graduate student support and the mitigation of non-resident tuition. This resulted in the formation of the joint administrative/Senate Graduate Student Support Advisory Committee (GSAC), chaired by former UCSD graduate dean Richard Attiyeh. This committee released a report in June, 2006 that set forth goals for graduate enrollment, and, based on clearly-stated assumptions, evaluated the expense of restoring the competitiveness of UC's graduate student support and eliminating

¹ "Academic Council Recommendations for the 2005-2006 Budget", October 2004; "Notice of Assembly Action: Concurrent Resolution on Graduate Education", March 2005; "Graduate Student Support (Strategic Sourcing) Memo", August 2005; "Academic Council Report, The Decline of UC as a Great International University", October 2005.

² "For Transmittal to The Regents of the University of California: The Academic Senate Memorial to The Regents on Non-Resident Tuition for Graduate Students," May 2006.

non-resident tuition for Ph.D. students. The work of this committee moved the University a large step forward in its understanding of graduate student enrollment and support, and stands as the basis for CCGA's and UCPB's current advocacy for graduate education.

It is the opinion of UCPB and CCGA that it is time to take the next step: to develop a concrete funding model, guided by the GSAC study, that aggressively advances the cause of graduate education while maintaining enough pragmatic restraint that it can garner the support of the University's administration, faculty, and governing bodies. To this end, we request that UCOP, in partnership with the chair of the Academic Senate, form a follow-on committee of roughly the same structure as the successful GSAC committee. This follow-on committee should begin its work, prior to the development of a formal funding model, by evaluating the assumptions that went into the original GSAC study, informed by the two years of data that have subsequently accrued, and update the study as appropriate. Additionally, before proposing a funding model, the committee should attempt to develop a more concrete evaluation of the consequences of the current policy regarding the funding domestic non-resident and international students.

Thus, CCGA and UCPB are formally requesting a joint senate/administrative follow-on to the GSAC committee. While not a formal charge (which would be developed as the committee is formed), the following is a suggested list of activities for this newly-constituted committee.

RECOMMENDED ACTIVITIES FOR GSAC FOLLOW-ON GROUP

1) Update the GSAC study

- *) Examine the assumptions on which the GSAC estimates were made.
- *) Test assumptions about trends against data that has been accumulated in past two years.
- *) Incorporate the results of the long-range enrollment planning (out to 2021).
- *) Update study with the latest data, including data on the impact of graduate student fee increases.

2) Examine the GSAC committee's conclusion that NRT mitigation is best restricted to PhD students. Develop a list of degrees (including, at a minimum, the PhD) for which NRT mitigation is felt to be advisable.

3) Determine, relative to relevant public comparison institutions, the relative impediment to principle investigators, programs, and divisions, for enrolling international and non-resident students for these identified degrees.

4) Establish goals for the enrollment of international students that will pursue the identified degrees.

5) Guided by the 2007 Graduate Support Survey, attempt to establish points of diminishing returns in mitigating NRT, and in closing the funding gap.

6) Establish goals and targets for overall enrollment, mean support, and NRT mitigation that

- *) Are realistic in terms of expected funding levels
- *) Take into account stated priorities, including the Faculty Memorial on Non-Resident Tuition

*) While appropriately aggressive, are also cognizant of and pragmatic with respect to the overall mission of the University and its service to the state, nation, and world.

7) Conduct a study of how the \$20M in additional graduate support funds that were allocated in 2007-2008 (\$10M from UCOP, \$10M in matching from the campuses) were used, and assess the impact that this allocation had.

8) Develop one, or a small number of alternate, funding model(s) that

*) Are clear in their utilization of new funds, and, alternatively, where they will rely on re-direction of currently allocated funds;

*) Recommend sources of redirected funds, or propose procedures for structuring the needed dialog on the separate campuses to identify sources;

*) Establish or maintain incentives that will provide the greatest support and reward for campuses that make the most progress towards the stated goals;

*) Make use of realistic levels of increased support from the State as well as the private sector;

*) Have clear controls that will abet oversight of the implementation of the chosen model, to ensure that directed funding is used as intended.

9) Consideration of the impact of graduate student fee increases.

We hope that the Council can endorse this request, and that, if forwarded from Council to UCOP, that it will meet with similar support within the campus administration. We look forward with great hope and anticipation to the formation of this task force, and hope to see it begin its work in Spring, 2008.

Respectfully submitted,

Chris Newfield
Chair, UCPB
Bruce Schumm
Chair, CCGA

cc: CCGA
UCPB
Executive Director Bertero-Barcelo