



Academic Senate

Office of the President
1111 Franklin Street
Oakland, CA 94607

senate.universityofcalifornia.edu

CAMPUSES

Berkeley
Davis
Irvine
UCLA
Merced
Riverside
San Diego
San Francisco
Santa Barbara
Santa Cruz

MEDICAL CENTERS

Davis
Irvine
UCLA
San Diego
San Francisco

NATIONAL LABORATORIES

Lawrence Berkeley
Lawrence Livermore
Los Alamos

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET (UCPB)

Robert Brosnan
rjbrosnan@ucdavis.edu

July 9, 2026

Ahmet Palazoglu
Chair, Academic Council

RE: UCPB Response to the Yale Report

Dear Ahmet,

Attached please find the UCPB response to the Yale Report. The committee discussed the report and how the University of California might use the issues and conclusions from the report to inform its approach to public perception of the UC in California and nationwide.

The response is a point-by-point engagement with the report, but the committee strongly agreed that its purpose was not to suggest policies for the UC or endorse the recommendations from the original report. UCPB hopes that this response opens up dialogue within the Academic Senate and helps create pathways to wider understanding of the positive impact the UC has on the state and nation.

Sincerely,

Robert Brosnan
Chair

cc: UCPB



UCPB Response to the *Yale Report*

Background and Purpose

In April 2026, a committee of Yale University professors published the *Report of the Yale Committee on Trust in Higher Education* (provided as an appendix and hereafter referred to as the *Yale Report*) which aimed to examine and evaluate reasons for the decline in public opinion about institutions of higher education. Building upon this introspective exercise, UCPB sought to examine whether issues and solutions raised within the *Yale Report* might apply in some way to the University of California.

The *Yale Report* concludes with a list of 20 separate recommendations. The purpose of UCPB's response to the *Yale Report* is to consider point-by-point whether problems or concerns addressed by each recommendation might be applicable to the University of California and how solutions identified at Yale might apply to our 10-campus system. However, the purpose of UCPB's response is ***not*** to provide policy suggestions or an endorsement of *Yale Report* recommendations. Rather, UCPB hopes that this document will be the impetus for a broader discussion within individual campuses and within the Academic Senate around building trust between the People of California and the world-class university system designed to serve them.

Comments on the 20 *Yale Report* recommendations

Recommendation #1: Take responsibility.

This *Yale Report* response is our attempt to provide a dispassionate and self-critical assessment of factors that may erode public trust in the University of California. We must define our role in the problem if we are to find solutions, and we must accept institutional accountability if we are to be trusted to fix these issues. This *Yale Report* review by UCPB is part of that effort.

Recommendation #2: Focus on the mission.

Listed among its basic assumptions (https://www.ucop.edu/institutional-research-academic-planning/_files/1974_78_UCAcademicPlan.pdf), the University of California states, "The distinctive mission of the University is to serve society as a center of higher learning, providing long-term societal benefits through transmitting advanced knowledge, discovering new knowledge, and functioning as an active working repository of organized knowledge. That obligation, more

specifically, includes undergraduate education, graduate and professional education, research, and other kinds of public service, which are shaped and bounded by the central pervasive mission of discovering and advancing knowledge.” However, in the decades that have followed this mission statement, there has been a steady withdrawal of state support as a fraction of University operations. This has made it increasingly difficult to meet all obligations defined by this tripartite teaching/research/service mission. How does the University fulfill its mission statement in a severely resource-constrained environment? Does this situation ultimately lead either to prioritization of some parts of the mission over others or to a reduction in achievement in all areas? What effect do struggles to meet mission obligations have on public trust?

Furthermore, is it time to clarify the mission of the University of California? We proclaim a tripartite mission of teaching, research, and service, but health system activities account for nearly half of the UC budget (<https://regents.universityofcalifornia.edu/regmeet/may25/f7attach.pdf>). Although teaching, research, and service are all involved in medical center operations, these words might not adequately capture the scope of clinical activities (as well as those of the agricultural experimental stations) and the important role they play in the health and welfare of all Californians. Is there a way to better define or communicate the importance of health and agriculture to the University of California’s teaching, research, and service missions?

Given the University’s challenges and responsibilities, UC should exercise restraint when considering whether to devote time and resources to activities that extend beyond the core mission. Accomplishing the University’s mission is further complicated by a distrustful partisan environment in which a liberal bias is presumed to accompany almost any activity undertaken by higher education. UC will need to find ways to better communicate a distinction between non-partisan facts and evidence and politics-influenced opinions about how those facts and evidence should be understood or acted upon. Nonetheless, any effort to depoliticize must preserve individual academic freedom. The University and its constituent schools and departments should try to present neutral forums for faculty, students, and community members to freely express and debate ideas.

Recommendation #3: Protect free speech.

It is important that the public view the University of California system as an institution that promotes debate and diversity of thought. The University should welcome discussion of all evidence-based ideas and opinions, whether perceived to be conservative, liberal, or non-partisan. Although freedom of speech is not absolute, identifying and implementing limits is difficult and likely to raise accusations of bias. For example, should the University provide an unchallenged forum for speech that is counterfactual (e.g., Earth is flat, climate change is a hoax, all vaccines are harmful) that undermines its education mission? If not, who is the arbiter of facts, and how do we avoid perceptions of “cancel culture” and “liberal intolerance”? As a more challenging example, how should the University deal with speech that might run counter to its stated values of inclusion and belonging (<https://www.ucop.edu/strategic-framework/values/index.html>)? What happens if speech makes a particular group uncomfortable or unwelcome or is aimed at diminishing equality or rights of group based on sex, sexual orientation/identity, nationality, race, religion, age or disability? Who determines when such speech is acceptable and when it is not, and how do we

ensure that decisions are transparent and consistent to minimize accusations of bias? How do we clearly define and distinguish unpopular speech from unacceptable speech?

Freedom of speech is also under threat from the external political environment. The Presidential Executive Order titled “Restoring Gold Standard Science” (<https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/05/restoring-gold-standard-science/>) states, “Actions taken by the prior Administration further politicized science, for example, by encouraging agencies to incorporate diversity, equity, and inclusion considerations into all aspects of science planning, execution, and communication,” and the Executive Order titled “Preventing Woke AI in the Federal Government” (<https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/07/preventing-woke-ai-in-the-federal-government/>) states, “...DEI includes the suppression or distortion of factual information about race or sex; manipulation of racial or sexual representation in model outputs; incorporation of concepts like critical race theory, transgenderism, unconscious bias, intersectionality, and systemic racism; and discrimination on the basis of race or sex. DEI displaces the commitment to truth in favor of preferred outcomes...” and the Executive Order titled “Improving Oversight of Federal Grantmaking” (<https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/08/improving-oversight-of-federal-grantmaking/>) states, “Discretionary awards shall not be used to fund, promote, encourage, subsidize, or facilitate... denial by the grant recipient of the sex binary in humans or the notion that sex is a chosen or mutable characteristic...[or] promote anti-American values.” Pen America, a non-profit organization dedicated to the protection of free expression, compiled a list of >250 words banned from federal governments documents and federal grant submissions (<https://pen.org/banned-words-list/>). Pressure from the federal government, including threats of federal funding loss for individual faculty and entire campuses, produces self-censorship and threatens freedom of speech. Critics have argued that this language could be applied to suppress viewpoints regardless of factual accuracy. How should the University respond if federal funding conditions are perceived as ideologically, rather than factually, motivated? If we don’t feel free to say what we mean, can the public trust what we say?

Finally, it is important to recognize that a university and its constituent schools and departments are comprised of faculty and students with differing backgrounds and perspectives. Therefore, to encourage intellectual inquiry and welcome diversity of opinions, the university its departments should avoid taking political views. Rather, expression of those opinions should be left to the faculty, staff, and students. Faculty should also have autonomy to integrate their own views into their curriculum while welcoming well-reasoned dissent.

Recommendation #4: Support academic freedom.

Academic freedom is a bedrock principle of the University of California. As stated, in APM-010 (https://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel-programs/_files/apm/apm-010.pdf), “[t]he University of California is committed to upholding and preserving principles of academic freedom.” In addition, the University Committee on Academic Freedom (<https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/committees/ucaf/index.html>) is a standing committee of the academic senate charged to study and report on conditions related to academic freedom of the

University of California and its faculty. The University should vigorously defend academic freedom for faculty, staff and students.

Recommendation #5: Make higher education affordable.

The University of California has considerably lower tuition and fees than Yale and most private universities. The Tuition Stability Plan (<https://admission.universityofcalifornia.edu/tuition-financial-aid/tuition-cost-of-attendance/tuition-stability-plan.html>) provides predictability for families in budgeting higher education expenses. However, better explanations of the differences in funding support levels available at different campuses and the availability of need-based assistance may help more people understand how a UC education can be affordable. The University might also consider improved messaging around how non-resident fees are used to help subsidize the cost of in-state student tuition. The University should explore avenues for reducing costs while maintaining educational standards; for example, perhaps by considering potential roles for AI in instruction and administration. Finally, the University should continue efforts to encourage increased state investment in UC and to buttress support for the California Higher Education Master Plan that ensures maximally efficient deployment of state higher education funds for the training of undergraduate, graduate, and professional students.

Recommendation #6: Reform undergraduate admissions

The *Yale Report* declares that the “[t]op priority in admissions decisions should be academic achievement.” However, it might be more appropriate to state that the top priority in admissions decisions should be academic achievement relative to opportunities. Objective indicators of academic achievement should be used in conjunction with socioeconomic factors and personal hardships overcome by the candidate (or other evidence of resilience or grit) to ensure equitable access to a UC education and diverse student body. UC campuses should be more transparent to the public about how admissions decisions are made and how different factors in an application are evaluated. Preferential admissions decisions (e.g., for athletes) should likewise be transparent. It is essential that the UC admissions processes are perceived as fair as well as being fair.

The *Yale Report* supports the use of a standardized entrance examination. UC faculty and the Academic Senate are currently debating whether to re-institute the SAT or ACT. If use of standardized examinations were to be considered, should such considerations be expanded to include performance on advanced placement examinations? For in-state students, could the California Assessment of Student Performance and Progress (CAASPP) currently administered to 11th graders potentially aid in identification of high-achieving students? Use of any standardized tests results for student admission should be performed as part of a comprehensive application review (https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/_files/committees/sttf/sttf-report.pdf) as outlined by the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/_files/committees/boars/documents/uc-academic-

senate-boars-roadmap-06-05-2026.pdf), and the process and components of this review should be publicly available as well as easy to find, concise, and clear.

Lastly, UC may have less of an undergraduate-access problem than an undergraduate-application maldistribution problem. Some campuses such as UCLA, UCB, and UCSD receive applications from many times the number of qualified candidates than they can accept whereas other campuses such as UCSC, UCR, and UCM have difficulty recruiting students. The UC statewide guarantee policy provides the top 9% of California statewide graduates who opt into the program an admission offer at one of the less popular campuses (<https://admission.universityofcalifornia.edu/admission-requirements/first-year-requirements/california-residents/statewide-guarantee/>). Although helpful, this has not entirely resolved access problems caused by applicant maldistribution. The University of California should continue to look for opportunities to promote less popular campuses, such as by holding high-profile systemwide meetings or conferences on these campuses, more literature focusing on promotion of these campuses, increased outreach, campus tours, etc.

Additionally, the three less popular campuses all currently lack an associated health system or are not in close proximity to a University health system. This fact may not be a coincidence. Accelerating plans for medical schools and hospital systems at UCR and UCM might translate to more undergraduate interest, particularly from students planning studies in pre-health-related disciplines. Likewise, UC might look to develop and facilitate more partnerships between UCSC and UCSF in the form of more hospitals and clinics in the Santa Cruz area and increased undergraduate educational opportunities for UCSC students at the UCSF medical school.

Recommendation #7: Open minds.

Open and critical debate on campus is important. However, is all debate equal? A university must be open to interpretations of facts and arguments over policies that come from either the political right or the political left. But what is the role of a university when debate devolves into arguments over facts versus “alternative facts”? What is the role of a university in defining and disseminating truth, and what role (if any) should a university have in guarding students and the public against the dissemination of falsehoods? What should a university do if part of a political ideology diverges from the values espoused by that university? If thought leaders within a political ideology aim to take away people’s rights or promote inequality based on gender, religious affiliation, ethnicity, or some other protected status, should the university still provide a venue for this ideology to be promoted or debated? Should some propositions, such as the dignity and rights and equality of all individuals, be truths that we hold to be self-evident and hence not subject to debate? If some debate is not appropriate, who decides, what criteria are used, how is transparency achieved, and how does one prevent any limits from being perceived as political bias and ideological intolerance?

Recommendation #8: Deliver educational value.

The University of California provides access to a world-class education with in-state tuition comparable to other public universities and much lower than most private schools. The University of California has been a leader in public higher education, and the system should strive to lead innovations for in-person, online, and AI instruction. Further increasing the value of a UC degree might be achieved by increasing the hiring rate of new graduates within their chosen field of study and by increasing the average salaries offered to new UC graduates. A path towards achieving these aims might start with discipline-specific reviews of common career paths for graduates within that field, identification of key “day-1” knowledge and skills for entry level positions within those careers, and modification of courses and degree requirements to ensure that students in those disciplines achieve these “day-1” knowledge and skills by graduation. Departments might also look for more opportunities to bring industry and other discipline-related employers into teaching labs and classrooms to strengthen relationships with academia and to give students more networking opportunities. Departments and colleges might also consider sponsoring more career fairs and industry-mentored events on campus. Undergraduate students should also be offered training or mentorship in fundamental job-seeking skills such as how to prepare a resume, mock interview practice, etc. Some of these ideas are currently being piloted in the University of California’s Degree Plus Program (<https://www.ucop.edu/academic-affairs/initiatives/degree-plus.html>) which combines the traditional undergraduate degree with a paid internship and skills-based certificates to strengthen workforce preparedness. If this program yields increased employment rate and salaries for new graduates, it should be expanded to more campuses and academic disciplines.

AI threatens to decrease workplace demand for new baccalaureate graduates as technology displaces entry-level positions. This, in turn, could threaten the economic proposition of an undergraduate education. To prepare students for the evolving workplace, we should look for opportunities to incorporate discipline-specific training on how to responsibly and ethically use AI to enhance productivity and work quality. This might also necessitate refocusing discipline-specific training to emphasize those skills that cannot be easily replaced by AI; namely, critical thinking and problem solving, evaluation of data and data quality, creativity, and generation of new knowledge. Higher education must teach how AI can be used as a tool while simultaneously ensuring that AI does not diminish educational development and thinking skills. How do we ensure that AI availability or misuse does not interfere with students’ acquisition of fundamental knowledge skills (e.g., math skills, foundational programming skills, writing skills, and analytical reading skills) that are needed for students to develop more advanced skills that AI cannot do well, such as creative writing and analytical reading proficiencies in the humanities and development of scientific inquiry and quantitative reasoning abilities in the STEM fields.

Recommendation #9: Open the gates.

The University of California is an incredible source of discovery, innovation, and expertise that directly benefits the state and people of California. These aspects also have secondary benefits to the California economy through the licensing of patents, creation of start-up companies, and maintenance of a pool of specialized knowledge and research expertise that supports established companies. While the University of California has a compelling record of

accomplishments to share, an excellent website (<https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/impact>), a publicity newsletter (<https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/subscribe>) and an advocacy network (<https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/advocate>), for many Californians, that story remains unheard. Many know of the University of California as a top public institution for undergraduate education. However, is the same true for UC's contributions to animal and plant sciences, energy, water resources, and the environment, all of which impact the state's \$61.2 billion agriculture industry that is the fifth largest supplier of food in the world (<https://www.cdfr.ca.gov/Statistics/>)? Do most Californians know that UC faculty and alumni are behind 13 of *TIME* magazine's best inventions of 2025 (<https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/news/uc-faculty-and-alums-behind-13-times-best-inventions-2025>)? Is it widely known that UC Health is the second largest health system in California that provides cutting-edge diagnostics and therapeutics and yet maintains strong commitments to rural health access through medical training programs, telehealth, and rural and mobile clinics? What additional media resources and outreach strategies could we be using to actively convey the UC story?

In particular, the University of California's message seems to have difficulty penetrating rural areas of the state and thus may not be adequately reaching conservative communities or Californians who do not have undergraduate students enrolled at UC or who are not themselves UC alumni. (See also related comments in Recommendation #19.) More active outreach that targets rural and conservative areas of the state and uses different types of communication strategies may be needed. For example, undergraduate students with rural or conservative backgrounds might be employed as trusted messengers to help deliver the UC message via a variety of social media platforms and in-person local events (e.g., 4-H and FFA fairs). UC serves all Californians, and everyone should feel that the UC system was built for them.

University of California campuses could look for additional opportunities to bring the community to campus. For example, senior citizens might be permitted to take some free courses for educational enrichment while simultaneously enriching the undergraduate student experience with perspectives from an older generation. The community might also be invited to participate in townhall informational or planning events to provide ideas as well as to become better acquainted with issues affecting the University. As logistics permit, the university campus could provide a venue to host local community and nonprofit organization meetings and events; this might improve outreach efforts and help engender goodwill.

Recommendation #10: Re-center the classroom.

Faculty strive to make the class time a valuable experience, and teaching methods and technologies should be considered to increase professor-student interactions and increase active learning opportunities. Online education presents both possibility and peril with respect to this *Yale Report* recommendation. Online courses may allow teaching of certain subjects—such as rare languages—that lack a critical mass to otherwise be taught on a single campus (<https://www.ucop.edu/uc-online/programs-and-initiatives/global-language-network/index.html>). Additionally, online courses offer the opportunity for instructional collaboration among faculty experts at different campuses that can result in a unique and comprehensive instructional experience. However, some types of asynchronous online education may reduce faculty-student

interactions and create a passive and less meaningful learning environment. As we increase online offerings, how do we create more active online learning experiences, and how do we ensure academic honesty for assessments that are not conducted in person?

Recommendation #11: Pay Attention.

The *Yale Report* proposes “a device-free policy—no phones, laptops, or tablets—as the default in classroom settings.” Although device-free examinations are reasonable to help prevent academic dishonesty, this recommendation is likely to have unintended consequences if applied to all classroom settings. Many course resources are online, and students need computers to record notes and annotate lecture materials. Moreover, technology is an accessibility tool, and device-free policies could diminish learning outcomes for students with disabilities. When possible, innovative and interactive instructional modalities should be utilized to help improve student engagement and to make lectures and discussion sessions more interesting than the latest competing social media distraction.

Recommendation #12: Resist self-censorship.

We agree with the sentiment expressed in the *Yale Report* that encourages open inquiry and intellectual debate and creation of an environment that welcomes students to challenge the perspectives of the faculty. However, in the current political environment, there are also external pressures to self-censor. During a 2025 federal investigation with alleged political motivations (<https://www.insidehighered.com/news/quick-takes/2025/09/16/berkeley-releases-160-names-complies-us-investigation>) and threats of large financial penalties for noncompliance, the University of California released the names of 160 faculty and students to the Department of Education. In a statement responding to this decision, (https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/_files/council-chair-to-president-council-statement-pii.pdf), the Academic Senate acknowledged “[t]hese disclosures have already chilled academic speech and instilled fear in our community of punitive measures and targeted threats.”

We also recognize that self-censorship issues predate the present political environment. Issues around “cancel culture” are real. People may be passionate in their beliefs, but passion should not cause ostracization of those with differing opinions. Freedom of thought needs to be protected both inside and outside of the classroom.

Recommendation #13: Grade like we mean it.

Grade inflation problems are probably not restricted to Yale, and UC campuses should consider measuring how grade distributions by course and/or by discipline have changed over time. This would allow the Academic Senate to make an objective assessment regarding the existence and magnitude of grade inflation within the University of California. However, simply limiting the number of “A” grades also may have unintended effects. First, faculty who are demanding graders are likely to be graded harshly by students in their course evaluations. The resulting poor

evaluations might be used to penalize faculty through loss of academic merits and perhaps even denial of promotions. For this system to be fair, there would need to be an objective faculty peer teaching evaluation system in place to balance student feedback. However, a peer evaluation system would necessarily add to faculty service workload.

Course enrollment numbers may also be adversely affected by more rigorous grading standards. Students are under pressure to maximize their GPAs, particularly for competitive professional school applications, and students may be loath to enroll in a course with limited “A” grades available if other less restrictive alternatives are available. Moreover, restrictions on the number of A grades may increase student competition and decrease student collaboration as every “A” grade awarded to one student is an “A” grade that is unavailable for their colleague to earn. Alternative performance measurements, such as recording the percentile achieved within a course, may work well for very large classes but become meaningless or misleading when enrollment is low. Other methods, such as a standardized course exam or use of a “markers meeting” for faculty to create an assessment rubric to align grading standards, may help give the impression of fair grading within a department, but this would come at the cost of substantial faculty time investment.

Recommendation #14: Be human.

“We recommend that Yale create and empower a committee of undergraduate, graduate, and professional students to develop guidelines for social media use and to formulate ideas for encouraging in-person interaction, with the goal of supporting an open, respectful, intellectually vibrant campus culture.” We agree. Campuses that do not already have such a program should consider implementing one.

Recommendation #15: Create common knowledge.

The diversity of educational opportunities and experiences is one of the many strengths of the University of California system. Consideration of a common core education program should be left to individual campuses. Nonetheless, a shared curriculum is likely not practical to administer to a large student body and may conflict with existing course scheduling and degree requirements. Perhaps an annual theme might be considered, for example centered around a book or works of art, that faculty can opt to include in classes and around which special events, discussions, and debates can be held for interested faculty, staff, and students to attend. Additionally, rather than a set of common knowledge, campuses or the University system might develop and promote a set of unifying core values that are shared among faculty, staff, and students.

Recommendation #16: Govern collaboratively.

The University of California has a shared governance system that gives Academic Senate faculty a voice in the operation of the University (https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/_files/resources/SHRDGOV09Revision.pdf). Faculty,

administration, and the Regents should be proud of our governance partnership, and both should continue to nurture a strong partnership.

Recommendation #17: Streamline bureaucracy.

Shared governance can be used to promote efficient operations by advising on resource allocation for individual units and providing regular consultation to campus leadership, as outlined in the 2023 UCPB report on divisional-CPB best practices (https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/_files/reports/js-senate-divisions-ucpb-best-practices.pdf). This work may be facilitated by more centralized data collection of costs and administrative structures at local campuses. Each of the 10 UC campuses can function as laboratories to identify best practices that can then be implemented systemwide to improve efficiency and outcomes. Additionally, individual campuses might consider the benefits of a HelioCampus subscription to access data and analytics from comparison schools for benchmark comparisons and improved data-driven decision making. For example, year-over-year administrative unit staffing and inflation-adjusted costs, indexed to student enrollment, could be compared to a group of similar benchmark public universities or to similar UC campuses. Outlier data can thus be highlighted and can be flagged for further investigation. Several UC campuses, including Davis and Irvine, have already joined HelioCampus, and it would likely be beneficial to the system if many of the other campuses subscribed as well.

UC should also distinguish practices that are required for federal, state, or local regulatory compliance versus those that are self-imposed, and cost-benefit ratios for the latter should be critically evaluated. The University of California should also identify regulatory requirements that do not seem to achieve benefits that outweigh the cost of compliance, and system administrators and lobbyists should work with the state legislature to reduce these regulatory burdens. Campus and systemwide academic senates could develop a comment system through which faculty, administrators and staff identify inefficient, unnecessary, and excessively burdensome practices or identify potential solutions to reduce bureaucracy and costs. These ideas could then undergo review and study at the campus or systemwide level.

Recommendation #18: Build trust with the trustees.

The Regents of the University of California delegate control over academic policy, admissions and granting of degrees, and the curriculum to the Academic Senate. In addition, the Academic Senate serves an advisory role for academic appointments, merit and promotion, and budget and planning. Successful shared governance is *prima facie* evidence of trust between our Regents and faculty. The Regents and Senate faculty should continue to support and strengthen their partnership.

Recommendation #19: Communicate effectively.

The University of California has talented and effective communicators, but this communication does not reach all communities and all parts of the state. (See also related comments in Recommendation #9.) More outreach is needed to rural and conservative areas and to other populations that do not regularly interact with our education mission. The University should identify trusted representatives from these communities and groups (e.g., students who come from the population targeted for outreach) to help deliver its message. Communication should enlist television, radio, print, and social media outlets preferred by these groups as well as in-person awareness campaigns at local events important to the target populations. The University should also listen to what the residents of California have to say; this might be accomplished through online events, town halls, or other outreach to better understand their viewpoints, concerns, and needs.

Recommendation #20: Lead by example.

The *Yale Report* concludes by stating, “We recommend that Yale take concrete actions on its own campus, while working with other colleges and universities toward the common goal of building trust in higher education.” Individual UC campuses can work collaboratively as a system on these aims, and the UC should continue to seek collaborative opportunities with California State Universities, California Community Colleges, and private universities in California to achieve these goals. This UCPB committee hopes that the above commentary on the *Yale Report* can be used by the Academic Senate to initiate a more thorough evaluation of factors affecting public trust in the University of California and to identify concrete actions to strengthen that trust.