

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, ACADEMIC SENATE

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

SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

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

June 24, 2011

**MARK YUDOF, PRESIDENT
LAWRENCE PITTS, PROVOST AND EVP
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

Re: Revision of Principles for Non-Resident Enrollment

Dear Mark and Larry:

At its meeting on June 22, the Academic Council unanimously approved a revision to the Non-Resident Enrollment Principles authored by BOARS and endorsed by the Academic Council in 2009. Due to greater selectivity at certain campuses, and the broadening of the eligibility policy, BOARS recommended that Principle #6 be revised to state, “Non-resident domestic and international students admitted to a campus should compare favorably to California residents admitted at that campus,” rather than to applicants in the “upper half of those ordinarily eligible” as stated in the Master Plan.

I have enclosed BOARS’ letter explaining the need for the revision, as well as a red-lined version of the Principles for Non-Resident Enrollment, and a final version. Council requests that you circulate these documents to the campus admissions offices, EVCs, and the Enrollment Management Council. We will send the revised policy to the Divisional Senates and the campus admissions committees.

Thank you for your assistance in disseminating the revised document, and please do not hesitate to contact me or BOARS’ Chair Bill Jacob if you have any questions.

Sincerely,



Daniel L. Simmons, Chair
Academic Council

Copy: Academic Council
Martha Winnacker, Academic Senate Executive Director

Encl. (3)

BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS (BOARS)

Bill Jacob, Chair

jacob@math.ucsb.edu

Assembly of the Academic Senate

1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor

Oakland, CA 94607-5200

Phone: (510) 987-9466

Fax: (510) 763-0309

June 17, 2011

DANIEL SIMMONS, CHAIR
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

Re: Clarification of Principles for Non-Resident Enrollment

Dear Dan,

Recently some ambiguity has arisen in the interpretation of one of the Non-Resident Enrollment Principles¹ authored by BOARS and endorsed by the Academic Council in 2009. As you know, UC eligibility policy changes are taking effect for fall 2012 admissions. BOARS believes it is necessary to clarify Principle #6 in light of those changes and this ambiguity. Principle #6 currently reads:

6. Non-resident domestic and international students should demonstrate stronger admissions credentials than California resident students by generally being in the “upper half of those ordinarily eligible” as stated in the Master Plan.

Since the California Master Plan for Higher Education² asked UC to “select from” the top 12.5% or 1/8 of California high school graduates, UC has applied its interpretation of “eligibility” to this group of graduates. At the time the Master Plan was written, however, eligibility was essentially synonymous with admission for applicants who met basic eligibility criteria, unlike today, when the most selective UC campuses admit one quarter or fewer of their applicants. As such, it does not make sense to interpret Principle 6 to mean a campus that admits residents only from the upper quarter of their applicant pool should admit non-residents from the upper half of the pool.

The situation becomes even more ambiguous with the changes taking effect in 2012, because the new policy broadens eligibility to include the “entitled to review” group, while restructuring the pool of “guaranteed” applicants to include a population less than 12.5%. Rather than debating the interpretation of the Master Plan’s use of “eligible,” **BOARS recommends the following revision of Principle 6. We ask Council to endorse the change and forward it to the President.**

6. Non-resident domestic and international students admitted to a campus should compare favorably to California residents admitted at that campus.

¹ http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate/reports/MC2Yudof_BOARS%20Non-Resident%20Principles_082109.pdf

² <http://www.ucop.edu/acadinit/mastplan/mp.htm>

The purpose of the revision is to help prevent a resident applicant from claiming that her/his admission slot was taken by a non-resident with weaker credentials but a willingness to pay non-resident tuition. In revising the principle, BOARS is aware that the lack of a grade point bump or local context information for non-residents can make apples-to-apples comparisons of resident and non-resident applicants difficult. BOARS believes, however, that campus admissions professionals are fully capable of making appropriate judgment calls, and leaves the term “compare favorably” to their interpretation.

In addition, BOARS wants to make sure these clarifications are at the forefront of Council’s mind as it considers options for managing the budget gap, enrollment, and cost per undergraduate student, and moves forward with the project to “re-bench” the formulas for distributing state funds to campuses.

In these difficult financial times, BOARS also believes it is important to re-emphasize Principle 3, which states that “*non-resident enrollment should not be used exclusively as a revenue-producing strategy to the detriment of resident access,*” and Principle 5, which urges that “*fiscal considerations should not be a primary factor guiding the review of files or admissions decisions.*”

As campuses embark on programs to recruit more non-residents, they should take care to match any special considerations with equivalent considerations for comparable resident applicants. More generally, campus admissions committees and leaders should keep these principles in mind as they launch new non-resident recruitment efforts.

Sincerely,

Bill Jacob
BOARS Chair

cc: BOARS
Martha Winnacker, Senate Executive Director

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

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

Preamble: Balancing Objectives

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

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

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

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

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

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

Preamble: Balancing Objectives

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

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

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

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