



J. Daniel Hare
Telephone: (510) 987-9303
Fax: (510) 763-0309
Email: dan.hare@ucop.edu

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

September 22, 2015

**PRESIDENT JANET NAPOLITANO
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**

Re: Funding for Enrollment of 5,000 Students

Dear Janet:

The University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB) has previously communicated their concerns to the Academic Council about the consequences should UC enroll 5,000 additional resident undergraduate students in exchange for an additional \$25 M in enrollment funding. This letter conveys the Academic Council's perspective and concerns.

The Council recognizes that this is a challenging problem and a difficult and politically charged process, as UC aspires to work in partnership with the state. We have long advocated in favor of expanded access, as long as there is funding to provide that access without compromising quality, and the University has indeed been steadily expanding its resident undergraduate enrollment.

The Council is confident that the concerns in this letter are well known to the administration. We add our support for efforts by the administration to try to find a way to make this proposal work, and put our perspective on record. This letter should be read as a list of concerns to which the University must attend, not as a list of reasons to oppose the proposal.

- (a) The additional appropriation of \$25 M is only half of the \$50 M needed to support 5,000 additional students, using the agreed upon marginal cost figure of \$10 K. Thus, this proposal will diminish the University's budget position by \$25 M, requiring UC to make cuts to other programs, possibly even including student aid. We acknowledge the state's view that increased revenue from non-resident tuition could contribute to UC's share of the \$50 M, but we also note that there are many competing uses for those funds, including funding the current number of over-enrolled students, deferred maintenance, and mandatory cost increases, to list but a few.
- (b) The language of the budget item indicates an all-or-nothing mandate. If UC were to fall short of the May 2016 enrollment target by even a small increment, the state would apparently not provide even a portion of its \$25 M, though the campuses would likely have committed to many extra students. Predicting the number of admissions is more of an art than a science. All campuses offer admission to more students than ultimately enroll, and the fraction of students that enroll (the "yield rate") varies, sometimes unpredictably, among campuses and between years. The uncertainty is not recognized in the proposal, but it means that UC will have to admit a considerably higher number of students and hope that the fraction that enrolls will be predicted accurately.

- (c) The addition of 5,000 students has important consequences for the University. Will the academic needs of the increased enrollments be met by increasing class size, by hiring new lecturers, by more fully employing current part-time lecturers, or by increasing the teaching of ladder-rank faculty? There is little time to recruit new positions in any but the most temporary of employee categories. It will be important to consider how such an expansion can be carried out, and how it will affect attainment of the University's mission of teaching, research, and public service.
- (d) The language requires all 5,000 additional students to be resident undergraduates; the increased need for graduate student teaching assistants has not been considered.
- (e) There will be significant strain on physical infrastructure (labs, classrooms, dormitories, etc.) to accommodate 5,000 students on this short timescale. This is heightened because one of the putative revenue sources for the University's \$25 M share is the addition of more non-resident students, who themselves necessitate additional resources. UCPB has noted that the campuses that might accommodate more resident undergraduates are not those that benefit from recruiting large number of nonresident undergraduates.
- (f) Of critical importance, the language is silent on both University and State action beyond the 2016-17 academic year. The acceptance of 5,000 additional students carries a responsibility through their graduation; it is not a one-year event. The University has hoped that the current stability in State finances would allow us to begin the long-term planning necessary to make long-term commitments to those whom it serves. Without a sustained increase in funding, even seeing these 5,000 students through to graduation is problematic, but sustaining such an increased number of freshmen admits every year is almost completely out of the question. By their senior year, these students would be part of a cumulative increase in enrollment that reaches the size of an entire campus.

In summary, the Academic Council greatly appreciates the priority of the Legislature to increase the enrollment of resident undergraduate students. However, we are concerned that the terms and conditions of the current proposal will shortchange, by erosion of academic quality and resources, all students, whether new or already enrolled, that the Legislature is trying to help. We support any efforts that may be undertaken to negotiate a modified proposal, but, failing that, we urge that the financial compromises necessary to accept the current proposal be carefully modeled and that the consequences of those compromises be fully understood and communicated widely to current students, legislators, and other stakeholders.

Sincerely,



J. Daniel Hare, Chair
Academic Council

Cc: Academic Council
Chief of Staff Grossman
Provost Dorr
Executive Vice President - Chief Financial Officer Brostrom
Associate Vice President Obley
Senate Director Baxter