

**Academic Senate Chair Shane White**  
**Remarks to the University of California Board of Regents**  
**September 2017**

One of the great strengths of the Senate is its constant renewal. We say goodbye to Jim Chalfant, and we welcome Robert May, distinguished professor of Philosophy and Linguistics at UC Davis, as our new vice chair. Robert was born in Brooklyn where he attended public schools, before attending Swathmore College and receiving a PhD in Linguistics from MIT. He then served Barnard College, Columbia University and UC Irvine before settling at Davis. Robert has a two-decade record of systemwide Academic Senate service, notably serving as chair of the University Committee on Faculty Welfare and of the Health Care Task Force. He served on President Yudof's Post-Employment Benefits Task Force, along with Jim Chalfant and me. Robert received the Charles P. Nash Award at UC Davis in recognition of his contributions to shared governance. Robert, Welcome.

The University, our University, our bridge to a better future, faces the assaults of a hostile environment.

We must continue to support and maintain the principles of academic freedom; they *"enable the University to advance knowledge and to transmit it effectively to its students and to the public."* Likewise, there is no doubt that we must work even harder to uphold another freedom, that of speech. But we must also recognize the asymmetry of power and the consequences of hate speech on the vulnerable and those who may more easily be denigrated or marginalized. Moreover, we must ensure the security and dignity of all of our students, staff and faculty, especially those at risk, the undocumented and those covered by DACA. We are a single community; we must behave like one, celebrating our diversity, supporting one another, respecting all.

More insidious than overt assault, our University is undergoing a slow corrosion. Diminished State investment is the problem; bloat and fat are a myth. Dan Hare and Jim Chalfant highlighted graphs showing a steady decrease in per-student average expenditures for education over the past three-plus decades. We suffered a 34% decrease in available resources per student since 2000-01. That figure includes augmentation from tuition increases, including from nonresidents, making it very clear that we cannot do without State funding. State support remains below that of 2007-08 levels in real terms. Student tuition surpassed State support for the first time in 2011-12, a shift from the state to student burden. However, the number of qualified applicants continues to increase, and the University stepped up to the plate, absorbing the largest enrolment increases since World War Two, and at the same time

increasing diversity. Every campus, every department feels the strain, as do our students. This Fall's entering class continues the trend comprising 38% under-represented minority students, 45% first generation college attendees, and 42% students from low income families. A tremendous achievement, but the University continues to rust. These students, the State's best, the brightest, and our most diverse, must not be short-changed by a diminished quality of a UC education. We must continue to improve in: accessibility and affordability through financial aid; student to faculty ratio; developing new courses and programs; student support, notably mental health; graduation rates; and time to degree. This cannot be done without a return to realistic funding levels.

Not only the UC bridge to the future rusting, but cracks are growing. We do not have a funding model that works for all campuses. We came close through the Rebenching Process, with a vision that all campuses could aspire to eventually reach equal quality. But the huge cuts of the great recession, 40% over 2 years, caused the cracks to grow. Individual campuses tried, as hard as they could, to compensate for decreases in state support programs through non-resident tuition, through self-supporting programs, through research funding, through commercialization of intellectual property, philanthropy, and every means available. But our campuses started from different places, different levels of maturity; those with historically higher levels of financial support and superior infrastructures are advantaged. Furthermore, all campuses have huge capital needs; bricks and mortar erode, additional classrooms and labs are needed to accommodate the enrollment surge.

Every applicant, whether California freshman, non-resident freshman, transfer student, or graduate student knows which campuses are better resourced and have historically been better resourced – all other things being equal, that is where they will preferentially apply. Depending upon the exact assumptions made, a student, say at Riverside will have their education supported by approximately two-thirds of the dollars that would be spent at, say, Berkeley. We need a funding model that will let all campuses aspire to and grow towards a uniform standard of excellence. But, directly transferring funds from Berkeley to Riverside will only enlarge Berkeley's structural deficit. You have seen the campus budget presentations; all campuses are on unhealthy fiscal trajectories, their expenses grow faster than their revenues. This is a systemic disease; however, the historically best resourced and those with the broadest portfolios are better positioned to fight it off. We have nothing to say to the students considering applying to the least resourced campuses or to the assistant professors considering job offers from those campuses.

Our applicants vote with their feet, they preferentially apply to the better resourced and most selective campuses. Individual student life choices, made one by one, drive enrollment. There is

a cascade effect among our, and other, campuses as offers are given or not and as acceptances are made or not. Campuses can only enroll the qualified and prepared students who pick them. Our campuses are all different with distinct funding histories, regional geographies, regional demographics, academic offerings, research foci, and stars of light. A varied system, but a single united system, a system that is incredibly successful in enrolling underrepresented, first generation, and economically disadvantaged students. For example, Riverside, while making gains with transfers, is exceptionally successful in enrolling underrepresented and first generation students; whereas, our very most selective campuses are successful in enrolling higher proportions of Community College transfer students. All campuses work hard through the application of policy to reach, recruit, enroll and support incredible classes.

But, the policies must be right. Blunt legislative mandates, such as demanding that a 2:1 freshman to transfer student ratio be reached, not just systemwide, but at every campus, ignores differences among the campuses and the determination of our applicants, does more harm than good, and creates perverse enrolment incentives at the campuses. Should Berkeley turn transfers away so that they might enroll at another UC campus further down the admission cascade? Should Irvine limit its freshman enrollees so that it maintains its 2:1 ratio? Should a campus admit an insufficiently qualified applicant to meet a numerical goal? Absolutely not, yet these are the perverse incentives that well intended but ill-considered legislation applies. I cannot overemphasize this point: the Academic Senate is very committed to enhancing transfer pathways, but very strongly opposed to forcing every campus to meet a 2:1 ratio. Those who want to benefit transfer students should ask faculty in all 3 higher education segments how best to do so. To illustrate this point, the Community College and UC Faculty Senates are working together to produce an Associate of Science degree pathway that would benefit and better prepare students interested in transferring to UC or CSU. We can and will work with the other two segments and with the State to achieve our shared goals.

We live up to our responsibilities under the Master Plan and we will continue to do so; likewise the State must do so too. This will ensure access and a quality education at the research university, not any university, but the world's greatest public research University, our University. We provide long-term societal benefits through transmitting advanced knowledge, discovering new knowledge, and functioning as an active working repository of organized knowledge. Yes, Governor Brown, you are right: *"We have a lot of firepower! We've got the scientists. We've got the universities. We have the national labs."* We are the University of California, we have earned your trust, help us, let us do our business, your business. Resist the rust, arrest the cracks, restore the funding.

Chair Kieffer, that concludes my remarks.