



OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

1111 Franklin Street  
Oakland, California 94607-5200  
Phone: (510) 987-9074  
Fax: (510) 987-9086  
<http://www.ucop.edu>

July 2, 2002

The Honorable Dede Alpert  
Chair, Joint Committee to Develop  
a Master Plan for Education  
State Capitol, Room 5050  
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Senator Alpert:

I am writing to provide you with the University's formal response to the draft Master Plan for Education released in May. On behalf of the University of California, I would like to express my gratitude for your and the Joint Committee's willingness to take on this difficult task. I recognize the extraordinary difficulty you, members of the Joint Committee, and staff faced in sifting through the multiplicity of ideas presented over the past two years to create a draft Master Plan from those elements believed to be most promising.

This response reflects the input, and has the support, of the University of California Academic Senate. As I noted to you in April, senior University representatives, including faculty, administrators, and Regents, were active in the deliberations of the working groups and generally concurred with the direction of the working group reports. The University is generally supportive of the direction of the report. However, a number of new recommendations and accompanying text have since emerged in the draft Master Plan, some of which are of concern to the University. I will highlight the issues of greatest concern in this letter. Comprehensive comments, included in the attachment, provide UC positions and suggested amending language on all of our issues of concern.

UC supports the draft's focus on improving access for K-12 students to rigorous academic preparation. We are very supportive of the draft's focus on increasing rigor in the academic preparation of students in our public schools and on assuring that underserved students are given the opportunity and resources to succeed in a more rigorous curriculum. This focus on improving student achievement and broadening opportunity in the public schools is consistent with the University becoming a more active partner in K-12 educational improvement, a goal articulated in the UC statement on the Master Plan transmitted to you with my letter of May 8.

We believe that the University and the state must strike a balance between setting high standards and recognizing current inequities of educational opportunity in our schools. Over the past three

years, with the support of the Academic Senate, the University has undertaken a far-reaching series of admissions and outreach initiatives designed to address these challenges. Eligibility in the Local Context (ELC) guarantees that all students who rank in the top four percent of *each* high school class will be admitted to a campus of the University. Dual Admissions will extend the Master Plan promise of eligibility to all students who achieve in the top 12.5 percent of *each* high school class. Students in this program will be required to complete lower division work at a community college—an arrangement that supports the Master Plan goal of making transfer a more robust route to obtaining a baccalaureate degree. Comprehensive Review in admissions requires campuses to evaluate each student individually and in the context of the opportunities available and challenges faced. Our current re-examination of standardized testing policy seeks to link admissions tests students must take more closely to the recommended college preparatory curriculum.

These changes, along with our expanded outreach efforts, have allowed us to make steady progress in enrolling a diverse class of academically prepared students. This will assist not only students, but also schools, because it provides clear guidance on what the University expects college-bound students to have learned. Thus, we support the draft Master Plan’s affirmation of these directions in K-12 school improvement and linking the K-12 and the higher education systems.

UC strongly supports the reaffirmation of access, affordability, and quality in higher education. The draft reaffirms the state’s commitment to higher education access, affordability and quality. These and other central tenets of the original Master Plan have served the state well. As part of a larger K-university framework, they will continue to provide a foundation for success of California’s higher educational system.

UC’s major concerns with the draft Master Plan. Our major concerns with the draft Master Plan focus on recommendations in the following three areas. The attachment articulates these, and a number of other, concerns in additional detail and provides suggested amending language.

**Access to a public college and university education should remain an entitlement.**

Recommendation 13 states that UC and CSU should continue to select freshman students from *among* the top one-eighth and one-third of the high school graduating class, respectively. The University requests that you **amend** this language to reflect existing Master Plan for Higher Education policy that guarantees access to all students who apply from these eligibility pools.

While the language in the 1960 Master Plan stated that UC and CSU were to select *from* these pools, the state and the higher education segments have always interpreted this provision as an entitlement. It is the heart of what the California public understands as the Master Plan. That is, if a student works hard enough to be included in one of these eligibility pools, that student will be *guaranteed* a space somewhere in the respective system. Since 1960, even under severe budgetary constraints, UC and CSU have admitted and offered a place to every California high school student who applies on time and is eligible, and the California Community Colleges have offered places to all high school graduates and adults who wish to attend. This has been possible because, with very few exceptions, the state has committed to funding a place for all eligible

students every year since 1960. This guarantee of admission to the top one-third and one-eighth was a key recommendation agreed to in the 1989 Joint Committee Master Plan report.

**UC supports Recommendations 30.1 and 48, which would build a long-term approach for funding higher education based on the existing partnership model.** Recommendation 48 recommends that the state adopt polices to provide more stability for postsecondary finance and to dampen the “boom and bust” in funding for higher education. Recommendation 30.1 endorses building on the partnership approach in linking funding and accountability. UC **supports** these two recommendations. However, we **strongly oppose** the second paragraph of text in Recommendation 48 that suggests a mechanism for funding higher education by levels. We respectfully request it be **deleted**. Significantly, this issue was considered by the Postsecondary Finance and Facilities Work Group but was not included among the group’s recommendations to the Joint Committee.

UC strongly supports expanding on the partnership approach as a means of stabilizing higher education funding. The partnership is, in large part, the means by which the state has implemented the access guarantee at the center of the Master Plan. The state commits to funding UC and CSU’s core needs—competitive faculty and staff salaries, academic support, cost increases, facilities, libraries, and equipment. In turn, the institutions agree to take all eligible students and meet state accountability targets in a number of areas, including graduation rates, time-to-degree, transfer enrollments, and student/faculty ratios. We agree with the recommendation that the issue of “boom and bust” in higher education finance should be addressed by emphasizing one-time allocations above base partnership levels in good economic times so that core activities are not reduced in times of financial stress.

As part of this financing model, the state calculates how much funding the segments receive for each new student. The marginal cost approach was developed and agreed to by the Governor’s Office, the Department of Finance, the Legislative Analyst, UC, and CSU. While it does have some drawbacks (marginal cost is inadequate in times of rapid as opposed to marginal growth), it provides a clear and understandable mechanism for financing higher education tied to the Master Plan goal of access. Issues of variation among the segments related to mission, proportion of high-cost disciplines, proportion of courses at various educational levels, faculty salary levels, library, laboratory, and other academic support costs can all be accounted for in the calculation of the marginal cost. We believe a refinement of this model in the context of the partnership approach will work well to ensure that higher education is financed appropriately into the future.

UC opposes funding higher education by level rather than mission. On the other hand, the text in Recommendation 48 (second paragraph) discusses funding students by level – unbundling lower division instruction from upper division instruction, undergraduate instruction from graduate instruction, and, consequently, teaching from research. Such an approach would be extremely harmful to the University given the structure of the 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education. One of the major premises and reasons for the success of the 1960 Master Plan was its limitation on the number of more expensive research-based campuses in order to reduce costs so that the state could provide universal access to Californians seeking higher education. The differentiation of function to eliminate redundancy among systems allows California to focus its limited state resources on a smaller number of research-oriented campuses and to greatly expand the number

of CSU and community college campuses more focused on undergraduate education. In fact, it was understood that students at CSU and the community colleges were to have a more intimate freshman and sophomore experience—lower division class sizes were expected to be smaller and large lecture halls were discouraged in construction plans.

The University hires faculty to carry out all of our missions and to teach at all levels. The funding-by-level approach could cleave UC into two kinds of faculty— those funded to teach at the lower division and those exclusively focused on research and graduate education. UC hires faculty to carry out all of the University’s missions—from teaching undergraduates to scholarship and research at the frontiers of their discipline. Students at all levels benefit from engagement with this kind of faculty. Freshmen and sophomores have benefited from recent UC efforts to improve undergraduate education such as increasing the numbers of lower division seminars and undergraduate research opportunities.

Funding by level would not be fair unless we also examine: (1) disaggregating costs by discipline—the differences here are likely to be greater than by level, (2) measures of outcome and efficiency—UC costs per student may be greater but our cost per BA degree produced is almost certainly less given our time-to-degree and completion rates, (3) how to treat non-state funded activities such as UC Extension—UC Extension educates large numbers of Californians without receiving any state funds. Enormous administrative costs and arbitrary accounting judgments would also be entailed in a disaggregated approach.

The relevant question the state should ask is, has the current funding formula been successful? We think it has. By focusing on faculty and enrollments, it has allowed California to attract the best and brightest faculty and students at the same time as providing unprecedented access for all Californians who seek a higher education. The state benefits enormously from focusing its resources in the area of research and advanced graduate training. UC’s preeminence in these areas brings large amounts of federal research funding to the state and is a critical piece of California’s new economy.

**UC is heavily engaged in research responsive to California priorities, and research should not be artificially earmarked as applied or basic.** Recommendation 48.3 calls for earmarking a percentage of state-supported research for “applied research in areas of public priority.” We are concerned about this recommendation and are even more troubled by a passage on page 55 stating the Joint Committee has concerns about the Board of Regents’ “responsiveness” in providing data for long-range planning “as well as its resistance to engage in applied research responsive to State priorities.” We strongly object to this statement; we are not aware of it having been raised in the working groups and we believe it is without foundation. We request that this passage be **deleted** from page 55 and that Recommendation 48.3 be **amended** to eliminate the distinction between basic and applied research and recognize UC’s Master Plan role as the “primary state-supported academic agency for research.”

State research funds have always been allocated to research in areas of state priority. In fact, California has been much more successful than most states in both ensuring that research is conducted in areas of state priority and in leveraging state resources in order to secure federal research funding.

At the urging of the Legislature, California has already developed two mechanisms for ensuring that research of state priority is given adequate attention. One is the California Council on Science and Technology (CCST), a body that includes California higher education institutions, industry, and state government. The CCST was developed to identify ways that science and technology can be used to improve California's economy and quality of life, including the long-range research requirements for sustaining the state's economic development and competitiveness. In addition, UC created the California Policy Research Center in 1977 (as the California Policy Seminar), as a systemwide research and public service program charged with applying the extensive research expertise of the UC system to the analysis, development, and implementation of state policy and federal policy issues of statewide importance.

The University is continually engaged in conducting research in areas of public priority. Under my tenure as president, we have established task forces at the state's request to address issues as diverse as flood response, sudden oak death syndrome, Pierce's disease and the glassy-winged sharpshooter, exotic pests, and disposal of low-level radioactive waste. Both historically and currently, the largest portion of state general funds allocated to UC for research is for agricultural research, clearly a long-standing state priority. Other research priorities funded at UC by the state include areas as diverse and important to California as research on issues of educational access and equity, linguistic minority students, labor and employment, breast cancer, tobacco-related diseases, AIDS, health policy, toxics substances control, earthquake engineering, energy efficiency, air pollution, digital arts, transportation and bio-terrorism. One would be hard-pressed to find state-funded research programs at UC not applicable to state priorities.

UC's research has been vital to California's economic competitiveness in both traditional sectors (e.g., agriculture) and newly established industries such as in the semiconductor, software, and biotechnology industries in California. And in an attempt to keep California competitive economically, the governor and the legislature recently funded UC's four California Institutes for Science and Innovation, all of which will focus on cutting-edge technology that has the potential to transform our society. The Institutes, by their very design, will conduct research that transcends any distinction between basic and applied research. In fact, that distinction has little relevance in today's world in which advances in basic research are often translated into applications in very short order and, in turn, the requirements of the applications help shape priorities for additional basic research.

Other recommendations. There are a number of other recommendations that we support and also where we would like to see changes or further discussion. These are detailed in the enclosed document in the order they appear in the report. However, I will briefly highlight some of the key issues here [recommendation numbers are in brackets]:

- While we welcome the opportunity to participate in a process to improve and strengthen the functioning of the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC), we are unsure whether or not higher education issues would be given adequate attention if CPEC were reconstituted as a planning agency for both K-12 and higher education. The University recognizes the dilemma here. Many issues affecting higher education are, indeed, issues of coordination with the K-12 system. At the same time, many important

issues CPEC has dealt with are really issues internal to higher education. We need to find a mechanism to do both – to ensure the proper coordination between K-12 and higher education, and also to adequately address issues of importance to higher education. [39]

- The recommendation to eliminate extra weight for honors and Advanced Placement (AP) courses might send the wrong message that students should not take the most challenging courses. Although UC faculty are reviewing this policy, a recommendation to eliminate it is premature and overly prescriptive for a state-level Master Plan. With comprehensive review, the University takes into account in admissions decisions the extent to which a student had the opportunity to take honors or AP courses. [13.1]
- We support the principle of valuing teaching in tenure review [11.1] and the idea of ensuring flexibility in how the systems deploy permanent and temporary faculty [10]. However, the recommendations in the report are too prescriptive for a state-level Master Plan.
- Assessment in higher education needs to reflect the different mission and culture of higher education. K-12 conceptions of content and performance standards and end-of-program exit exams are not necessarily appropriate in higher education. Similarly, the accountability language about monitoring quality and achievement across “common academic content areas” is probably unworkable given the large number of different degree programs in higher education. UC alone offers over 700 different degrees. [21, 22]
- We believe the state and the higher education segments should develop principles relating to the level of student fees and that such principles need to be linked to overall state support for the institutions and adequate financial aid for needy students. [49]

We look forward to working with you and your staff as the next draft of the Master Plan is developed. Because so many new higher education issues emerged that were not in the working group reports, we would respectfully request the opportunity to sit down and work through some of these issues in detail with your staff before the next draft is made public.

As always, we appreciate your consideration of our views.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Dick" followed by a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Richard C. Atkinson  
President

Attachment

cc: Members of the Joint Committee

## **Attachment**

### **University of California Positions on the Recommendations and Issues contained in the May 7, 2002 draft *California Master Plan for Education***

This document provides the University of California's responses to the May 7, 2002 draft California Master Plan for Education. It follows the structure of the draft Master Plan, divided into four sections that follow the four main chapters of the report. Each section of this response begins with a general statement of areas where the University supports or concurs with recommendations in the report. It then provides a detailed listing of UC's concerns with the report and suggested deletions or amending language to address such concerns. This response reflects the input, and has the support, of the University of California Academic Senate.

Not all Master Plan provisions are statutory. It should be noted that the University's positions and recommended amendments are for a Master Plan document, not statutory enactment. Many of these issues may not be appropriate for statutory enactment because they are in the domain of the faculty, campuses, or governing boards of the segments. Thus, the University's positions may be quite different if this language is suggested for inclusion in statute. Previous Master Plan reviews have recognized this distinction and we would recommend inclusion of similar language in this Master Plan document. Numerous provisions of the original Master Plan were adopted by the higher education segments but have never been included in statute.

#### **ACCESS TO HIGH QUALITY EDUCATION**

Significant areas within this section of the report focus on providing California public school students with access to academically rigorous curriculum that will allow students to have a true choice of going to college or directly into an occupation. The recommendations also seek to ensure that students are able to "keep up" rather than "catch up" with their progression through this curriculum. The report suggests that this be done by ensuring that targeted support services are provided at critical transition points in the educational continuum. All of this is consonant with the University's goal of becoming a more active partner in K-12 educational improvement. UC also supports the goals behind the recommendations to increase higher education's capacity to prepare greater numbers of qualified teachers and to encourage segmental collaborations to develop new programs in educational leadership. The recommendation on maintaining competitive salaries for California educators is also critical. The most recent CPEC report projects an average salary lag of 7.7 percent for UC faculty for the next academic year.

#### **Recommendation 9.4 – Professional development for postsecondary faculty**

All UC campuses provide faculty with ongoing professional development opportunities related to teaching. These opportunities include feedback on instructional techniques via mentoring

programs, classroom videotaping, and departmental reviews; instructional improvement grants to explore new pedagogical techniques; supplementary student input on teaching styles (beyond standard course evaluations); cross-discipline collaborations for faculty focusing on specific topics such as writing instruction. Whether offered through a single campus resource center or through individual college, school, division or departmental units, the range of strategies focusing on instructional improvement evidence a dedication to high-quality teaching.

In addition, UC provides training in general and discipline-specific pedagogy for graduate students who are teaching assistants. The University, however, does not require all students at the masters and doctoral level to undergo such training. For the professional schools and many graduate disciplines, relatively few individuals plan to pursue careers as academics. Most students complete their graduate programs and move to industry or other settings outside higher education. Accordingly, we request that Recommendation 9.4 be **amended** to reflect that teaching and learning curricula should be integrated into graduate curricula for those students interested in pursuing faculty careers:

Recommendation 9.4, second bullet: integration of teaching and learning curricula into master's and doctoral degree programs for those students interested in pursuing faculty careers.

### **Recommendations 10, 10.1, 10.2 – Ratio of permanent/tenure-track and temporary faculty**

Over the past 20 years, the University's permanent faculty has remained quite stable as a percentage of its total budgeted positions; UC has filled about 80 percent of its budgeted positions with permanent faculty. The funds associated with the remaining 20 percent are used to hire temporary (or non-tenure track) faculty, allowing UC to maintain flexibility in adjusting to disciplinary enrollment shifts.

While UC is amenable to reporting on permanent and temporary faculty, we do not believe the Master Plan should require policy adoption of a single ratio as the appropriate balance. Variation in the ratio, however modest, is needed over time. For example, steep undergraduate enrollment growth anticipated over the next few years will likely result in the use of more temporary faculty in the near term. Concomitant growth in the permanent faculty—essentially the long-term teaching infrastructure—will follow but will occur more slowly. The text under Recommendation 10 confirms the importance of temporary faculty in providing flexibility for the use of instructional resources. Rather than adopting an inflexible target ratio, the University accordingly should retain the ability to assess the permanent/temporary faculty balance as circumstances warrant.

In addition, we are concerned that Recommendation 10.2 assumes the University inappropriately excludes its temporary faculty from participating in certain activities. In fact, many temporary faculty members participate in activities beyond classroom instruction including curriculum development. Other responsibilities such as establishing student admission criteria and promotion/tenure reviews generally remain in the purview of Academic Senate members. The extent to which non-tenure-track faculty members participate in activities beyond teaching and

the nature of that participation varies significantly by discipline. An accounting lecturer from private industry, for example, might be a non-voting participant in the tenure review of a business school colleague but the mathematics and English departments would not likely have a parallel. Accordingly, attempting to standardize responsibilities of temporary faculty across disciplines could inhibit rather than encourage the University's use of this valuable complement of instructors.

For these reasons, we request the following **amendments**:

~~Recommendation 10: The Legislature should direct the California Community Colleges, California State University, and the University of California to adopt policies, within one year of being directed to do so, regarding the appropriate balance of temporary and permanent/tenure-track faculty for their respective systems, and provide the rationale for the policies.~~

Recommendation 10.1: Annually, the California Community Colleges, California State University and University of California shall report to the legislature the ratio of permanent/tenure-track to temporary faculty employed by their respective systems ~~and how that ratio compares to systemwide policy.~~

~~Recommendation 10.2: The California Community Colleges, California State University and University of California shall report to the legislature the set of activities reserved for permanent/tenure-track faculty and the rationale for why temporary faculty cannot be enlisted to assist in carrying out such activities.~~

### **Recommendation 11.1 – Ensure teaching excellence given significant weight**

The University concurs with the importance of teaching excellence to decisions about faculty compensation. In the early 1990s, UC undertook a major review of faculty rewards, confirming that “clearly demonstrated evidence of high quality teaching is an essential criterion for (faculty) appointment, advancement, or promotion.” We remain dedicated to the findings of this report and the resulting changes made to the University’s Academic Personnel Manual to reflect this importance of UC’s instructional mission. Given this comprehensive review, we do not believe another review would be necessary at this time. The Master Plan should call for public segments’ ongoing commitment to teaching excellence. Accordingly, we request the following amendment:

Recommendation 11.1: The governing Boards of all three public sectors of postsecondary education should ~~direct an examination of faculty promotion, tenure, and review policies and practices, and revise them, as needed,~~ to ensure that teaching excellence is given significant weight in decisions regarding promotion and tenure and that affect the compensation awarded to faculty. (p. 23)

## **Recommendation 12.2 – Academically rigorous curricula**

The University also supports the intent of Recommendations 12 and 12.2 regarding access to high-quality, academically rigorous courses that prepare students for higher education. It should be recognized, however, that not all of California’s high school students will want to attend a four-year postsecondary institution, nor do they need to in order to pursue meaningful and economically productive occupations. Nevertheless, the Master Plan makes the promise that postsecondary education will be available for those who want it. To make this promise real, the state needs to ensure that students are not denied access to the preparation they need in high school. This draft Master Plan wisely emphasizes the need to have in place the resources and infrastructure these courses require—a cadre of teachers qualified to teach college preparatory courses and adequate facilities, including laboratory space. The University is pledged to continue to expand its efforts to help high schools develop the capacity they need as a precursor to full implementation of this recommendation.

The University has no institutional interest in limiting access to vocational and skills-building courses for students who wish them. UC has worked productively with schools and vocational education teachers for many years to help them understand the process for approving college preparatory courses. UC has certified hundreds of courses that could be considered career-technical in such areas as agricultural science, biotechnology, business management, communications, and the arts. UC continues this work and has developed an a-g website to simplify the process. The University is not seeking to impose the A-G college preparatory curriculum on students who do not want or need it. But the state should have an *educational* interest in ensuring that those who dream of pursuing higher education are not denied that option because of limited access to the preparation they need. Thus, the University will support Master Plan language that opens wide the door to higher education, while honoring the full range of possible occupational and educational paths students may choose.

## **Recommendation 12.6 – “Industry skill certifications”**

This recommendation states that “all postsecondary education institutions should offer *industry skill certifications* [emphasis added] that prepare students to enter the job market with a set of competencies they will need to succeed.” While this requirement may be appropriate to some University Extension courses and programs, it is not generally applicable to UC undergraduate, graduate, or even professional school instruction. We request that this recommendation be **amended**, as follows:

Recommendation 12.6, second sentence: ... ~~all~~ where appropriate, postsecondary education institutions should offer industry skill certifications that prepare students to enter the job market with a set of competencies they will need to succeed...

### **Recommendation 13 – Access to participation in California’s public universities.**

The language in Recommendation 13 states that UC and CSU should continue to select freshman students from *among* the top one-eighth and one-third of the high school graduating class, respectively. While the language in the 1960 Master Plan stated that UC and CSU were to select *from* these pools, the state and the higher education segments have always interpreted this provision as an entitlement. It is the heart of what the California public understands as the Master Plan. That is, if a student works hard enough to be included in one of these eligibility pools, that student will be *guaranteed* a space somewhere in the respective system. Since 1960, even under severe budgetary constraints, UC and CSU have admitted and offered a place to every California high school student who applies on time and is eligible and the California Community Colleges have offered places to all high school graduates and adults who wish to attend. This has been possible because, with very few exceptions, the state has committed to funding a place for all eligible students every year since 1960. This guarantee of admission to the top one-third and one-eighth was a key recommendation agreed to in the 1989 Joint Committee Master Plan report. We would urge that you revise the language to preserve this promise to Californians.

Thus, we request that Recommendation 13 either be **deleted** from the report—numerous existing provisions of the Master Plan for Higher Education are not included in your report and could be incorporated by reference—or be **amended** to reflect the existing Master Plan for Higher Education, as follows:

Recommendation 13. The California State University and the University of California should continue selecting its freshman students from among the top one-third and the University of California should continue selecting its freshman students from among the top one-eighth of high school graduates throughout the state to adhere to the existing Master Plan for Higher Education policy of assuring that all students who apply for freshman admission and who are eligible to attend pursuant to Master Plan guidelines (top one-eighth of high school graduating class at UC; top one-third of high school graduating class at CSU), be offered admission within the system to which they are eligible. The state should continue its policy of fully funding such access.

### **Recommendation 13.1 & 13.2 – Eliminate AP/honors weight and use “objective/subjective” criteria in admissions**

The University is concerned about the language in Recommendation 13.1 that seeks to eliminate the practice of granting additional weight in the GPA calculation for grades earned in honors, Advanced Placement (AP), and college-level courses. The intent of this policy is to serve an important educational purpose by (1) providing students with an incentive to take the most demanding courses and (2) eliminating the perceived risk associated with earning lower grades in these courses. UC adopted this policy at the strong urging of high school teachers and counselors who reported that, without it, students were “gaming the system” by opting for less challenging versions of the same course in order to maximize their GPAs. However, the relevant UC faculty committees have been reviewing this policy to see if it has been effective in

achieving its intended goals and may recommend changes to the policy. Nevertheless, a recommendation to eliminate the policy is premature and overly prescriptive for a state-level Master Plan.

In keeping with the aim of the draft Master Plan to equalize educational opportunities in terms of teacher qualification, school facilities, and program offerings, a better alternative might be to have the state make a commitment to provide high-quality AP and honors courses to all students who may benefit from them. For example, the UC College Prep program has been providing AP courses to school districts that are not able to mount the courses on their own.

Accordingly, we request the following **amendment**:

Recommendation 13.1: The California State University and the University of California should continue collaborating with K-12 schools to increase the rigor of all academic courses to achieve the goals of reducing demand for remedial instruction among freshmen students and eliminating the current practice of providing additional weight to honors and AP courses in admissions decisions. In addition, the state shall ensure all high school students who may benefit from honors and Advanced Placement coursework shall have access to such classes.

With regard to Recommendation 13.2, we do agree it is important to evaluate potential students individually in the context of opportunities available and challenges faced. For example, rather than eliminating the incentive to take honors courses, the admissions process can be used to determine whether or not students had access to honors courses. The University's newly-adopted policy on Comprehensive Review of applications evaluates students in this manner. It states "[s]tudents applying to UC campuses are evaluated for admission using multiple measures of achievement and promise while considering the context in which each student has demonstrated academic accomplishment." However, using multiple measures is not quite the same as saying that "objective and subjective personal characteristics" be treated "equally." In addition, the UC Academic Senate rightly points out that, even though we agree in principle in this area, this recommendation is quite specific about the detail of admissions policy, an area delegated to the faculty. Accordingly, we request that the Joint Committee either (1) **convert** the recommendation into a more general statement in the text of the report or (2) **amend** the recommendation as follows:

Recommendation 13.2: ~~The~~ In developing policies related to selecting students for admission, the California State University and the University of California should authorize each of their campuses to consider both objective and subjective personal characteristics equally in assembling their classes annually from among the pool of eligible candidates should include both quantitative and qualitative measures of achievement and promise and provisions for considering the context in which each student has demonstrated academic accomplishment.

## ACHIEVEMENT OF STUDENTS

The University supports K-12 and postsecondary collaborations outlined in this section that build on joint endeavors proposed under “Access.” Specifically, we believe it would be helpful to expand the opportunities for K-12 and higher education faculty consultation regarding curricular alignment. In general, it is important that the state have some means—via the Governor’s Office or otherwise—for broad coordination of K-12 and higher education policy.

### **Recommendations 21.2, 21.3, and 22 – Assessment**

University students are evaluated continuously in their coursework as they progress through their degree programs. While the most common form of assessment is a written examination, faculty use many tools including portfolios and work samples to allow students to demonstrate what they have learned. Whatever the form, assessments generally occur at several points in a course and culminate in a final exam. Faculty members determine the classes that comprise such a course of study considered appropriate for an undergraduate major. Collectively, passage of a prescribed series or subset of applicable courses constitutes mastery of a particular discipline and results in attainment of an undergraduate degree.

Recommendations 21.2 and 21.3 are unclear in their implications for higher education. Terms such as “grade level” included therein make their application to postsecondary institutions somewhat ambiguous. It was our understanding that the Student Learning working group recommended a separate process for examining assessment in higher education. Recommendation 22 is consistent with that action. Thus, we request that Recommendations 21.2 and 22.3 be **amended**, as follows:

Recommendation 21.2: The State should encourage schools ~~and postsecondary institutions~~ to develop end-of-course assessments that can serve the dual purposes of measuring what a student has mastered at each grade level and of the student’s readiness to successfully undertake learning at the next grade level.

Recommendation 21.3: Schools, ~~colleges, and universities~~ should use authentic assessments that measure students’ school accomplishments, including work samples and portfolio entries, in relevant academic subjects that would allow the student to move through a variety of coordinated delivery systems, regardless of the provider.

With regard to Recommendation 22, the state should not require the use of a common assessment instrument for all sectors of higher education. We do not believe a single, standardized assessment would be very beneficial or informative for the state. In practice, an undergraduate degree requires selection of a major course of study. The specialization inherent in this choice suggests that meaningful evaluation of undergraduate learning should reflect some disciplinary component rather than focusing exclusively on general education. Moreover, it seems incongruous to advocate standardized testing as an effective means to assess students leaving UC at a time when the University and the state agree that those entering should be evaluated on a comprehensive basis that highlights individual experience.

## **Recommendation 24, 24.1, and 24.2 – Transfer**

The University supports the goals articulated in the Master Plan draft regarding development of clear and sustainable transfer mechanisms. UC has worked diligently to improve transfer, including establishing transfer targets as part of the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the California Community Colleges. The articulation processes established to date have been the result of collaboration between the CCC and our eight general campuses. Many years ago all three public segments collaborated in the development of the Intersegmental General Education Transfer Curriculum (IGETC). Given IGETC and other joint efforts to assist student transfer, we request Recommendation 24.1 be **amended** to reflect the ongoing nature of transfer improvements:

Recommendation 24.1: The governing boards of the University of California, the California State University, and the California Community college system should establish an intersegmental group of faculty to devise system-wide articulation ~~agreements~~ processes that will better enable students to transfer units between and among public colleges and universities in California.

Most recently, we expressed our willingness to work with colleagues regarding a transfer associate's degree. Extensive faculty consultation would be required to address divergent major and GPA requirements among institutions potentially enrolling students who complete the degree. Also, if development of this type of degree proceeds, any admission guarantee should apply to the system in general rather than to a specific campus. Given this, we request the following **amendment**:

Recommendation 24.2: The University of California, California State University, and California Community College systems should establish an intersegmental group that includes faculty and students, to consider what steps need to be taken to establish a transfer Associate's degree, within the existing Associate degree unit requirements, the attainment of which will guarantee admission, and course transferability, to ~~any~~ CSU or UC ~~campus~~ for students successfully completing the transfer degree program. (pp. 41-42)

## **ACCOUNTABILITY FOR LEARNER OUTCOMES AND INSTITUTIONAL PERFORMANCE**

State support for public institutions necessitates some mechanisms of accountability for the investment of resources. The University appreciates the importance of many accountability concepts outlined in the draft Master Plan, including those associated with the higher education Partnership agreements of recent years. In addition, we support the recommendation to reconstitute the Community College Board of Governors. We would hope to make significant improvements in areas such as transfer and course articulation with a strengthened CCC Board. Finally, the University recognizes the need for improved education data and would be willing to consider an independent educational data collection entity provided this entity has appropriate institutional and academic oversight.

### **Recommendation 30 – Postsecondary accountability**

We agree that education institutions should be accountable for their performance and for reporting appropriate accountability indicators. We support Recommendation 30.1 that uses the “partnership” budget approach as a basis for accountability in postsecondary education [see discussion on this under **Recommendation 48**]. However, as discussed in the recommendations on assessment, Recommendation 30 makes reference to the K-12 notion of collecting accountability information in common academic content areas. UC alone has over 700 different degree programs. We request that this recommendation be **amended** to either focus solely on K-12 or as follows:

Recommendation 30: The State should bring postsecondary education into an integrated accountability system by developing a set of accountability indicators that are consistent with state policy objectives and institutional missions and that would monitor quality and equity in access and achievement of all students ~~in common academic content areas~~.

### **Recommendation 37 – Reconstitute the California Community College Board of Governors as a public trust**

The University **supports** Recommendation 37 that seeks to strengthen the higher education model of governance at the California Community Colleges (CCC). Every Master Plan review since 1960 has sought to reinforce the original Master Plan vision that the community colleges move away from their K-12 origins (under the State Board of Education) and function as a full partner in higher education. This could facilitate significant improvements in areas where UC works with the community colleges, such as in the areas of transfer and course articulation.

### **Recommendations 39, 39.1, and 39.2 – Eliminate CPEC and establish a new California Education Commission to oversee both K-12 and higher education**

The University has concerns with Recommendation 39 that seeks to replace the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) with a new California Education Commission (CEC) that would provide policy and fiscal advice and approve programs for all of education, pre-K through university. Attention to higher education issues might be lost in a commission that also has responsibilities for the K-12 system, whose issues and state budget dwarf that of the colleges and universities. Higher education needs a body where discussions and policy analyses of major higher education issues can occur. It also needs a mechanism to coordinate new higher education programs and campuses. A commission that also has a K-12 focus will probably not be able to devote significant time, attention, and resources to key issues of higher education. It may be that the particular functions historically performed by CPEC—provision of policy and fiscal advice, data analysis, review of programs, review and approval of new campuses—are best left with an entity that focuses on postsecondary segments.

We want to participate in a process to improve and strengthen the functioning of the CPEC. We would support proposals that would make CPEC more effective in carrying out policy and coordination functions such as more independence for board members, elimination of

cumbersome hiring requirements, and more visibility for policy debate. A strengthened and revitalized CPEC should be a goal of this Master Plan.

Program review versus program approval. In addition, the University opposes granting program approval rather than review authority to CPEC or a successor commission. UC has worked effectively with CPEC for many years in developing an effective program review process. University campuses and the systemwide office take into account the local, regional, or statewide need for any particular program in its internal program development and review processes. CPEC then reviews the proposal against a set of criteria related to state and societal need and the degree of coordination with other campuses and segments. UC works collaboratively with CPEC to answer questions and respond to concerns related to the criteria applied by CPEC on behalf of the state. We take seriously recommendations made by the Commission and it is unlikely that the University would move forward on a proposal until CPEC concerns were adequately addressed. It is also unlikely that the legislature and the governor would provide state funding for new programs not recommended by CPEC. A recent example is CPEC's finding that there was neither sufficient demand nor societal need to establish an additional publicly supported law school. The University strongly supports maintaining CPEC's crucial role in the program approval process, but that is not the same as giving CPEC statutory authority for approving or rejecting programs.

Given the foregoing, we request Recommendation 39 be **amended** as follows:

Recommendation 39: ~~The Legislature should replace~~ state should strengthen and revitalize the functioning of the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) ~~with a new California Education Commission (CEC).~~ CPEC should have as its primary functions:

- Providing policy and fiscal advice, based on data analysis, that represents the public interest in California's postsecondary education system, ~~pre-kindergarten through university;~~
- ~~Approving~~ Reviewing and making recommendations regarding the need for postsecondary education programs for public and state-approved private postsecondary degree-granting institutions; and
- Reviewing and approving new public campuses

Commission membership. The proposed CEC membership in Recommendation 39.1 eliminates segmental representation. We were amenable to such an approach for CPEC during discussions in the Governance Work Group. It was proposed that all the members of CPEC be appointed for lengthy terms and by a single appointing authority. However, the draft report would maintain multiple appointing authorities. In that case, we would urge retention of segmental representatives. We disagree with the statement that CPEC's current composition "brings too many vested interests together to govern themselves." In fact, the segments collectively represent less than one-third of the Commission's total membership (5 out of 16). The University believes that this arrangement works well to balance input from UC and other segments with the interests of the general public. We also believe having one or more representatives from the K-12 schools on CPEC is a better way to ensure that issues that intersect between K-12 and higher education are addressed rather than giving CPEC responsibility for K-

12 policy and fiscal advice. We request that this recommendation be **amended** to restore the segmental representatives:

Recommendation 39.1: The membership of the California Postsecondary Education Commission should consist of nine lay representatives appointed equally by the Governor, the Speaker of the Assembly, and the President Pro-tempore of the Senate and 5 ex officio voting representatives of the University of California, the California State University, the California Community Colleges, the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities, and the State Board of Education.

### **Recommendation 42.2 – CEC/CPEC responsibilities related to publics and privates**

We are unclear what is meant by the term “standards” in Recommendation 42.2 and request that it be **amended** as follows:

Recommendation 42.2: The California Postsecondary Education Commission should ~~develop standards to~~ promote articulation, when appropriate, and ~~to~~ foster collaborative shared use of facilities and instructional equipment between state-approved private colleges and universities awarding academic degrees and regionally accredited public and independent colleges and universities.

### **AFFORDABILITY OF A HIGH QUALITY EDUCATION SYSTEM**

The University supports the draft’s reaffirmation of the importance of maintaining affordability of public higher education. We agree with the recommendation that there is a need “to provide more stability for finance and dampen the ‘boom and bust’ swings of state appropriations to postsecondary education.” Clearly, all segments would benefit from this approach. As noted in the draft, a blueprint for more stable funding would support Master Plan goals of access, affordability, quality, accountability, and choice.

### **Recommendation 47 – School Facilities (p. 66)**

The State Allocation Board is an entity with a membership designed for K-12 school allocations. It is not an appropriate body to allocate facility funds to higher education institutions or to maintain an inventory for those institutions. Accordingly, we request the third sentence of Recommendation 47 be **amended** as follows:

Recommendation 47, third sentence: The State Allocation Board is the appropriate body to develop and maintain such an inventory on behalf of the State and to allocate facility funds to public schools, ~~colleges, and universities.~~

**Recommendations 48 on financing Postsecondary Education (includes Recommendation 30.1) (p. 67 and p. 49)**

UC supports Recommendations 48 and 30.1 that would build a long-term approach for the funding higher education based on the existing partnership model. Recommendation 48 recommends that the State adopt polices to provide more stability for postsecondary finance and to dampen the “boom and bust” in funding for higher education. Recommendation 30.1 endorses building on the partnership approach in linking funding and accountability. UC **supports** these two recommendations. However, we **strongly oppose** the second paragraph of text in Recommendation 48 that suggests a mechanism for funding higher education by levels. Significantly, this issue was considered by the Postsecondary Finance and Facilities Work Group, but was not included among the group’s recommendations to the Joint Committee.

UC strongly supports expanding on the partnership approach as a means of stabilizing higher education funding. The partnership is, in large part, the means by which the state has implemented the access guarantee at the center of the Master Plan. The state commits to funding UC and CSU’s core needs—competitive faculty and staff salaries, academic support, cost increases, facilities, libraries, and equipment. In turn, the institutions agree to take all eligible students and meet state accountability targets in a number of areas including graduation rates, time-to-degree, transfer enrollments, and student/faculty ratios. We agree with the recommendation that the issue of “boom and bust” in higher education finance should be addressed by emphasizing one-time allocations above base partnership levels in good economic times so that core activities are not reduced in times of financial stress.

As part of this financing model, the state calculates how much funding the segments receive for each new student. The marginal cost approach was developed and agreed to by the Governor’s Office, the Department of Finance, the Legislative Analyst, UC, and CSU. While it does have some drawbacks (marginal cost is inadequate in times of rapid as opposed to marginal growth), it provides a clear and understandable mechanism for financing higher education tied to the Master Plan goal of access. Issues of variation among the segments related to mission, proportion of high-cost disciplines, proportion of courses at various educational levels, faculty salary levels, library, laboratory, and other academic support costs can all be accounted for in the calculation of the marginal cost. We believe a refinement of this model in the context of the partnership approach will work well to ensure that higher education is financed appropriately into the future.

UC opposes funding higher education by level rather than mission. On the other hand, the text in Recommendation 48 (second paragraph) discusses funding students by level – unbundling lower division instruction from upper division instruction, undergraduate instruction from graduate instruction, and, consequently, teaching from research. Such an approach would be extremely harmful to the University given the structure of the 1960 Master Plan for Higher Education. One of the major premises and reasons for the success of the 1960 Master Plan was its limitation on the number of more expensive research-based campuses in order to reduce costs so that the state could provide universal access to Californians seeking higher education. The differentiation of function to eliminate redundancy among systems allows California to focus its limited state resources on a smaller number of research-oriented campuses and to greatly expand the number of CSU and community college campuses more focused on undergraduate education. In fact, it

was understood that students at CSU and the community colleges were to have a more intimate freshman and sophomore experience—lower division class sizes were expected to be smaller and large lecture halls were discouraged in construction plans.

The University hires faculty to carry out all of our missions and to teach at all levels. The funding-by-level approach could cleave UC into two kinds of faculty—those funded to teach at the lower division and those exclusively focused on research and graduate education. UC hires faculty to carry out all of the University’s missions—from teaching undergraduates to scholarship and research at the frontiers of their discipline. Students at all levels benefit from engagement with this kind of faculty. The University has expanded the range of options offered to undergraduates in a number of ways: by consciously involving undergraduates in the research mission of the University, by providing a large number of lower-division seminars to facilitate close faculty-student contact, by ensuring the quality of undergraduate teaching, and by providing experiential learning opportunities for undergraduates. A funding model that differentiated by level within UC would threaten these kinds of improvements.

The current differential in per student funding is based on the differentiation of mission and function that is at the core of the Master Plan for Higher Education. When the state funds enrollments, it primarily is paying for faculty and related academic support. A typical UC faculty member teaches all levels of students—lower division, upper division, graduate students, and even postdoctoral scholars. UC faculty members are expected to devote significant time to each aspect of UC’s tripartite mission: teaching, research, and service. Thus, UC’s costs are higher because: (1) a significant portion of faculty time is spent on research, (2) faculty salaries are established at a level competitive with institutions which have similar missions, (3) UC offers doctoral and professional degree programs not taught at other segments that are more expensive because they are heavily research-dependent and require intensive individual supervision, (4) UC offers a greater proportion of programs in high-cost and research-intensive disciplines, and (5) library and other academic support costs are greater in these programs and disciplines.

Funding by level would not be fair unless we also examine: (1) disaggregating costs by discipline—the differences here are likely to be greater than by level; (2) measures of outcome and efficiency—UC’s *costs* per student may be greater due to the mission differentials discussed above, but any analysis of costs should also factor in UC’s higher persistence and graduation rates. If one were to look at the output measure of the number of baccalaureate degrees produced per state dollar invested, UC would be seen as a great bargain; (3) how to treat non-state funded activities such as UC Extension—UC Extension educates large number of Californians without receiving any state funds). Should this level of education be funded at the same amount across the various segments?

The calculation of cost by level of instruction would result in enormous administrative costs for all of the segments of higher education. It would require numerous arbitrary accounting judgments—how much of a faculty members time is spent at the lower division when the courses that faculty member teaches include students from all levels—lower division, upper division, and graduate school? And after all of these accounting systems and allocation methodologies were developed, would the state then choose to allocate funds much differently than we do today?

The relevant question the state should ask is—has the current funding formula been successful? We think it has. By focusing on faculty and enrollments, it has allowed California to attract the best and brightest faculty and students at the same time as providing unprecedented access for all Californians who seek a higher education. The state benefits enormously from focusing its resources in the area of research and advanced graduate training. UC’s preeminence in these areas brings large amounts of federal research funding to the state and is a critical piece of California’s new economy.

Thus, we are strongly **opposed** to the language in the second paragraph of Recommendation 48 on page 68 that suggests a disaggregated funding approach for California and would urge **deleting** this paragraph from the report. Significantly, this issue was considered by the Postsecondary Finance and Facilities Work Group, but was not included among the group’s recommendations to the Joint Committee.

~~Recommendation 48, second paragraph of text: As with K-12 financing structures, we believe the State should maintain a long term objective for postsecondary financing of aligning the allocation and expenditure of moneys with the actual costs of providing the educational services for which they are spent. Consistent with this objective, the committee carefully considered testimony suggesting that the State should allocate funding to support lower division instruction at roughly comparable levels in all three public sectors of postsecondary education. This recommendation is attractive in several respects: (1) it is consistent with our stance that quality educational opportunities should be available to all students enrolling in public colleges and universities and that state financing should reflect this commitment; (2) it would provide substantial additional resources to community colleges, which serve students with the greatest range of preparation and needs; and (3) it might foster greater faculty collaboration and course articulation. Simultaneously, we recognize that pursuing this option could result in a substantial additional financial obligation for the State, which could threaten community college access during poor economic times and exert pressure to increase fees charged to community college students. This approach to financing would also lead to consideration of comparable funding between the CSU and UC where they offer equivalent graduate instruction and, perhaps, differential funding for upper division instruction. These directions may be appropriate for consideration, since they come closer to identifying the education components essential to quality education at the postsecondary level; but the financial implications of this approach require that it be studied carefully before acting to implement it. Examination of this option should also be accompanied by an analysis of its potential impact on student fee policy and financial aid requirements.~~

**Recommendation 48.3 – Earmarking for applied research and related language** (p. 55 and p. 68)

Recommendation 48.3 calls for earmarking a percentage of state-supported research for “applied research in areas of public priority.” We are concerned about this recommendation and are even more troubled by a passage on page 55 stating the Joint Committee has concerns about the Board of Regents’ “responsiveness” in providing data for long-range planning “as well as its resistance

to engage in applied research responsive to State priorities.” We strongly object to this statement; we are not aware of it having been raised in the working groups and we believe it is without foundation.

State research funds have always been allocated to research in areas of state priority. In fact, California has been much more successful than most states in both ensuring that research is conducted in areas of state priority and in leveraging state resources in order to secure federal research funding.

At the urging of the legislature, California has already developed two mechanisms for ensuring that research of state priority is given adequate attention. One is the California Council on Science and Technology (CCST), a body that includes California higher education institutions, industry, and state government. The CCST was developed to identify ways that science and technology can be used to improve California's economy and quality of life, including the long-range research requirements for sustaining the state's economic development and competitiveness. In addition, UC created the California Policy Research Center in 1977 (as the California Policy Seminar), as a systemwide research and public service program charged with applying the extensive research expertise of the UC system to the analysis, development, and implementation of state policy and federal policy issues of statewide importance.

The University is continually engaged in conducting research in areas of public priority. Under my tenure as president, we have established task forces at the state's request to address issues as diverse as flood response, sudden oak death syndrome, Pierce's disease and the glassy-winged sharpshooter, exotic pests, and disposal of low-level radioactive waste. Both historically and currently, the largest portion of state general funds allocated to UC for research is for agricultural research, clearly a long-standing state priority. Other research priorities funded at UC by the state include areas as diverse and important to California as research on issues of educational access and equity, linguistic minority students, labor and employment, breast cancer, tobacco-related diseases, AIDS, health policy, toxics substances control, earthquake engineering, energy efficiency, air pollution, digital arts, transportation and bio-terrorism. One would be hard-pressed to find state-funded research programs at UC not applicable to state priorities.

UC's research has been vital to California's economic competitiveness in both traditional sectors (e.g., agriculture) and newly established industries such as in the semiconductor, software, and biotechnology industries in California. And in an attempt to keep California competitive economically, the governor and the legislature recently funded UC's four California Institutes for Science and Innovation, all of which will focus on cutting-edge technology that has the potential to transform our society. The Institutes, by their very design, will conduct research that transcends any distinction between basic and applied research. In fact, that distinction has little relevance in today's world in which advances in basic research are often translated into applications in very short order and, in turn, the requirements of the applications help shape priorities for additional basic research.

We request that this passage be **deleted** from page 55 and that Recommendation 48.3 be **amended** to eliminate the distinction between basic and applied research and recognize UC's Master Plan role as the “primary state-supported academic agency for research”:

Fourth sentence of last paragraph on page 54: While the Joint Committee has some concerns about the responsiveness of the Board of Regents – especially with respect to its reluctance to provide some of the data necessary to enable the State to conduct effective long-range planning, as well as its resistance to engage in applied research that is responsive to State priorities – we find no compelling reason to alter the powers, responsibilities or structure of the Regents as specified in the California constitution.

Recommendation 48.3: The State should ~~earmark a percentage of its annual investment in~~ ensure that state-supported research by public postsecondary education institutions for applied research in areas of public priority as identified by the Legislature and bodies such as the California Council on Science and Technology are adequately addressed in state funding of research.

### **Recommendations 49, 49.1 and 49.2 – Fees and Financial Aid**

We welcome the report's recommendation that the state needs to examine its fee and financial aid policies. We believe fee increases should be gradual and moderate but that a low-fee policy often results in less assistance being available for financially needy students while at the same time providing large subsidies for higher-income students. A fee policy also needs to be linked with the level of state support for the institutions and with financial aid policy. At a minimum, fee increases must be offset with additional financial aid to those students receiving either Cal Grants or institutional aid awards.

Therefore, we request that these recommendations be **amended** to reframe the recommendations in this section in accordance with the state's long-standing policy of providing California students with both access and choice. Access and choice for all California students can be achieved with a strong Cal Grant program that augments the resources available from students, their families, the federal government, and institutional aid programs. The language is intentionally left general so that each segment can design institutional aid programs to complement the Cal Grant program in ways most appropriate to the issues students in that segment face in managing their total educational costs:

Recommendation 49: The Legislature and the Governor should reform the State's approach to student charges in the public segments and continue the State's commitment to providing all eligible California students – regardless of family resources – with both access to higher education and choice of what institution to attend and maintain the Cal Grant need-based financial aid entitlement.

Recommendation 49, first sentence of second paragraph: The Committee believes that California should continue its commitment to ~~low fees~~ affordable fees and other costs for students enrolled in public colleges and universities.

Recommendation 49.1: The State should adopt a student fee policy aimed at stabilizing student fees and assuring that (1) student fee increases are gradual and moderate, (2) fee

levels are linked to adequate state support of the higher education segments, (3) and support for the Cal Grant and institutional aid programs at CCC, CSU, and UC are increased to offset the impact of fee increases for all eligible students. The state should resist the pressure to buy out student fee increases or reduce student fees at CCC, CSU and UC during good economic times.

Recommendation 49.2: The State should continue to promote student access and choice through strong support for the Cal Grant program, which, in combination with resources from students, families, the federal government and institutions, allows low and moderate income students to manage the cost of attending college. The State should continue to emphasize financial need as well as merit in the award of state-supported student grants and should continue to fund the Cal Grant ‘entitlement’ as defined in SB 1644 (statues of 2000).