



INTERSEGMENTAL COMMITTEE OF ACADEMIC SENATES

December 17, 2009

Dear Assembly Member Ruskin,

On behalf of my colleagues on the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates (ICAS), I am submitting this memorandum on the Master Plan. This is the first in a series of white papers that ICAS will provide and is longer than we anticipate for the future.

We were very pleased to hear many of those who addressed the December 7 hearing affirm that the Master Plan is not broken, but is seriously underfunded. My colleagues and I feel that a real 'educational emergency' has occurred in California as the impact of fiscal pressures has undermined the historic guarantees of access to, and affordability of, higher education just as increasing numbers of would-be students – both those attracted by new opportunities and those driven by the loss of previous employment – seek to enter the state's public universities and colleges.

We hope that this memorandum will be helpful to you and your colleagues as the California Legislature prepares for the coming year. We encourage all members of the legislature to treat higher education as the economic 'escalator' that will both lift individuals toward their aspirations and at the same time renew the formidable powers of the California economy.

With very best wishes,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Henry C. Powell', with a long, sweeping underline.

Henry C (Harry) Powell
Chair, Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates
Chair, Academic Council and Assembly, University of California

Cc: Jane Patton, President, CCC Academic Senate
John Tarjan, Chair, CSU Academic Senate
Martha Winnacker, UC Senate Executive Director

Encl (1)

STATEMENT OF THE INTERSEGMENTAL COMMITTEE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATES REGARDING THE PRINCIPAL PROVISIONS OF THE 1960 MASTER PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION ON THE OCCASION OF ITS FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY

The Intersegmenal Committee of the Academic Senates, including the leadership of the Academic Senates of the California Community Colleges, the California State University, and the University of California, has examined the recommendations of the 1960 California Master Plan for Higher Education. These provisions remain as the key guiding principles for California's three segments of higher education, the Community Colleges, the State University, and the University of California.¹ The Master Plan is one of the most significant documents produced that defines the roles of public higher education. It represents a model plan to which other states and nations aspire. In California, where we face a crisis of funding for higher education, the fundamental principles of the Master Plan continue to provide sound guidance to the segments of California Higher Education. Our current crisis environment is not the result of flaws in the Master Plan; it is a crisis of funding. Our first priority is to stand behind the principles of the Master Plan and the world class standards of public higher education that are reflected in the document. We must re-awaken the citizens of the State of California to the fact that the greatest jewel in the crown of California is its system of higher education. Public higher education produces an educated workforce for the State's ever evolving economy. Public higher education provides access to learning to all of the diverse people of the State of California. Public higher education not only leads to the innovations that fuel the State's changing economy, it educates and trains the people who will discover those innovations and who will run the facilities that produce goods and services resulting from innovation. In sum, California's system of public higher education fuels the California economy. A State failure to invest in public higher education will lead to a failure of our future.

We find a great deal of common interest in the provisions of the Master Plan, and no disagreement regarding the application of those provisions in the current environment. We recognize that integration of the segments of California higher education is important to embrace California's students into higher education. We also recognize our collective responsibility to inform students and the public about the importance of post-secondary education and to assure that all students are provided appropriate opportunities to complete a secondary degree.

In this memorandum we examine the language of Master Plan recommendations with comments regarding current issues. These provisions are considered in the order of their contemporary importance. The headings are from the original Master Plan Report and the bold text represents quotations from the Master Plan recommendations.

¹ The Master Plan document uses the terms State Colleges and Junior Colleges for what are now the California State University (CSU) and the California Community Colleges (CCC). This report retains the Master Plan terminology in quotations from the Master Plan, but otherwise uses the current designations for the State University and Community Colleges.

**I. MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATION--SELECTION AND RETENTION OF STUDENTS
ADMISSIONS POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**

A. MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATION NO. 1.

In order to raise materially standards for admission to the lower division, the state colleges select first-time freshmen from the top one-third (33 1/3 per cent) and the University from the top one-eighth (12½ per cent) of all graduates of California public high schools . . .

ICAS COMMENTS

1. This standard is reflected in California Education Code § 66202.5, which provides as follows:

“The State of California reaffirms its historic commitment to ensure adequate resources to support enrollment growth, within the systemwide academic and individual campus plans to accommodate eligible California freshmen applicants and eligible California Community College transfer students, as specified in Sections 66202 and 66730.

“The University of California and the California State University are expected to plan that adequate spaces are available to accommodate all California resident students who are eligible and likely to apply to attend an appropriate place within the system. The State of California likewise reaffirms its historic commitment to ensure that resources are provided to make this expansion possible, and shall commit resources to ensure that students from enrollment categories designated in subdivision (a) of Section 66202 are accommodated in a place within the system.”

2. “The most significant, and apparently permanent, departure from the Master Plan has been the abrogation of its foundational public policy commitment to college opportunity—that is its commitment to make higher education available for every Californian who can benefit from college.” Patrick M. Callan, California's Higher Education, the Master Plan and the Erosion of College Opportunity, (National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, 2009). 12.
3. All three segments of public higher education are currently enrolling students in excess of the numbers supported by the State of California.

II. MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATION--STUDENT FEES

A. MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATION NO 1:

The two governing boards reaffirm the long established principle that state colleges and the University of California shall be tuition free to all residents of the state.¹⁴

Note 14: The distinction between “tuition” and “fees” is as follows: “tuition” is defined as student charges for teaching expense, whereas “fees” are for charges to the students for services not directly related to instruction, such as health, counseling other than that directly related to the students’ educational program, placement services, housing, recreation, and the like.

ICAS COMMENTS:

1. We remain committed to the eligibility and fee concepts as the cornerstones of affordability and access to higher education in California.
2. The language of Education Code § 66202.5 establishes responsibilities for both the State and the institutions of higher education. Up to the current year the three segments have met their obligations to provide access to all students who are eligible. However, the State has reneged on its statutory commitment where it recognized “its historic commitment to ensure adequate resources to support enrollment growth.”
3. The absence of adequate funding for higher education has forced the University and the State University to reduce enrollments and the Community Colleges to restrict access through a reduction in course offerings.
 - a. None of the three segments is funded to meet the ever-expanding demand or the promise of the Master Plan.
 - b. The State University has said that budget cuts require it to reduce enrollments by 40,000 over the next two years.
 - c. The reduction in funding for student enrollments at the University of California and the California State University has had a significant impact on the Community Colleges as students who are denied or delayed admission seek to enroll in the Community Colleges. At the same time the Community Colleges are also subject to budgetary constraints and have had to reduce access to courses through a reduction in course offerings.
 - d. As UC and CSU push students into the Community Colleges, the least prepared students, and the students who perhaps require the most support of the Community Colleges are pushed out of higher education.
 - e. Because of the demographic shifts in California, the challenges faced by secondary schools, the demands of employers, and the limited capacity of the CSU and UC to offer pre-collegiate instruction, the Community Colleges have seen unprecedented need for basic skills courses in mathematics, English

composition, reading and ESL. Community Colleges find that over 70% of entering freshmen require courses in one or more basic skills areas, and at some colleges the percentage is much higher. The mission of the colleges has expanded and contributed greatly to the capacity concerns.

- f. The reduction in enrollments is occurring in the face of increasing applications to all three segments. For example, applications to the State University for 2010-2011 have increased from 477,000 to 609,000. Most campuses of the State University have also closed new enrollments, including transfer students, for the 2010 Spring semester.
 - g. During periods of high unemployment, postsecondary enrollments typically expand. This not only involves working adults who need to retrain for careers, but recent data show that fewer high school graduates have been able to get jobs in the last year. Thus, demand is higher among all age groups and reduced enrollments are disastrous to the state economy.
 - h. In addition, returning veterans may also find it more difficult to gain admission upon their return as residents, even with government support.
4. The shifting enrollments and increased fees also affect adult education. This is reflected in the following—

MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATION—ADULT EDUCATION IN CALIFORNIA

MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATION NO. 4:

In the long-range plans for providing opportunities in higher education to the people of California provision for adequate state support of adult education services be assured. However, in this determination of what the state should support, effort be made to differentiate between those enrollees who are pursuing a stated planned program with definite occupational or liberal education objectives, and those who are enrolling in single courses for which matriculation or prerequisites are absent.

- a. Adult students returning to higher education, be it for learning new skills after job loss, or in pursuit of a degree, are also pushed out of higher education as the segments lose capacity to meet the enrollment demand of eligible students.
5. The issue of rising fees, which, contrary to the direction of the Master Plan, have been imposed to cover teaching expenses, is directly related to the absence of adequate State support.
- a. State University fees have increased over 32 percent in the current year to \$4,026 per year not including the average campus mandatory fees of \$867 dollars.
 - b. University fees are increasing by 15% in the current year and an additional 15% for the 2010-2011 academic year. The 2010-2011 fees for resident undergraduate students will be \$10,302, plus individual campus fees.

6. ICAS's principal advocacy and first priority is to promote restoration of adequate support levels for affordable access to higher education for all students eligible to enroll in one of the three public segments.

B. MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATION NO.'S 3, 4 AND 5:

3. Each system devise a fee structure and collect sufficient revenues to cover such operating costs as those for laboratory fees, health, intercollegiate athletics, student activities, and other services incidental to, but not directly related to, instruction.

4. The operation of all such ancillary services for students as housing, feeding, and parking be self-supporting. Taxpayers' money should not be used to subsidize, openly or covertly, the operation of such services. Because of the various methods which are used to finance construction of auxiliary enterprises such as residence halls and dormitories, it is impossible to state in general which portions of amortization and interest payments are properly chargeable to operating expense. Consequently, it is recommended further that the governing boards determine which of such costs are appropriate charges to operating expense and include as much as possible of those with other operating expenses of such ancillary services.

5. Additional provisions be made for student aid and loans, particularly as fees and nonresident tuition increase.

ICAS COMMENTS:

1. These ancillary fees for non-instructional programs represent a significant part of the issue of affordability. Students and families make decisions on college based on total costs (including general fees, and living expenses), not simply the cost of instruction.
2. Financial aid is an important component of the fee structure, both as it provides support for lower income students and as it increases the overall amount of fees paid by non-supported students. However, students are generally expected to incur loans as part of the finance package, and particular populations may be loan averse including first-generation, specific racial/ethnic groups, and families rising into the middle-class who may not qualify for any other aid.

C. MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATION NO.'S 2 AND 7:

2. Students who are residents of other states pay as follows:

- a. All students except those exempt by law pay tuition sufficient to cover not less than the state's contribution to the average teaching expense per student as defined by the Master Plan Survey Team's

Technical Committee on Costs of Higher Education in the institution or system as follows :

“Teaching expense is defined to include the cost of the salaries of the instructors involved in teaching for the proportion of their time which is concerned with instruction, plus the clerical salaries, supplies, equipment and organized activities related to teaching.”

b. Other fees for services not directly related to instruction.

7. Each institution retain moneys collected from nonresident tuition.

MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS--ADMISSIONS POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATION NO. 6:

Undergraduate applicants to the state colleges and the University who are legally resident in other states be required to meet higher entrance requirements than are required of residents of California, such out-of-state applicants to stand in the upper half of those ordinarily eligible. Furthermore, that there be developed and applied a common definition of legal residence for these public segments.

ICAS COMMENTS

1. In combination, these provisions are putting pressure on all three segments to increase enrollment of non-resident and international students in order to overcome shortfalls in state funding at a time when applications for admission by state residents to the University and State University and the demands for courses at the Community Colleges are rapidly increasing.
2. This is another example of the effect of State budget shortfalls that affects access to California higher education for California students.

III. MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS--FACULTY DEMAND AND SUPPLY

MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATION NO.'S 3 AND 5:

3. Greatly increased salaries and expanded fringe benefits, such as health and group life insurance, leaves, and travel funds to attend professional meetings, housing, parking and moving expenses, be provided for faculty members in order to make college and university teaching attractive as compared with business and industry. Greater use be made of California-trained doctoral degree holders, especially in the shortage years immediately ahead. For the three-year period 1955-58 only 53 per cent of those so trained who entered teaching did so in California. Evidence indicates that those leaving California do not do so by choice?

5. Individual faculty members and their institutions jointly assume responsibility for both the initiative and opportunity for the faculty in-service preparation and self-improvement, so essential for the growth and development of the institutions.

ICAS COMMENTS:

1. The promise of access and affordability to higher education incorporates California’s long-standing tradition of providing access to a quality educational system. Stated somewhat differently, when considering issues of affordability and access, policy makers must incorporate the question, “Access to what?”
2. The first requirement for quality in education is the quality and availability of the faculty in each of the segments of higher education.
3. Faculty quality requires competitive levels of compensation (both current and retirement benefits), administrative support, and opportunity for professional development.
4. Faculty compensation at all three segments is below comparison institutions.
5. Professional development opportunities—training for faculty to teach effectively to students with unprecedented educational needs—for Community College faculty are non-existent.
6. If the high level of quality faculty in the three segments is seriously eroded by continued uncompetitive compensation levels, the State of California will not recover for decades, if ever.
7. Faculty availability necessitates full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty who are committed to the institution and the students. Nonetheless, each of the segments has been forced to increasingly rely on temporary faculty rather than tenured or tenure-track faculty to meet educational needs.

IV. MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS--STRUCTURE, FUNCTION AND COORDINATION

MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS 2, 3, AND 4:

2. The junior colleges shall be governed by local boards selected for the purpose from each district maintaining one or more junior colleges. The State Board of Education shall prescribe minimum standards for the formation and operation of junior colleges, and shall exercise general supervision over said junior colleges, as prescribed by law. Said public junior colleges shall offer instruction through but not beyond the fourteenth grade level including, but courses not for limited to, one or more of the following: (a) standard collegiate transfer to higher institutions, (b) vocational-technical fields leading to employment, and (c) general, or liberal arts courses. Studies in

these fields may lead to the Associate in Arts or Associate in Science degree.

3. The State College System:

a. Shall constitute a public trust, to be administered by a body corporate known as “The Trustees of the State College System of California” with number, term of appointment, and powers closely paralleling those of the Regents.

...

b. The state colleges shall have as their primary function the provision of instruction in the liberal arts and sciences and in professions and applied fields which require more than two years of collegiate education and teacher education, both for undergraduate students and graduate students through the master’s degree. The doctoral degree may be awarded jointly with the University of California, as hereinafter provided. Faculty research, using facilities provided for and consistent with the primary function of the state colleges, is authorized.

4. The University of California shall be governed by The Regents as provided in Section 9 of Article IX of the California Constitution. The University shall provide instruction in the liberal arts and sciences, and in the professions, including teacher education, and shall have exclusive jurisdiction over training for the professions (including but not by way of limitation), dentistry, law, medicine, veterinary medicine, and graduate architecture. The University shall have the sole authority in public higher education to award the doctor’s degree in all fields of learning, except that it may agree with the state colleges to award joint doctor’s degrees in selected fields. The University shall be the primary state-supported academic agency for research, and The Regents shall make reasonable provision for the use of its library and research facilities by qualified members of the faculties of other higher educational institutions, public and private.

ICAS COMMENTS:

1. In drafting Article IX into the California Constitution of 1868, the early constitutional convention recognized the importance of a central and autonomous governing body for the University.
2. One of the Master Plan’s fundamental features recommended the creation of an independent Board of Trustees to unify and govern the State University.
3. The Community Colleges currently suffer from the same kind of fragmentation that plagued the State University at the time the Master Plan was incorporated into legislation. Although State law provides a voice to faculty on matters of

- courses and curriculum, the specifics of the Community College educational curriculum remain subject to legislative interference, which degrades the quality of the educational program.
- a. The California Community Colleges grew out of the K-12 system. Vestiges remaining from that system prevent the colleges from being viewed/treated as higher education. The system is highly regulated, and many regulations are inconsistent with the principles of higher education. For example, the chancellor's office is currently a state agency; and the vice chancellors are governor-appointed.
 - b. We should develop strategies to move the community colleges fully into higher education.
4. Language describing vocational education at the Community Colleges should be updated to provide for vocational education leading to certificates and employment.
 5. Graduate education in California is seriously underfunded, diluting the ability of the University of California to attract top graduate students.
 6. The language designating UC as the sole authority to issue doctoral degrees is obsolete. The State University currently offers a doctorate in education
 7. UC and CSU faculty should consider the issuance of other professional level doctoral degrees.
 - a. ICAS should consider standards for identifying need and appropriate programs for professional level doctorate degrees.
 - b. CSU faculty should determine the degree to which CSU resources should be devoted to doctoral programs.
 - c. UC should remain the sole institution offering the Doctor of Philosophy Degree.
 - d. The UC Academic Senate will have to review any proposal for revising UC's long-standing antipathy towards changing the differentiation of function with respect to doctoral degrees.
 - e. Any discussion of expanding doctoral education must consider the Master Plan recommendations on FACULTY DEMAND AND SUPPLY, Master Plan recommendation No. 2:

More funds be secured to provide financial assistance to those in graduate training. The high attrition rate in graduate programs is, in large part, due to financial difficulty; and these withdrawals constitute not only a loss to the potential faculty supply but an economic waste to the state. Provision of fellowship and loan funds for graduate students is undoubtedly one of the best ways of reducing the attrition rate.

V. MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS--DISTRIBUTION OF LOWER DIVISION STUDENTS

MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATION:

In order to implement more fully the action of The Regents of the University of California and the State Board of Education in 1955, “the University of California emphasize policies leading to the reduction of lower division enrollments in relation to those of the upper and graduate divisions, and the state colleges pursue policies which will have a similar effect,” the percentage of undergraduates in the lower division of both the state colleges and the University be gradually decreased ten percentage points below that existing in 1960 (estimated to be 51 per cent in both segments) by 1975. It is further recommended that the determination of the means by which this recommendation can best be carried out, be the responsibility of the governing boards.

ICAS COMMENTS

1. This has resulted in a distribution of 60 % upper division and 40% lower division students at UC.
2. ICAS historically is dedicated to facilitating the transfer of students from the Community Colleges into CSU and UC.
3. As more students are encouraged to complete lower division education at Community Colleges, the multiple missions of the Community Colleges are shifted towards meeting this need and away from the other responsibilities of the Community Colleges to provide carrier technical education and basic skills.

VI. MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS--INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITIES AND AREA NEEDS:

UTILIZATION OF PHYSICAL PLANTS

MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATION NO. 9:

- 9. In order to provide calendar arrangements that will both fit the public school year and permit fuller use of the state’s higher education physical facilities :**
 - a. Every public higher education institution, and private institutions as able, offer academic programs in the summer months of unit value equivalent to one-quarter of a year, one-half or three-quarters of a semester.**
 - b. State funds be provided for the state colleges and the University of California to offer during the full summer period academic programs on one or more of the patterns indicated in (a) above for regular**

degree and credential candidates who have met basic admission requirements.

c. The co-ordinating agency (or a continuing committee which it might create) study during 1960 the relative merits of three-semester and four quarter plans for year-round use of the physical plants of both public and private institutions, and on the basis of that study recommend a calendar for higher education in California.

ICAS COMMENTS

1. This is not a silver bullet. Going back to the date of the original Master Plan, campuses in each of the segments have attempted to expand summer programs. Students do not enroll. The concept of a student summer vacation is so ingrained in our culture that year around operation is not supportable.
2. Nonetheless, each of the segments continues to expand summer operations. However, in response to state budget cuts this year, virtually all CSU campuses have moved state-supported summer programs to self-support in 2010.
3. Many Community Colleges have been forced reduce summer sessions (and January inter-sessions) because they have reached enrollment maximums.
4. On many campuses, multiple enriching summer programs ranging from teacher training to outreach are actively pursued.
5. Research is needed to understand the extent to which students are actually using summer enrollment to complete degree requirements. This varies from campus to campus, where some use the summer to accelerate degree progress while others do not.

DATED: DECEMBER 4, 2009