June 19, 2009

Mary Croughan
Chair of the Academic Council
University of California

In Re: UCLA Response to Principles for Non-Resident Enrollment

Dear Mary,

Thank you for the opportunity to opine upon the Principles for Non-Resident Enrollment. Upon receipt, I sent the proposal to all committees of the Academic Senate with an invitation to opine, while specifically requesting responses from the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools, the Undergraduate Council, the Council on Planning and Budget, and the Executive Board, which speaks for the division on such matters. The UCLA Academic Senate supports the principles as written.

However, both CUARS and the UgC, respectively, raised issues for consideration. I am attaching those responses, which the Executive Board endorsed.

- CUARS and the Executive Board resolved that revenues generated from non-resident tuition should be earmarked to enhance undergraduate education.
- The UgC and the Executive Board resolved that access to the UC must be preserved for residents of California; a cap on non-resident enrollment should be reaffirmed.

I encourage you to review the comments of CUARS and the UgC in their entirety, as other salient remarks were made.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and opine upon this important matter. Please don’t hesitate to contact me if I can be of further service.

Sincerely,

Michael S. Goldstein
UCLA Academic Senate Chair

Cc: Martha Kendall Winnacker, Executive Director, Systemwide Academic Senate
Jaime R. Balboa, Chief Administrative Officer, UCLA Academic Senate
June 10, 2009

Michael Goldstein, Chair
UCLA Academic Senate

Re: Proposed Principles for Non-Resident Enrollment

Dear Academic Senate Chair Goldstein:

At its May 22, 2009 meeting, the Committee on Undergraduate Admissions and Relations with Schools (CUARS) thoughtfully considered the proposal submitted by the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) that provides guiding principles for non-resident enrollment. The Committee voted 7 in favor, with 0 opposed, and 1 abstention. The student vote was 1 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

Although the consensus of the Committee was to endorse the guidelines, and members appreciated that the BOARS document is intentionally vague to allow individual campuses to establish their own policies, several concerns were raised that CUARS urges be taken into consideration:

- Members asserted that preference should not be given to applicants based on their ability to pay higher tuition fees. We currently hold Non-resident Undergraduate applicants to higher standards than residents. If the admission of non-residents is fixed at a higher percentage than the current level, would we still admit them even if their qualifications are lower than those of residents? If so, we would be admitting weaker students based on their ability to pay.
- Would preference be given to non-residents who do not qualify for financial aid over those who do? Although the proposal claims that the increased percentage of non-residents will not affect the number of California resident students enrolled, it appears that this is only the case under the current scenario of an over-enrollment of California residents. As a long-term strategy, an increase in the percentage of Non-resident Undergraduates can only lead to a decrease in the percentage of Resident Undergraduates, which will damage UCLA’s primary land grant mission. Since non-resident students tend to come from higher socioeconomic backgrounds, any change to the ratio would also decrease the economic diversity of undergraduate students.
- The proposal does not suggest a guarantee that the money raised from non-resident tuition would be earmarked for enhancing the quality of undergraduate education. Could the funds be diverted for other uses and if so, who would make this decision? Would Senate committees or CUARS input be solicited?

If you have any questions or need additional information, please feel free to contact me (x 5-1778; sharpe@ucla.edu ) or Judith Lacertosa, CUARS Principal Policy Analyst (x51194; jlacertosa@senate.ucla.edu ).

Sincerely,

Jenny Sharpe, Chair, CUARS
cc: Jaime Balboa, CAO, Academic Senate  
Judith Lacertosa, Principal Policy Analyst  
Dorothy Ayers, Assistant to Senate Leadership & CAO
June 12, 2009

To: Michael Goldstein, Chair
    Academic Senate

From: Dorothy Wiley, Chair
    Undergraduate Council

Re: Proposed Principles for Non-Resident Enrollment

I am writing to report that at its June 5, 2009 meeting, the Undergraduate Council (UgC) thoughtfully considered the proposal submitted by the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) that provides guiding principles for non-resident enrollment. The Council voted 11 in favor, with 0 opposed, and 1 abstention to endorse the proposed principles. The student vote was 1 in favor, 1 opposed, and 1 abstention.

Although the consensus of the UgC was to endorse the guidelines without emendations, members urged that UC specify and publish the targeted proportion of resident vs. non-resident enrollment for campuses to reference as a model. Members would like to emphasize the following points in the proposed principles be considered:

- Academic excellence must be sustained, especially given the severity of the budget cuts facing UC.
- Access to California residents must be maintained. It must be reaffirmed that UC is obligated to establish a cap on non-resident enrollment.

It was brought to the Council’s attention that non-resident, non-domestic (international) transfer students are considered international students in the data. Thus, a mechanism should be implemented that allows campuses to track these students internally and set a target for admission of both transfer and freshman international students at the university.

If you have any questions or need additional information, please feel free to contact me (x 5-0803; dwiley@ucla.edu) or Judith Lacertosa, UgC Principal Policy Analyst (x51194; jlacertosa@senate.ucla.edu).

cc: Jaime Balboa, CAO, Academic Senate
    Judith Lacertosa, Principal Policy Analyst, Undergraduate Council
    Dorothy Ayer, Assistant to Senate Leadership & CAO