

UC Office of the President

Understanding the University's Role in American Culture and Society

Title

Remarks to the Commission for the Review of the Master Plan, Sacramento, California

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7653j7wt>

Author

Gardner, David P.

Publication Date

1985-03-01

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License, available at

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

The Master Plan for Higher Education assigned to the University major responsibilities in broad functional areas. Let me review them briefly:

- ° At the undergraduate level the University was expected to offer the broad range of disciplines in the liberal arts and sciences.
- ° In the professions of law, medicine, dentistry, and veterinary medicine the University was assigned "exclusive jurisdiction" over training.
- ° The University was granted "sole authority" in public higher education to award the doctorate, except that provision was made for joint doctorates with the State Colleges and Universities in selected fields.
- ° Lastly, the University was designated as the primary State-supported agency for research.

These functions define the ways in which the University builds physical plant, expands libraries, equips and modernizes laboratories, provides support services, competes in the market for outstanding faculty, and allocates resources for teaching, research, and public service. Obviously, any substantive change in these functions would have profound

resource implications for the University, the other segments, and the State.

To fulfill these functions requires a large and complex enterprise.

- ° There are nine campuses, eight general campuses and one campus devoted exclusively to the health sciences.
- ° There are five teaching hospitals, three law schools, nine agricultural field stations, some twenty-six sites in the Natural Reserve System, and a world-renowned oceanographic institution.
- ° The University has affiliations with Hastings College of the Law, the Charles R. Drew Postgraduate Medical School, and the San Francisco Art Institute.
- ° 126 organized research units are distributed through the University system, of which some 23 are multi-campus units.
- ° We have exchange agreements with the world's leading universities, and through our Education Abroad Program we sent more than 750 students in 1984-85 to participate in educational programs at over 45 host institutions in 25 countries.

- ° Through University Extension, Cooperative Extension, and the University Press we reach out to the general public and to specialized audiences with educational programs and the fruits of research.
- ° Our main and specialized libraries house 20.5 million volumes.
- ° More than 100,000 employees work at the various branches and campuses, including some 31,000 academic personnel.
- ° There are some 144,000 students--106,000 undergraduates, 26,000 graduate students, and an additional 12,000 health sciences students.
- ° To finance these activities some \$3.3 billion was expended in 1983-84, of which roughly 40 percent came from the State and general funds.
- ° Three national laboratories are managed by the University for the Federal Department of Energy. In 1984 these laboratories had total budgets of \$1.49 billion, and employed 20,000 people.

By just about any measure, the standing and reputation of the University's academic programs are excellent. Over the last twenty years surveys of the quality of graduate programs have

consistently singled out the University of California. In the last major study--in 1983--Berkeley rated number one nationally, based on the quality of its graduate programs, while UCLA was fifth nationally. They were the only public institutions in the top five. Individual programs of significant strength were identified at the other campuses, and several programs distributed among the campuses appear on "the most improved" list.

The major reason for these ratings is the University's faculty which includes 15 Nobel Laureates and over 200 members of the National Academy of Science (approximately 15 percent of the total membership). Since 1964, 12 percent of the Guggenheims awarded nationally have come to our faculty. In 1984 UC faculty comprised more than 13 percent of the new members of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Science Digest Magazine, when it recently selected the 100 brightest and most promising young scientists nationally, included 17 University faculty, the largest number of any University system.

The teaching, research, and public service carried out by the University have a significant influence on California and the way we live as Californians. Recently, the Postsecondary Education Commission, the three public segments of higher education, and the independent colleges and universities evaluated the economic and other impacts of higher education in California. On the economic front their report

specifically pinpointed the contributions made through research to international trade, biotechnology, management and productivity, medicine and health care, agriculture and livestock management, and many other areas of society. Using 1981-82 data, they estimated the economic impact of the University at some \$8.6 billion, divided between direct and generated expenditures. The institutional purchases of the University plus those of its faculty and staff result in the employment of over 240,000 Californians in addition to those employed directly by UC.

Other states have been quick to note the relationship between higher education and economic development. As a result there is a growing competition in higher education in terms of faculty salaries, state-of-the-art facilities, and equipment for high technology enterprises. These are seen as necessary elements in maintaining preeminence in a variety of fields including physics, astronomy, computer sciences and engineering, and biotechnology. This competition comes not only from states that have traditionally supported higher education but from a number of others, some in the Sun Belt, seeking the benefits which result from leadership in higher education. Consequently, I have welcomed the improvement in our competitive position made possible by the 1984-85 budget and the 1985-86 budget now under review, while stressing the need to maintain the edge we have.

Of course, the contributions of a university should not be measured solely in dollars and cents. University research has contributed to the quality of life in California--and the world--for example, by increasing milk productivity, by eradicating pests which threatened to destroy the citrus industry, through the development of biological pest controls, and a series of advances which made the wine industry possible as we know it. Recombinant DNA research has helped create new organisms capable of producing insulin and interferon. Beyond these contributions are the people, the competent, talented, productive people who contribute to society in a variety of positive ways. Historically the colleges and universities of this nation have provided our people with the opportunity to improve their lives, those of their families, and the communities in which they live. This historic role is reflected clearly in the land grant movement and it has been an important determinant of an open American society.

I now want to turn to two important trends and relate them to a planning effort we have started. First, University enrollments have been growing substantially just at a time when we expected enrollment growth to slow. In fact, applications for admission to the University for the past two years were higher than at any time in the University's history.

University-wide, freshman applicants for admission for Fall 1985 increased by 13 percent over Fall 1984, which in turn was 17 percent higher than in Fall 1983. Openings at some

campuses were further reduced by higher continuation rates among students. Because of these unprecedented conditions it has not been possible to admit all eligible applicants to the campus of first-choice, a situation which has caused unhappiness for some students and their parents.

Now I turn to the second trend which has to do with the profound change in the make-up of California's population. Current projections indicate that by the year 2000 nearly half of all Californians will be ethnic minorities. To ensure access and opportunity for young people to participate at all levels in California's educational system, the K-12 schools, the community colleges, the California State University, the University of California, and the private institutions will need to work together even more fruitfully than in the past. Through our student affirmative action programs, the University has had some modest success in increasing minority enrollments. The persistent problem, however, is that the number of minorities eligible for admission remains well below what will be necessary to realize our hopes. We are committed to continuing to work with the schools to help ensure that students are provided with the opportunity to qualify. For a decade, we have sponsored programs in the junior high and high schools to improve minority students' academic preparation and thus increase their rates of eligibility. The results of these programs are encouraging and we intend to continue them as a major part of our effort to improve access to the

University for minority students. For example, based on 1983 data, 24 percent of the graduates of our early outreach programs were University eligible as compared with 13.2 percent of all graduates. Some 70 percent of the participants went on to enroll in some postsecondary institution. Improved access is critical to the future of this state, which has drawn so much of its leadership from among University graduates, and to the future of the students themselves.

These trends require us to look afresh at our academic planning for the next fifteen years. The effectiveness of the University's planning, the directions set, the priorities chosen early in these years, will be crucial in setting the University's course well into the 21st century. The challenge before us is to identify what needs to be done to maintain, enhance, and renew the excellence of the University. Such efforts must be guided by what the campuses and the institution as a whole need to be in the year 2000. Within that context we will establish unifying goals and formulate concrete courses of action regarding students and faculty; instruction at all relevant levels; research; and public service, broadly defined.

More specifically I see this planning effort as essential for the University to fulfill the Master Plan obligation to all qualified students by establishing realistic undergraduate and graduate enrollment plans and identifying the necessary

resources to accommodate these students. That will be the first major step in this planning effort--to look at enrollment potentials to the year 2000 and evaluate the potentials and prospects for growth on our existing campuses. As we proceed with the planning effort we will seek to discover and nurture new approaches to doing what we have been doing historically. The MELVYL online computerized catalog for our research libraries is a good example of ways we can take advantage of technological change.

Now let me turn to ways in which the segments work together. Under the Master Plan each segment was assigned a functional sphere but each segment was seen as an essential part of an integrated system. Cooperation was assumed and coordination provided through a coordinating body, originally the Coordinating Council for Higher Education and later through the California Postsecondary Education Commission. In the last four or five years the segments of higher education have embarked on an unprecedented number of intersegmental programs and activities. These efforts were prompted by demographic trends and the obvious need to deal cooperatively with many mutual problems related to these trends. For instance, student preparation has been recognized as a persistent problem which needs to be addressed at every level of education. These are all welcome signs.

Since your Commission has been asked as a first priority to review the function and programs of the community colleges I will provide some examples of our cooperative efforts with the colleges. You should know that from 1965 to 1975 there was a fairly steady climb in transfers from the colleges to the University from about 3,000 in 1965 to about 8,000 in 1975. From 1975 to 1981 the numbers dropped by about 42 percent to about 5,000. In the past two years, numbers of transfers have increased somewhat, but it is too early to conclude this is a trend.

A disturbing dimension to the level of community college students transferring is the low number of minorities who make this transition. Slightly more than half of all students graduating from California high schools go on to postsecondary education. Beyond that, examining the makeup of this group, we find that more than 60 percent attend community colleges, and more than 80 percent of underrepresented minorities who go on to higher education enroll in community colleges. As these figures show, minority students in the State are concentrated in community colleges, although their distribution among the colleges is quite uneven.

To forcefully address this problem a proposal has been included in the 1985-86 Governor's Budget to establish 20 transfer centers to increase the number of students transferring from community colleges to four-year

institutions. The 1985-86 Governor's Budget includes funds for the University of California, the California State University, and the California Community Colleges to establish the centers. The community colleges would assume primary responsibility for the transfer centers. They would establish a system to identify potential transfers and provide physical facilities, a full-time counselor, and a full-time staff assistant. The four-year institutions would provide visiting counseling representatives who would both advise students individually and work to improve coordination of two- and four-year programs in order to raise the rate of transfer. This initiative is an important addition to promising University efforts already in place.

The Santa Barbara campus has had a successful cooperative program with Santa Barbara City College to motivate potential transfer students, especially underrepresented minorities, to pursue their education through the baccalaureate level. Last fall Santa Barbara sent the greatest number of transfers to the University of any community college. As a result the program is expanding to three other colleges.

Other examples of cooperation with community colleges can be noted briefly:

- ° The Irvine campus has developed a computerized version of its articulation system and is working on it in cooperation with the Los Angeles Community Colleges.
- ° Berkeley has developed programs with community colleges which guarantee admission to qualified students, who cannot be accepted for admission initially, after they complete two years at selected local colleges.
- ° Another example is the Davis Transfer Opportunity Program, a cooperative effort with the colleges of the Los Rios district. The goals of the program are to identify, attract, and motivate potential transfers to pursue their education through the baccalaureate degree; to strengthen academic preparation, improve academic and graduation rates of Los Rios transfers, particularly among underrepresented minorities. Initial reports indicate substantial success for this program which will expand to the Peralta colleges in Fall 1985.

Recognizing the essential role of the community colleges in the Master Plan the Legislature has asked you to review as a first priority the functions and programs of the community colleges. The community colleges serve many purposes through transfer, vocational, community service, adult education, remediation and basic skills, and non-credit programs. Of these several purposes the transfer function is a key one

because it provides an additional avenue of access to the University, California State University, and four-year institutions in the private sector for those who for one reason or another could not or chose not to enroll immediately following high school. To the extent this role has diminished in recent years it should be strengthened. Our hope, and intent, as I have indicated, is that more students will use the community colleges as a bridge to the University in the future. To that end I would urge you to approach your task with the clear recognition of the importance of a vital transfer function to the entire system of higher education. The strengthening of that function must be a priority for us all.

As you proceed with this task, be assured of the complete cooperation of the University. We stand ready to provide data and assistance where needed. Regent Williams deeply regrets his inability to be with you for this organizational meeting, but does look forward to meeting you all and becoming deeply involved in the Commission's work.

Finally, I want to make clear the University's full support of the Master Plan for Higher Education. It may be a truism, but one surely supported by the record, that California has better than any other state created the conditions under which the segments could meet their obligations, while avoiding the destructive competition so often seen elsewhere. The genius

of the Plan, I believe, was the decision to assign to each of the public segments clearly defined educational missions within which each was encouraged to develop programs of the highest quality. This arrangement has worked exceedingly well. I believe the basic structure to be sound, but it is appropriate that we pause periodically to reexamine that structure and make necessary adjustments. Thank you.