CHANCELLORS

As you may know, last month President Emeritus David P. Gardner and President Emeritus Richard C. Atkinson addressed the UC Commission on the Future. Given their long associations with and great knowledge of the University, I thought you might be interested in their remarks. As Presidents Emeriti, they have a unique perspective, and I hope you will benefit from their thoughts.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Mark G. Yudof
President
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DEFINING THE UNIVERSITY OF THE FUTURE

President Emeritus Richard C. Atkinson

- Thank you for this opportunity to visit with you. In the words of Chairman Gould, the task of this commission is—and I quote—"to develop a vision for the future of the University that will reaffirm our role in sustaining California’s economy and cultural life while recognizing that our limited state resources require us to be creative and strategic in meeting that mission." That is an excellent formulation of the issue. It puts the emphasis in exactly the right place—the role the University should play in this state despite its enormous fiscal challenges.

- Let me begin with a prediction. The University of California will continue as a great university. I do not minimize California’s spectacular economic spiral over the past few years, the stunning budget cuts the University has sustained, or the endemic disarray of California’s State budget process. But no state or nation is immune to economic misfortune; downturns have happened before and they will happen again.

- What really worries me is the stories I keep hearing about promising young academics who are being warned not to associate themselves with UC because of its financial perils. I have encountered too many people, in this country and abroad, who are convinced that the State of California is on the way to bankruptcy and the University of California will go down with it. It is a scenario that underestimates the entrepreneurial resourcefulness of the people of California and the innovative

---
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energies of this institution. There are paths the University can take that will sustain its excellence, in spite of economic circumstances. We should be careful not to send a message about UC’s future so bleak that it becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy.

- The University of California must do everything necessary to protect its stature as one of the world’s pre-eminent universities, but for the next few years that term is a comparative one: public universities throughout the country are in trouble; so are private institutions, including elite universities like Stanford, to mention a nearby example. The question is, where do we want to be when California recovers from the most serious global contraction since the Great Depression of the 1930s? Here are a few of my answers:

- We want to remain a great public research university, united by common standards of admission, a single State budget, a single Board of Regents dedicated to a system of shared governance, a strong universitywide Academic Senate, a systemwide office with responsibility for oversight and accountability, and a single voice in Sacramento.

- We want to remain one university composed of ten research campuses, not all identical and not all moving toward the same template. Just as Princeton and the University of Michigan are both research universities but clearly different in size, in the array of academic disciplines, and in the number of professional schools, so the University of California’s campuses can be seen as variations on a single theme, each pursuing excellence in different ways.

- We must protect our constitutional autonomy, which gives the Regents full powers of governance and the university far more freedom from sectarian or legislative control than other public universities in this country.
• These are the fundamental characteristics that made the University a great institution. They are a source of both strength and flexibility in weathering the most unfavorable of economic winds. UC has succeeded as an elite public research university because it has offered all ten campuses the opportunity to pursue their academic aspirations with as much independence as possible.

• This does not mean that every campus is free to do whatever it wishes. It does mean, in my view, that a University of California with tiered campuses—some devoted primarily to research and some to teaching, some more equal than others—is inconsistent with the mission, the history, and the future of UC. Excellence in research is crucial to the standards of quality at the six UC campuses that have been elected to the prestigious Association of American Universities—an achievement no other university system has attained. It is even more crucial to the three general campuses that have not yet been elected to the AAU.

• If the University expects to emerge from today's challenging economic environment with its distinction intact, its first priority must be preserving faculty quality. Faculty leadership enabled UC to take control of its own destiny throughout the punishing years of the Great Depression and to come out on the other side a stronger and better institution. Great faculty leaders, wisely supported by President Robert Gordon Sproul, set the standard for cutting-edge research that led to UC's post-World War II emergence as the best public university in the world. Today every campus of the University of California is the equivalent of a research university in its own right, and no faculty in the country has compiled a more brilliant record of success—particularly in Nobel Prizes and federal research grants. The intellectual, scholarly,
and scientific creativity of UC's faculty is the bedrock on which its eminence is built. UC must continue to make it possible for the faculty to perform at the highest levels. If we lose our competitive edge now, in all likelihood it could be lost forever.

- When the California economy comes back—and it will—the University must be in a position to compete vigorously and successfully for State and Federal funds. Until then, there are two time-honored ways to address its fiscal problems: by increasing revenues and cutting costs. I'll start with the revenue side.

- Today's financial challenges obviously require doing more of what you are already doing now—working to convince the State and the Federal governments of the University's value to California and to American society. Private fund-raising is a higher priority than ever before. This is appropriately left to the campuses, but it is important for the Office of the President and the Regents to make a clear and forceful systemwide commitment to seeking out more funds from private sources, and particularly from UC alumni, who have benefited from a superb education at a modest price.

- No one likes to raise student fees, especially in the context of UC's long tradition of seeking to keep fees low. As you know better than anyone, that is a valiant but increasingly untenable effort. I applaud President Yudof's billion-dollar initiative to raise private funds for student aid and keep UC affordable; we have done a great job in that respect with both low- and middle-income students, an achievement that must continue. But every economic analysis I am aware of makes it clear that we must move even further toward a high-fee, high-aid model.
• I am not a supporter of differential fees by campus at the undergraduate level (professional schools are a different matter). UC's historical policy of a uniform student fee for all undergraduates (and for graduate students in academic programs) is sound and should continue. But each campus should have great latitude to impose supplemental fees to protect its excellence during these hard times. When the fiscal crisis recedes, I hope it will be possible to eliminate these supplemental fees. Given the size of the funding gap, for the moment there is no realistic alternative.

• I would support the strategy of enrolling more out-of-state students at high tuition rates to enhance revenue—as long as UC's Master-Plan obligation to admit all qualified California undergraduates is met first. The decision about exactly how many out-of-state students to take should be left to each campus, subject to a systemwide requirement that all eligible California students are accepted. I realize that increasing the number of out-of-state students is a controversial strategy because it could result in some California residents not being admitted to the campus of their first choice. But the University's Master-Plan obligation to admit all eligible California high-school graduates has always been understood to guarantee a place somewhere within the UC system, not admission to a particular campus. Out-of-state tuition revenue can help UC afford the costs of educating our own California students, at a time when the State of California will not or cannot do so. It is a less than perfect measure in a less than perfect fiscal environment.

• There must be real incentives for faculty on every campus to search out new sources of revenue. Research partnerships with industry can be expanded; many opportunities exist, and the University has long experience in how to cooperate with
industry without compromising its academic integrity or its research agenda.

Industry-university research projects also support graduate education by supplying funding and real-world experience to graduate students. UC should do more of it.

- However, the aim should be to encourage all faculty to explore funding opportunities. The need is particularly compelling in the humanities and other disciplines in urgent need of additional revenues. The creation of high-fee, part-time master’s degree programs through University Extension, with faculty involvement, should be a high priority. This is an area in which the Internet can play an important role. We already have a model for part-time degree programs in the University of California—the Master of Advanced Study—but only a few have been established. Many private universities and for-profit organizations like the University of Phoenix have been very successful in this field, and UC could quickly become a major player. But this will only happen if regular faculty are rewarded for their active involvement in designing courses and seeing that these programs offer academic quality and intellectual relevance. They fill a real public need and there are plenty of Californians who will want to take advantage of them. Harvard, Stanford, Columbia, and other outstanding research universities have long relied on part-time degree programs to supplement faculty salaries and generate income. This is one case in which UC should follow their lead.

- The long period of rising undergraduate enrollment is now winding down. The number of high school graduates is projected to remain relatively stable through the next decade. The end of dramatic growth has its advantages—there is less need for capital outlay, for example, and time to plan for the likely resumption of enrollment
growth by the early 2020s. We have stabilized enrollments in the past and we should do so again. UC Merced is a possible exception. It may need to grow, although not as quickly as planned.

- The University should expand graduate enrollments only in areas of great national needs. This is not a time for large new programs such as medical schools at UC Merced and UC Riverside. There are longstanding cooperative residency and medical programs at UC Davis, UC San Francisco, and UCLA that serve the Central Valley and the Inland Empire, and they can be expanded if necessary.

- A much more pressing need is to trim and in some cases eliminate academic programs that are not making robust contributions to their discipline, or that no longer serve the educational needs of our students or the priorities of our state. Every campus is searching for ways to cut costs. Academic programs should not be exempt. Admittedly, program disestablishment is the third rail of academic politics. It is a difficult and unpopular process. In today’s circumstances, it is essential.

- Even if we are not growing in terms of enrollment, diversity remains a goal UC must pursue with undiminished energy and absolute dedication. Among UC undergraduates, the long-term trend is up, and that is cause for celebration. Since 1985, the proportion of underrepresented minority students—African American, American Indian, and Chicano/Latino—has risen by almost 160 percent. In light of California’s needs, however, UC should take this figure as encouragement to redouble its efforts. There is enormous potential in community-college transfer and collaboration because the vast majority of minority students in California are community college students. For students of all backgrounds, the community
colleges—which were created first in California—represent the second chance that is the great hallmark of American higher education. UC’s historical commitment to transfer is so important it needs to be renewed periodically.

- Part of that commitment is having high expectations for community college students and for the preparation they receive. It should be a UC requirement for transfer students from a community college to complete the associate of arts degree, thereby ensuring that they will derive the greatest benefit from a UC education.

- Some UC campuses already offer joint lower-division courses with the community colleges to qualify students for transfer. They are a good start, but we could be doing so much more, especially through the Internet—one of the great educational tools of the technological revolution. Online lower-division classes could be taught by UC faculty from across the system to students from UC and the community colleges.

When I first became president, I found myself in trouble with the mathematics faculty for suggesting that UC should offer our own students some online coursework in mathematics, but I believed it then and I believe it now. We should do more Internet-based instruction, particularly at the lower-division level. For example, selected faculty from throughout the University could present a core set of lectures online, supplemented by campus sections organized in the traditional way.

- On the administrative side, the campuses should be encouraged to work more closely together on purchasing administrative and financial systems that allow them to operate on common business platforms. These common decision and transaction support systems will save money and improve administrative efficiency across the
University—while still allowing the campuses to decide what is best for their faculty and students.

- As this commission recognizes, there is no single answer to our fiscal predicament; there are many answers that must be pursued by many people. And that brings me back to the question I raised at the beginning: where do we want to be when California recovers?

- We do not want to be a University of Michigan or a University of Virginia, both distinguished institutions that are nonetheless becoming less public and more private all the time. We may need to move in their direction in terms of student fees and certain revenue-enhancing measures, but I do not believe they are a model for the University of California in the broadest sense. Over one-third of Michigan’s and Virginia’s students are from out of state; at UC the systemwide figure has never been more than six percent. We are a multicampus system, and we must work out our problems and our destiny as a public system.

- With this in mind, let me conclude with what may sound like a radical proposal. I suggest you consider the ten campuses as ten experiments, each testing policy answers to the question of how UC can maintain access and affordability while sustaining its academic quality and pre-eminence in research. These experiments should be guided by three principles: there would be as few constraints on the campuses as possible, although the Office of the President would play its traditional role in coordination and accountability; any revenue generated by a campus would stay on that campus; and the faculty would lead. Every campus would be encouraged to find its own solutions, with no particular expectation of what those
solutions should be. Experiments that succeed will be quickly adopted by other campuses; even those that do not, may open new avenues to explore. Designed by the campuses with leadership from the faculty, they would capitalize on the variety, inventiveness, and strengths of the UC system—one university with ten different laboratories of innovation.

- A UC planning statement written in 1974 defines a research university as a place in which every activity is "shaped and bounded by the central and pervasive mission of discovering and advancing knowledge." The University of California must have an evolving intellectual agenda in key areas of research, scholarship, and education, developed by the faculty, articulated by the chancellors and the president, and supported by the Regents. This is what attracts faculty to the University and creates rallying points for the state’s opinion leaders, the general public, and our students. This is, in essence, what you have been asked to do—to protect UC’s intellectual vitality and therefore its ability to lead. Everyone who cares about the University of California has a stake in your success.
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Chairman Gould, President Yudof and members of the Commission. I welcome the opportunity to be with you this morning.

The University of California was founded in 1868, some 141 years ago in what was then a raw frontier at the far reaches of the American West. It was then and remains today a new-comer to the world of universities. As you meet to consider its future, it is well to remember that, young though it may be, it is presently as respected and famous a university as even the most ancient universities in the United Kingdom and on the European continent. In the United States it stands pre-eminent among our nation’s public universities and highly ranked among the handful of leading private universities. It is no small matter, therefore, to be asked to consider the future of such a university, given its remarkable past and the distinguished position it holds among the world’s leading centers of learning.

How, within a mere century and one half, did the University of California become such an institution, especially given its great distance, for most of its short life, from the major centers of learning in our own country and abroad?
Well, it didn’t just happen! It happened for several reasons, the most crucial of which form the substance of my remarks this morning.¹

My views on this are not held by me alone. Indeed, they have been shared and advanced by most of UC’s academic, administrative, and regental leaders over the larger part of the 20th century, most of whom I have known personally. For example, of the 59 persons who served as Chairman or as Vice-Chairman of the Board of Regents since 1920 to the date of my retirement in 1992, I have known 53 of the 59. Of the 19 persons who served as UC’s President, I have known 10. Prior to my retirement, I had known 45 of the University’s 49 Chancellors and 20 of the 29 members of the faculty who chaired the Academic Council during those years.

Now to the reasons for UC’s rise to eminence.

First, is UC’s favored constitutional position as embodied in Article IX, Section IX, of the State Constitution. These provisions vest in the Board of Regents virtually unqualified authority to govern the university subject only to the board’s fiduciary duties and the obligation to keep UC free from political and sectarian influence in the appointment of its officers and in the conduct of its internal affairs.

These provisions, enacted in 1879, were intended to put as much distance as possible between the university and the government whose judgments about university operations, programs, policies, teaching, research, public service, administration, faculty and
administrative appointments might otherwise come to prevail over those of the university itself. This freedom should never be the object of negotiation or compromise.

Second, is the conduct of the Board of Regents and the crucial decisions it has made over seven score years. How the board meets its responsibilities, interacts with the president and key administrative and faculty officers, organizes itself and makes decisions is telling, given its constitutional position.

Generally speaking, the Regents do not live in the world of academe even though they are charged constitutionally to govern it. Most of them live in a corporate, legal, political or professional culture with which the university’s academic culture sometimes conflicts.

The reality, however, is that with three or four notable exceptions, the board has proven itself to be a real champion and protector of the university dedicated to its welfare, jealous of its independence, supportive of its presidents and chancellors, most of the time, and quite willing to assert its constitutional role when challenged.

Third, is the steady and diligent commitment to the concept of the University of California as one university operating now on 10 campuses. The university is a single corporate entity. It is governed by a single board of regents. There is one president appointed by the board to whom sufficient authority is given to exercise UC’s central executive function. There is one Academic Senate, possessing authority delegated directly to it, not by the administration, but by the board itself. There is a single,
consolidated university budget for the state's share of UC funding. There is a single set of personnel policies, salary schedules, and policies for UC faculty and other academic personnel. There are university-wide negotiations, and some campus-based ones as well, with the unionized staff. There are common fees and charges for students across all campuses, except for a handful of campus-specific professional schools, programs and student facilities.

The concept of a single university operating on 10 campuses permits the university to reconcile and resolve its internal differences internally. Thus, it is enabled to speak as a single institution with its many parts on the same page, and with a common agenda, whatever the differences may have been when formulating such policies or budgets.

Fourth, is the willingness of the Board of Regents to delegate nearly all of its authority to the president and of the president, in turn, to delegate most of the president’s authority to the chancellors so as to provide them with the means necessary to administer their respective campuses as well as to be their advocates.

The role of the president is pivotal to the sustainability of the university as a single institution; the effective functioning of the governing board and of the academic senate; the securing and allocation of UC’s resources; the appointment of its key officers, the coherent exercise of its executive powers, the preservation of its constitutional autonomy; and the discharge of many of the university’s ceremonial and symbolic obligations.
The president holds the single position within the university that is accountable for the totality of its endeavors. The chancellors are responsible to the president for the administration of their campuses. The vice presidents are staff to the president. The regents cannot act as individuals in their role but only collectively as to their governing duties. It is only the president who has responsibility as a single individual, and within the scope of delegated authority, to exercise the executive function for the university as a whole.

The realities, of course, are that the regents, the president, the vice presidents, the chancellors, the academic senate, the staff and the students must work together and with mutual respect and regard for UC’s system of delegated authority and shared governance for it to work at all.

Fifth, is the regents decision in 1920 to delegate direct and full authority to the Academic Senate over courses of instruction and curricular requirements, for the setting of UC’s academic standards and student admissions, and for the university’s educational policy and programs in general. New campuses and schools and colleges were reserved to the board for approval as were major intercampus or university-wide research institutes, bureaus and centers.

The Academic Senate has the right to organize itself as it wishes, to create its special and standing committees, and its leadership as it chooses without interference from either the university’s administrative officers or the regents.
While technically not a part of management, the Senate plays an indirect and sometimes a direct part in virtually every major decision made within the university; and my experience, when at UC, was that the Academic Senate leadership and committees advised and acted in the most thoughtful and rational of ways, respectful both of their roles and that of others.

Sixth, is the adoption of a common and rigorous standard for freshman admission to the nine campuses offering undergraduate instruction, consistent with California’s Master Plan for Higher Education. A commitment was also made to find a place on one of its campuses for every qualified California resident seeking admission at the freshman level, although not necessarily at the campus of preference or in the major of choice. I am aware, of course, that with the present fiscal crisis this commitment is at risk. Admission of students to the Graduate Schools and professional schools and colleges, however, rests with the faculty of the admitting entity.

Seventh, is the university’s development of multiple sources of income to augment and to leverage, the core support provided by the state. The university chose to follow this path decades ago, not because of waning state support or a dearth of students, but instead at the very time the state budget was favorable and enrollments were growing.

These varied sources of support, together with the discretion to allocate state appropriations as the university thought best, permitted UC to make budgetary
adjustments based more on their merit than in response to pressure groups or political, gubernatorial or legislative influences, usually expressed in the form of threats or promises, or both.

Eight, is the generous levels of state support Californians have historically provided UC over the years. While it is not true that state funds for UC have been consistently favorable, or always sufficient, it is fair to say that on balance and over time they have been sufficient, if not even generous as circumstances allowed.

Californians have supported the university when things were going well, but sent UC a message via the state budget when they were unhappy or even furious with us, as during the loyalty oath controversy of 1949-52, the free speech movement of 1964, and the anti-Vietnam war protests of the late 1960’s, among others.

Nine, is the steady and enduring commitment to the underlying values of academic life by most parties within the university, buttressed by a system of governance and management which is mostly designed to secure these very objectives.

In remarks made to the regents in 1985, during the controversy over the divestment of UC’s holdings in companies doing business in South Africa, I made reference to these most elemental values as follows:
"The University of California, like all universities in America, is committed to the established values of academic life: patient inquiry, the sequential development of ideas, the emphasis on reasoned discussion and criticism; and the continued reference to evidence. These values affirm the University’s faith in intelligence and knowledge and its obligation to ensure the conditions for their free exercise..."

"These values are the means by which the cause of truth is carried forward. They are the values that distinguish the University from governments, churches, businesses and other institutions, parties, groups, and associations in our society. They form the core of the enterprise and the basis of whatever respect and freedom the University can hope to command from the larger society”.

Tenth, is the unwavering commitment of the entire university community to achieve at the highest possible levels whatever it undertakes to do, and I emphasize, for all campuses, not just two or three. It is this self-imposed standard of excellence that has guided UC’s faculty recruitment and retention policies; the procurement and/or construction of the most advanced laboratories, equipment, clinics, and computer capabilities; to build one of the world’s greatest and most electronically advanced library systems; to draw resources to its campuses from governments, donors, alumni, corporations and foundations worldwide; to attract the world’s most promising young people to study under a faculty world-renowned for its scholarship and scientific accomplishments; and to number more than one-half of its campuses among members of the American Association of Universities and within the top 20 public universities in the United States. As with the University’s autonomy and freedom, this tenth pillar, and the excellence it reflects, must never be the object of negotiation or compromise.

Within the constraints of time this morning, I will not be able to comment on the issues with which you will be contending as a commission. I would only note that most of these
are not new but issues with a history that tend to arise during periods of institutional stress and/or fiscal uncertainty. The same will most likely be true for many of the the suggestions you will be receiving.

My only advice is that you study the efficacy of the 12th grade, the transition to university, and the freshman year of university. Each is now not an optimal experience for students. Each cannot be considered independently as actions in one area directly impact the other, e.g., earning of AP credits in high school will impact the number of credits a UC student must earn at the university.

A more effective and efficient set of educational possibilities, freshly examined, might very well suggest modifications in the present arrangements, such as making a more fulsome and serious use of the 12th grade and/or the engagement of university extension's concurrent courses of study, and similarly, of the community colleges offerings, and those of summer sessions, during the 12th grade and/or after its completion but before formal enrollment in the university as an undergraduate. The timely offering of remedial work in some areas and the completion of more university-level work prior to official university enrollment holds out the possibility of accelerating the entire process without any substantive diminishment of academic work expected or required of such students.

Such also holds the promise of major cost savings for the schools, the university, and the students by reducing the number of years now required for formal study and making more effective use of the time spent, both by the students and the institutions serving
them. Consideration of a three year baccalaureate degree would naturally arise from such an examination as would the prospect of a move by the university from a semester or a quarter system to a trimester one or some other rearrangement of the academic year.

The nation seems to be talking about a three year degree. The UK and continental Europe are already committed to such an arrangement, albeit the academic expectations of entering students in that system are at present more demanding than are our own, which provides four years of study for the same degree as is offered in the UK and Continental Europe in three.

In any event, a hard look at the options here is much needed although you can expect no small measure of push-back from interested parties.

The ten points or pillars upon which the university’s rise to eminence rests can be tampered with only at a very real and dangerous risk to the delicate balances within the university’s private and subtle inner life. These pillars are not to be surrendered or relinquished point by point merely because the university is currently under fiscal stress, or bartered away for short term gains or because they are inconvenient to defend, or because of the pressure of political threats or promises. No! They are to be explained, defended, advanced, and employed in the university’s service.

It is also worth remembering, in our time of travail, that our predecessors since the 12th century somehow managed in the face of complacency, indifference, ignorance, hostility
and despair to lift the lamp of learning high enough to illuminate not only the university’s sense of its own enduring purposes, but also, its link to a more broadly civilized and cultured society. Fiat Lux!
