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Keep California’s Promise
Master Plan Then

- Reduce duplication between 3 higher ed sectors
- Specialization of missions
- Increase efficiency
- Expand student opportunities
Key Values

- Access
- Affordability
- Quality
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Master Plan Succeeded

- Best public higher education system in the world
- Universities emphasize upward mobility
- Most effective pathway from CCs to UC and CSU
- Efficiency created by the Master Plan’s specialization saves money
- Costs taxpayers less than subsidizing private higher ed
Central Problem

- Political decision to deprioritize higher ed and shift it from a public to a private good
  - Schwarzenegger implemented far-reaching privatization
  - Brown is cheap and offended by UC’s arrogance
- California funding higher ed at levels 20% below average of other states
2000: Seats for all qualified students

2015:
- UC short 20,000 seats
- CSU short 25,000 seats
- Community colleges short 450,000 seats

Brown’s legacy: Less opportunity
- Community Colleges’ focus on transfers disenfranchising vocational and other programs
- Increased transfers to UC and CSU, will reduce access for freshmen
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### Reduced Affordability

**Paying more for less**

Funding per full time equivalent student (2015 dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UC</th>
<th></th>
<th>CSU</th>
<th></th>
<th>Community Colleges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tuition/fees</td>
<td>State Funds</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Tuition/fees</td>
<td>State Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>$5,364</td>
<td>$23,627</td>
<td>$27,221</td>
<td>$2,488</td>
<td>$11,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,488</td>
<td></td>
<td>$21,692</td>
<td>$4,214</td>
<td>$11,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>$13,200</td>
<td>$12,848</td>
<td>$21,692</td>
<td>$5,472</td>
<td>$8,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$298</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,134</td>
<td>$920</td>
<td>$4,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% change</td>
<td>+146%</td>
<td>-46%</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>+120%</td>
<td>-30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Huge increase in student debt**
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Fee increases not large enough to cover the cuts in state funding

More large lecture classes, less interaction with faculty

More scheduling difficulties
  - Lack of class capacity leads to longer times to graduation

Reduced graduate and professional programs
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Coping Strategies Aggravate Problem

- Higher tuition
- Reducing number of students
- More out-of-state students
- Unrealistic efficiencies
- More part-time adjuncts
- Priorities of donor class (fancy stadiums, art museums, conference centers)
- Cuts to state-funded public interest research
- Money losing public-private partnerships
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National recognition of problem

Access and affordability
- President Obama
- Democrats Hillary Clinton and Bernie Sanders
- Tennessee Republican Governor Bill Haslam

Still framing higher ed as private good some need help purchasing

Not addressing quality

Keep California’s Promise
Solution is Possible and Affordable

- Push the “Reset” button
  - Roll back tuition and fees to 2000-1
  - Return per-student funding to 2000-1
  - Fund seats for all qualified students
  - Return out-of-state admissions to 2000-1 levels
- If income tax surcharge: $31 for median family
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