



The Master Plan Five Years Later

A Report of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education

Sacramento and San Francisco
March, 1966

Members of the Council

Representing the General Public:

WARREN M. CHRISTOPHER, Los Angeles
DR. ARTHUR G. COONS, Newport Beach, President of the Council
DR. GEORGE GELMAN, Bakersfield
BERT W. LEVIT, San Francisco
LOUIS J. KROEGER, San Francisco
ROBERT SETRAKIAN, San Francisco

Representing the Private Colleges and Universities:

FATHER CHARLES S. CASASSA, President, Loyola University of Los Angeles
DR. MILTON C. KLOETZEL, Dean of the Graduate School, University of Southern California
DR. C. EASTON ROTHWELL, President, Mills College

Representing the Public Junior Colleges:

MRS. ELEANORE D. NETTLE, Trustee of the College of San Mateo
MRS. TALCOTT BATES, Member, State Board of Education
STUART M. WHITE, Superintendent, State Center Junior College District and Vice President of the Council

Representing the California State Colleges:

DR. GLENN S. DUMKE, Chancellor of the State Colleges
LOUIS HEILBRON, Trustee
ALBERT J. RUFFO, Chairman of the Board of Trustees

Representing the University of California:

EDWARD W. CARTER, Chairman of the Board of Regents
DR. CLARK KERR, President of the University

Council Staff

WILLARD B. SPALDING, Director
RUSSELL M. BARTHELL, Associate Director
ALVIN MARKS, Associate Director
KEITH SEXTON, Associate Director
SIDNEY W. BROSSMAN, Higher Education Specialist

FRANKLIN G. MATSLER, Higher Education Specialist
CHARLES McINTYRE, Higher Education Specialist
J. CLAUDE SCHEUERMAN, Higher Education Specialist
JOHN M. SMART, Higher Education Specialist
COURTLAND L. WASHBURN, Higher Education Specialist
LELAND MYERS, Research Associate
BERT K. SIMPSON, Research Associate
ARTHUR F. SUGUITAN, Fiscal Analyst
THEODORA M. THAYER, Fiscal Analyst
JOHN DYKES, Administrative Assistant
DOUGLAS ADCOCK, Staff Analyst
THIERRY F. KOENIG, Staff Analyst

This report was prepared by Alvin Marks

With the assistance of

Russell W. Barthell
Sidney W. Brossman
Franklin G. Matsler
J. Claude Scheuerman
Keith Sexton
Bert K. Simpson
John M. Smart
Arthur F. Suguitan
Courtland L. Washburn

— 3 —
— 5 —

Foreword

The Master Plan Five Years Later, presents the record of implementation of the 67 recommendations of the *Master Plan for Higher Education in California 1960-1975* prepared in 1959. The number of recommendations which have been implemented in whole or in part, sixty out of sixty-seven, alone provides substantial evidence to support the conclusion that great progress has been made.

However, evidence of success should not lead to the belief that no problems remain to be faced. To the contrary, a number of old problems continue to exist and in addition, new ones have arisen since the Master Plan was conceived and drafted.

On December 18, 1959, Dr. Arthur Coons, then Chairman of the Master Plan Survey Team, presented the Plan to a joint session of the State Board of Education and the Regents of the University of California. At that time he said that the Master Plan had been developed because of unsettling concern about the future of higher education. As he saw it, five factors contributed to this concern: (1) anticipated large increases in enrollments; (2) aspirations of many localities to secure a campus of a public institution of higher education; (3) strongly voiced aspirations of the State Colleges; (4) the fears of each segment of higher education that its contribution would be minimized, and (5) the numerous proposals to reorganize the structure and control of higher education.

In spite of the many successes achieved under the Master Plan, many of these same factors arouse concern today. Enrollments have exceeded those projected in the Master Plan and new projections may also prove to be conservative. In the five years that California higher education has operated under the Master Plan, the independent and public segments have grown even beyond the estimates made in 1959. The University of California has expanded full-time student enrollment by 61%, the State Colleges by 74%, the Junior Colleges by 89%, and the independent colleges by 35%. The University has established three new campuses, the State Colleges have opened four new colleges, and 11 new Junior Colleges have been authorized.

In 1964, when the Coordinating Council for Higher Education held hearings on the need for new State Colleges and University campuses, the aspirations of many localities were strongly expressed. Further, the State Colleges are not completely satisfied with the rate of establishment of joint doctoral programs. Other problems facing higher education today result from the fact that certain Master Plan recommendations have not been fully implemented yet which are central to the development of excellence in higher education. For example, the lack of fiscal authority and flexibility for the California State Colleges has seriously handicapped that system in its efforts to provide a quality education to its large and continuously expanding student body while effectively administering its eighteen campuses and planning for four new ones. Another complex problem is that of providing conditions which lead to an uninterrupted and unimpeded flow of eligible students from high school into, and among, the public segments of higher education. Still another example is the lack of progress in achieving an increased proportion of State support for the Junior Colleges. Suggestions for reorganizing the structure and control of higher education continue to be discussed at all levels and within each segment.

Today, concern about higher education arises from factors which were not as paramount in 1959 as they appear to be now. These are: (1) student unrest; (2) the search by faculty for more meaningful roles in the governance of colleges; (3) federal legislation relating to higher education; (4) the problems of governance created by size, particularly in multi-campus systems, and (5) the need for greater higher educational opportunities for economically and culturally disadvantaged students.

The first two factors may be viewed as internal problems of the segments, rather than as appropriate areas for Council action. However, with half of the population of California now 25 years of age or less, more student unrest is inevitable and more ways to turn it to constructive use are needed. There is a marked increase in the influence of faculty upon the internal governance of colleges and university. Here, too, more ways are needed to use this influence for salutary purposes.

In creating the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, the Legislature did not intend to eliminate factors causing concern, rather it developed a new agency in which they could be considered and from which it could receive recommendations taking all educational factors into account. We are confident that the Legislature remains fully aware that continuing concern about higher education is essential if California is to maintain its efforts in achieving excellence in higher education. Newly emergent factors present new responsibilities for the Council. Council studies of the sizes of colleges and campuses are reviewed frequently and new standards are developed, a key element in any consideration of systems of governance.

— 6 —

The Council and its staff are already deeply involved in developing and administering a State plan for allocating federal funds to colleges and universities under the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1965, and it has been designated by the Governor to perform these same functions with respect to Titles I and VI-A of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and Section 802 of the Housing Act of 1964.

Reflecting national concerns and emphasis, the Council has been designated to coordinate training programs in higher education under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1963 and has applied for federal funds for this purpose, although no funds have been received to date. A study of higher education for culturally deprived

students is nearing completion.

Implementation of the Master Plan has progressed successfully, with some important problems such as those discussed above not yet completely resolved. The fact that all segments are represented on the Council along with strong public representation produces workable solutions to higher education's problems. Looking ahead, new problems will continue to arise; their solution with wisdom similar to that displayed in recent years is essential to continued excellence in public higher education.

—Willard B. Spalding
Director of the Council
March 21, 1966

— 7 —

Introduction

Six years ago the late Assemblywoman Dorothy Donahoe introduced Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 88 in the 1959 Legislature. This resolution, calling for a Master Plan for Higher Education during the next decade, set in motion a massive study of California higher education conducted by a survey team and numerous technical committees composed of representatives of all segments of public and private higher education. Within the several years since, this study has gained national—and even international—attention and praise.

Over five years have passed since the State Board of Education and the Regents of the University of California met in joint session to unanimously approve in principle the sixty-seven recommendations designed to implement the Survey Team report, *A Master Plan for Higher Education in California 1960-1975*. In 1960, the Legislature considered those recommendations needing legislative implementation and as a result enacted the Donahoe Higher Education Act, later signed by Governor Brown. Few changes have been made in that Act since 1960. (The Donahoe Higher Education Act as amended is reproduced in Appendix III.)

What progress has been made in implementing the Master Plan recommendations? A status report seems necessary and desirable in light of questions raised from time to time by the segments, the Coordinating Council, the public, and others as to the adequacy of implementation and the feasibility of certain recommendations, and the need for modification of others. Legislative concern has risen, particularly during the last two years, as to the efficacy of certain aspects of the Master Plan, as well as to the Plan itself.

As a result of these concerns, the Director of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education requested the University of California, the California State Colleges, the California Junior College Association, the State Scholarship Commission and the Coordinating Council staff to review the degree of implementation of the Master Plan recommendations and to make suggestions, if any, for modification. (A portion of the responses to this request are reproduced in Appendix I.)

Although implementation of these recommendations involve many groups, agencies, organizations, and individuals, the primary responsibility for implementation rests with the following: University of California, California State Colleges, California Junior Colleges, Private Colleges and Universities, State Scholarship Commission, Coordinating Council for Higher Education, and California State Government.¹

¹ State government as used herein includes the executive branch (including the Governor, the Department of Finance, and the Department of Education), and the Legislature (including the Legislative Analyst's office).

— 9 —

1. State government as used herein includes the executive branch (including the Governor, the Department of Finance, and the Department of Education), and the Legislature (including the Legislative Analyst's office).

I. Implementation

This section quotes ² each of the sixty-seven recommendations of the Master Plan together with comments relating to degree of implementation. Suggestions for study and possible change of certain recommendations, are provided in Section II of this report.

The number of each recommendation in the Master Plan appears before the text of each recommendation. The number appearing in the box beside each recommendation is a serial number assigned to each recommendation for easy reference and discussion. Tables 1 through 8 provide a summary of the degree of implementation of each recommendation by major subject area.

1 Footnotes in the Master Plan and their numbers are not reproduced in this report.

Structure, Function, and Co-ordination

It is recommended that:

[1] 1. An amendment be proposed to add a new section to Article IX of the California Constitution providing that: Public higher education shall consist of the junior colleges, the State College System, and the University of California. Each shall strive for excellence in its sphere, as assigned in this section.

Comment: *Partially Implemented*

The Legislature did not approve a proposed constitutional amendment for referral to the voters but enacted the Donahoe Higher Education Act as a part of the Education Code. All segments of education supported the passage of this statute.

[2] 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 not limited to, one or more of the following: (a) standard collegiate courses for 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. Nothing in this section shall be construed as altering the status of the junior college as part of the Public School System as defined elsewhere in the Constitution.

Comment: *Implemented*

Contained in the Donahoe Act.

[3] 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 board shall consist of five ex-officio members; the Governor, the Lieutenant Governor, the Speaker of the Assembly, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and the chief executive officer of the State College System; and 16 appointive members appointed by the Governor for terms of 16 years. The chief executive officer of the State College System shall also sit with The Regents in an advisory capacity, and the President of the University of California shall sit with the Trustees in an advisory

2. Footnotes in the Master Plan and their numbers are not reproduced in this report.

capacity. The members of the State Board of Education shall serve ex-officio as first Trustees, being replaced by regular appointees at the expiration of their respective terms.

- c. 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.

Comment: *Implemented (with Modification)*

The Trustees are a board not a body corporate.

The name has since been officially changed to the California State Colleges.

The Speaker of the Assembly is not technically an ex-officio member, but in effect serves in that capacity.

The Chancellor does not sit with the Regents and the President of the University does not sit with the Trustees although the statute provides for it.

Trustees serve for eight-year terms—provided by a 1960 constitutional amendment.

— 10 —

The Trustees do not enjoy “powers closely paralleling those of the Regents.” (3a above) i.e., fiscal flexibility.

The first joint doctoral degree program to be operated between the University and San Diego State College in chemistry was approved by both boards in July 1965.

[4] 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.

Comment: *Implemented*

Contained in the Donahoe Act. The Regents have made library and research facilities available to faculty members of the State Colleges, Junior Colleges, and private colleges.

[5] 5. An advisory body, the Co-ordinating Council for Higher Education:

- a. Shall consist of 12 members, three representatives each from the University, the State College System, the junior colleges, and the independent colleges and universities. The University and the State College System each shall be represented by its chief executive officer and two board members appointed by the boards. The junior colleges shall be represented by (1) a member of the State Board of Education or its Chief Executive Officer; (2) a representative of the local governing boards; and (3) a representative of the local junior college administrators. The independent colleges and universities shall be represented as determined by agreement of the chief executive officers of the University and the State College System, in consultation with the association or associations of private higher educational institutions. All votes shall be recorded, but effective action shall require an affirmative

vote of four of the six University and state college representatives; except that on junior college matters the junior college representatives shall have effective votes; and on the appointment and removal of a director of the Council all 12 shall be effective.

- b. A director of the staff for the Co-ordinating Council shall be appointed by a vote of eight of the 12 Council members, and may be removed by a vote of eight members of the Council. He shall appoint such staff as the Council authorizes.
- c. The Co-ordinating Council shall have the following functions, advisory to the governing boards and appropriate State officials:
 - (1) Review of the annual budget and capital outlay requests of the University and the State College System, and presentation to the Governor of comments on the general level of support.
 - (2) Interpretation of the functional differentiation among the publicly supported institutions provided in this section; and in accordance with the primary functions for each system as set forth above, advise The Regents and The Trustees on programs appropriate to each system.
 - (3) Development of plans for the orderly growth of higher education and making of recommendations to the governing boards on the need for and location of new facilities and programs.
- d. The Council shall have power to require the public institutions of higher education to submit data on costs, selection and retention of students, enrollments, capacities, and other matters pertinent to effective planning and co-ordination.

Comment: *Implemented (with Modification)*

The Coordinating Council for Higher Education was established by the Donahoe Act in 1960 with the following major departures from the Survey Team recommendations:

— 11 —

- a. *Three members appointed by the Governor to represent the general public were added.*
- b. *The Governor appoints the three private college representatives upon nomination by the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities.*
- c. *The Junior College local board member is nominated by the California School Boards' Association and the Junior College administrator is nominated by the California Junior College Association. Both are appointed by the State Board of Education.*
- d. *Majority voting.*
- e. *Ten votes required to hire or remove the Director.*
- f. *Report on differentiation of functions to the Governor and the Legislature every two years was added.*
- g. *A section was added stating legislative policy that no new State Colleges or University campuses will be authorized without the Council's recommendation.*

In 1965 the Legislature made the following changes:

- a. *Added three more public representatives bringing total Council membership to 18.*
- b. *Established four-year staggered terms of office for all members except University and State College representatives who now serve for annual terms.*
- c. *Eliminated the use of proxies and restricted the use of alternates.*
- d. *Required Senate confirmation of gubernatorial appointees.*

LEGEND

I Implemented.

P Partially implemented.

X Not implemented. (No entry indicates agency not responsible for implementation)

|| Serial number of recommendation.

Selection and Retention of Students

Validity of Entrance Requirements

It is recommended that:

[6] 1. The junior colleges, state colleges, and University make statistical studies of their entrance requirements, and report annually, in standard form, to the co-ordinating agency on validity judged by: (a) scholastic success (b) persistence (c) rate of dismissal, and (d) scores on standard tests.

Comment: *Partially Implemented*

All segments are in the process of reporting in standard form most of the information called for in this recommendation. Since the University and Junior Colleges do not require a standard test for entrance, it is doubtful that these two segments will be able to supply the information called for in subparagraph (d) directly above. (CCR-4, 17, 40, 49, 53)³

[7] 2. Each public segment report annually to the coordinating agency on its grading standards, providing data on such matters as the following:

- a. Distribution of undergraduate grades awarded (proportion of each grade given for each institution, department, and by lower and upper division).
- b. Its grading differential with other institutions or segments as computed from the records made by transfers.

Comment: *Not Implemented*

This recommendation was not implemented by agreement of the segments and the Council. See discussion in Section II of this report.

2 Coordinating Council Reports (CCR) relevant to a recommendation are cited where appropriate. The numbers indicated refer to the order of listing of the reports in Appendix II.

Admissions Policies and Procedures

It is recommended that:

[8] 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 ? per cent) and the University from the top one-eighth (12 ½ per cent) of all graduates of California public high schools with:

— 12 —

- a. Continuation of existing special programs and curricula involving exceptions to this rule subject to approval by the respective boards, and these to be kept to a minimum, and those that are continued to be reported annually to the co-ordinating agency. Any new special programs and curricula involving

3. Coordinating Council Reports (CCR) relevant to a recommendation are cited where appropriate. The numbers indicated refer to the order of listing of the reports in Appendix II.

such exceptions to be approved by the co-ordinating agency.

- b. Graduates of private and out-of-state secondary schools to be held to equivalent levels.

Comment: Implemented

The University and the State Colleges adopted new admission standards which were effective in the fall 1962 and fall 1965 respectively. A high school transcript study now under way will evaluate these standards in relation to this recommendation. (CCR-4, 17, 40, 49, 53)

[9] 2. Implementation of Recommendation Number 1 to be left to the two systems with the following provisions:

- a. Each to have the new requirements in force for students admitted for Fall, 1962.
- b. Inasmuch as the Survey Team favors acceptance in both systems of a requirement that all, or almost all, of the recommending units for admission shall be in college preparatory courses, that the application of such a requirement be carefully studied during 1960, and this principle be applied as fully as possible throughout both systems.

Comment: Implemented

Due to technical difficulties and lack of lead time, the State Colleges were unable to have the new requirements in force by the fall of 1962.

The State Colleges do not use college preparatory courses as a basis for admission. See Section II for a discussion of this part of the recommendation. (CCR-4, 17, 40, 49, 53)

[10] 3. For both the state colleges and the University, freshman admissions through special procedures outside the basic requirements of recommending units of high school work and/or aptitude tests (such as specials and exceptions to the rules) be limited to 2 per cent of all freshman admissions in each system for a given year. Furthermore that all "limited" students be required to meet regular admission standards.

Comment: Implemented

See Section II of this report for discussion relating to possible modification of this recommendation. (CCR-4, 17, 40, 49, 53)

[11] 4. Junior College functions now carried by state colleges and non-degree lower division programs at any state college or University campus (other than extension) be subject to the following rule:

The equivalent of junior college out-of-district tuition be charged beginning in Fall, 1960, against the counties of residence of all lower division students who are ineligible to admission by regular standards, and the funds collected paid to the General Fund of the State.

Furthermore, that such junior college functions now carried by state colleges at State expense be terminated not later than July 1, 1964, all admittees thereafter being required to meet standard entrance requirements.

Comment: Implemented

The second paragraph of this recommendation is considered to be inapplicable due to implementation of the third paragraph. (CCR-11, 19, 35, 49, 51, 53, 57)

[12] 5. The state colleges and the University require a minimum of at least 56 units of acceptable advanced standing credit before considering the admission of applicants ineligible to admission as freshmen because of inadequate grades in high school, except for curricula that require earlier transfer, and except also that each state college and campus of the University, through special procedures developed by each, be permitted to

accept for earlier transfer not more than 2 per cent of all students who make application for advanced standing in any year.

Comment: *Implemented*

See Section II of this report for a discussion relating to possible modification of this recommendation. (CCR-4, 11, 17, 35, 40, 49, 51, 53, 57)

[13] 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.

Comment: *Partially Implemented*

The State Colleges do not require undergraduate transfer non-resident applicants to stand in the upper half of those ordinarily eligible. Both the University and the State Colleges require freshmen non-resident applicants to stand in the upper half of those ordinarily eligible (top 1/6 for the State Colleges and top 1/16 for the University). (CCR-4, 17, 35, 40, 44, 49, 51, 53, 57)

[14] 7. A study of the transfer procedures to both the University and the state colleges be undertaken through the co-ordinating agency during 1960 with the view of tightening them. Evidence available to the Master Plan Survey Team indicates the need for such action.

— 13 —

Comment: *Partially Implemented*

Transfer procedures are under continuing review and study. Procedures since 1960 have been modified in light of Recommendation [12] above. (CCR-4, 11, 17, 35, 40, 49, 51, 53, 57)

[15] 8. A continuing committee on selection, admission, and retention as a part of the co-ordinating agency be established, to make further studies in these fields (see Recommendations 1 and 2, under “Validity of Entrance Requirements.” page 4), and to report annually to the appropriate agencies and persons on the following practices:

- a. Transfer procedures as indicated in Recommendation 7.
- b. State college and University procedures in admission to the graduate division.
- c. The desirability of differing standards of admission for the varying programs within each segment of publicly supported institutions.

Comment: *Partially Implemented*

A continuing committee was established in 1963 to implement this recommendation. It is now proposed that the purposes of this committee can best be served through other Council-sponsored committees. (CCR-4, 11, 17, 35, 40, 49, 51, 53, 57)

[16] 9. Private institutions of higher education in California in the approaching period of heavy enrollments strive for increased excellence by adopting rigorous admission and retention standards.

Comment: *Not Determined*

Retention

It is recommended that:

[17] 1. Each segment strive for greater uniformity in policy and practices on probation and dismissal; that among segments where the programs are comparable, an effort be made to secure uniformity in policy and practices on probation and dismissal; and that each segment report annually full retention statistics to the coordinating agency.

Comment: *Implemented*

Both the State Colleges and University have achieved greater uniformity in policy and practices on probation and dismissal in their respective segments. The Council has recently given advice to the State Board of Education on proposals for greater uniformity in the Junior Colleges which are still under consideration. (CCR-40, 53, 57)

Distribution of Lower Division Students

It is recommended that:

[18] 1. 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.

Comment: *Partially Implemented*

The State Colleges are gradually decreasing the ratio of lower division enrollments to those of the upper and graduate divisions. The same ratio in the University is not gradually decreasing. The implementation of this recommendation has been the source of considerable controversy among the segments and the Coordinating Council. The issues involved are noted in Section II of this report. See letters in Appendix I for additional discussion concerning this recommendation. (CCR-9, 11, 19, 32, 34, 35, 49, 51, 53, 57)

State Scholarships and Fellowships

It is recommended that:

[19] 1. The present scholarship program be expanded to include additional scholarships to provide for the rapidly increasing number of qualified applicants.

Comment: *Implemented*

The number of scholarships has been increased to equal 1% of the California high school graduates. The 1965 Legislature provided enabling legislation.

[20] 2. The amount of the scholarship be increased to compensate for additional educational costs since the original stipend was established.

Comment: *Implemented*

Two years ago, the Legislature enacted enabling legislation to provide for up to 95% of the cost of tuition.

[21] 3. In the event a State scholarship recipient elects to attend a junior college before entering a four-year institution, his scholarship be retained for him, provided his junior college record meets the level required by

the State Scholarship Commission.

Comment: *Implemented*

The State Scholarship Commission now provides for Junior College reserve awards.

[22] 4. In addition to the State Scholarship Program a new and separate bill be enacted to provide subsistence grants to recipients of State scholarships, the amount of such grants to be based on the financial need of the individual students, the maximum amount being that necessary to defray expenses of room and board at the average of such charges to the student in institutionally operated student residences.

Comment: *Not Implemented*

The State Scholarship Commission has sought legislation to implement this recommendation. The Legislature has consistently deleted requests of this nature.

[23] 5. In view of the need to divert more college graduates into teaching and the need for more funds to provide fellowship assistance to those in graduate training, a new State Graduate Fellowship Program be established to accomplish these purposes and to assist in making it possible for graduate schools to operate at as near capacity as possible.

Comment: *Partially Implemented*

The Legislature, at its 1965 session provided enabling legislation but did not fund the program.

TABLE 2 DEGREE OF IMPLEMENTATION OF MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS RELATING TO SELECTION AND RETENTION OF STUDENTS								
SELECTION AND RETENTION OF STUDENTS (Summarized Recommendations)	University	State Colleges	Junior Colleges	Private Colleges and Universities	State Scholarship Commission	Coordinating Council	State Government	
VALIDITY of ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS	[6] 1. SEGMENTS MAKE STATISTICAL STUDIES. . . .	P	P	P	—	—	P	P
	[7] 2. EACH SEGMENT REPORT GRADING STANDARDS. . . .	X	X	X	—	—	X	X
	a. Distribution of Undergraduate Grades. . . .	X	X	X	—	—	X	X
	b. Grading Differential with Other Institutions. . . .	X	X	X	—	—	X	X
ADMISSIONS POLICIES AND PROCEDURES	[8] 1. RAISE LOWER DIVISION ADMISSION STANDARDS. . . .	I	I	—	—	—	—	—
	a. Special Programs and Curricula. . . .	I	I	—	—	—	—	—

TABLE 2 DEGREE OF IMPLEMENTATION OF MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS RELATING TO SELECTION AND RETENTION OF STUDENTS

SELECTION AND RETENTION OF STUDENTS (Summarized Recommendations)	University	State Colleges	Junior Colleges	Private Colleges and Universities	State Scholarship Commission	Coordinating Council	State Government
b. Graduates of Private and Out-of-State Schools. . . .	I	I	—	—	—	—	—
[9] 2. IMPLEMENTATION OF #1 ABOVE TO BE LEFT TO SEGMENTS. . . .	I	I	—	—	—	—	—
a. Institute New Standards in Fall, 1962. . . .	I	X	—	—	—	—	—
b. College Preparatory Courses Favored. . . .	I	X	—	—	—	—	—
[10] 3. TWO PERCENT EXCEPTION FOR FRESHMEN. . . .	I	I	—	—	—	—	—
[11] 4. STATE COLLEGES CEASE JUNIOR COLLEGE FUNCTIONS. . . .	—	I	—	—	—	—	—
[12] 5. 56 UNIT TRANSFER RULE AND 2% EXCEPTIONS. . . .	I	I	—	—	—	—	—
[13] 6. HIGHER ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS FOR NON-RESIDENTS. . . .	I	P	—	—	—	—	—
[14] 7. STUDY OF TRANSFER PROCEDURES. . . .	P	P	—	—	—	P	—
[15] 8. COMMITTEE ON SELECTION, ADMISSION & RETENTION. . . .	—	—	—	—	—	P	—
a. Transfer Procedures. . . .	—	—	—	—	—	P	—
b. Graduate Admission Procedures. . . .	—	—	—	—	—	X	—
c. Differential Admissions Within Segments. . . .	—	—	—	—	—	X	—

TABLE 2 DEGREE OF IMPLEMENTATION OF MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS RELATING TO SELECTION AND RETENTION OF STUDENTS

SELECTION AND RETENTION OF STUDENTS (Summarized Recommendations)		University	State Colleges	Junior Colleges	Private Colleges and Universities	State Scholarship Commission	Coordinating Council	State Government
	[16] 9. PRIVATE SEGMENT ADOPT RIGOROUS ADMISSION STANDARDS. ...	—	—	—	?	—	—	—
RETENTION	[17] 1. GREATER UNIFORMITY IN POLICY ON PROBATION. ...	I	I	X	—	—	—	X
DISTRIBUTION	[18] 1. 60/40 RATIO (UPPER DIVISION TO LOWER DIVISION). ...	X	P	—	—	—	—	—
STATE SCHOLARSHIPS AND FELLOWSHIPS	[19] 1. ADDITIONAL SCHOLARSHIPS. ...	—	—	—	—	I	—	I
	[20] 2. INCREASE IN STIPEND. ...	—	—	—	—	I	—	I
	[21] 3. RETENTION OF SCHOLARSHIP FOR JUNIOR COLLEGE STUDENT. ...	—	—	—	—	I	—	I
	[22] 4. NEW BILL FOR SUBSISTENCE GRANTS. ...	—	—	—	—	P	—	P
	[23] 5. NEW PROGRAM FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS. ...	—	—	—	—	P	—	P

LEGEND

I Implemented.

P Partially implemented.

X Not implemented. (No entry indicates agency not responsible for implementation)

[] Serial number of recommendation.

Institutional Capacities and Area Needs

Utilization of Physical Plants

It is recommended that:

[24] 1. The standard utilization of classrooms in the Junior colleges, state colleges, and the University of California be at the maximum practicable levels, but in no case shall (use of classrooms) average less than 30 scheduled hours per week with class enrollments after the first month of the term averaging 60 per cent of room capacity.

— 15 —

Comment: *Partially Implemented*

The State Colleges and the University have traditionally planned new facilities based on utilization standards which are higher than the minimums recommended by the Master Plan. Because all campuses have been continually growing, the actual utilization of facilities has been somewhat lower than the Master Plan minimums in certain cases. The State Board of Education at its November 1965 meeting adopted utilization standards for the Junior Colleges on an interim basis which are very close to the Master Plan minimums. Utilization of facilities in the Junior Colleges has been somewhat lower than the Master Plan minimums. (CCR-32, 42, 51)

[25] 2. The standard room utilization of teaching laboratories in the junior colleges, the state colleges, and the University of California be at the maximum practicable levels, but in no case shall (use of laboratories) average less than 20 scheduled hours per week, with class enrollments after the first month of the term averaging 80 per cent of room capacity.

Comment: *Partially Implemented*

The comments for No. 1 [24] directly above apply to this recommendation. (CCR-32, 42, 51).

[26] 3. In determining the need for instructional facilities in the junior colleges, state colleges, and campuses of the University of California, these factors be taken into account:

- a. The two recommended standards of utilization.
- b. The space standards as found in Tables 33, 34, and 36 of *A Restudy of the Needs of California in Higher Education* (with such modifications as changes in the present differentiation of functions among the public segments may justify).
- c. The number of FTE (full-time equivalent) students used in projecting building requirements be limited to those to be instructed in the day program, that is, from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Comment: *Partially Implemented*

The Comments for No. 1 [24] above apply to this recommendation. (CCR-32, 42, 51).

[27] 4. In the scheduling of classes greater use be made of the late afternoon and evening hours and when possible of Saturday, thereby making the achievement of the foregoing utilization standards easier.

Comment: *Partially Implemented*

Larger metropolitan campuses tend to offer more classes in the late afternoon and evenings than the smaller campuses in outlying areas. There is generally better utilization and a more even distribution of scheduled classes in those campuses which are nearing their planned maximum enrollment. There is little or no indication that more courses are being offered on Saturdays. The Junior Colleges, as a whole, offer proportionately more night classes than do the other two segments.

[28] 5. The scheduling of instructional facilities be centrally controlled on each campus with such exceptions as may be approved by the appropriate governing board. (Examples of exceptions are the physical facilities for medicine, law, and other areas where the facilities are designed for highly specialized uses).

Comment: *Implemented*

[29] 6. The co-ordinating agency (or a continuing committee on plant problems which it might create) undertake without delay the following studies:

- a. A complete study of the current utilization in the junior colleges, state colleges, and the University of California (no such study has been made since 1953-54) for the specific purpose of making such modification in the above recommended standards of utilization as are justified by the findings.
- b. The possible economic and educational gains that might be effected by the adoption of an articulated calendar for all segments of public higher education in California.

Comment: *Implemented*

A complete inventory of all physical facilities in the public segments, along with a utilization study of classroom and laboratory facilities was made using fall 1963 data. (See A Progress Report on the Study of Utilization of Physical Facilities of California's Public Institutions of Higher Education, 1963-64, No. 65-2A). Final recommendations concerning any changes in standards are expected to be made in May 1966. Subparagraph (6) has been implemented by Council reports. (CCR-10, 32, 33, 37, 42, 51).

[30] 7. Space provisions for health services be increased to allow for infirmary care on state college and University campuses where dormitories are provided.

Comment: *Not Implemented*

Recent action of the Legislature (approval of the State College 1965-66 budget) indicates legislative doubt concerning this recommendation. This legislative action called for some State Colleges to experiment with health insurance plans and the greater use of physicians in the local community.

In addition, Coordinating Council advice, accepted and implemented by the Regents and Trustees, calls for capital outlay funds for student

— 16 —

health facilities to be derived from student fees. The State Colleges are in the process of revising its student fee structure to accommodate this policy. (CCR-28, 29).

[31] 8. Inasmuch as the space standards found in *A Restudy of the Needs of California in Higher Education*, in Tables 33, 34, and 36, were based on the then existing function of the state colleges and the University, such standards be modified where agreed-upon changes in functions require different space allocations.

Comment: *Not Implemented*

A study is currently in progress and will be completed and reported to the Council at its May 1966 meeting. (CCR-32, 42, 51).

[32] 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.

Comment: *Partially Implemented*

Sub paragraph (a) has been partially implemented by actions of the Regents and Trustees in adopting calendars for year-round operation. Sub paragraph (b) has been implemented to the degree that the segments have been granted all funds requested of the Legislature. Paragraph (c) has been implemented. (CCR-10, 32, 33, 37, 42, 51).

Enrollment Limitations and Projected Plant Needs

It is recommended that:

[33] 1. With respect to the establishment of new state colleges and campuses of the University, the governing boards reaffirm their action taken in joint session on April 15, 1959, to the effect that “no new State Colleges or campuses of the University, other than those already approved, shall be established until adequate Junior College facilities have been provided, the determination of adequacy to be based on studies made under the direction of the Liaison Committee of the State Board of Education and The Regents of the University of California...” with the further provision that the new state colleges and campuses of the University established by action of the Legislature in 1957, and by action of The Regents, also in 1957, be limited to upper division and graduate work until such time as adequate junior college opportunities are provided for the primary area served by these institutions.

Comment: *Implemented*

[34] 2. The following full-time enrollment ranges be observed for existing institutions, for those authorized but not yet established, and for those later established:

Type of Institution	Minimum	Optimum	Maximum
Junior Colleges. ...	400	3,500	6,000
State Colleges			
In densely populated areas in metropolitan centers. ...	5,000	10,000	20,000
Outside metropolitan centers	3,000	8,000	12,000
University of California Campuses. ...	5,000	12,000	27,500

Comment: *Implemented (with Modification)*

This recommendation was modified by the Coordinating Council at its June 1964 meeting as follows:

Minimum and Maximum Enrollment Ranges in Fall Term Enrollment Applied in the 1964 Additional Centers Study (Full-time Students)		
Type of Institution	Minimum	Maximum
Junior Colleges. ...	900	5,000-7,500
State Colleges		
In densely populated areas in metropolitan centers. ...	5,000	17,500-20,000

Minimum and Maximum Enrollment Ranges in Fall Term Enrollment Applied in the 1964 Additional Centers Study (Full-time Students)		
Type of Institution	Minimum	Maximum
Outside such areas. . . .	3,000	9,500-12,000
University of California Campus. . . .	5,000	25,000-27,500

NOTE: The minimum figures for State College and University campuses are to be attained within seven to ten years after students are first admitted. The minimum for Junior Colleges is to be attained within two years, and may be lowered if the State Board of Education so determines due to isolation factors as provided in the Education Code. Also the maximum for Junior Colleges may be exceeded in densely populated areas in metropolitan centers. (CCR-15, 19, 28, 32, 36, 42, 51).

[35] 3. The state give encouragement to making junior college facilities available for the school districts not now adequately served either through the establishment of new junior colleges or by making them a part of districts now served by junior colleges. Evidence at hand indicates that there is need for new junior colleges in the following school districts: (See pages 9 and 112 of Master Plan for detailed listing).

Comment: Implemented

New Junior Colleges have been established composed of nearly all of the school districts referred

— 17 —

to above. Over 90% of high school graduates now reside within a Junior College district. (CCR-19, 34, 51).

[36] 4. New state colleges in addition to those already authorized be established and in operation by 1965 in the following areas and in descending order of estimated enrollment potential:

Approximate location	Estimated 1975 full-time enrollment potential
In the vicinity of Los Angeles International Airport. . . .	19,900
In the San Bernardino-Riverside vicinity (vicinity of Rialto). . . .	12,800

Although it is believed that these two institutions should be master planned for an ultimate capacity of 20,000, the Survey Team recommends that the 1975 enrollment be held to 10,000 and 8,000 respectively.

Comment: Implemented

The California State College at Palos Verdes (Dominguez Hills) and the California State College at San Bernardino accepted students in the fall of 1965.

[37] 5. In 1965 and again in 1970, if applicable, and before considering the need for new state colleges in any other areas of the state, careful studies be made by the co-ordinating agency of the following State Economic Areas to determine the actual need for new state colleges that exists at the time each study is made:

State Economic Area	
F	Los Angeles-Long Beach Metropolitan area, Griffith Park-Glendale vicinity
A	San Francisco-Oakland Metropolitan area, vicinity of Redwood City

State Economic Area	
A	San Francisco-Oakland Metropolitan area, Contra Costa County
K	Bakersfield Metropolitan area, Kern County
7	South Coastal area, Ventura County

Comment: *Implemented*

Recommendations of the Council were that a new State College campus should be authorized in Kern County immediately and that a definite ultimate need existed for State Colleges in Contra Costa, San Mateo-Santa Clara area, and Ventura. Acquisition of sites in advance of the actual authorization of campuses in these three areas was also recommended by the Council. (CCR-15, 30, 36, 47).

[38] 6. The three new campuses approved by the Regents in 1957—(a) San Diego-La Jolla area (b) Southeast Los Angeles-Orange County area, and (c) the South Central Coastal area (Santa Clara, San Mateo, Santa Cruz, San Bonito and Monterey Counties)—be completed without delay and in any event construction to be started not later than 1962.

It is further recommended that the campus in each of the following locations be planned for 1975 enrollments as follows:

San Diego-La Jolla. . . .	7,500
Southeast Los Angeles-Orange County. . . .	12,500
South Central Coast. . . .	10,000

Comment: *Implemented*

The San Diego, Irvine, and Santa Cruz campuses of the University are all under construction and in operation.

[39] 7. Inasmuch as the estimated enrollment potential of the Berkeley campus of the University is 43,950 for 1975 (as compared with a maximum enrollment of 27,500 as recommended in 2 above for a University campus, the co-ordinating agency undertake appropriate studies of how best to accommodate the difference between these figures (approximately 16,000), such steps to include careful study of these possibilities:

- a. Diversion of some of these potential students particularly to the Davis campus and the new South Central Coast campus.
- b. The accommodation of the remaining part of the difference (i.e., 16,000 less the impact of (a) above) through the establishment of branch installations from existing campuses in specialized fields of study such as instruction in science at Livermore. (These would be similar to the off-campus centers for teacher education now operated by certain of the state colleges).

Comment: *Partially Implemented*

Sub paragraph (a) has been implemented.

Sub paragraph (b) has not been implemented.

The feasibility of branch campuses by the University is now being studied. (CCR-15, 30, 36).

[40] 8. In 1965, and again where applicable in 1970, and before considering the need for new University facilities in any other areas of the state, careful studies be made by the co-ordinating agency of the need for

additional University facilities in the San Joaquin Valley and the Los Angeles area. In the latter area special consideration should be given as to how the difference between the 1975 estimates of potential University enrollment of 52,550 and the 27,500 maximum for the University of California, Los Angeles, campus (some 25,000 students) can best be accommodated. Such consideration should include the following:

- a. To what extent will this difference be cared for by the new Southeast Los Angeles-Orange County campus, and to what extent could these potential students be diverted to the La Jolla, Riverside, and Santa Barbara campuses?
- b. Will there be a need for the establishment of branch installations in specialized fields of study from existing campuses in this area similar to that included in Recommendation 7b?

Comment: Partially Implemented

The recommendation through subparagraph (a) has been implemented. Subparagraph (b) has not been implemented for the reason given for subparagraph (b) of recommendation 7 ([39]) directly above. (CCR-15, 30, 36).

[41] 9. Because the University, among the publicly supported institutions in California, has the sole responsibility for the preparation for professions such as architecture, dentistry, law, librarianship (graduate), medicine, optometry, pharmacy, public health, and veterinary medicine, periodic studies be made of the relation of supply to demand, particularly in fields where there seem likely to be shortages, such as medicine and pharmacy, for the purpose of determining what steps the University should take to meet its responsibilities in these professional fields.

Comment: Implemented

This recommendation requires continuous implementation. Several studies have been made by the Council staff and the segments. These include studies of medical, nursing, and dental education in California. Other studies are in the planning stage. (CCR-2, 16).

TABLE 3 DEGREE OF IMPLEMENTATION OF MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS RELATING TO INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITIES AND AREA NEEDS							
INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITIES AND AREA NEEDS (Summarized Recommendations)	University	State Colleges	Junior Colleges	Private Colleges and Universities	State Scholarship Commission	Coordinating Council	State Government
UTILIZATION OF PHYSICAL PLANTS							
[24] 1. MINIMUM CRITERIA FOR USE OF CLASSROOMS. ...	P	P	P	—	—	—	P
[25] 2. MINIMUM CRITERIA FOR USE OF LABORATORIES. ...	P	P	P	—	—	—	P
[26] 3. FACTORS FOR DETERMINING NEED OF INSTRUCTIONAL FACILITIES. ...	P	P	P	—	—	—	P

TABLE 3 DEGREE OF IMPLEMENTATION OF MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS RELATING TO INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITIES AND AREA NEEDS

INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITIES AND AREA NEEDS (Summarized Recommendations)	University	State Colleges	Junior Colleges	Private Colleges and Universities	State Scholarship Commission	Coordinating Council	State Government
a. Minimum Criteria in 1 and 2 directly above. . . .	P	P	P	—	—	—	P
b. Space standards in Restudy. . . .	P	P	P	—	—	—	P
c. 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM F.T.E.	I	I	—	—	—	—	—
[27] 4. GREATER USE OF EVENING HOURS AND SATURDAY. . . .	P	P	P	—	—	—	—
[28] 5. CENTRAL CONTROL OF SCHEDULING OF FACILITIES. . . .	I	I	I	—	—	—	—
[29] 6. COUNCIL UNDERTAKE STUDIES. . . .	—	—	—	—	—	I	—
a. Up-to-Date Study of Utilization Standards. . . .	—	—	—	—	—	I	—
b. Articulated Calendar for all Segments. . . .	—	—	—	—	—	I	—
[30] 7. SPACE FOR HEALTH SERVICES FOR INFIRMARY CARE. . . .	X	X	X	—	—	—	X
[31] 8. MODIFICATION OF STANDARDS FOR CHANGE IN FUNCTIONS. . . .	—	—	—	—	—	X	—
[32] 9. YEAR-ROUND CALENDAR AND SUMMER PROGRAMS. . . .	P	P	P	P	—	I	P
a. Academic Programs in Summer. . . .	P	P	P	P	—	—	—
b. State Support for Summer Programs. . . .	—	—	—	—	—	—	P
c. Study of Three-Semester and Four-Quarter Plans. . . .	—	—	—	—	—	I	—

TABLE 3 DEGREE OF IMPLEMENTATION OF MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS RELATING TO INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITIES AND AREA NEEDS

INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITIES AND AREA NEEDS (Summarized Recommendations)	University	State Colleges	Junior Colleges	Private Colleges and Universities	State Scholarship Commission	Coordinating Council	State Government	
ENROLLMENT LIMITATIONS AND PROJECTED PLANT NEEDS	[33] 1. RESTRICTION ON STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITY UNTIL ADEQUATE JUNIOR COLLEGE FACILITIES. ...	I	I	—	—	—	—	
	[34] 2. MINIMUM, OPTIMUM, AND MAXIMUM ENROLLMENTS. ...	I	I	I	—	—	I	
	[35] 3. MAKE JUNIOR COLLEGES AVAILABLE TO DISTRICTS NOT SERVED. ...	—	—	I	—	—	—	I
	[36] 4. ESTABLISHMENT OF TWO NEW STATE COLLEGES. ...	—	I	—	—	—	—	I
	[37] 5. STUDY OF THE NEED FOR NEW STATE COLLEGES. ...	—	—	—	—	—	I	—
	[38] 6. ESTABLISHMENT OF THREE NEW CAMPUSES OF THE UNIVERSITY. ...	I	—	—	—	—	—	I
	[39] 7. STUDY OF ACCOMMODATION OF EXCESS STUDENTS AT BERKELEY. ...	—	—	—	—	—	P	—
	a. Redirection of Students to Davis and Santa Cruz. ...	I	—	—	—	—	I	—
	b. Establishment of Branch Campuses of University. ...	P	—	—	—	—	P	—
	[40] 8. STUDY OF NEED FOR NEW UNIVERSITY CAMPUSES. ...	—	—	—	—	—	P	—
a. Accommodation of Excess Students at U.C.L.A. ...	—	—	—	—	—	I	—	

TABLE 3 DEGREE OF IMPLEMENTATION OF MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS RELATING TO INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITIES AND AREA NEEDS							
INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITIES AND AREA NEEDS (Summarized Recommendations)	University	State Colleges	Junior Colleges	Private Colleges and Universities	State Scholarship Commission	Coordinating Council	State Government
b. Need for Branch Campuses in Los Angeles Area. ...	—	—	—	—	—	X	—
[41] 9. STUDIES OF SUPPLY AND DEMAND OF PROFESSIONS. ...	I	—	—	—	—	I	—

LEGEND

I Implemented.

P Partially implemented.

X Not implemented. (No entry indicates agency not responsible for implementation)

[] Serial number of recommendation.

Faculty Demand and Supply

It is recommended that:

[42] 1. Much greater effort be made to divert a greater proportion of college graduates into graduate training preparatory to careers in college and university teaching. This diversion can best be accomplished by a concerted effort on the part of adequately staffed and supported counseling and guidance services at all levels of education, and with the full cooperation of all college and university faculty members.

Comment: Partially Implemented

All segments have endeavored to implement this recommendation. The development of more graduate teaching internships and the Junior College leadership programs are examples of an increasing effort to train students for college teaching. In addition, all segments have increased finance support to their counseling and guidance services as a step toward adequate staffing of those services. (CCR-18, 24, 27, 46).

[43] 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.

Comment: Partially Implemented

All segments have actively sought additional funds for this purpose. The staff comment on recommendation [23] points out that the Legislature did provide enabling legislation for such a program but has not yet provided the necessary funds.

[44] 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.

Comment: *Partially Implemented*

The Legislature has provided increases in salary, travel funds and leaves. The Council has advised the Legislature of the need for additional salary and fringe benefit increases. A Council staff report concerned with faculty career profile data and special privileges and benefits will be presented to the Coordinating Council in the near future. (CCR-4, 8, 9, 17, 18, 24, 46)

[45] 4. 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.

Comment: *Not Implemented*

All segments have attempted to implement this recommendation. Council and segmental studies have indicated the need for additional compensation in order to implement this recommendation. (CCR-18)

[46] 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.

Comment: *Partially Implemented*

All segments have partially implemented this recommendation through informal programs and, in some cases, formal policy.

[47] 6. Strengthening of the master's degree programs in all institutions offering such programs be undertaken by these institutions so that holders of this degree may be more effective additions to the faculties of colleges, universities, and junior colleges.

Comment: *Partially Implemented*

Master's degree programs have been strengthened in the State Colleges and University by revision of standards, curricula, and programs. There appears to be a need for increased financial support of these programs in order to fully implement this recommendation. (CCR-55)

[48] 7. Reorientation of present doctoral programs offered by California institutions be undertaken to insure that those receiving the degree and planning to enter college and university teaching possess the qualities not only of scholars, but of scholar-teachers. Because the University of California awarded 54.6 per cent of the doctorates given by California institutions for the period 1952-53—1955-56, it has a particular responsibility for the implementing of this recommendation.

Comment: *Not Implemented*

There is no evidence at this time that doctoral programs have been reoriented to the scholar-teacher concept.

[49] 8. Because of the continual change in faculty demand and supply, the co-ordinating agency annually collect pertinent data from all segments of higher education in the state and

— 20 —

thereby make possible the testing of the assumptions underlying this report.

Comment: *Implemented*

Studies of faculty recruitment, market conditions throughout the nation, and review of relevant research, have been conducted by the Council staff. (CCR-4, 8, 9, 17, 18, 24, 46)

TABLE 4 DEGREE OF IMPLEMENTATION OF MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS RELATING TO FACULTY DEMAND AND SUPPLY

FACULTY DEMAND AND SUPPLY (Summarized Recommendations)	University	State Colleges	Junior Colleges	Private Colleges and Universities	State Scholarship Commission	Coordinating Council	State Government
[42] 1. DIVERT COLLEGE GRADUATES INTO GRADUATE PREPARATION FOR COLLEGE TEACHING. ...	P	P	P	P	—	—	—
[43] 2. MORE FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR STUDENTS IN GRADUATE TRAINING. ...	P	P	—	P	P	—	X
[44] 3. GREATLY INCREASED SALARIES AND EXPANDED FRINGE BENEFITS FOR FACULTY. ...	P	P	P	P	—	P	P
[45] 4. GREATER USE OF CALIFORNIA-TRAINED DOCTORAL DEGREE HOLDERS. ...	X	X	—	—	—	—	—
[46] 5. FACULTY IN-SERVICE PREPARATION AND SELF-IMPROVEMENT. ...	P	P	P	P	—	—	—
[47] 6. STRENGTHENING OF MASTER'S DEGREE PROGRAMS. ...	P	P	—	P	—	—	P

TABLE 4 DEGREE OF IMPLEMENTATION OF MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS RELATING TO FACULTY DEMAND AND SUPPLY							
FACULTY DEMAND AND SUPPLY (Summarized Recommendations)	University	State Colleges	Junior Colleges	Private Colleges and Universities	State Scholarship Commission	Coordinating Council	State Government
[48] 7. REORGANIZATION OF DOCTORAL PROGRAMS TO SCHOLAR-TEACHER. . . .	X	X	—	X	—	—	—
[49] 8. COUNCIL CONTINUOUSLY STUDY FACULTY DEMAND AND SUPPLY. . . .	—	—	—	—	—	I	—

LEGEND

I Implemented.

P Partially implemented.

X Not implemented. (No entry indicates agency not responsible for implementation)

[] Serial number of recommendation.

Adult Education in California

It is recommended that:

[50] 1. The “Guiding Principles for Adult Education in California's Publicly Supported Institutions” as revised by the State Advisory Committee on Adult Education in February 1958, be continued as the policy framework within which co-ordination is accomplished, such principles to be periodically examined in the light of changing conditions throughout the state.

Comment: *Implemented*

The Council-sponsored State Committee on Continuing Education (successor to the State Advisory Committee on Adult Education) has considered the guidelines for continuing education standards, recommended the formation of regional committees (a number of which have been since established), and has reviewed and aided in the resolution of jurisdictional and function problems among the segments. (CCR-3, 6, 19, 22, 38)

[51] 2. The existing State Advisory Committee on Adult Education be responsible to the co-ordinating agency and continue the responsibilities delegated to it by action of the State Board of Education and The Regents of the University of California in 1953. Furthermore, that the co-ordinating agency, to which the Committee will annually report and to which it will make its recommendations, provide the Committee with necessary staff assistance.

Comment: *Implemented*

The State Advisory Committee on Adult Education was replaced by the State Committee on Continuing Education in 1963. The Council has provided full staff assistance to the committee which reports annually to the Council on matters affecting continuing education throughout the state. (CCR-3, 6, 19, 22, 38)

[52] 3. In order for the State Advisory Committee to be more fully representative of agencies engaged in adult-education, it be enlarged to include the following representatives, these to have the same length of terms as other members of this committee.

- a. A representative of the Agricultural Extension Service of the University of California to be appointed by the President of the University.
- b. A representative of the Independent Colleges and Universities of the state to be appointed by the association of Independent California Colleges and Universities.

Comment: *Implemented*

Representatives called for in the subparagraphs were appointed to the State Advisory Committee. Representatives from both Agricultural Extension and the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities have recently been added to the State Committee on Continuing Education on an ad hoc basis.

[53] 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.

Comment: *Partially Implemented*

At the present time the State Colleges receive no State support for adult education services and the University receives a limited amount. Both the State Committee on Continuing Education and the Coordinating Council recommended that the University be supported to the extent of its 1962-63 budget and that the State Colleges be permitted to retain their surplus extension funds. (CCR-3, 6, 19, 22, 38)

TABLE 5 DEGREE OF IMPLEMENTATION OF MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS RELATING TO ADULT EDUCATION IN CALIFORNIA							
ADULT EDUCATION IN CALIFORNIA (Summarized Recommendations)	University	State Colleges	Junior Colleges	Private Colleges and Universities	State Scholarship Commission	Coordinating Council	State Government
[50] 1. POLICY FRAMEWORK FOR COORDINATION. ...	I	I	I	—	—	I	—
[51] 2. STATE ADVISORY COMMITTEE RESPONSIBLE TO COUNCIL. ...	—	—	—	—	—	I	—
[52] 3. FULLER REPRESENTATION ON STATE COMMITTEE. ...	I	—	—	I	—	I	—

TABLE 5 DEGREE OF IMPLEMENTATION OF MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS RELATING TO ADULT EDUCATION IN CALIFORNIA							
ADULT EDUCATION IN CALIFORNIA (Summarized Recommendations)	University	State Colleges	Junior Colleges	Private Colleges and Universities	State Scholarship Commission	Coordinating Council	State Government
a. Representation of University Agricultural Extension. . . .	I	—	—	—	—	I	—
b. Representation of Private Colleges and Universities. . . .	—	—	—	I	—	I	—
[53] 4. STATE SUPPORT FOR ADULT EDUCATION. . . .	—	—	—	—	—	P	P

LEGEND

I Implemented.

P Partially implemented.

X Not implemented. (No entry indicates agency not responsible for implementation)

[] Serial number of recommendation.

Total Estimated Costs

Junior College Support

It is recommended that:

[54] 1. Procedures be devised to assure that all funds allocated to and for junior colleges for current expense or for capital outlay by the state be expended only for junior college purposes, and further that the law be clarified to require that all funds received from county junior college tuition funds for use of buildings and equipment be expended solely for junior college purposes.

Comment: *Implemented*

This recommendation has been implemented through legislative action and new accounting procedures developed by the Department of Education. (CCR-19, 34, 35, 51)

[55] 2. In view of the added local financial obligations, for both current expenses and capital outlay, which will result from the Master Plan Survey recommendations designed to divert to the Junior colleges some 50,000 lower division students from the 1975 estimates for the state colleges and the University of California, and the attendant savings to the state resulting therefrom, the following actions to be taken:

- a. Procedures and methods be devised and adopted by the Legislature that will increase the proportion of total current support paid to the junior colleges from the State School Fund (augmented for this purpose) from the approximately 30 per cent now in effect to approximately 45 per cent, to be achieved not later than 1975.
- b. A continuing program be devised and adopted by the Legislature that would distribute construction

funds, either through grants or loans or both, for capital outlay purposes annually to junior colleges as determined by growth, this program being for the purpose of assisting junior colleges to meet the facility needs of projected enrollments and of the students to be diverted to the junior colleges.

Comment: *Partially Implemented*

The action called for in subparagraph (a) has not been accomplished. The recommendation called for in subparagraph (b) has been accomplished. (CCR-19, 34, 35, 51)

[56] 3. All the territory of the state not now included within districts operating junior colleges be brought into junior college districts as rapidly as possible, so that all parts of the state can share in the operation, control, and support of junior colleges. Pending the achievement of this

— 22 —

objective, means be devised to require areas that are not a part of a district operating a junior college to contribute to the support of junior college education at a rate or level that is more consistent with the contributions to junior college support presently made by areas included in districts that maintain junior colleges.

Comment: *Partially Implemented*

Approximately 85% of the territory of the state is now included in Junior College districts.

Some discussion has been held concerning plans to require areas outside Junior College districts to contribute to the support of Junior College education at a rate or level more consistent with areas presently included in such districts. No action on such plans has been taken to date. (CCR-19, 34, 35, 51)

Student Fees

For the state colleges and the University of California it is recommended that:

[57] 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.

Comment: *Implemented*

It is assumed that this recommendation was implemented when the Regents and Trustees adopted the Master Plan. Although neither governing board has specifically and formally reaffirmed the tuition-free principle, past and present policies and actions of the two boards indicates an implicit endorsement of the principle.

The Trustees and Regents are currently studying the tuition-free principle and will report their findings to the Coordinating Council in the spring 1966. (CCR-4, 20, 43)

[58] 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.

Comment: *Implemented*

Non-resident students pay tuition sufficient to cover the State's contribution to the average teaching expense per student. In addition to tuition, non-resident students pay the regular material and services fee at the State Colleges and the incidental fee at the University. (CCR-4, 20, 43)

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

Comment: *Implemented*

The State Colleges are currently studying their fee structure for possible modification to accommodate the continued implementation of this recommendation as well as No. 4 ([60]) directly below. (CCR-4, 20, 43)

[60] 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. (CCR-44, 45)

Comment: *Implemented*

[61] 5. Additional provisions be made for student aid and loans, particularly as fees and non-resident tuition increase.

Comment: *Implemented*

Both segments have continuously implemented this recommendation. (CCR-20, 43)

[62] 6. Periodically the governing boards recompute their per-student teaching expense and set non-resident tuition accordingly. Periodically they recompute the cost of operation of services such as feeding, housing, and parking, and set fees for such services accordingly.

Comment: *Implemented*

Non-resident tuition was raised in fall 1965 to \$800 per annum for the University and \$600 per annum for the State Colleges. (CCR-20, 43)

— 23 —

[63] 7. Each institution retain moneys collected from nonresident tuition.

Comment: *Not Determined*

See Section II for a discussion of this recommendation.

[64] 8. All the above policies when approved by the two governing boards be applicable immediately to the state colleges and the University of California, and that they be applied to the junior colleges as a matter of state policy and when applicable.

Comment: *Partially Implemented*

Recommendation 1 ([57]) has been implemented in that the State Board of Education might be considered the governing board for all of the Junior Colleges and adopted the Master Plan over five years ago, thus implicitly

reaffirming the tuition-free principle. Recommendations 2 ([58]), 5 ([61]) and 7 ([63]) have also been implemented. Recommendations 3 ([59]) and 4 ([60]) have not been implemented. However, the Legislature (through HR 621) has requested the Council to “undertake a thorough study of the present fee structure of the Junior College system, including a comparison with the fees of the University and the State Colleges... and include therein its recommendations as to what, if any, changes in the fee structure might be made to best reflect the relationship between the costs of non-educational services and the fees” and to report the results of the study in January, 1967. Recommendation 6 ([62]) has been partially implemented in that per student teaching expense is periodically recomputed. (CCR-19, 34, 35)

TABLE 6 DEGREE OF IMPLEMENTATION OF MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS RELATING TO TOTAL ESTIMATED COSTS							
TOTAL ESTIMATED COSTS (Summarized Recommendations)	University	State Colleges	Junior Colleges	Private Colleges and Universities	State Scholarship Commission	Coordinating Council	State Government
JUNIOR COLLEGE SUPPORT	[54] 1. ALL FUNDS COLLECTED FOR JUNIOR COLLEGES BE USED FOR THAT PURPOSE. ...	—	—	I	—	—	I
	[55] 2. ADDED FINANCIAL BURDEN ON LOCAL DISTRICTS. ...	—	—	—	—	—	P
	a. Increase State Support from 30% to 45%. ...	—	—	—	—	—	X
	b. Increase State Capital Outlay Support. ...	—	—	—	—	—	P
	[56] 3. INCLUSION OF ALL STATE TERRITORY IN JUNIOR COLLEGE DISTRICTS. ...	—	—	P	—	—	P
STUDENT FEES	[57] 1. REAFFIRMATION OF TUITION-FREE PRINCIPLE. ...	I	I	I	—	—	I
	[58] 2. NON-RESIDENTS. ...	I	I	I	—	—	—
	a. Non-residents Pay Tuition Not Less Than Cost of Teaching. ...	I	I	I	—	—	—
	b. Non-residents Pay Other Fees Not Related to Instruction. ...	I	I	I	—	—	—
	[59] 3. EACH SEGMENT COLLECT FEES TO COVER COSTS NOT RELATED TO INSTRUCTION. ...	I	I	X	—	—	—

TABLE 6 DEGREE OF IMPLEMENTATION OF MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS RELATING TO TOTAL ESTIMATED COSTS							
TOTAL ESTIMATED COSTS (Summarized Recommendations)	University	State Colleges	Junior Colleges	Private Colleges and Universities	State Scholarship Commission	Coordinating Council	State Government
[60] 4. ANCILLARY SERVICES BE SELF SUPPORTING. . . .	I	I	X	—	—	—	—
[61] 5. ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS FOR STUDENT AID AND LOANS. . . .	I	I	I	—	I	—	I
[62] 6. RECOMPUTATION OF TEACHING EXPENSE AND ADJUSTMENT OF NON-RESIDENT TUITION. . . .	I	I	I	—	—	—	—
[63] 7. RETENTION OF NON-RESIDENT TUITION BY SEGMENTS. . . .	?	?	I	—	—	—	?
[64] 8. APPROVAL OF ABOVE 7 RECOMMENDATIONS AND APPLICATION TO JUNIOR COLLEGES. . . .	I	I	P	—	—	—	—

LEGEND

I Implemented.

P Partially implemented.

X Not implemented. (No entry indicates agency not responsible for implementation)

[] Serial number of recommendation.

Other Recommendations

It is recommended that:

[65] 1. The foregoing recommendations, in the form approved by the two boards, be transmitted by the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the President of the University to the Governor and to the Legislature through the chairmen of the legislative committees on education.

Comment: *Implemented*

[66] 2. The Superintendent of Public Instruction and the President of the University be requested to call to the attention of the Governor the desirability of including in any call for Special Session of the Legislature in 1960 the consideration of those recommendations which require legislative action.

Comment: *Implemented*

[67] 3. On behalf of the two boards, the Superintendent of Public Instruction and the President of the University express to the Governor and the Legislature appreciation for this opportunity to place before them and the people of California the views of the two governing boards on how best to meet the difficult problems of higher education in the next decade.

Comment: *Implemented*

TABLE 7 DEGREE OF IMPLEMENTATION OF MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS RELATING TO OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS		
OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS (Summarized Recommendations)	University	State Board of Education
[65] 1. TRANSMITTAL OF MASTER PLAN RECOMMENDATIONS.	I	I
[66] 2. SPECIAL SESSION OF LEGISLATURE.	I	I
[67] 3. EXPRESSION OF APPRECIATION.	I	I

LEGEND

I Implemented.

P Partially implemented.

X Not implemented. (No entry indicates agency not responsible for implementation)

[] Serial number of recommendation.

TABLE 8 SUMMARY OF PRECEDING 7 TABLES

See Indicated Table For Details	MAJOR CATEGORIES	Serial Number of Recommendation	University	State Colleges	Junior Colleges	Private Colleges and Universities	State Scholarship Commission	Coordinating Council	State Government	
1	Structure, Function and Coordination	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	P	
		2	—	—	I	—	—	—	I	
		3	—	I	—	—	—	—	I	
		4	I	—	—	—	—	—	I	
		5	—	—	—	—	—	I	I	
2	Selection and Retention of Students	Validity	6	P	P	P	—	—	P	P
		7	X	X	X	—	—	X	X	
		Admissions Policies and Procedures	8	I	I	—	—	—	—	—
		9	I	I	—	—	—	—	—	
		10	I	I	—	—	—	—	—	
		11	—	I	—	—	—	—	—	
		12	I	I	—	—	—	—	—	
		13	I	P	—	—	—	—	—	
		14	P	P	—	—	—	P	—	
		15	—	—	—	—	—	P	—	
		16	—	—	—	?	—	—	—	
		Retention	17	I	I	X	—	—	—	X
		Distribution	18	X	P	—	—	—	—	—
		State Scholarships and Fellowships	19	—	—	—	—	I	—	I
		20	—	—	—	—	I	—	I	
		21	—	—	—	—	I	—	I	
22	—	—	—	—	P	—	P			
23	—	—	—	—	P	—	P			
3	Institutional Capacities and Area Needs	Utilization of Physical Plants	24	P	P	P	—	—	—	P
		25	P	P	P	—	—	—	P	
		26	P	P	P	—	—	—	P	

TABLE 8 SUMMARY OF PRECEDING 7 TABLES

See Indicated Table For Details	MAJOR CATEGORIES		Serial Number of Recommendation	University	State Colleges	Junior Colleges	Private Colleges and Universities	State Scholarship Commission	Coordinating Council	State Government
			27	P	P	P	—	—	—	—
			28	I	I	I	—	—	—	—
			29	—	—	—	—	—	I	—
			30	X	X	X	—	—	—	X
			31	—	—	—	—	—	X	—
			32	P	P	P	P	—	I	P
	Enrollment Limitations and Projected Plant Needs	33	I	I	—	—	—	—	—	—
		34	I	I	I	—	—	—	—	I
		35	—	—	I	—	—	—	—	I
		36	—	I	—	—	—	—	—	I
		37	—	—	—	—	—	—	I	—
		38	I	—	—	—	—	—	—	I
		39	—	—	—	—	—	—	P	—
		40	—	—	—	—	—	—	P	—
41	I	—	—	—	—	—	I	—		
4	Faculty Demand and Supply	42	P	P	P	P	—	—	—	
		43	P	P	—	P	P	—	X	
		44	P	P	P	P	—	P	P	
		45	X	X	—	—	—	—	—	
		46	P	P	P	P	—	—	—	
		47	P	P	—	P	—	—	P	
		48	X	X	—	X	—	—	—	
		49	—	—	—	—	—	—	I	—
5	Adult Education in California	50	I	I	I	—	—	I	—	
		51	—	—	—	—	—	I	—	
		52	I	—	—	I	—	I	—	

TABLE 8 SUMMARY OF PRECEDING 7 TABLES

See Indicated Table For Details	MAJOR CATEGORIES		Serial Number of Recommendation	University	State Colleges	Junior Colleges	Private Colleges and Universities	State Scholarship Commission	Coordinating Council	State Government	
			53	—	—	—	—	—	P	P	
6	Total Estimated Costs	Junior College Support	54	—	—	I	—	—	—	I	
			55	—	—	—	—	—	—	P	
			56	—	—	P	—	—	—	P	
		Student Fees	57	I	I	I	—	—	—	—	I
			58	I	I	I	—	—	—	—	—
			59	I	I	X	—	—	—	—	—
			60	I	I	X	—	—	—	—	—
			61	I	I	I	—	I	—	I	I
			62	I	I	I	—	—	—	—	—
			63	?	?	I	—	—	—	—	?
			64	I	I	P	—	—	—	—	—
7	Other Recommendations		65	I	—	—	—	—	—	I	
			66	I	—	—	—	—	—	I	
			67	I	—	—	—	—	—	I	

LEGEND

I Implemented.

P Partially Implemented.

X Not Implemented. (No entry indicates agency not responsible for implementation)

II. Conclusions and Recommendations

In assessing the degree of implementation of Master Plan recommendations (See Tables 9 and 10) it is necessary to remember that some recommendations require substantive and sweeping changes ([1]) while others are merely procedural ([65]). In addition, some recommendations require considerable research, consultation, and the development of new procedures which affect many groups and individuals outside of higher education ([8]) while others can be implemented easily by administrative directive ([28]).

Some recommendations are more difficult, or take longer, to implement because the action of several groups is necessary for implementation. For example, recommendation ([17]) requires the action of five groups: the University, State Colleges, Junior Colleges, the Council, and the State Board of Education. On the other hand, recommendation ([11]) required action by only one group: the State Colleges.

In addition to the above, consideration of the degree of implementation should include a realization that there are too many unmeasurable variables involved to produce an objective index of what percentage of implementation would constitute success or failure. A careful reading of the letters in Appendix I will indicate some of the difficulties and complexities involved in implementation of certain recommendations.

In view of these complexities, some subjective judgment is necessary in arriving at conclusions and recommendations.

Clarification of Meaning

Master Plan recommendations [8] [18], and [63] present some difficulty in implementation because of lack of agreement as to their meaning. Comments following each recommendation either attempt to explain the points of disagreement and/or suggest an interpretation of the recommendation.

[8] 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 ⅓ per cent) and the University from the top one-eighth (12 ½ per cent) of all graduates of California public high schools with:

- a. Continuation of existing special programs and curricula involving exceptions to this rule subject to approval by the respective boards, and these to be kept to a minimum, and those that are continued to be reported annually to the co-ordinating agency. Any new special programs and curricula involving such exceptions to be approved by the co-ordinating agency.
- b. Graduates of private and out-of-state secondary schools to be held to equivalent levels.

Comment:

*Subparagraph (b) should be clarified to indicate that the reference is to residents who graduated from private and out-of-state secondary schools.*⁴

[18] 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

4. A recent Council report on the flow of students comments on this and related recommendations.

(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.

3 A recent Council report on the flow of students comments on this and related recommendations.

TABLE 9 DEGREE OF IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATION BY STATUS		
STATUS OF RECOMMENDATION	RECOMMENDATIONS	
	Number	Percent ⁵
IMPLEMENTED. . . .	33	49
PARTIALLY IMPLEMENTED. . . .	27	40
NOT IMPLEMENTED. . . .	5	7
NOT DETERMINED. . . .	2	3
	_____	_____
TOTAL. . . .	67	100

* Rounded to nearest whole number.

Table 9 indicates that 33 (49%) of the Master Plan recommendations have been implemented and 27 (40%) partially implemented. Five (7%) of the recommendations have not been implemented. (One of

— 26 —

these, [7], was not implemented by agreement of all responsible groups.) It is not possible at this time to determine the status of two (3%) of the recommendations. Thus, either full or partial implementation has been accomplished on 60 and possibly 62 of the 67 recommendations.

Some partially implemented recommendations are close to full implementation while others are in early stages of fulfillment. If an assumption is made that partial implementation averages out to “half accomplished”, it can be generally stated that the Master Plan has been approximately 70% implemented to date.

TABLE 10 DEGREE OF IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS BY RESPONSIBLE ORGANIZATION			
RESPONSIBLE ORGANIZATIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS		
	NUMBER RESPONSIBLE	NUMBER IMPLEMENTED⁶	PERCENT IMPLEMENTED⁷
UNIVERSITY. . . .	42	37	88
STATE COLLEGES. . . .	38	34	89
JUNIOR COLLEGES. . . .	27	22	81
PRIVATE COLL. & UNIV. . . .	9	8	89
SCHOLARSHIP COMMISSION	7	7	100
COORDINATING COUNCIL. . . .	18	16	89

5. Rounded to nearest whole number.

6. Categories of implemented, partially implemented and not determined have been combined.

7. Rounded to nearest whole number.

TABLE 10 DEGREE OF IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS BY RESPONSIBLE ORGANIZATION			
RESPONSIBLE ORGANIZATIONS	RECOMMENDATIONS		
	NUMBER RESPONSIBLE	NUMBER IMPLEMENTED	PERCENT IMPLEMENTED
STATE GOVERNMENT. . . .	34	31	91
	_____	_____	_____
TOTAL ⁸	175	155	86

* Categories of implemented, partially implemented and not determined have been combined.

+ Rounded to nearest whole number.

++ Total exceeds number of recommendations because more than one organization is required to implement some recommendations.

One possible interpretation of the data in Table 10 is that full implementation of all 67 Master Plan recommendations requires 175 “actions” by the seven groups. If the implemented, partially implemented, and not determined categories are combined, then 155 (86%) of these “actions” have been taken to date.

It is recognized that the following comments focus attention on a relatively few recommendations and thus may imply that all recommendations which have been implemented have been beneficial and that most of the partly implemented recommendations will become fully implemented in time. The purpose of this report is to assess the degree of implementation of Master Plan recommendations without commenting to any significant degree as to the merit of the recommendations. A notable exception is the comment on recommendation [7].

Comment:

Page 60, paragraph 3 and page 62, Table 8 of the Master Plan, make it clear that the ratio referred to in this recommendation is between the lower and upper divisions. Thus, it should be clarified that the “40/60” ratio means that the undergraduate divisions should be in the ratio of 40% lower division to 60% upper division.

[63] Each institution retain moneys collected from nonresident tuition.

Comment:

The intent of this Master Plan recommendation can only be surmised. The object of a nonresident tuition fee is to charge out-of-state students for part of the cost of their instruction, a cost which is largely State-financed. Thus the revenue from a nonresident fee constitutes a reimbursement to the State for the State's investment in the education of out-of-state students. On this basis, all nonresident tuition revenue should be used to reimburse the State. Thus, the intent of the Master Plan recommendation can be surmised, at the minimum, as a desire to ensure that nonresident tuition fees are paid to the institution of higher education rather than to the State Treasurer so that the revenue is used to assist in financing the collegiate instructional program rather than the other governmental programs of the state. From this standpoint, the recommendation has long been implemented since such fees are paid to the institution and the revenue is used to supplement the State's appropriation in financing the support costs of the institution.

At the other extreme, the intent of the Master Plan recommendation could be surmised to mean that the total institutional cost of instruction should be financed by the State and that nonresident tuition revenue should be considered as surplus income subject to the discretion of the governing board as to its disposition or retention.

8. ++ Total exceeds number of recommendations because more than one organization is required to implement some recommendations.

Between these two extremes, the intent of the recommendation might be construed to mean that at the time nonresident tuition revenue is increased either by an unanticipated increase in out-of-state enrollment or by an increase in tuition fee rates, the governing board shall have the prerogative as to the disposition or retention of such surplus income. In essence, this third alternative intent underlay the Council resolution on March 30, 1965, relating to a recommended increase in tuition rates. The pertinent "Resolved" clause read as follows:

RESOLVED, That the Governor be advised that additional revenue derived from non-resident tuition be allocated to the urgent need for faculty salaries and libraries beyond sums now in the Governor's Budget,...

In effect this council recommendation was implemented in that additional funds were appropriated by the Legislature for faculty salaries and libraries, but in much greater amounts than the estimated additional receipts from the increase in non-resident tuition fees. To clarify the intent for the future, it is recommended that the Master Plan recommendation be augmented by the words "and all such

— 27 —

moneys be used to reduce the State's contribution to the operating cost of the institution."

Further Study Needed

Master Plan recommendations [9] [10] [12] [18], and [39] present problems which indicate the need for additional study concerning their implementation. The problems are discussed in the comments following each recommendation.

[9] Implementation of Recommendation Number 1 to be left to the two systems with the following provisions:

- a. Each to have the new requirements in force for students admitted for Fall, 1962.
- b. Inasmuch as the Survey Team favors acceptance in both systems of a requirement that all, or almost all, of the recommending units for admission shall be in college preparatory courses, that the application of such a requirement be carefully studied during 1960, and this principle be applied as fully as possible throughout both systems.

Comment:

The State College Freshman Admission Study indicated that recommending units and college preparatory courses were not the best predictors of success in the California State Colleges. One issue, on which the staff has no recommendation at this time, is leaving the implementation of the top one-third and top one-eighth to the two systems. A problem resulting from the use of different criteria is the lack of support for the implication that the one-eighth is part of the one-third. Theoretically, a student could be eligible to enter the University (and thus be part of the top one-eighth by definition) and be ineligible to enter the State Colleges (and thus not be part of the top one-third by definition).⁹

[10] For both the state colleges and the University, freshman admissions through special procedures outside the basic requirements of recommending units of high school work and/or aptitude tests (such as specials and exceptions to the rules) be limited to 2 per cent of all freshman admissions in each system for a given year. Furthermore that all "limited" students be required to meet regular admission standards.

[12] The state colleges and the University require a minimum of at least 56 units of acceptable advanced standing credit before considering the admission of applicants ineligible to admission as freshmen because of inadequate grades in high school, except also that each state college and campus of the University, through special procedures developed by each, be permitted to accept for earlier transfer not more than 2 per cent of all students who make application for advanced standing in any year.

9. A recent Council report on flow of students comments on this and related recommendations.

Comment:

[18] *The limit of two percent for admission by special procedures may be too small or too large to accommodate the differences between segments and between campuses within each segment. Campuses within a segment serve different functions. In addition, it may be desirable to experiment from time to time with differential admission standards. Finally, some follow-up may be desirable as to the scholastic success of those admitted by special procedures.*¹⁰

[18] 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 emphasizes 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.

Comment:

The present trend of enrollments at the University indicates that achievement of the “40-60” ratio may not be realized. The University is experiencing some difficulty in offsetting its freshmen enrollments with upper division transfers. This effect combined with lower division transfers interferes with progress toward the “40-60” goal.

In addition, both the University and State Colleges believe that it was not the intent of the recommendation to eliminate the lower division on any of their respective campuses. On the other hand, many Junior College officials believe the intent was to establish a systemwide ratio and that circumstances might well dictate (i.e. crowded urban campuses) the elimination of the lower division at particular campuses. The concern of the Junior Colleges is that campuses which have “topped out” cannot guarantee admission to all qualified Junior College transfers and that this is contrary to California educational policy. The Junior Colleges argue that qualified Junior College transfers should have preference over first-time freshmen who have other resources available such as Junior

— 28 —

Colleges and less crowded State Colleges and University campuses.

The University and State Colleges recognize the problem but believe a lower division program at each campus is essential and desirable. (See letters in Appendix I for discussions concerning this problem.)

[39] Inasmuch as the estimated enrollment potential of the Berkeley campus of the University is 43,950 for 1975 (as compared with a maximum enrollment of 27,500) as recommended in 2 above for a University campus, the co-ordinating agency undertake appropriate studies of how best to accommodate the differences between these figures (approximately 16,000), such steps to include careful study of these possibilities:

- a. Diversion of some of these potential students particularly to Davis campus and the new South Central Coast campus.
- b. The accommodation of the remaining part of the difference (i.e., 16,000 less the impact of (a) above) through the establishment of branch installations from existing campuses in specialized fields of study such as instruction in science at Livermore. (These would be similar to the off-campus centers for teacher education now operated by certain of the state colleges).

Comment:

10. A recent Council report on flow of students comments on this and related recommendations.

The use of branch installations requires continual study by the segments and the Council as such installations affect higher education in the state as a whole.

* A recent Council report on flow of students comments on this and related recommendations.

Recommendation of Doubtful Value

The following Master Plan recommendation is of doubtful value as indicated in the comment following the recommendation.

[7] Each public segment report annually to the coordinating agency on its grading standards, providing data on such matters as the following:

- a. Distribution of undergraduate grades awarded (proportion of each grade given for each institution, department, and by lower and upper division).
- b. Its grading differential with other institutions or segments as computed from the records made by transfers.

Comment:

This recommendation does not contribute any knowledge of use to higher education because of differentiation of function and differing composition of the student bodies. Also, the grading differential, while of some use to each campus unit within each segment is of no known use to the Coordinating Council for Higher Education. The Council staff believes that data of doubtful value should not be collected from the segments.

— 29 —

Appendices

— 31 —

[Appendix IA: Response of Henry T. Tyler (Junior Colleges)] California Junior College Association

Modesto Junior College
Modesto, California 95350
Telephone: 524-1451, Ext. 214

August 16, 1965

Dr. Willard B. Spalding, Director
Coordinating Council for Higher Education
785 Market Street, Room 1200
San Francisco, California 94103

Dear Willard:

I am replying at once to a carbon of the letter to Dr. Edward Simonsen dated August 9, and sent over the signature of Stuart M. White, since I know that Dr. Simonsen is on vacation this week and a reply is desired by August 15. This will be a few days late, but I trust it may still be of some use to you.

Summary of Actions Taken by CJCA with Respect to Master Plan Recommendations

1. Proposed Constitution Amendment.

CJCA supported. (However, the Donahoe Act was substituted. CJCA supported it.)

2. Validity of Entrance Requirements

Studies have been made by a number of the junior colleges and by the State Department of Education.

Junior colleges will participate in CCHE studies when requested.

3. Admissions Policies and Procedures

Junior colleges (and CJCA) have urged UC and California State Colleges to implement the recommendations raising admission standards for UC and California State Colleges, and have prepared to accept larger numbers of students in consequence.

CJCA has urged that both California State Colleges and UC reduce lower division percentages of undergraduates, and eliminate junior college functions from their programs.

CJCA has representation on the continuing CCHE Committee on Selection and Retention. Junior colleges, with CJCA support, have raised retention standards, and have achieved increased similarity in probation and dismissal standards.

4. State Scholarships and Fellowships

CJCA has cooperated with the State Scholarship Commission in seeking expansion of the first and establishment of the second.

5. Utilization and Costs

Junior colleges have participated in CCHE's utilization and cost studies, and CJCA has had representatives on the technical committees for these studies.

As regards year-round operation, JCs are lengthening summer sessions, and studies have been made, especially by Los Angeles, regarding pros and cons of various calendars. Enabling legislation to move to quarterly calendars has been adopted by the Legislature on the initiative of the South County Junior College District.

6. New Junior Colleges

Since publication of the list showing areas of the State needing junior college service virtually all of the heavily populated area of the State has become part of new or expanded districts having junior colleges. Over 90 per cent of high school graduates now reside within a junior college district. Further expansion is rapidly taking place. CJCA has supported efforts to achieve the Legislature's intent that all high school districts become part of districts maintaining junior colleges.

7. Faculty Demand and Supply

Efforts by junior colleges to interest increasing proportions of students in teaching have been hampered by two events since adoption of the Master Plan. The first of these is the Fisher Act revising credentials which, by its undue emphasis upon "academic" courses and majors seems to make second-class citizens of those preparing to teach in any but the academic portions of the comprehensive junior college curriculum. The second has

been recent action by the State Board of Education requiring that the Introduction to Education course, which junior colleges had used widely as a means of acquainting students with career opportunities in teaching, be offered—if at all—as an elective only.

On the positive side, increases in salaries offered by junior colleges have reasonably well maintained the inflow of instructors to junior colleges, except for a few shortage fields. It is believed, however, that unless the State Board of Education and the Legislature take steps to remedy the weaknesses of the present credential

— 32 —

laws, or to remove the requirement that junior college instructors be credentialed, the supply will soon be found woefully inadequate to meet the increased demand.

Junior colleges annually submit data—now to the State Department of Education—concerning sources of new instructors, degrees held, etc., as recommended by the Master Plan.

8. *Adult Education*

Junior colleges are represented on CCHE's State Committee on Continuing Education. CJCA has constantly urged legislation that would place on an equal footing with that for younger students the financial support for the education of adults who are pursuing, on a part-time basis, a planned program. Thus far the effort has been unsuccessful, though backed also by CCHE, the State Board of Education, CTA, and CSBA.

9. *Junior College Support*

With CJCA backing, laws have been passed requiring “that all funds allocated to and for junior colleges for current expense or for capital outlay” be expended solely for junior college purposes. The rapid decrease in the number of junior colleges operated by high school or unified districts has made this recommendation easier of achievement.

CJCA, with broad support by other educational organizations, has constantly sought legislation that would increase the percentage of State support for operating costs. Despite clear evidence from cost studies that junior college per student costs are lower than are the lower division per student costs in either UC or California State Colleges, the Legislature has not seen fit to adopt the legislation sought. As a result the State's contribution to junior college operational costs is still no larger a percentage than it was in 1960, and, indeed is perhaps somewhat less. Meanwhile, junior college average operating costs, *per ADA*, have been rising very slowly. Reasons for this are (1) the fiscal responsibility shown by local governing boards and administrations, and (2) the growth of the colleges, particularly the smaller ones which inevitably incur greater per ADA costs than those of the large institutions. CJCA has also constantly urged adoption of a continuing program of State sharing in the cost of junior college facilities. It worked diligently for the passage of the several recent State bond issues. It was actively represented on the Committee which devised the procedures for distribution of the State moneys derived from those issues. Passage of SB 318 by the 1965 Legislature now establishes a continuing program of construction aid.

CJCA has also supported legislation designed to bring all areas of the State into districts maintaining junior colleges. As noted above (No. 6) this effort is proving rather successful. New, 1965, Legislation (SB 712) puts still further pressure on such areas as are not already within districts maintaining junior colleges to take early steps toward this end.

10. *Student Fees*

Master Plan recommendations on this subject were limited to UC and California State Colleges except for the final clause (No. 8, page 15) “... that they be applied to the junior colleges as a matter of State policy and when applicable.” CJCA has maintained that junior colleges, as part of the State's system of free, public education, should continue to be free from fees. However, the Legislature has now made permissive parking and health service fees of a minimal nature, and sizeable tuition fees for out-of-state students have been made mandatory.

CJCA in 1965, sought legislation that would authorize local governing boards to assess mandatory student body fees, but the bill failed of passage.

It is hoped that the foregoing summary of CJCA activities, and those of the junior colleges as individual institutions, relative to recommendations of the Master Plan, will prove appropriate in reply to the A portion of your August 9 inquiry, at the top of page 2.

With respect to the B portion of your request, it is scarcely proper for me to frame a definitive reply, since I was a member of the Master Plan team. It can be said, however, that throughout the study, and since, many junior college people have certain reservations about its recommendations. Prominent, I believe are these:

1. Convincing evidence has not been produced to show why at least some new California State Colleges might not appropriately be upper division and graduate institutions only, especially when they are established in areas already well supplied with junior colleges. It is strongly believed that large savings to the State and its taxpayers, with no reduction in the quality of higher education, could result were such a policy adopted. It appears timely to point out that each of the four new State Colleges established by the 1965 Legislature could very well be made upper division and graduate only, and it is strongly hoped that this possibility will be seriously examined.
2. Earlier mention has been made (No. 7, above) of difficulties created for junior college staffing by actions taken since the Master Plan. Although

— 33 —

they did not follow from any specific Master Plan recommendation, I believe many persons attribute them to Master Plan influence.

3. Pressures to have students and/or their parents assume a larger share of the costs of their post high school education are opposed, at least for junior colleges, by an overwhelming majority of junior college officials, I believe. This, too, has been mentioned above (No. 10).

Concerning the C part of your inquiry, this might well be examined by obtaining the views of junior college people over the State. One which would certainly emerge is the issue of “Who speaks for the junior college?” This relates both to the possibility of a separate State Board for Junior Colleges and to the possibility of a stronger and more unified staff for junior college services within the State Department of Education. Clearly these are the study contracted for by CCHE with the UC Berkeley Center for the Study of Higher Education.

Actually, the Master Plan did give some recognition to junior college needs for strengthening State-level services. It should be noted that “no real reduction in local autonomy is proposed by the survey team” and that “the junior colleges have been, and ought to be, community based and locally controlled.” (Quotations are from page 29) Earlier, in 1965, the *Restudy* had recognized junior college needs for strengthened State-level services, and CJCA has striven since 1956, at least, for creation of a Division of Junior College Education, headed by an Associate Superintendent of Public Instruction. It seems probable that had this objective achieved several years ago, the present clamor for a separate State Board might not have arisen.

A second area in which the Master Plan may not fully have anticipated junior college needs is that of growth. Here a judgment as of this date seems premature. It appears that the proportion of high school graduates seeking higher education, augmented by the many older persons seeking further education and/or retraining, may be rendering growth projections of the Master Plan overconservative. Fall, 1965, enrollments in the three public segments will probably clarify this situation somewhat.

This reply is already overly long. I shall therefore at this time make no comment upon the three possible questions indicated in the next-to-last paragraph of your August 9 letter. I appreciate your having called these to our attention, and you may be sure that they are receiving study.

CJCA will extend full cooperation, to the limit of its staff resources, to the work of this new study of California Higher Education as it may relate to the junior colleges.

Yours very sincerely

/s/ Henry T. Tyler
Executive Secretary

cc: Edward Simonsen
Julio L. Bortolazzo
Robert E. Swenson
Stuart M. White
John N. Given
Thomas B. Merson

— 34 —

[Appendix IB: Response of Glenn S. Dumke (State Colleges)] The California State Colleges

August 20, 1965

Dr. Willard B. Spalding, Director
Coordinating Council for Higher Education
Room 1200
785 Market Street
San Francisco, California 94103

Dear Willard:

It was an instructive experience to assess our progress in achieving the Master Plan recommendations. To my recollection this is the first time since the publication of the Master Plan that a progress report on all the recommendations has been made. In the attached document you will find comments on each of the Master Plan recommendations pertaining to the State Colleges. In reviewing these comments I feel that a great deal has been accomplished in implementing the Master Plan recommendations.

There are 49 recommendations (major and minor) directly related to the State Colleges. Of these, 34 have been or are nearly fully implemented, eight are under study, and only seven have not been implemented. Of these seven recommendations not implemented, it is interesting to note that almost all are not within the power of the State Colleges to approve. The constitutional amendment and retention of funds realized from nonresident tuition are two examples which illustrate this point. In my opinion, the implementation of so many of the Master Plan recommendations during the complex and formative years of the Coordinating Council and the State College System is a noteworthy achievement.

If you desire any clarification or more detail on any of these comments, please do not hesitate to contact me.

My comments on the doubts or reservations on Master Plan recommendations and on needs which have been developed since 1960 not fully anticipated in the Master Plan are brief. I have no serious doubts or reservations with respect to any of the major recommendations in the Master Plan. The only unanticipated development, and I feel a most serious one, is the rapid increase in the pressure on the tax dollars for the support of public higher education. Improvement is badly needed in finding ways and means of relieving this pressure, and at the same time find the necessary revenue to maintain the quality and meet the rising costs of higher education.

It is my hope that the Coordinating Council will assume a stronger role in helping all segments of public higher education achieve these objectives.

Sincerely

/s/ Glenn S. Dumke
Chancellor

Structure, Function, and Co-Ordination

1. *Constitutional Amendment* (not implemented)

Efforts have been made and plans are being developed to implement the *spirit* of this recommendation. These plans include planning, study, and negotiation between the state colleges and other State agencies (principally the Department of Finance). It should be recognized that implementation in this manner is not as desirable as implementing the *letter* of the recommendation, e.g., a constitutional amendment.

3. The State College System (a partly implemented; b and c implemented)

- a. The Legislature in passing the Donahoe Act established the Trustees of the State Colleges and in effect gave to the Trustees responsibilities closely paralleling those of the Regents but not the powers as recommended. The Board of Trustees has worked most effectively in administering the state colleges. With increased fiscal flexibility that we hope will be forthcoming through studies and negotiations now underway, the Board of Trustees will become even more effective in striving for the excellence in their sphere as assigned in the Donahoe Act.
- b. The Board of Trustees was established with minor differences according to this recommendation. There is no doubt that the specifications set forth in this recommendation were selected wisely.
- c. The primary function assigned to the state colleges in this section in the liberal arts and sciences and in professions in applied fields, both at the undergraduate and graduate levels, has been pursued vigorously by the Board of Trustees, Chancellor's Office, and the individual campuses. Great strides have been made in developing a state college wide total program

— 35 —

to meet the needs of the State as well as facilitating well deserved diversity in programs among the individual campuses. The first joint doctoral degree to be conferred by the University of California and the San Diego State College in Chemistry has been approved by the Board of Trustees on July 29, 1965. The negotiations with the University of California on the awarding of joint doctoral degrees, although at times slow, were carried out by both institutions with a spirit of cooperation and understanding. It is anticipated that even greater strides will be made on other joint doctoral programs in the next few years.

4. *University Programs and Use of University Facilities by Other Segments* (Implemented)

Only the latter part of this recommendation applies directly to the state colleges. The Regents have made provisions for the use of library and research facilities by qualified state college faculty members. This has, to our knowledge, worked very effectively.

Selection and Retention of Students

Validity of Entrance Requirements

1. *Statistical Studies of Entrance Requirements* (Implemented)

Phase I of the California State Colleges 1963 Admissions Study (reported in November, 1964), presented a statistical study of the validity of freshman standards as judged by scholastic success. Additional validity studies are in progress or are being considered. Additional reports on the 1963 freshman will be prepared periodically. It is doubted that validity studies are reportable in a standard form. While studies of persistence, rate of dismissal, and scores on standard tests would be worthwhile, their usefulness in establishing the validity of entrance requirements is open to question.

2. *Report on Grading Standards* (not implemented by agreement)

It is our understanding that distribution of undergraduate grades for each institution, department, and level is not of great interest or value to the Coordinating Council, however, as soon as the colleges can be properly equipped and staffed, it is our intention to encourage this kind of reporting to the Chancellor's Office. Though distribution of grades awarded and grading differentials may not establish validity of standards, the information would be extremely useful were funds available to obtain it. Some state colleges are now reporting to high schools and college of transfer on the scholastic achievement of their students. Lack of E.D.P. equipment and personnel seriously handicaps systematic and comprehensive reporting.

Admissions Policies and Procedures

1. *Selection from the Upper Third of High School Graduates* (Implemented)

October, 1961: Board of Trustees review of 1960 Admissions Study and recommended that a new, comprehensive study be undertaken.

March, 1962: Interim change in freshman admissions standards effective Fall, 1963, reducing eligibility to an estimated 40% were approved by the Board of Trustees.

January, 1963: Special admissions standards for Orange State College (now Cal-State at Fullerton), effective Fall, 1963, were approved by the Board of Trustees.

December, 1964: The Board of Trustees adopted the new freshman admissions standards effective Fall, 1965, that conform fully with the Master Plan.

2. *Implementation of Recommendation No. 1* (Implemented but not on schedule)

- a. Meeting the Fall, 1962, effective date was technically impossible. Standards would have had to be changed within four months after the Board of Trustees first assumed its duties.
- b. The use of college preparatory recommending units was studied extensively as part of the 1963 Admissions Study. Since about 80% of the high school courses taken by the 1963 freshmen were college preparatory, no requirement of college preparatory was included in the new standards. The per cent of college preparatory courses in the total high school program of freshmen admitted to state colleges will be checked periodically.

3. *Special Procedures* (Implemented)

Has been implemented for some time, with 1965 Administrative Code changes improving the wording. There is doubt, however, that inter-collegiate heterogeneity can be secured or maintained without an increase in the number of permissible exceptions. The Master Plan is vague as to which groups of students should be included within the 2% rule. The state college systemwide average was 2.1% in 1963 and 1.9% in 1964 not including adult specials.

4. *Junior College Functions* (Implemented)

No action was necessary to charge out-of-district tuition since all junior college functions in state colleges other than terminal agriculture programs, were terminated by Fall, 1963.

5. *Transfer of Students Ineligible as Freshmen* (Implemented)

Since 1960, a minimum of 60 semester units of acceptable advanced standing credit has been required for such students. The Board of Trustees on March 7, 1963, deleted the provision for earlier transfer based on 24 units of B average work. The 2% limitation has been included in the Administrative Code. For the past three years the state college systemwide average has been within .1% of this limitation. A transfer student admission study is in progress. Findings from this study should be available in Fall, 1966.

6. *Applicants Legally Resident in Other States* (Implementation nearly completed)

- a. Higher entrance requirements for out-of-state applicants are effective Fall, 1965. These standards were developed as part of the 1963 Admissions Study.
- b. The State Colleges and the University have worked quite closely in the development of a common definition of legal residence. Most of the problems have been resolved.

7. *Study of Transfer Procedures* (Implementation nearly completed)

This study is in progress with the staff of the Coordinating Council. Several study groups of state college personnel are at work on this project including articulation of junior college and state college curricula.

8. The state colleges are participating in the Coordinating Council continuing committee on selection, admission, and retention. A study of differing standards of admission for the varying programs has been implemented.

Retention (Implemented)

1. The Chancellor's Executive Order No. 3, effective September 1, 1965, established more uniform standards for probation and disqualification complying with that portion of the Master Plan.

Distribution of Lower Division Students (Implementation on Schedule)

Implementation of this recommendation is in progress. Lower division as a per cent of total undergraduate enrollment has been reduced from 53.6% in 1961 to 48.4% in 1964. Full compliance is expected by the target date of 1975. In 1963 the Board of Trustees established enrollment quotas at San Francisco and San Jose State College since those colleges are approaching their instructional plant capacities. It is anticipated that the new admission standards effective Fall 1965 will further reduce this percentage. When the Fall, 1965 enrollment by class level is known, further consideration will be given, if necessary, to policies that will insure achieving the 40% lower division by 1975.

Institutional Capacities and Area Needs

Utilization of Physical Plants

1. *Utilization of Lecture Rooms* (Not implemented)

The State Colleges continue to use for lecture rooms 30 schedule hours per week with class enrollments at the

census date averaging 75% of room capacity rather than the recommended 60% of room capacity. The State Colleges have never used the lower figure in any of their utilization studies. The 60% figure is not acceptable to the Department of Finance. The Department of Finance has indicated that the 75% average class room size established some years prior to the Master Plan must continue to be used.

2. *Utilization of Laboratories* (Not implemented)

The Master Plan recommendation for laboratories of 20 scheduled hours per week with class enrollments averaging 80% of room capacity is also a lower standard than used by state colleges. The older standard of 20 schedule hours per week and classes averaging 85% of room capacity is still being used for the same reasons.

3. *Utilization Standards* (a—not implemented; b—in progress, and c—implemented)

- a. The standards used for utilization studies in the state colleges are those expressed in 1 and 2 above. State Colleges also use a third standard for activity rooms. This standard is 25 hours per week and average classes at the census date of 85% of room capacity.
- b. The Chancellor's staff is now working with the Coordinating Council staff on modifications on the *Restudy* space standards.
- c. Commencing in January 1963 the state colleges have used the FTE 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. as a basis for projecting building needs.

4. *Increased Use of Evening Hours for Instruction* (Implemented)

State College campuses in metropolitan areas are continuing to show increasing use of class room

— 37 —

facilities and library in the late afternoon and evening hours.

5. *Centralized Class Scheduling* (Implemented)

The scheduling of instructional facilities are centrally controlled generally in the office of the Academic Vice President (or Dean of Instruction) on all campuses. This has proven to be a very effective mechanism for achieving greater utilization.

6. *Utilization Study* (Implemented)

- a. A complete study of utilization in the state colleges Fall 1963 was conducted by the state colleges under the guidance of the Coordinating Council. All data requested by the Coordinating Council has been forwarded.
- b. The advantages of an articulated calendar for all segments of public higher education in California is in the process of study by the segments of public higher education under the guidance of the Coordinating Council. The state colleges will affect a systemwide articulated calendar by 1975 when all campuses will be on the quarter system.

7. *Health Services* (Implemented)

By action of the Board of Trustees, at their June 2-3, 1965 meeting, the Chancellor was empowered to authorize State College presidents to require students living in college-supervised housing to carry supplemental health and accident insurance on either an individual or group basis. Such insurance must include hospital, surgical and medical benefits. It is felt that this action meets the essential spirit and intent of the Master Plan recommendations.

8. This recommendation is, in effect, a duplication of 3b.

9. *Calendar Arrangements* (a and c implemented, b not implemented)

- a. The state colleges have continued to strengthen the academic offerings in the summer months. Most of the larger campuses have for a number of years provided 10 semester units or 2/3 of a semester course work in the summer months. This is simply close to 3/4 semester course work mentioned in this recommendation.
- b. No State funds have been requested to provide for full summer period academic programs as indicated in 9a above. It is still Department of Finance policy that *summer sessions* be fully self-supporting.
- c. In 1962 the staff of the Chancellor's Office studied the relative merits of the three semester and four quarter plans for year-round use of physical plants under the guidance of the Coordinating Council staff. These discussions and studies were very profitable. As a result, the Board of Trustees on January 24, 1964, passed a resolution that in effect mandated a systemwide adoption of the four quarter academic year by 1975. In the summer of 1965 an experimental fourth quarter was conducted at Cal-State Hayward. Results of this experiment will be available shortly. In the summer of 1966 it is anticipated that funds will be requested for continuing the program at Hayward and also for full summer quarters at both campuses of Cal Poly.

Enrollment Limitations and Projected Plant Needs

1. *Commencement of Lower Division Programs* (Implemented)

The Board of Trustees upon the beginning of their responsibilities in July 1961, adopted the policy concerning the beginning of lower division instruction at new state college campuses until there was adequate junior college coverage. The Board of Trustees requested and the Coordinating Council granted the approval for commencement of lower division instruction at Sonoma, Hayward, Fullerton and Stanislaus. In each case the request was made following several years of operating upper division programs only on these campuses.

2. *Enrollment Ranges* (Implemented)

At the request of the segments of public higher education the Coordinating Council appointed an ad hoc technical committee to study the enrollment ranges to be observed for existing institutions and those authorized but not established. The committee report simplified the table contained in this recommendation. The Board of Trustees has adopted the new table approved by the Coordinating Council on July 29, 1964.

3. *New Junior Colleges* (Implemented)

Although this recommendation makes specific recommendations about making junior college facilities available for school districts not adequately served and hence is not directly applicable to the state colleges. It has been the policy of the Board of Trustees and the Chancellor's Office to encourage a full statewide coverage of junior college districts. The Board of Trustees feel that full coverage of the State by junior college districts and junior college campuses is in the best interests of the state colleges and the State of California.

— 38 —

4. *San Bernardino and South Bay State Colleges* (Partly implemented)

The Board of Trustees will open the San Bernardino campus in 1965 as recommended. However, at this time there is some doubt that the other campus (South Bay) will be able to open this fall. At this time the recommended restriction of enrollments of 10,000 full time students at South Bay and 8,000 at San Bernardino in 1975 is realistic.

5. *New State College Campuses (Implemented)*

In May 1963 the Board of Trustees passed a resolution that expressed a concern over the growing need for state colleges in the 5 areas listed in this recommendation. The Coordinating Council studied the resolution of the Board of Trustees and recommended that further study be made in 1965 on the need for additional centers of higher education. In November 1964 the Coordinating Council recommended a State College in Kern County and advanced land acquisition in Contra Costa, San Mateo-Santa Clara and Ventura Counties, with the stipulation that one of these three campuses could commence construction before 1969. In July 1965 the Board of Trustees approved a study on the Selection of Sites in these four areas based upon all related Coordinating Council policy.

Faculty Demand and Supply

1. *Diversion of Graduate Students into Teaching (In progress)*

The Board of Trustees adopted a resolution at the June 3, 1965 meeting calling for adequate staffing and fiscal support of counseling, as well as other student personnel services. Since these services are supported from student fees, they are intimately related to the current study of student fees mentioned elsewhere in this report. The number of master's degrees granted has increased markedly in the State Colleges in recent years. For example, in 1963 the University of California granted 2,407 master's degrees and the California State Colleges granted 2,747 master's degrees.

The establishment of the Statewide Academic Senate has been a major instrument to provide both a means of insuring faculty participation in the evolution of systemwide academic policies and a means of impressing potential faculty with the importance of the faculty in the development of policy.

2. *Graduate Student Financial Assistance (Not fully implemented)*

The California State Colleges supported successful legislation this past year which authorizes a minimal program of graduate fellowship awards administered by the State Scholarship Commission. Efforts in this direction are being continued.

To help provide financial support for graduate students as well as give graduate students useful experience and a means of increasing their interest in college teaching, the Board of Trustees established the position of graduate assistant. The graduate assistants are to provide general assistance to faculty in all duties other than teaching. So far we have been unable to secure any funding for these positions.

We have also discussed with Finance and the Legislative Analyst the establishment and use of positions for graduate teaching fellows. It has not been our intention to use these individuals in lieu of regular faculty but rather to assist faculty by serving as section leaders, occasional lecturers, etc. However, apparently because of the fear that this might lead to the "over-use" of these positions in a manner similar to what has happened elsewhere, we have been unable to get any encouragement and use of these positions. Actually, if properly used, these positions would provide an excellent means of increasing the skills and interests of potential faculty members as well as easing the burdens of the regular faculty.

3. *Increased Salaries and Expanded Fringe Benefits (Partly implemented)*

The Board of Trustees has consistently pushed for greatly increased salaries. For example, three years ago they urged an increase of 12 ½% of Professors and 7 ½% for the other ranks. Funds for an increase averaging 5% were provided with a six months delay in the effective date. The Board pressed for an increase the following year, no pay increase was granted. At the last legislative session the Board requested 15.8% and funds for a 10% increase for faculty and 5% for administrators were granted. For at least two years the Board has requested funds to revise the academic and academic-administrative salary structure. These have not received

the approval of Finance.

The Board has consistently requested increased funding of sabbatical leaves and funds for professional travel. There has been a gradual improvement in the funding in each of these areas although the Board for the past two years has been unable to obtain permission to use sabbatical leave funds to grant sabbaticals to librarians or

— 39 —

academic-administrators. The Board has also consistently pushed for funds for moving and interviewing expenses. The most recent session of the Legislature granted the first funding for these areas as well as for awards to outstanding teachers. (Two outstanding faculty members have been selected for each of the past two years and given awards of \$1,000 each from funds provided from private sources.) The Board has made available group insurance programs which can be participated in by faculty and other employees without the necessity of being a member of any membership organization.

Considerable further improvement will be necessary before the salaries and fringe benefits of faculty and academic administrators are truly competitive.

4. *Greater Use of California Doctorate* (Not implemented)

There has been a decrease rather than an improvement in the use of those granted doctoral degrees by California institutions. This has not been because of choice. The State Colleges would welcome the opportunity to hire more of these individuals. Two factors have prevented the hiring of more of those with doctoral degrees from California colleges. These are: (1) the high salaries and other benefits offered by other colleges (including junior colleges) both in and out of California, and (2) the high salaries offered by private industry in California.

5. *Faculty Self-Improvement* (Partly implemented) There are several aspects to the activities related to the efforts to improve the performance of faculty:

- (1) A total package including criteria for hiring, promoting and granting tenure to faculty, standards for professional conduct, etc., is being developed with the Academic Senate.
- (2) For two years there have been statewide programs to award outstanding teachers funded with private funds. With the recent appropriation of funds by the Legislature, the Trustees have asked the Chancellor and the Academic Senate to intensify their efforts with regard to criteria for the evaluation of teaching in conjunction with the development of guidelines for granting awards to outstanding teachers. There are already in existence programs on a number of campuses to recognize outstanding teachers.
- (3) Great effort is expended on all campuses to encourage those lacking the doctorate to complete their degree programs.
- (4) Campus procedures involving peer judgments in the evaluation of faculty for retention, tenure and promotion help to bring an awareness to both the evaluators and the evaluated of the attributes of an outstanding faculty member.
- (5) The personnel rules adopted by the Trustees allow time taken on leave for purposes of obtaining more training or enriched professional experience not to interfere with the career programs of the faculty member.

6. *Strengthening Master Degree Programs* (Implemented)

As was noted above the State Colleges are producing an increasing number of individuals with the master's degree. There also has been a continuing effort to improve the quality of the training programs. The first joint doctoral program is about to start. However, the development of these and other graduate programs has

been slowed because of the tendency to fund all or parts of new programs out of funds made available for existing programs. Until this tendency and the resulting increase in the load on faculty and administrators can be reversed there will be considerable reluctance to embark on new programs or expand others which might increase the supply of trained potential faculty.

8. *Collecting Data on Faculty Demand and Supply* (Partly Implemented)

Shortage of staff, short deadlines, work backlogs coupled with the newness of the system and inadequate data processing have impeded or prevented as much coordinative effort as would be desirable. There is no reluctance to participate jointly in so far as staff and time available will permit. The State Colleges welcome as much collaborative effort as possible.

Adult Education in California

4. *Adult Education Programs* (In progress)

Although no Board of Trustee action has as yet been taken to change policies in the area of adult education services, the existing programs in the colleges have continued to grow and expand and yet fall short of meeting the needs of the community. Federal legislation, automation, and the increasing need for retraining and upgrading are having a significant influence on these programs.

— 40 —

Student Fees

1. *Tuition* (In progress)

Since this issue is related to the entire problem of student fees, which is currently under study within the state college system, no formal action has yet been taken.

2. *Non-Resident Tuition* (Implemented)

The Board of Trustees on the basis of interim estimated teaching expense costs in the state colleges, on January 11, 1963, raised the out-of-state tuition from \$360.00 to \$500.00 per year. The Board of Trustees on the basis of the state college teaching expense computed in the California Public Higher Education Cost and Statistical Analysis Study on July 29, 1965, adopted a resolution increasing the non-resident tuition fees to \$600 per year beginning with the fall term of 1965. Both these non-resident fees are in addition to the M & S fees paid by residents of California.

3. *Fee Structure* (In progress)

The Board of Trustees held a public hearing on the subject of Student Fees on March 4, 1965. At this time Legislators, taxpayer group representatives, students, faculty and interested lay persons were invited to voice their opinions on problems of financing higher education in California. Following this meeting a special Task Force was appointed by the Chancellor to study and recommend changes in the structure of Student Fees in the State Colleges with a view toward bringing them into line with the recommendations of the Master Plan. This Task Force plans to have its work completed by this fall. Their recommendations will go through the consultative process and then to the Board of Trustees in November or December of 1965.

4. *Ancillary Services* (Implemented)

At their December 6, 1963 meeting, the Board of Trustees adopted a resolution supporting this recommendation. Principles included in this resolution include the following: (1) "All California State College

campus master plans will provide the necessary space required for auxiliary enterprise facilities and where additional land is needed it will be financed from state funds. (2) The ultimate source of revenue to pay for the construction of these auxiliary enterprise facilities will be obtained from student fees or charges.”

5. *Student Aid* (Implemented)

The California State Colleges have, in recent years, developed important programs of student financial aid. For the first time, the support budget for 1965-66 recognizes the professional and clerical workload involved in administering these programs. Most colleges offer a combination of part-time work, loans and scholarship assistance to their needy students. The growth of such programs is reflected in the NDEA student loan funds committed to the system. In 1961 approximately 2 million dollars were loaned to State College students. In 1965-66 almost 5 million dollars will be available. Increasing federal assistance to students in higher education through NDEA, Work-Study, and other programs, when combined with locally generated scholarship and loan funds could bring the dollar volume of these services to approximately 20 million in 1966-67.

6. *Computation of Teaching Expense and Ancillary Services* (Teaching expense implemented; ancillary services nearly implemented)

The Board of Trustees of the California State Colleges, since their inception, have taken official action affecting only the rates of housing of these three services. On March 8, 1963, the Board, by resolution, readjusted the housing rental schedule effective July 1, 1963.

All feeding operations at the California State Colleges to date have been operated by various auxiliary organizations. The Board of Trustees has taken no action relating to feeding costs or charges.

Several studies involving costs of construction, operation and maintenance of feeding, housing and parking at the various State Colleges have been conducted by the Chancellor's Staff during the past three years. Further extensive study of costs, charges that should be made to cover these costs, and the manner in which funds will be raised to construct, operate and maintain facilities necessary for feeding, housing and parking is now under way by special task force appointed by the Chancellor. It is anticipated that action of a substantial nature affecting all three of these elements of service will be taken in the very near future by the Board of Trustees.

7. *Retention of Fees* (Not implemented)

As part of the current study of Fiscal Responsibility in the California State Colleges, it is anticipated that this recommendation will be receiving favorable action in the very near future.

— 41 —

[Appendix IC: Reponse of Frank L. Kidner (University)] University of California

Berkeley, California

August 25, 1965

Dr. Willard B. Spalding, Director
Coordinating Council for Higher Education
785 Market Street, Room 1200
San Francisco, California 94103

Dear Willard:

Attached herewith you will find a statement of the actions undertaken by the University of California in respect to each recommendation in the Master Plan, as requested under paragraph 3 (a) of your letter of August 4,

1965. Statements concerning questions 3 (b) and (c) will shortly be before you as will observations on other aspects of your August 4 memorandum.

Kindest personal regards.

Cordially

/s/ Frank

Frank L. Kidner

Enclosure

[Statement Regarding the University and Master Plan Recommendations]

To: Director, Coordinating Council for Higher Education

From: University of California /s/ F.L.K.

Subject: The University and Master Plan Recommendations

Certain recommendations of the Master Plan are addressed to State Government, some to the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, and some to the University of California or other segments of higher education. The statements appearing below seek to describe the manner in which the University of California has reacted to Master Plan recommendations addressed to the University and, separately, to comment on the University's participation in the recommendations addressed directly to the Council.

I. The Validity of Entrance Requirements

The University has cooperated with the Coordinating Council for Higher Education and the other segments in the development of recommendations looking to compliance with the Master Plan recommendations on the validity of entrance requirements. The Technical Committee on Retention, Admission and Transfer has established an appropriate schedule for the development of such reports.

II. Admissions Policies and Procedures

- A. The Master Plan recommended that, effective with respect to students entering in the fall term of 1962, the University adjust its admission standards so that the top 12 1/2% of the graduates of California public high schools be eligible; the graduates of other secondary schools to be held to equivalent levels. This recommendation was made fully effective with respect to the fall semester of 1962.
- B. The University has long required that all recommending units for admission be in a specific pattern of carefully designated college preparatory programs.
- C. Students technically ineligible but admitted by special procedures have been limited to not more than 2% of all freshman admissions. There are no special programs or curricula requiring in and of themselves such exceptions. There are no lower division non-degree programs now being carried on by the University of California. The last students in a two-year agricultural program at Davis were graduated in June, 1960.
- D. Effective with respect to entrants in the fall of 1962, all applicants ineligible at the time of high school graduation because of inadequate grades in high school must offer at least 56 units of acceptable advanced standing credit. Exceptions to this rule have been limited to not more than 2% of all students who make application for advanced standing in any year.
- E. Effective for all applicants for admission for the fall of 1962 and thereafter, students who are residents

of other states are admitted only if they are in the upper half of those otherwise eligible.

I attached a copy of a more detailed report on those recommendations of the Master Plan relating to admissions which was submitted to the Council under date of October 23, 1962.

III. Retention

The University has sought for greater uniformity in policy and practices relating to probation and dismissal. Reports on such action have been forwarded to the Council under date of August 17, 1965. The University continues to cooperate with the Council in the development of materials relating to this subject.

IV. Distribution of Lower Division Students

The University has regularly supported a reduction in the proportion of lower division students and has taken certain steps to this end, as reported in the attached document under date of October 23, 1962, and again under date of August 17, 1965.

— 42 —

V. Utilization of Physical Plants

- A. The University continues to seek expanded use of its physical plants, and included in its efforts is an expansion of plant use in late afternoon and evening hours; it continues to develop capital outlay programs in the light of the space standards indicated in the Master Plan.
- B. The University has adopted a quarter system calendar effective for the academic year 1966-67 on all campuses (it is effective in 1965-66 at San Diego, Irvine and Santa Cruz), and, subject to appropriate financing, has determined to undertake year-round operations at Berkeley or Los Angeles or both beginning with the academic year 1966-67. Additional campuses will undertake year-round operations as the need becomes evident and as financing becomes available.

VI. Enrollment Limitations and Projected Plant Needs

The University has established enrollment limitations on each of its several campuses and has estimated the need for additional campuses. It is in conformity with the recommendations of the Master Plan under this heading.

VII. Joint Doctoral Degrees

The Regents of the University of California on September 20, 1963 and the Trustees of the California State Colleges on September 6 and October 11, 1963 adopted a statement of principles together with a document entitled: Organization and Procedures for the Joint Doctoral Program of the Joint Graduate Board.

VIII. Library Facilities

The University has extended to the members of the faculties of all accredited institutions of higher learning in California the following privileges:

- A. Reference privileges to all University libraries.
- B. Library loan privileges.

C. Borrowing privileges without fee in the borrowing areas adjacent to University libraries.

IX. Ancillary Services

Ancillary services such as housing, food and parking are operated from fees collected from the users of such services and are thus self-supporting. The incidental fee has been increased from time to time to cover other ancillary services such as student health, student activities, and other services incidental but not directly related to instruction.

X. Student Fees

The University has regularly accommodated the nonresident fee structure to the recommendations of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education. The most recent increase in the nonresident tuition fee is effective as of the fall term, 1965, and establishes the nonresident tuition fee at \$800 per annum.

If there are specific recommendations of the Master Plan directed to the segments concerning which you would like an additional report, it will be provided upon request.

cc: President Kerr

Enclosure

Progress Report on Implementation of the Master Plan Recommendations on Admissions

<i>Recommendations</i>	<i>Action Taken</i>
“Admission Policies and Procedures”	
<i>It is recommended that:</i>	
<p>“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 ¹¹ (33 ? percent) and the University from the top one-eighth ¹² (12 ½ per cent) of all graduates of California public high schools with:</p>	<p>After a study of approximately 15,750 transcripts of seniors graduated in the year ending June 1961, it was found that approximately 14.8% of the graduating class was eligible for admission to the university. The eligibility study further showed that 2.2% of the graduating class were eligible under one or more Methods II, III, IV, which were variants of Method I. Since experience had shown that the performance of students admitted thereunder was consistently less satisfactory than that of those admitted under Method I, the Board of Regents approved, in January of 1962, the recommendation of the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools that Methods II, III, and IV be abolished effective Fall, 1962. As a result of this action, the proportion of graduating seniors now eligible to the University (12.6%) is as close to the Master Plan recommendation as is statistically possible to achieve. The University has further reduced, by a small percentage, the proportion eligible to the University by stipulating that no grade of less than C in the ninth grade will be accepted in satisfaction of the subject-matter requirements.</p>

11. 1 “3 As defined by the state college system.”

<p>“a. Continuation of existing special programs and curricula involving exceptions to this rule subject to approval by the respective boards, and these to be kept to a minimum, and those that are continued to be reported annually to the co-ordinating agency. Any new special programs and curricula involving such exceptions to be approved by the co-ordinating agency.</p>	<p>No special curricula or programs exist which involve exceptions to the above requirements.</p>
<p>“b. Graduates of private and out-of-state secondary schools to be held to equivalent levels.</p>	<p>Graduates of private and out-of-state secondary schools are held to equivalent levels except as provided pursuant to recommendation No. 6.</p>
<p>“2. Implementation of Recommendation Number 1 to be left to the two systems with the following provisions:</p>	
<p>“a. Each to have the new requirements in force for students admitted for Fall, 1962.</p>	<p>The new requirements for first-time freshmen were in force for students applying for admission in the Fall semester of 1962.</p>
<p>“b. Inasmuch as the Survey Team favors acceptance in both systems of a requirement that all, or almost all, of the recommending units for admission shall be in college preparatory courses, that the application of such a requirement be carefully studied during 1960, and this principle be applied as fully as possible throughout both systems.</p>	<p>The University has continued to follow its long-established requirements that all recommending units for admission be in a specific pattern of carefully designated college preparatory courses.</p>

<p>“3. For both the state colleges and the University, freshman admissions through special procedures outside the basic requirements of recommending units of high school work and/or aptitude tests (such as specials and exceptions to the rules) be limited to 2 per cent of all freshman admissions in each system for a given year. Furthermore that all ‘limited’ students be required to meet regular admission standards.¹³</p>	<p>All Admissions Officers have been instructed that admission by “special action” must be limited to not more than 2 per cent of freshman admissions. For the Fall semester, 1962 “special action” admissions amounted to slightly under 1.6%. All limited students are required to meet regular admission standards.</p>
<p>“4. Junior college functions now carried by state colleges and nondegree lower division programs at any state college or University campus (other than extension) be subject to the following rule:</p>	<p>No lower division, non-degree programs are now being carried on in the University of California. The last students in the two-year agricultural program at Davis were graduated in June, 1960.</p>
<p>“The equivalent of junior college out-of-district tuition be charged beginning in Fall, 1960, against the counties of residence of all lower division students who are ineligible to admission by regular standards, and the funds collected paid to the General Fund of the State.</p>	
<p>“Furthermore, that such junior college functions now carried by state colleges at State expense be terminated not later than July 1, 1964, all admittees thereafter being required to meet standard entrance requirements.</p>	

13. 3 “5 State Board of Education action makes this effective Fall of 1960.”

<p>“5. The state colleges and the University require a minimum of at least 56 units of acceptable advanced standing credit before considering the admission of applicants ineligible to admission as freshmen because of inadequate grades in high school, except for curricula that require earlier transfer,¹⁴ and except also that each state college and campus of the University, through special procedures developed by each, be permitted to accept for earlier transfer not more than 2 per cent of all students who make application for advanced standing in any year.</p>	<p>Transfer students ineligible for admission to the University at the time of high school graduation because of inadequate grades are now required to transfer 56 units of acceptable advanced standing credit to be considered for admission to the University. This requirement was approved by the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools and reported to the Academic Senate in October 1961, or prior to the adoption of the first-time freshman regulation, because implementation of this rule did not require extensive study. Exceptions are made for students in curricula requiring earlier transfer, largely limited to architecture. Other exceptions are limited to not more than two per cent of all students who make application in any year.</p>
<p>“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.”</p>	<p>For many years, the University has had higher qualitative admission requirements for out-of-state students than for residents of California. In conformity with this Master Plan recommendation, the out-of-state student is now required to present a record which would place him at a level equivalent to the top 6 1/4% of the graduates of California public high schools. Out-of-state students applying for admission by examination must achieve scores which have been adjusted consistently with the new admission requirements.</p>

In reference to question two, it should be noted that the University of California has fully implemented (in each instance within the time period specified) recommendations one through six, pages 4 and 5, of *A Master Plan for Higher Education in California*.

Page Six

<p align="center">“Distribution of Lower Division Students”</p>	
<p>“It is recommended that:</p>	

14. 4 “6 Both systems have adopted 60 unit rules for such transfer students, but each left a way to bypass it. The state colleges allow admission on 24 units with a B average; the University, on 30 or more with a 2.4 grade-point average and a satisfactory score on the Scholastic Aptitude Test.”

“Distribution of Lower Division Students”	
<p>“1. 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. ¹⁵”</p>	<p>Several actions can be reported with reference to this recommendation. 1) The University has recently abolished certain curricula in which a large proportion of lower division students could be found; for example: Industrial Arts at Los Angeles and Santa Barbara, and Home Economics at Berkeley. 2) The University has implemented (as described above) the recommendation relating to transfer students ineligible upon graduation for admission to the University due to scholastic deficiencies. 3) Every University catalogue and undergraduate admission circular carries a statement which reads: “Frequently, students who intend to complete their advanced studies at the University will find it to their advantage to complete the first two years of their college course in one of the many excellent California public junior colleges.” In published statements, public speeches, and at various conferences, similar statements are emphasized, to the end that high school counsellors are provided with the necessary background and information so that, when appropriate, they may advise students to transfer to the University upon completion of a two year course of study at their local junior college. Finally, provision has been made in the Regents' Scholarship program to ensure a proper balance between freshman scholars and junior scholars, who may transfer from junior colleges. Because of this provision, a student who elects to attend a junior college in no way diminishes his opportunity for a Regents' Scholarship. 4) The Board of Regents have declared their intention to refrain from introducing lower division instruction at new University campuses until such time as adequate junior college facilities exist in the area.</p>
	<p>No doubt further implementation of this recommendation will be necessary. This must be judged against the pattern of enrollment in the immediate and more distant future. The University will continue to study this question.</p>

1 “3 As defined by the state college system.”

2 “4 As defined by the University of California.”

3 “5 State Board of Education action makes this effective Fall of 1960.”

4 “6 Both systems have adopted 60 unit rules for such transfer students, but each left a way to bypass it. The state colleges allow admission on 24 units with a B average; the University, on 30 or more with a 2.4 grade-point average and a satisfactory score on the Scholastic Aptitude Test.”

5 “7 It is estimated that this recommendation would result in the transfer of some 40,000 lower division students to the junior colleges by 1975. It is expected that the recommendation to select state college students

15. 5 “7 It is estimated that this recommendation would result in the transfer of some 40,000 lower division students to the junior colleges by 1975. It is expected that the recommendation to select state college students from the upper 33% per cent of all public high school graduates and the University from the upper 12½ percent, together with the recommendation that all 'limited' students be required to meet regular admission requirements, will make up another 10,000.

from the upper 33 ½ per cent of all public high school graduates and the University from the upper 12 ½ percent, together with the recommendation that all 'limited' students be required to meet regular admission requirements, will make up another 10,000.

NOTE: Footnote 4 above from the Master Plan report is incorrect in light of the new University requirements for transfer students.

— 46 —

[Appendix ID: Response of Frank L. Kidner (University)] University of California

Berkeley, California

September 27, 1965

Dr. Willard B. Spaulding, Director
Coordinating Council for Higher Education
785 Market Street, Room 1200
San Francisco, California 94103

Dear Willard:

I have written heretofore about the reply to be made on behalf of the University of California concerning the recommendations of the Master Plan and the measure and schedule of compliance therewith by the University. Now I write concerning the other two questions you raised in your original letter.

First, and by way of background, I think it essential to point out that the Master Plan is, in a real sense, less than five years old. Effective in 1960, it nevertheless took at least a year to activate the Coordinating Council for Higher Education and the Trustees of the California State Colleges. The early days of the Coordinating Council for Higher Education were beset with a variety of problems now happily resolved. Nevertheless, this means that the Coordinating Council for Higher Education has had only four years of existence. The record of increasing effectiveness, given this background, is good. It must be preserved and improved.

My discussions with officers of the University and others have given rise to no serious doubts or reservations concerning the Master Plan (I do not here refer to the composition of the Council which is a matter of high-level political decision, but to the plan itself), save for those provisions which relate to the planned diversion of students from the University and the State Colleges to the Junior Colleges. The doubts concerning this issue do not stem from any reservations having to do with the essential role played by the most outstanding system of Junior Colleges in the nation. They stem, instead, from what I believe to be a mistaken conception, either in principle or in language, which beset the authors of the relevant section of the Master Plan.

To be specific: It is possible by a variety of means, some appropriate and some less so, to deny admission to the University (or the State Colleges); but it is not demonstrably possible to assure that those thus denied will in fact go to the Junior Colleges. The combination of circumstances, motivations, and wishes which direct a prospective University (or State College) student to begin his work in the Junior College are not wholly understood (though Dale Tillery has contributed much to the necessary understanding).

In any case, I doubt whether (apart from the adoption and maintenance of Master Plan admission requirements) efforts should be made to "divert" a measurable number of prospective students to the Junior Colleges.

I do believe it to be appropriate in the University (and in the State Colleges) that increasing emphasis be placed upon the development of programs at the upper division level. I would expect, moreover, that the

University would continue its long-standing practice of calling to the attention of the prospective student the possible advantages to him of beginning his collegiate work in the Junior College. I would expect, too, that the University will continue to seek all reasonable means of enhancing the ease of transfer. But there, I think, the matter should end.

You asked also about needs not recognized in the Master Plan which have since become clear. I think that, in principle, the Master Plan did not fail to recognize any essential need; but it did, as so often has happened before, underestimate the magnitude of those needs. More recent demographic data speak for themselves in this matter.

All in all the Master Plan has functioned admirably during troubled times and will surely serve well in the years to come. I am sure that the discussions now going forward, and to continue for some months, will bear out these views.

Cordially

Frank L. Kidner

FLK:cf

cc: President Clark Kerr

— 47 —

[Appendix IE: Response of Arthur S. Marmaduke (State Scholarship Commission)] State of California - California State Scholarship Commission

Sacramento, California

September 28, 1965

Mr. Keith Sexton
Assistant to the Council
Coordinating Council for Higher Education
1127 Eleventh Street, Room 305
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Keith:

Pursuant to your request, I am pleased to relate the extent to which the Master Plan recommendations concerning student financial assistance have been implemented.

The Master Plan report contained five expressed and one implicit recommendation about scholarships and fellowships. All but one of these have been implemented by legislation.

The Master Plan report carried the implicit recommendation that the State Scholarship Commission and the State Scholarship Program become permanent. The termination date for both was repealed in 1960.

The report also carried the recommendation that the Scholarship Program be expanded and that the amount of the scholarship be increased. The expansion was authorized in 1960 when the number of authorized awards was increased from 2,560 to 5,120 in annual increments of 640 additional awards each year. A further expansion was authorized in 1965 when the Legislature authorized scholarships in an amount equal to 1% of the high school graduating class plus provision for renewal. There will be approximately 6,200 scholarships in effect in 1966-67. The maximum amount of the award was increased from \$600 to \$900 in 1960 and again, in 1964, it was increased to \$1,500.

The recommendation for a Junior College Reserve Scholarship was authorized in 1960 by the Legislature.

A program of state graduate fellowships for students planning a college teaching career was authorized by the 1965 Legislature although it has not been financed as of this date.

The recommendations for a Master Plan for subsistence scholarships to recipients of State Scholarships has not been approved by the Legislature. It should be noted that the subsistence feature of the State Graduate Fellowships Program, originally proposed by the Commission, was deleted by the Legislature. It can essentially be said that the Legislature has been consistent in refusing to authorize subsistence payments of any type.

If I can supply additional information, please let me know.

Sincerely

/s/ Art

Arthur S. Marmaduke
Executive Director

— 48 —

[Appendix] II Coordinating Council Reports

1. *Scope, Functions, and Procedures for the Coordinating Council for Higher Education* (1000), May 1962.
2. *Medical Education in California* (1001), January 1963.
3. *Continuing Education Programs in California Higher Education, Part I.* (1002), January 1963. (Replaced by 1005)
4. *Budget Report to the Legislature, 1963: Level of Support, Faculty Salaries, Admissions Standards, Student Fees* (1003), February 1963.
5. *1963 Report of the Director to the Coordinating Council for Higher Education* (1004), April 1963.
6. *Continuing Education Programs in California Higher Education* (1005), July 1963.
7. *A Directory of Higher Education in California* (1006), July 1963. (Replaced by 1011)
8. *A Report on the Study of Faculty Opinion Toward Salary, Fringe Benefits and Working Conditions* (1007), August 1963.
9. *Budget Report to the Legislature, 1964: Level of Support, Diversion of Students, Auxiliary Enterprises, Faculty Salaries* (1008), February 1964.
10. *A Comparison of the Trimester and Four Quarter Calendars for Year-Round Operation of Public Higher Education in California* (1009), February 1964.
11. *Specialized Curriculums and the Diversion and Redirection of Students* (1010), June 1964.
12. *A Directory of Higher Education in California* (1011), July 1964.
13. *Universities' Coordination Exercised by the University Grants Committee of Great Britain* (1012), July 1964.
14. *Annual Report of the Director 1963-1964* (1013), August 1964.
15. *California's Needs for Additional Centers of Public Higher Education* (1014), December 1964.
16. *Dental Education and Manpower* (1015), December 1964.
17. *Budget Report to the Legislature, 1965: Level of Support, Faculty Salaries, Admissions Policies* (1016), February 1965.
18. *Faculty Recruitment in California Higher Education* (1017) March 1965.

19. *A Consideration of Issues Affecting California Public Junior Colleges* (1018), April 1965.
20. *An Evaluation of the Tuition Free Principle in California Public Higher Education* (1019), May 1965.
21. *A Directory of Higher Education in California* (1020), September 1965.
22. *Status Report on Continuing Education Programs in California Higher Education* (1021), December 1965.
23. *Budget Review in Public Higher Education* (1022), December 1965.
24. *Annual Report on Faculty Salaries, Benefits and Recruitment* (1023), January 1966.

The following are Staff Reports not included, or are yet to be included, in the printed Council report series:

— 49 —

25. *A Report on the Level of State Support Sought by the Segments of Public Higher Education*, February 21, 1962. (no number assigned)
26. *Progress Report on the Coordinating Council for Higher Education to the Governor and the 1962 Legislature* (62-1), March 1, 1962.
27. *Report on Faculty Research in the State Colleges* (62-2), March 1, 1962.
28. *Support for Capital Outlay for Higher Education: A Report to the 1962 Legislature* (62-3), March 1, 1962.
29. *Research in the California State Colleges* (62-4), June 1962.
30. *Interim Report on the Need for Additional Centers for Higher Education* (Transmittal Report) (63-2B), May 7, 1963.
31. *Federal Aid to Higher Education in 1963* (63-4), April 12, 1963.
32. *Report on Need, Purpose, Scope and Organization—California Public Higher Education Cost and Statistical Analysis* (63-7), June 25, 1963.
33. *Background Material Concerning the 12-Month Academic Calendar* (Report for Technical Committee) (63-10), September 3, 1963.
34. *Design of the Council's Study of the Junior Colleges* (63-11), October 29, 1963.
35. *Reflection of Diversion of Students to Junior Colleges in Capital Outlay Programs* (63-16B), December 17, 1963.
36. *Prospectus for 1964 Staff Report on California's Needs for Additional Centers of Public Higher Education, 1965-1980* (64-4), February 28, 1964.
37. *Cost Estimates for Year-Round Operations at the University of California and the California State Colleges* (64-5), March 16, 1964.
38. *First Annual Report of the State Committee on Continuing Education* (64-7), June 30, 1964.
39. *The Capital Outlay Needs of California Public Higher Education* (64-8B), August 18, 1964. (64-8C), August 25, 1964.
40. *A Report of a Consideration of Student Probation-Dismissal Standards Among the Segments of Public Higher Education* (64-10), October 20, 1964.
41. *Special Education Teaching Training Programs in California Higher Education* (64-15), December 14-15, 1964. (A Report in Response to A Request of the California State Assembly, Interim Committee on Education).
42. *A Progress Report on the Study of Utilization of Physical Facilities of California's Public Institutions of Higher Education 1963-64* (As Developed from Data Secured in the California Public Higher Education Cost and Statistical Analysis) (65-2A), January 25, 1965 (Revised February 15, 1965 Supersedes Report No. 65-2).
43. *A Consideration of California Public Higher Education Non-Resident Tuition Fees* (65-5B), March 30, 1965.

44. *Higher Education Facilities Act Allocation of Funds, 1964-65 Section 104 Applications* (65-6), March 29, 1965 (Report to the Committee on Federal Programs).
45. *Higher Education Facilities Act Allocation of Funds, 1964-65 Section 103 Applications* (65-7), April 27, 1965 (Report to Committee on the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963).
46. *Faculty Fringe Benefits* (65-8), April 27, 1965.
47. *The Need for the Advanced Acquisition of Sites for New State Colleges in Three Areas* (65-9), April 27, 1965.
48. *Budget Review in Public Higher Education* (65-10), June 29, 1965.
49. *Enrollment Restrictions and the Redirection, Diversion and Transfer of Students* (65-11), June 29, 1965.
50. *Report on Federal Programs* (65-12), June 29, 1965.
51. *Determining Student Capacity in Existing Physical Facilities in California's Junior Colleges, and Determining Standards in Planning New Facilities* (65-14), September 28, 1965.
52. *September Report on the Level of Support for the University of California and California State Colleges 1966-67* (65-15), September 27-28, 1965.
53. *September Report 1965 on the Flow of Students Into, Among, and Through the Public Institutions of Higher Education in California* (65-16), September 27-28, 1965.
54. *Revision of California's State Plan Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963* (65-17), September 28, 1965.
55. *Academic Plans in the California State Colleges and in the University of California* (65-18), September 27-28, 1965.
56. *California Higher Education Library Resources and Planning: A Status Report* (Prepared by Dr. James Clark, Special Consultant for the Study and Associate Professor of English, San Jose State College) (65-19), November 22-23, 1965.
57. *Report on the California Conference on Transfer Articulation* (Sponsored by the Articulation Conference Administrative Committee and the National Project for Improvement of Articulation between Two-Year and Four-Year Colleges) (No number assigned), November 30, 1965.

— 50 —

[Appendix] III Donahoe Higher Education Act of 1960 as Amended

Division 16.5 Higher Education

Chapter 1. General Provisions

22500. Public higher education consists of (1) all public junior colleges heretofore and hereafter established pursuant to law (2) all state colleges heretofore and hereafter established pursuant to law, and (3) each campus, branch and function of the University of California heretofore and hereafter established by The Regents of the University of California.

22501. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the Legislature not to authorize or to acquire sites for new institutions of public higher education unless such sites are recommended by the Co-ordinating Council for Higher Education and not to authorize existing or new institutions of public education, other than those described in subdivisions (2) and (3) of Section 22500, to offer instruction beyond the fourteenth grade level.

Nothing in this section shall be construed to require any further recommendations as a prerequisite to legislative action with respect to state colleges intended to be in operation by 1965 or University of California campuses intended to be under construction by 1962, as set forth in the recommendations contained in the

Master Plan for Higher Education printed at page 42, paragraphs 4 and 6, Senate Journal (Regular Session) for February 1, 1960.

22503. Each segment of public higher education shall strive for excellence in its sphere, as assigned in this division.

22504. The provisions of this division shall supersede the provisions of any other law which conflict with the provisions of this division.

Chapter 2. University of California

22550. The Legislature hereby finds and declares that the University of California is the primary state-supported academic agency for research.

22551. The university may provide instruction in the liberal arts and sciences and in the professions, including the teaching profession. The university has exclusive jurisdiction in public higher education over instruction in the profession of law, and over graduate instruction in the professions of medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine and architecture.

22552. The university has the sole authority in public higher education to award the doctoral degree in all fields of learning, except that it may agree with the state colleges to award joint doctoral degrees in selected fields.

22553. The university may make reasonable provision for the use of its library and research facilities by qualified members of the faculties of other institutions of public higher education in this State.

Chapter 3. The California State Colleges ¹⁶

22600. The California State Colleges shall be administered by a board designated as the Trustees of the California State Colleges which is hereby created.

22600.1 Whenever, in any law, the term “Trustees of the State College System of California” or the term “chief executive officer of the State College System” is used, such terms shall be deemed to mean the Trustees of the California State Colleges and the Chancellor of the California State Colleges respectively. (Added 1965).

22601. The board shall be composed of the following four ex officio members: the Governor, the Lieutenant Governor, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and the person named by the trustees to serve as the Chancellor of the California State Colleges; and 16 appointive members appointed by the Governor, except that the members, as of the effective date of this section, of the State Board of Education shall serve ex officio as and among the first appointive trustees. The Speaker of the Assembly shall have the status of a legislative interim committee on the subject of the California State Colleges and shall meet with the board and participate in its work to the extent that such participation is not incompatible with his position as a Member of the Legislature.

22601.5 Commencing on March 1, 1961, the terms of the appointive trustees shall be eight years, except that the 16 appointive trustees serving on February 28, 1961, shall have new terms of office which they shall classify by lot so that two of the terms of such appointive members shall expire on the first day of

— 51 —

March of each calendar year commencing in 1962 and ending in 1969.

16. Amended 1961 to substitute California State Colleges for “State College Systems of California.”

22602. The expiration of a trustee's term of office as a member of the State Board of Education or any earlier vacancy in that office shall create a vacancy in his trusteeship, unless the term ascribed thereto by lot has already expired. In case of any vacancy on the board of trustees, the Governor shall appoint a successor for the balance of the term as to which such vacancy exists.

22603. If the trustees and the Regents of the University of California both consent, the chancellor of the California State Colleges shall sit with the Regents of the University of California in an advisory capacity and the President of the University of California shall sit with the trustees in an advisory capacity.

22604. The Trustees of the California State Colleges shall succeed to the powers, duties and functions with respect to the management, administration and control of the state colleges heretofore vested in the State Board of Education or in the Director of Education, including all powers, duties, obligations, and functions specified in Article 2 (commencing at Section 24501) of Chapter 11 of Division 18 of this code, and all obligations assumed by the State Board of Education pursuant to that article prior to July 1, 1961.

On and after July 1, 1961, the Trustees of the California State Colleges shall have full power and responsibility in the construction and development of any state college campus, and any buildings or other facilities or improvements connected with the California State Colleges. Such powers shall be exercised by the Trustees of the California State Colleges notwithstanding the provisions of Chapter 2 (commencing at Section 14100) and Chapter 3 (commencing at Section 14250) of Part 5 of Division 3 of Title 2 of the Government Code, except that the powers shall be carried out pursuant to the procedures prescribed by these laws.

The provisions of this chapter relating to the transfer of the powers, duties, and functions with respect to the management, administration and control of the state colleges shall become operative on July 1, 1961.

Prior to October 1, 1965, the Trustees of the California State Colleges may accept gifts of land, or gifts of options on land, may accept and expend gifts of money for the purchase of land or options on land and may enter into negotiations and contracts for the purchase of land for a future state college site in the vicinity of any of the areas specified in the recommendations contained in the Master Plan for Higher Education printed in page 42, paragraph 5, Senate Journal (Regular Session) for February 1, 1960, except that such gifts, expenditures, negotiations, and contracts shall not obligate the expenditure of any state funds for the purchase of such land or for development on such land, unless the Legislature shall subsequently approve the obligation by appropriating the funds for that specific purpose. (Added 1963).

Any such acceptance or acceptances and expenditure or negotiations and contract may be conditioned upon an automatic reversion back to the donor or automatic termination of the negotiations and contract if a new state college is not established at a specific site prior to a specific date designated by the trustees and the donor or the trustees and the person or corporation with whom the trustees are negotiating or contracting. (Added 1963).

22605. The California State Colleges shall be entirely independent of all political and sectarian influence and kept free therefrom in the appointment of its trustees and in the administration of its affairs, and no person shall be debarred admission to any department of the state colleges on account of sex.

22606. The primary function of the state colleges is the provision of instruction for undergraduate students and graduate students, through the master's degree, in the liberal arts and sciences, in applied fields and in the professions, including the teaching profession. Presently established two-year programs in agriculture are authorized, but other two-year programs shall be authorized only when mutually agreed upon by the Trustees of the California State Colleges and the State Board of Education. The doctoral degree may be awarded jointly with the University of California, as provided in Section 22552. Faculty research is authorized to the extent that it is consistent with the primary function of the state colleges and the facilities provided for that function.

22607. All state employees employed on June 30, 1961, in carrying out functions transferred to the Trustees of the California State Colleges by this chapter, except persons employed by the Director of Education in the Division of State Colleges and Teacher Education of the Department of Education, are transferred to the California State Colleges.

Nonacademic employees so transferred shall retain their respective positions in the state service, together with the personnel benefits accumulated by them at the time of transfer, and shall retain such rights as may attach under the law to the positions which they held at the time of transfer. All nonacademic positions filled by the trustees on and after July 1, 1961, shall be by appointment made in accordance with Chapter 9 (commencing at Section 24201) of Division 18 of this code, and persons so appointed shall be subject to the provisions of Chapter 9.

The trustees shall provide, or co-operate in providing, academic and administrative employees transferred

— 52 —

by this section with personnel rights and benefits at least equal to those accumulated by them as employees of the state colleges, except that any administrative employee may be reassigned to an academic or other position commensurate with his qualifications at the salary fixed for that position and shall have a right to appeal from such reassignment, but only as to whether the position to which he is reassigned is commensurate with his qualifications. All academic and administrative positions filled by the trustees on and after July 1, 1961, shall be filled by appointment made solely at the discretion of the trustees. The trustees shall establish and adjust the salaries and classifications of all academic and administrative positions and neither Section 18004 of the Government Code nor any other provision of law requiring approval by a state officer or agency for such salaries or classifications shall be applicable thereto. The trustees, however, shall make no adjustments which require expenditures in excess of existing appropriations available for the payment of salaries. The provisions of Chapter 9 (commencing at Section 24201) of Division 18 of this code relating to appeals from dismissal, demotion or suspension shall be applicable to academic employees.

Persons excluded from the transfer made by this section shall retain all the rights and privileges conferred upon civil service employees by law. Personnel of state agencies employed in state college work other than those transferred by this section and who are employed by the trustees prior to July 1, 1962, shall likewise be provided with personnel rights and benefits at least equal to those accumulated by them as employees of such state agencies.

1 Amended 1961 to substitute California State Colleges for “State College Systems of California.”

Chapter 4. Junior Colleges

22650. The public junior colleges are secondary schools and ¹⁷ shall continue to be a part of the public school system of this State. The State Board of Education shall prescribe minimum standards for the formation and operation of public junior colleges and exercise general supervision over public junior colleges.

22651. Public junior colleges shall offer instruction through but not beyond the fourteenth grade level, which instruction may include, but shall not be limited to, programs in one or more of the following categories: (1) standard collegiate courses for transfer to higher institutions; (2) vocational and technical fields leading to employment; and (3) general or liberal arts courses. Studies in these fields may lead to the associate in arts or associate in science degree.

1 “are secondary schools and” added 1963.

17. “are secondary schools and” added 1963.

Chapter 5. Coordinating Council for Higher Education

22700. There is hereby created an advisory body, the Co-ordinating Council for Higher Education, to be composed of three representatives each of the University of California, the California State Colleges, the public junior colleges, the private colleges and universities in the state, and six representatives of the general public. The university shall be represented by the president and two regents appointed by the regents. The California State Colleges shall be represented by the chancellor and two trustees appointed by the trustees. Public junior colleges shall be represented by a member of the State Board of Education or its chief executive officer as the board may from time to time determine, and a member of a local public junior college governing board and a public junior college administrator. The junior college governing board member shall be selected by the State Board of Education from a list or lists of five names submitted for its consideration by any association or associations of statewide coverage which represent junior college governing boards. The public junior college administrator shall be selected by the State Board of Education from a list of five names submitted for its consideration by the California Junior College Association. The private colleges and universities shall be represented by three persons, each of whom shall be affiliated with a private institution of higher education as a governing board member or as a staff member, in an academic or administrative capacity and shall be appointed by the Governor after consultation with an association or associations of such private institutions and subject to confirmation by the Senate. The general public shall be represented by six members appointed by the Governor subject to confirmation by the Senate. The terms of the appointments made pursuant to this section shall be as follows:

- (a) The three representatives appointed by the regents shall serve until the first meeting of the regents in the next succeeding calendar year following their appointment.
- (b) The trustees appointed by the trustees shall serve until the first meeting of the trustees in the next succeeding calendar year following his appointment.
- (c) The member of the State Board of Education or its chief executive officer who represents the public junior colleges shall serve until the first meeting of the board in the next succeeding calendar year following his appointment.
- (d) Except as otherwise provided in this subdivision, the term of office of all of the other members of the council appointed pursuant to this section is four years, and they shall hold office until the appointment of their successors.

The terms of such members in office on November 1, 1965, shall expire as follows:

- (1) The term of the member who, as a member of a local public junior college governing board, is representing the public junior colleges, the term of one of the members representing the private colleges and universities, and the term of one of the members representing the public shall expire on November 1, 1965.
- (2) The term of one of the members representing the private colleges and universities, and the term of one of the members representing the public shall expire on November 1, 1966.
- (3) The term of the member who, as a public junior college administrator, is representing the public junior colleges and the term of one of the members representing the public shall expire on November 1, 1967.
- (4) The term of the other member representing the private colleges and universities, and the term of one of the members representing the public shall expire on November 1, 1968.
- (5) The terms of the other two members representing the public shall expire on November 1, 1969.

On or before November 1, 1965, the Governor shall designate the order in which the terms of his appointees expire pursuant to this subdivision.

(e) Any person appointed pursuant to this section may be reappointed to serve additional terms.

No appointing authority specified in this section shall appoint any person to alternate membership on the council with the following exceptions who shall be appointed by the appropriate appointing authority: two alternates for the president and the two representatives of the regents: two alternates for the chancellor and the two representatives of the trustees, and one alternate for the one representative of the State Board of Education. Each alternate shall be a member of the appropriate appointing authority and shall be appointed for an annual term.

22701. The council shall appoint and may remove a director in the manner hereinafter specified. He shall appoint persons to such staff positions as the council may authorize.

22702. The council shall prescribe rules for the transaction of its own affairs, subject, however, to the following requirements and limitations: (1) the votes of all representatives shall be recorded; (2) effective action shall require the affirmative vote of eight members; and (3) the affirmative votes of 10 members shall be necessary to the appointment or removal of the directors.

22703. The co-ordinating council shall have the following functions, advisory to the governing boards of the institutions of public higher education and to appropriate state officials; (1) review of the annual budget and capital outlay requests of the university and the State College System, and presentation of comments on the general level of support sought; (2) advice as to the application of the provisions of this division delineating the different functions of public higher education and counsel as to the programs appropriate to each segment thereof, and in connection therewith shall submit to the Governor and to the Legislature within five days of the beginning of each general session a report which contains recommendations as to necessary or desirable changes, if any, in the functions and programs of the several segments of public higher education; and (3) development of plans for the orderly growth of public higher education and the making of recommendations on the need for and location of new facilities and programs.

22704. The council shall have power to require the institutions of public higher education to submit data on costs selection and retention of students enrollments, plant capacities and other matters pertinent to effective planning and co-ordination, and shall furnish information concerning such matters to the Governor and to the Legislature as requested by them.

22705. This division shall be known and may be cited as the Donahoe Higher Education Act.

22706. All meetings of the Council shall be open and public and all persons shall be permitted to attend any meetings of the council. (Added 1961)