

Separate and Unequal by Dr. Robert Samuels, UCSB

Although we do not have information on how many students have accepted UC offers of admissions for 2015-16, we do know that there has been another large increase (2,453) in non-resident offers of admissions and a decrease in offers for students from California (down 1,039). We also know that extra tuition for non-resident students will go up 8% to \$24,700 per student, while in-state tuition will remain at \$12,192. This increased incentive to enroll non-resident students has resulted in the following changes in admissions offers: “45 percent of offers at UC Berkeley went to out-of-state and international students; the figure was 42 percent at UCLA, 39 percent at UC San Diego and 35 percent at UC Davis.” In other words, these campuses stand to take in a huge amount of extra funds. For instance, if a campus takes in 1,000 non-resident students for four years, the increased funding is \$100 million. It is no wonder that UC has rejected the legislature’s offer of \$25 million if the entire UC system increases enrollments for Californian students by 5,000. Instead of getting an extra \$5,000 per resident student for one year, the UC can get an extra \$24,700 per non-resident student.

As the charts below show, the rush for non-resident student revenue will enhance the inequity of the system so that the campuses with the highest number of underrepresented students (UCR, Merced, UCSB, UCSC) will continue to receive the lowest level of revenue, and the campuses with the highest number of wealthy students will receive the most funding. As I have previously reported, last year’s admissions enhanced the inequity among the campuses:

CAMPUS	TUITION GENERATED BY			ADDITIONAL FUNDS (NON-RESIDENT TUITION PLUS REBENCHING)	AMOUNT OVER/UNDERFUNDED IN 2009-10
	NUMBER OF NON-RESIDENT STUDENTS	NON-RESIDENT STUDENTS	FUNDS FROM REBENCHING		
Berkeley	1,762	\$ 40,526,000	\$ 4,688,619	\$ 45,214,619	\$11,469,000
Davis	1,090	25,070,000	1,909,144	26,979,144	30,197,000
Irvine	1,232	28,338,000	8,589,098	36,927,098	(70,103,000)
Los Angeles	1,805	41,515,000	0	41,515,000	99,232,000
Riverside	328	7,544,000	3,524,648	11,068,648	(42,412,000)
San Diego	1,508	34,684,000	5,600,124	40,284,128	(26,861,000)
Santa Barbara	670	11,671,000	8,926,299	20,597,299	(94,645,000)
Santa Cruz	854	19,642,000	3,827,496	23,469,496	(62,812,000)

This chart tells us that campuses that received higher funding in the past (see the last column) built up their reputations and now can cash in on non-resident student revenue (NRT) (the second column). Moreover, the extra NRT funds on one campus do not help the students on other campuses, and the amount of financial aid for non-resident students (\$32 million last year) is almost as much as the total amount of rebenching (\$37 million last year).

As the state auditor pointed out in 2009, the campuses receiving the lowest level of per student funding were also the campuses with the highest number of underrepresented minority students. The chart below lists the percentage of undergraduate underrepresented minority students and Freshman Pell grant students for each campus in 2014-15:

Underrepresented Pell (Freshmen)

UCB	16	27
UCD	19	37
UCI	22	48
UCLA	21	31
UCR	41	56
UCSD	17	30
UCSB	27	41
UCSC	30	51
Merced	47	63

Thus, while 16% of undergrads at Berkeley were underrepresented minority students, Riverside had 41%; meanwhile Berkeley took in over \$40 million in non-resident student tuition revenue, as Riverside only brought in \$7.5 million. Furthermore, 31%

of freshmen at UCLA are Pell grant eligible, but 51% at UCSC fall into this low-income category, and yet UCLA brought in an additional \$41 million in non-resident student tuition, while UCSC brought in \$19 million. These statistics clearly show that UC has a separate and unequal funding model based on race and class, and this situation only promises to get worse next year.