DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 138 161 HE 008 815

TITLE Common Enrollment Related Terms for the University of California and the California State University and Colleges.

INSTITUTION California State Postsecondary Education Commission, Sacramento.

PUB DATE 13 Dec 76

NOTE 49p.; Some parts of appendix may be marginally legible

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Budgeting; *Classification; Comparative Analysis; Educational Finance; *Enrollment; *Enrollment Trends; *Glossaries; Graduate Students; Guidelines; Higher Education; Part Time Students; State Aid; State Colleges; State Legislation; State Universities; Statistical Data; Undergraduate Students

IDENTIFIERS *California; California State University and Colleges; *Full Time Students; University of California

ABSTRACT

Although enrollment is one of the bases by which the state funds its segments of higher education, different assumptions and calculation methodologies exist between the California State University and Colleges and the University of California in determining the enrollment statistics reported for budgetary purposes. The state legislature therefore demanded development of standards and reporting criteria. This report provides a common terminology as an assistance to those people concerned with developing more reliable means of comparing segmental enrollments. The principal differences between UC and the state university and colleges are in determining full-time equivalent (FTE) students, and in designating students as lower division or upper division undergraduates. The glossary of enrollment terms designed by the staff of the Postsecondary Education Commission is discussed and recommendations for improving the budget proposal process are offered. (LBH)

Resolution 25-76

Concerning Recommendations For Commonality of Enrollment Related Terms for the University of California and the California State University and Colleges

WHEREAS, Assembly Bill 557 directs the California Postsecondary Education Commission ". . . to develop uniform standards and criteria for reporting the actual and estimated student enrollment at the University of California and at the California State University and Colleges," and

WHEREAS, Assembly Bill 557 calls for such standards and criteria to be "uniform for the two segments to the extent feasible and desirable, so as to facilitate comparisons of the costs and needs of the two segments," and

WHEREAS, Commission staff has reviewed present terminology with representatives of both senior segments, and

WHEREAS, The Commission's Standing Committee on Information Systems has voted to recommend to the California Postsecondary Education Commission adoption of staff recommendations for common terminology for both segments; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the California Postsecondary Education Commission recommends commonality of enrollment related terminology and definitions for use both by the University of California and by the California State University and Colleges, as appropriate, as these terms appear in the Commission staff's report, which by reference becomes part of this resolution, and be it further

RESOLVED, That the California Postsecondary Education Commission recommends to the Governor and the Legislature that these commonly defined terms be used for budgetary reporting of enrollments for the 1978-79 budgetary year, and be it further

RESOLVED, That the report be transmitted formally to the Legislature, the Governor, the Board of Regents of the University of California, and to the Trustees of the California State University and Colleges for their consideration.

Adopted
December 13, 1976

Common Enrollment Related Terms for the University of California and the California State University and Colleges

December 13, 1976

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Common Enrollment Related Terms for the University of California and the California State University and Colleges

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Although the overall missions of the California State University and Colleges and the University of California differ, their responsibilities to provide for instruction at the undergraduate and master's level are essentially similar.

2. The level of academic courses and the course credit loads of master's degree students and first year doctoral students within the University of California are similar.

3. Procedures used by the segments for reporting full-time equivalent student enrollments in their budget proposals are dissimilar.

4. Commission staff has not found a valid reason, for the University of California and the California State University and Colleges, for reporting undergraduate, master's and doctoral I FTE enrollments in a dissimilar manner.

   RECOMMENDATION

   Commission staff recommends that the University of California and the California State University and Colleges, in presenting budget proposals, submit FTE enrollment statistics for undergraduate, master's and doctoral I students in each of two formats: (1) by level of instruction, and (2) by level of student.

5. Although the University of California and the California State University and Colleges cooperate in joint doctoral programs, instruction at the doctoral II level is primarily a function of the University. Professional level instruction, as defined in Appendix B, page four, is exclusive to the University. Students at these levels utilize institutional resources in a different manner than do students at other levels. Formal course credits are not as accurate a measure of the students' utilization of resources as is the case for students at the undergraduate, master's and doctoral I levels.

   RECOMMENDATION

   Commission staff recommends that student credit units generated by doctoral II and professional students be deleted from calculations of FTE student enrollment both by level of instruction and by level of student. The Full-Time Equivalency of doctoral II and professional students for budgetary reporting purposes, should continue to be based on a student's rate of progress to the degree relative to the "normal" rate for students at the doctoral II or professional level. The FTE values should be one of the following: 0.00, 0.25, 0.50, 0.75, 1.00.

6. Undergraduate students are classified as either lower division or upper division. Traditionally, and currently in the majority of states, institutions have classified students based upon completion of half of the credit units required for the baccalaureate. Institutions on the quarter system, including all campuses of the University and seven campuses of the State University and Colleges, generally require 180 units for degree completion, although in some instances there are factors which may necessitate the completion of credit units beyond this general requirement, e.g., acceptability of transfer units in the major, change of major, one year full-time residency requirement, five year baccalaureate programs. Half of 180 units is 90 units. The California State University and Colleges classifies students for reporting purposes as either lower division or upper division based on 90 quarter units. The University of California reports students as either lower division or upper division based on 84 student credit units.

7. Unless both segments define student level in the same manner, no comparisons of student credit distribution, Full-Time Equivalency, or lower/upper division student mix can be made.

RECOMMENDATION

Commission staff recommends a common accounting procedure for reporting undergraduate enrollment on quarter system campuses of the University of California and the California State University and Colleges as follows:

lower division	*0.0 - 89.9 units*
upper division	*90 units*

8. Dissimilar terms are used by the Department of Finance in displaying enrollments for the University of California and the California State University and Colleges in the Governor's Budget. Additionally, when the same term is used, it has different meanings for each segment.

RECOMMENDATION

Commission staff recommends common terms and uses of terms for reporting enrollments in the Governor's Budget. For enrollment in the year prior to the year in which the budget is presented, the term ACTUAL should be used. For current year estimates of enrollment, staff recommends the term ESTIMATED. The legislatively mandated enrollment support level for the current budget year should be reported as BUDGETED. For the budget request year, staff recommends the term PROPOSED.

BACKGROUND

Enrollment is one of the bases by which the state funds its segments of higher education. Different assumptions and calculation methodologies exist, however, between the State University and Colleges and the University in determining the enrollment statistics which are reported for budgetary purposes. Several studies have been done to address this problem of noncomparability in enrollment and funding methodologies between the two senior segments.

State-level policy framers and decision makers have been hampered in the past by lack of comparability in information used to describe postsecondary education. This problem is not limited to California. Recognizing the situation as national in scope, both the National Center for Education Statistics of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems of the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education have been working for the past eight years to develop and implement a common terminology among institutions and among the states as a step in the direction of developing comparable information. Although institutions have generally accepted several products of these two organizations, i.e., the Higher Education General Information Survey Taxonomy of Instructional Disciplines, and the Program Classification Structure, it is safe to say that few institutions or states have implemented these products in the same manner.

Federal publications would lead the reader to believe a great deal of comparability exists in data submitted by 3,000+ institutions across the nation through the annual Higher Education General Information Survey, (HEGIS). All institutions report, for example, their "Full-Time," "Part-Time," "Full-Time Equivalent of Part-Time," and "Total Credits Enrolled For" categories of enrollment on the HEGIS "Fall Enrollment and Compliance Report of Institutions of Higher Education." However, the definitions of these terms are left to the institutions.[1]

Later, in 1969, the Joint Committee on Higher Education of the California Legislature published a report entitled The Challenge of Achievement, in which it was noted that over twenty different definitions of "student"

---

1. Note the HEGIS definition of Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Enrollment of Part-Time Students is:

   (1) Use a method already employed in your institution to compute FTE's for some other purpose, (OR)

   (2) Sum the credit hours for part-time students and divide by the normal full-time credit-hour load. Note: Divide by normal, or average full-time load, not by the minimum full-time load. For most institutions, this will be 15 credit-hours (not 12), (OR)

   (3) Assign a fractional value of full-time to each part-time student, appropriate to your institution, such as 1/4, 1/3, or 1/2. Remember that a student taking 3/4 (75%) or more of a normal full-time load should be classified as a full-time student.

were in use by various institutions and agencies in State government at that time.[2] The report suggested that there existed three principal categories in which students could and should be defined: (1) "students" or "individual student" (comparable to the present definition of "headcount students"), meaning any individual enrolled regardless of the number of units for which s/he was enrolled; (2) "full-time student," one taking at least 12 (twelve) units, plus all University graduate students; and (3) "full-time equivalent student," a combination of full-time and part-time students derived by dividing total student credit units by a measure of full-time load.[3] Even though the report used these categories for defining students, it was noted that since both the University and the State University and Colleges used different methodologies for accounting for full-time equivalent students, resulting measures were not exactly comparable for certain detailed purposes.[4]

The issue of comparability of information came to light again in 1971 when the Coordinating Council for Higher Education was directed by the Legislature (Senate Concurrent Resolution 105) to conduct a study on the Costs of Instruction in California's Public Higher Education. Data from the University and the State University and Colleges were reported to the Coordinating Council both by "level of student" (a measure of student progress towards a degree) and by "level of instruction" (a measure based on courses in which students are enrolled). A major goal of the report was to achieve comparability in data and terminology, while attempting to isolate and describe variations in accounting and budgetary systems.

The Costs of Instruction report noted that techniques used for allocation of instructional expenditures by "level of instruction" and by "level of student" are not comparable. Both senior segments reported graduate instruction by graduate regular instruction and graduate independent study; yet differences still remained between the segments in their definition of workload constituting a full-time equivalent student, with the major differences occuring at the graduate I and graduate II levels.

The report found that the proportion of courses taken by lower and upper division students at different levels of instruction were approximately the same for students enrolled at both the University of California and the California State University and Colleges.[5] However, the proportions

---

2. Joint Committee on Higher Education of the California Legislature, The Challenge of Achievement, 1969, p. 30.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid.

5. Coordinating Council for Higher Education, The Cost of Instruction in California Public Higher Education, February 1974.

varied at the graduate level. At the University, the graduate student enrolled for the majority of his course work at the graduate level, while at the State University and Colleges, the graduate student enrolled for the majority of his course work at the undergraduate level.

Due to these various differences and practices, a number of projects dealing with the problem of noncomparability in definitions between California's senior segments of higher education were undertaken. One of the most notable, but never completed projects, was known as the Higher Education Budget Project. A select group of individuals from the segments and from several State agencies served on the Task Force for the project. During its first policy meeting in February 1972, the following first phase objective was adopted:

> "Select for usage by the University and the State University and Colleges an interim and compatible faculty budgeting approach to develop and present the 1973-74 instructional budget to the Department of Finance and the Legislature."[6]

The following limitation was one of three placed on the first phase objective:

> "That essential common definitions or acceptable conventions (e.g., faculty, students, etc.) will be established for initial use within the context of 'faculty staff and instructional budgeting' only. In other words, usage of these definitions would not be appropriate for other purposes."[7]

Many short reports of the Higher Education Budget Project Task Force noted the need for comparable information. In addition, the Task Force felt that instructional program needs should be determined by enrollments. This could be attained by developing comparable definitions of enrollment at both the instructional level and student level. The Task Force discussed advantages and disadvantages of both measures -- level of instruction and level of student -- and applied both measures to several complex budget formulas. No final resolution was reached prior to dissolution of the Task Force.

Since 1972, several additional studies related to enrollment have also noted that terms and their applications have differed between the University and the State University and Colleges. The most recent legislative expression of concern regarding either comparability, commonality or uniformity was AB 557 (Kapiloff), signed into law in September of 1975. It directs the California Postsecondary Education Commission to:

---

6. Taken from the Narrative Report of the Higher Education Budget Project Task Force, February, 1972.

7. Ibid.

". . . develop standards and criteria for reporting the actual and estimated student enrollment at the University of California and at the California State University and Colleges. Such standards shall be uniform for the two segments to the extent feasible." (See Appendix A)

It was the intent of the Legislature that commencing with the 1977-78 fiscal year, budgetary requests and appropriations based upon student enrollment consider the utilization of the standards recommended by the Commission. Nonuniformity in current terminology and definitions contribute to making comparisons between programs and institutions in the two segments improper and unreliable. It is the intent of this study to provide a common terminology as an assistance to those people concerned with developing more reliable means of comparing segmental enrollments. The principal differences between the University of California and the California State University and Colleges are in determining full-time equivalent (FTE) students, and in designating students as lower division or upper division undergraduates.

In May of 1976, representatives of the systemwide administrations of the two segments met with staff of the Commission to discuss similarities and differences between definitions of enrollment related terms. Subsequent to this meeting Commission staff met with staff of the Department of Finance and of the Legislative Analyst's office. As a result of these meetings, Commission staff compiled a glossary of enrollment related terms as used by the University of California and by the California State University and Colleges. Commission staff then proposed definitions for these terms. (Appendix B)

The Glossary

As a first step in providing the means to draw valid comparisons between the University and the State University and Colleges, staff of the Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) designed a glossary of enrollment related terms (Appendix B). A variety of sources were used to select terms which staff felt needed either better definition and/or a higher level of comparability between both senior segments. Sources reviewed in the selection process included: segmental data element dictionaries, the Governor's Budget, the Legislative Analyst's "Analysis of the Budget Bill," and the newly designed "enrollment file" data element dictionary of the Commission's Information System.

With the assistance of representatives of the University and the State University and Colleges, and after Commission staff reviewed over 100 terms and definitions, a draft glossary, containing comparable definitions for 12 (twelve) primary enrollment related terms was circulated among staff at Systemwide Administration Offices of the University of California and the California State University and Colleges for comment. The glossary displays proposed Commission staff definitions for enrollment related terms, comparable for both segments, where comparability is judged by Commission staff to be both feasible and desirable. The intent of the glossary is

to illustrate:

(1) the comparability based on existing definitions;

(2) computational procedures based on similarities and differences in existing definitions; and/or

(3) the adoption of new terms and definitions for reporting student enrollment.

Discussion of Enrollment Terms

Many problems were encountered while attempting to develop comparable definitions of terms, e.g., several terms are used by the University which are not used by the State University and Colleges, and vice versa. In addition, a number of terms appearing in the Governor's Budget are not used by either segment, and when terms were the same for both segments, the definitions differed. Although several terms and definitions were compatible, the applications or uses of these terms differed between the two senior segments. Therefore, an apparent incomparability in student accounting procedures needed resolution. (For example, the University uses 84 1/2 quarter student credit units as a standard for designating a student as upper division; the State University and Colleges uses 90 quarter student credit units).

Staff engaged in a detailed review of noncomparability in terminology by doing one of the following: (1) adopting one of the segmental definitions; or (2) by modifying an existing definition; or (3) by proposing a new definition. Staff recommended a comparable definition for each of the following terms:

- Headcount Enrollment
- Average Term Enrollment - Headcount
- Average Term Enrollment - FTE
- Undergraduate Full-Time Equivalent
- Graduate Full-Time Equivalent
- Level of Instruction
- Level of Student
- Weekly Student Contact Hours
- Full-Time Undergraduate Student
- Full-Time Graduate Student
- Part-Time Undergraduate Student
- Part-Time Graduate Student

Enrollment definitions for counting students are established for a variety of segmental purposes, and many definitions are based on differing philosophies and missions at the segmental level. Commission staff feels, however, that commonality in terminology can be attained for both the undergraduate and graduate students for both level of student and level of instruction, and therefore, recommends adopting definitions of terms included in the "Glossary of Enrollment Related Terms for the University of California and the California State University and Colleges."

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It has been difficult in the past for members of the Legislature to evaluate budgetary support and capital outlay needs of the University of California and the California State University and Colleges. One source of this difficulty has been the lack of comparability in enrollment terms. Even when the same terms have been adopted, e.g., Full-Time Equivalent Student, the computational basis for reporting the data has been different. In order to bring some degree of comparability to discussion of enrollment, AB 557 (Kapiloff) was chaptered into law in 1975. The law directs the California Postsecondary Education Commission to:

> ". . . develop standards and criteria for reporting the actual and estimated student enrollment at the University of California and at the California State University and Colleges. Such standards and criteria shall be uniform for the two segments to the extent feasible and desirable, so as to facilitate comparisons of the costs and needs of the two segments." (Appendix A)

The phrase "to the extent feasible and desirable" served as an ever present reminder during the course of the present study, that the University and the State University and Colleges differ both in mission and in administration. These differences are most pronounced at the graduate level. The Commission staff determined that to recommend comparability for full-time equivalent students (FTE) definitions across all levels of graduate students would obscure the unique mission of the University. With this exception, however, most other terms and computational procedures used in enrollment statements applicable to undergraduate students, master's degree students, and doctoral I students can be reported in a comparable manner.

Categories of students common to both segments, and unique to the University are listed below. Comparable terminology is possible, of course, only in those areas common to both segments.

Common Student Categories

Undergraduate
- Lower Division
  - Freshman
  - Sophomore
- Upper Division
  - Junior
  - Senior

Graduate
- Master's

University Unique Student Categories

Doctoral I

Doctoral II

Professional

Enrollment terms referred to most frequently in budgetary discussions are listed and defined in Appendix B. Principal differences between the segments which could not be resolved among segmental representatives and Commission staff were (1) the student credit unit determination designating undergraduate students as freshmen, sophomores, juniors, seniors, lower division and upper division, and (2) the FTE student computational procedures.

Undergraduate - Lower Division/Upper Division Status

An undergraduate academic degree generally calls for successful completion of 120 - 124 semester, or 180 quarter credit units. Traditionally, across the nation, students who have completed less than half of the total number of units required for the degree are considered lower division students, while those who have completed half or more are considered upper division students. Although the California State University and Colleges follows this pattern for designating students by level, the University of California does not do so.

Present
Undergraduate Student Classification, Quarter Units

Student Level	CSUC	UC
Lower Division	0.0 - 89.9	0.0 - 83.5
Freshman	0.0 - 44.9	0.0 - 40.0
Sophomore	45.0 - 89.9	40.5 - 83.5
Upper Division	90.0 +	84.0 +
Junior	90.0 - 134.9	84.0 - 134.5
Senior	135.0 +	135.0 +

As a consequence of this dissimilarity, the University would appear to have a greater proportion of its undergraduate student body in upper division due to a lower student unit requirement for upper division classification, than would be the case were the University to use a "half of total credit units required for graduation" system. Unless

both segments define level of student in the same manner, no comparisons of student credit unit distribution, full-time equivalent students or upper division/lower division mix can be made between the University and the State University and Colleges.

Basic to any attempt at achieving comparability in enrollment related terms, is that student level must be defined identically. Commission staff recommends adoption by the University of the following classification system for budgetary reporting purposes:

Proposed
Undergraduate Student Classification
Quarter Student Credit Units

Lower Division	0.0 - 89.9
Freshman	0.0 - 44.9
Sophomore	45.0 - 89.9
Upper Division	≥ 90.0
Junior	90.0 - 134.9
Senior	≥ 135.0

Enrollment Estimating

AB 557 directed the Commission to develop uniform standards and criteria for reporting actual and estimated student enrollment within the two senior segments. "Actual" enrollment refers to past enrollment figures - something which has already been accounted for and considered an historic fact. "Estimated" enrollment refers to an approximation of something unknown. Current year enrollment as it appears in the Governor's Budget must be estimated inasmuch as census data for the fall term have not been verified by the time the budget proposal is presented. Estimating current enrollments can be done in a number of ways, but usually includes taking recent historic trends into consideration (See Appendix C for a further discussion).

Enrollment projections are estimates made by both the University and the State University and Colleges, and by the Department of Finance. The methodology followed by the Department of Finance and the two senior segments are quite similar. One-year fall headcount enrollment projections are prepared by the Department of Finance, Population Research Unit, and forwarded to each segment. These projections are then modified by the segments in cooperation with the Department of Finance based upon segmental policy considerations, recent experiences of the campuses, and segmental conversion of headcount enrollment to FTE enrollment. Ten-year projections are updated annually based upon trends evidenced in the year prior to the year in which the projections are made.

Inasmuch as the methodologies for estimating projected enrollments of the two segments are essentially the same, Commission staff recommends no change. However, it should be recognized that although methodologies for estimating headcount enrollment are essentially the same, conversion of these estimates to FTE enrollments differ substantially between the two segments. The California State University and Colleges calculates FTE in reference to the level of instruction as well as by level of student. The University of California, on the other hand, calculates FTE based on the class level of students.

It is the recommendation of Commission staff that both actual enrollments and enrollment estimates of FTE students be reported by level of instruction for all students other than doctoral II and professional students, and by level of student for all student levels including doctoral II and professional students.

Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTE)

Full-Time Equivalency is a measure of enrollment which can be calculated by either (1) dividing the total number of student credit units by some standard student load measure for a specific period of time; or (2) by assigning a rate of progress by a student towards a degree (0.00, 0.25, 0.50, 0.75, 1.00 FTE at the graduate level). In using either methodology, FTE becomes a principal element in determining the need for institutional resources. Additional FTE faculty requested by an institution, for example, is based on the number of additional FTE students expected to enroll in the forthcoming budget year.

Students are classified by level of progress towards a degree, i.e., freshmen and sophomores (lower division), juniors and seniors (upper division), and master's, professional, doctoral I and doctoral II students (graduate students). Courses, however, are classified by level of instruction, i.e., lower division, upper division, or graduate. Students generate credit units when enrolled in classes. Lower division courses are taken on occasion by upper division and graduate students, and conversely lower division students take on occasion upper division and even graduate coursework.

Tables 1 and 2 illustrate the percent distribution of student credits by both level of instruction and level of student.

Table 1 distributes total credit units generated by level of instruction, e.g., credit units generated from all lower division courses distributed by the level of students registered for these credit units. The State University and Colleges reports that of all lower division course credits taken by students, 56.68% were generated by lower division students; 40.14% by upper division students; and 3.18% by graduate students.

Table 1

Percent Distribution of Undergraduate/Graduate Student Credit Units by Level of Student[1]

Level of Instruction	Student Level: Lower Division		Upper Division		Graduate I		Graduate II	
	UC	CSUC	UC	CSUC	UC	CSUC	UC	CSUC
Lower Division	65.92	56.68	33.10	40.14	0.59	3.18	0.39	N/A
Upper Division	15.35	12.13	78.33	73.35	3.86	14.51	2.46	N/A
Graduate	0.20	0.53	3.02	5.87	32.87	93.60	64.00	N/A

1. University of California 1974-75; the California State University and Colleges data, 1975-76.

Table 2

Percent Distribution of Student Credit Units by Level of Instruction[1]

Level of Student	Instruction Level[1]: Lower Division		Upper Division		Graduate	
	UC	CSUC	UC	CSUC	UC	CSUC
Lower Division	79.41	77.74	20.50	22.13	0.09	0.13
Upper Division	27.35	28.92	71.73	70.30	0.92	0.78
Masters	3.56	8.00	26.68	48.61	69.76	43.39
Professional	1.14	N/A	12.29	N/A	86.57	N/A
Graduate I	3.23	N/A	19.66	N/A	77.10	N/A
Graduate II	1.73	N/A	8.57	N/A	89.69	N/A

1. University of California data, 1974-1975; the California State University and Colleges data 1975-76.

Table 2 reverses the accounting procedure, and identifies all student credit units generated by students at each level, regardless of the level of the courses. Looking at student credit units generated by lower division students within the State University and Colleges, we find that 77.74% of their units are at the lower division instructional level, while 22.13% are at the upper division level of instruction, and 0.13% at the graduate level of instruction.

Lower division and upper division students at both the University and at the State University and Colleges tend to follow similar patterns in the level of courses for which they enroll.

Tables 3, 4, 5, and 6 display the actual number of student credit units generated by level of instruction and level of student for both segments, rather than percentage breakouts as in Tables 1 and 2. These tables are intended as a further display of significance for using one accounting procedure as opposed to another in deriving and reporting FTE students.

Table 3

Distribution of Student Credit Units
by Level of Instruction and Headcount Enrollment

the California State University and Colleges 1975-76

Level of Student	Level of Instruction			Total	Term Headcount Enrollment
	Lower Division	Upper Division	Graduate		
Lower Division	2,330,010	663,255	4,005	2,997,270	75,584
Upper Division	1,649,745	4,010,040	44,415	5,704,200	156,380
Masters	130,680	793,485	708,255	1,632,420	71,465
Professional	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Graduate I	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Graduate II	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
TOTAL	4,110,435	5,466,780	756,675	10,333,890	303,429

Table 4

Distribution of Student Credit Units
by Level of Instruction and Term Headcount Enrollment
University of California 1974-75

Level of Student	Level of Instruction			Total	Term Headcount Enrollment
	Lower Division	Upper Division	Graduate		
Lower Division	397,598	102,641	450	500,689	34,313
Upper Division	199,644	523,600	6,716	729,960	50,470
Masters	2,907	21,793	56,983	81,683	7,931
Professional	840	9,029	63,601	73,470	5,348
Graduate I	663	4,030	15,802	20,495	1,887
Graduate II	1,507	7,450	77,947	86.904	9,457
TOTAL	603,154[1]	668,585	221,462	1,493,201	109,406

1. Total imprecise due to rounding.

Table 5

Distribution of Student Credit Units
by Level of Student

The California State University and Colleges 1975-76

Level of Instruction	Level of Student						Total
	Lower Division	Upper Division	Masters	Professional	Graduate I	Graduate II	
Lower Division	1,698,852	1,203,103.5	95,313	N/A	N/A	N/A	2,997,270
Upper Division	691,920	4,184,031	827,679	N/A	N/A	N/A	5,704,200
Graduate	8,652	95,823	1,527,945	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,632,420
TOTAL	2,399,424	5,482,957.5	2,450,937	N/A	N/A	N/A	10,333,890

Table 6

Distribution of Student Credit Units
by Level of Student
University of California 1974-75

Level of Instruction	Level of Student						Total
	Lower Division	Upper Division	Masters	Professional	Graduate I	Graduate II	
Lower Division	397,599	199,644	2,907	840	663	1,507	603,154
Upper Division	102,628	523,702	21,791	9,027	4,012	7,421	668,585
Graduate	443	6,688	56,987	63,601	15,812	78,132	221,462
TOTAL	500,687	729,960	81,684	73,467	20,467	87,060	1,493,201

The total number of student credit units generated by students is the same, whether identified by level of instruction or by level of student. However, a considerable difference in enrollment reporting by lower division, upper division, and graduate division is evident as a result of using one accounting procedure rather than another. Table 7 below converts semester student credit units generated by students within the California State University and Colleges to quarter student credit units in order to illustrate the FTE calculation in a similar manner for both senior segments of public higher education.

Table 7

Distribution of Student Credit Units and Number of Full-Time Equivalent Students by Level of Student and Level of Instruction[1]

the California State University and Colleges 1975-76

	Total Student Credit Units by Level of Instruction	FTE by Level of Instruction	Total Student Credit Units by Level of Student	FTE by Level of Student
Lower Division	4,110,435	91,343	2,997,270	66,606
Upper Division	5,466,780	121,484	5,704,200	126,760
Master/Graduate	756,675	16,815	1,632,420	36,276
TOTAL	10,333,890	229,642	10,333,890	229,642

1. Annualized FTE = SCU ÷ 45 quarter units.

When students are classified by their progress towards a degree, e.g., level of student, there are fewer lower division FTE students within the California State University and Colleges than in the case when FTE students are calculated based upon the total student credit units generated at the lower division course level.

At the University a similar occurence is noted (See Tables 8 and 9). After subtracting the number of student credit units generated by professional and doctoral II students from the total number of student credit units at the lower division, upper division, and graduate levels of instruction,[8] the FTE distribution by two accounting methods differs substantially.

The undergraduate mix of FTE students by level of instruction within the California State University and Colleges is 42.9% lower division, 57.1% upper division. The undergraduate mix of FTE students by level of student is 34.4% lower division, 65.6% upper division. The accounting procedure also makes a considerable difference when reporting the undergraduate/graduate FTE student mix. If reporting by level of instruction, 92.7% of the FTE enrollment is at the undergraduate level and 7.3% is at the graduate level. On the other hand, only 84.2% of the students are undergraduates and the graduate population doubles to 15.8%, when accounting by level of student. Although there may be justification for reporting FTE by level of student at the professional and graduate II level, instructional costs are more directly influenced by the level of the course being taught, rather than by the level of student who may be registered for the course.

Using student credit units as the basis for determining FTE is appropriate for reporting enrollments at the undergraduate, master's, and first doctoral student levels. At the professional and second doctoral level, however, students within the University of California are engaged in research and teaching. These activities are essential to their program, but do not generate student credit units. Were second doctoral level FTE to be calculated from student credit units, an inadequate picture would be presented of the resources expended on behalf of these students. The University currently assesses progress of these students toward their degree objective, and assigns an FTE value to the student of 0.0, 0.25, 0.50, 0.75, or 1.00. Commission staff recommends continuation of this practice at the professional and second doctoral levels. For those areas in which the two segments are most similar, i.e., undergraduate and master's and doctoral I, Commission staff favors budgetary reporting of FTE students by level of instruction.

---

8. Staff recommends that the University continue with its present practice of assigning a role of progress toward a degree of 0.00, 0.25, 0.50, 0.75, or 1.00 FTE for professional and doctoral II students. Therefore, to avoid duplication in accounting for FTE by both level of student and level of instruction, number of student credit units generated by professional and doctoral II students has been subtracted at the lower division, upper division, and graduate levels of instruction student credit unit totals.

Table 8

Distribution of Student Credit Units
by Level of Instruction

University of California 1974-75

Level of Instruction	Total SCU by Level of Instruction	FTE by Level of Instruction
Lower Division[1]	600,776	40,052
Upper Division[2]	652,110	43,470
Graduate A[3]	79,912	6,659
Graduate B[4]	160,403	14,185
TOTAL	1,493,201	104,366[5]

1. Total number student credit units minus the number of student credit units taken by professional and doctoral II students at this level of instruction; (603,154 - 2,378 = 600,776).
2. Total number student credit units minus the number of student credit units taken by professional and doctoral II students at this level of instruction; (668,585 - 16,475 = 652,110).
3. Total number student credit units minus the number of student credit units taken by professional and doctoral II students at this level of instruction; (221,462 - 141,550 = 79,912).
4. The number of student credit units generated by professional and doctoral II students is subtracted from the total number of student credit units generated at the lower division, upper division, and graduate levels since professional and doctoral II FTE is calculated by an assigned percentage of Full-Time Equivalency, i.e., 0.00, 0.25, 0.50, 0.75, or 1.00. If the number of credit units generated by professional and doctoral II students was included in the totals number of student credit units at the three levels of instruction, double counting of FTE would ensue: once at the level of instruction and once at the level of student calculation.
5. FTE totals are dissimilar due to differing accounting procedures calculated by either level of instruction or level of student.

Table 9

Distribution of Student Credit Units and
Number of Full-Time Equivalent Student by Level of Student

University of California 1974-75

Level of Student	Total SCU by Level of Student	FTE by Level of Student
Lower Division	500,687	33,379
Upper Division	729,960	48,664
Masters	81,684	6,807
Professional	73,467	5,138
Graduate I	20,467	1,706
Graduate II	86,936	9,047
TOTAL	1,493,201	104,741[5]

Governor's Budget Terminology

The Department of Finance, in displaying segmental budgets in the Governor's Budget, uses several identical terms for both segments, but with different meanings for each segment. Among terms appearing in the 1976-77 Governor's Budget were the following:

ACTUAL 1974-75 This term had the same meaning in both segmental budget presentations. "Actual" referred to an accepted historic reported enrollment figure for the year prior to the year in which the budget proposal was being submitted.

BUDGETED 1975-76 As applied to in the University of California budget proposal, this term referred to the enrollment support figure approved for the current year by the previous year's Budget Act. It is neither the actual enrollment for the year, nor an estimate of that enrollment. The California State University and Colleges used the term "Budgeted 1976-77." Hence, the term "budgeted" refers to the projected or proposed enrollments in the forthcoming year for which they were seeking legislative and gubernatorial support. In presenting segmental budgets, the Department of Finance had used the term "budgeted" for both segments, but in reference to different years and with different meanings.

REVISED 1975-76 and *ESTIMATED 1975-76* These were dissimilar terms, with identical meanings, applied by the Department of Finance to the University of California and to the State University and Colleges respectively. The terms were intended to convey the segments' best estimates of how many students were enrolled on census date in the fall term, 1975.

PROPOSED 1976-77 and *BUDGETED 1976-77* These terms were used respectively for the University and the State University and Colleges. These dissimilar terms, however, had similar meanings, viz., the segments' projected enrollment for the forthcoming year for which they were seeking budgetary support.

Commission staff recommends that past, budget supported, present, and projected enrollment terms and definitions of these terms as presented in the Governor's Budget proposal be identical for both segments. For the year prior to the year in which the budget proposal is presented, staff recommends retention of the term *ACTUAL* as a report of accepted historic fact.

The current year support budget enrollment figures should be identified as *BUDGETED*. As a statement reflecting the segments' best judgment of current year enrollments, staff recommends use of the term *ESTIMATED*.

For the budget request year, Commission staff recommends the term *PROPOSED*. This figure should reflect projections of recent enrollment trends, estimates of the number of students who will enroll, and policy considerations of the two segments as an enrollment base for budgetary support.

Assembly Bill 557 (Kapiloff)

September 1975

APPENDIX A

CHAPTER 1098

An act relating to budgeting by public institutions of higher education.

[Approved by Governor September 27, 1975. Filed with Secretary of State September 27, 1975.]

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 557, Kapiloff. U.C. and CSUC: budgets.

The law does not currently mandate any specified method of reporting student enrollment at the University of California and the California State University and Colleges for state budgetary purposes.

This bill expresses the Legislature's intent that, in appropriating funds for the support of public higher education, the Legislature have available to it factual comparative data concerning student enrollment at the two segments of public higher education. The bill directs the California Postsecondary Education Commission to develop uniform standards and criteria for reporting and estimating student enrollment, and requires that, commencing with fiscal year 1977-78, budgetary requests and appropriations therefor which are based upon student enrollment, consider the utilization of the uniform standards and criteria developed and recommended by the California Postsecondary Education Commission.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Enrollment data are a major factor in evaluating budgetary support and capital outlay needs of the University of California and the California State University and Colleges. Enrollment comparisons among the various segments of higher education are useful only if enrollment data are based upon similar criteria. It is essential that the Legislature, in appropriating public funds for support of the University of California and the California State University and Colleges, have available to it factual comparative data concerning student enrollment and the cost of education among the various segments of public higher education.

SEC. 2. The California Postsecondary Education Commission shall develop standards and criteria for reporting the actual and estimated student enrollment at the University of California and at the California State University and Colleges. Such standards and criteria shall be uniform for the two segments to the extent feasible and desirable, so as to facilitate comparisons of the costs and needs of the two segments. Commencing with the 1977-78 fiscal year, all budgetary requests, and appropriations therefor, which are based in whole or in part upon student enrollment, or estimates thereof, shall consider utilization of the uniform standards and criteria developed and recommended by the California Postsecondary Education Commission.

Glossary of Enrollment Related Terms for the University of California and the California State University and Colleges

APPENDIX B

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY
EDUCATION COMMISSION

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DEFINITIONS
TO ENROLLMENT RELATED TERMS

Headcount Enrollment

Headcount enrollments at both the undergraduate and graduate levels are defined as the number of students enrolled for credit as of the census date of each term.

Average Term Enrollment - Headcount

Sum of term enrollments divided by the number of regular terms in academic year, (or college year if including a state-supported summer term).

Average Term Enrollment - FTE

Sum of term Full-Time Equivalency enrollment, at either level of instruction or level of student, divided by the number of regular terms in the academic year, (or college year if including a state-supported summer term).

Undergraduate FTE

The Full-Time Equivalency of an undergraduate is derived by taking the normal amount of total credit units needed to attain a baccalaureate, divided by the number of terms normally required for completion of a baccalaureate.

For both the University of California and the California State University and Colleges:

- Term Undergraduate FTE; Level of Student = 15 student credit units taken by an undergraduate student.
- Term Undergraduate FTE; Level of Instruction = 15 student credit units taken at the undergraduate level of instruction.
- Annual Undergraduate FTE; Level of Student = 30 semester or 45 quarter units taken by an undergraduate student.
- Annual Undergraduate FTE; Level of Instruction = 30 semester or 45 quarter units taken at the undergraduate level of instruction.

Graduate FTE

The Full-Time Equivalency of master's, post-baccalaureate, and doctoral I graduates is derived by taking the normal amount of total credit units needed to attain a master's or its equivalent, divided by the number of terms normally required for completion of a master's or its equivalent.

The Full-Time Equivalency for first professional and doctoral II graduates is derived by an assessed percentage of full-timeness, i.e., 1.00, 0.75, 0.50, 0.25, 0.00 FTE.

For the California State University and Colleges:

- Term Graduate FTE, Master's and Post-Baccalaureate; Level of Student = 15 semester or quarter student credit units taken by a graduate student.
- Term Graduate FTE, Master's and Post-Baccalaureate; Level of Instruction = 15 semester or quarter student credit units taken at the graduate level of instruction.
- Annual Graduate FTE, Master's and Post-Baccalaureate; Level of Student = 30 semester or 45 quarter student credit units taken by a graduate student.
- Annual Graduate FTE, Master's and Post-Baccalaureate; Level of Instruction = 30 semester or 45 quarter student credit units taken at the graduate level of instruction.

For the University of California:

- Term Graduate FTE, Master's and Post-Baccalaureate; Level of Student = 12 quarter student credit units taken by a graduate student.
- Term Graduate FTE, Master's and Post-Baccalaureate; Level of Instruction = 12 quarter student credit units taken at the graduate level of instruction.
- Annual Graduate FTE, Master's and Post-Baccalaureate; Level of Student = 36 quarter student credit units taken by a graduate student.
- Annual Graduate FTE, Master's and Post-Baccalaureate; Level of Instruction = 36 quarter student credit units taken at the graduate level of instruction.
- Term Graduate FTE, Doctoral I; Level of Student = 12 quarter student credit units taken by a graduate student.
- Term Graduate FTE, Doctoral I; Level of Instruction = 12 quarter student credit units taken at the graduate level of instruction.
- Annual Graduate FTE, Doctoral I; Level of Student = 36 quarter student credit units taken by a graduate student.
- Annual Graduate FTE, Doctoral I; Level of Instruction = 36 quarter student credit units taken at the graduate level of instruction.
- Term Graduate FTE, Professional and Doctoral II; Level of Student = a percent of full-timeness towards a doctorate or professional degree taken by a graduate student in a term.[1]

---

1. Percent of full-timeness is defined as: 1.00, 0.75, 0.50, 0.25, 0.00 FTE.

- Term Graduate FTE, Professional and Doctoral II; Level of Instruction is equivalent to term graduate FTE level of student.

- Annual Graduate FTE, Professional and Doctoral II; Level of Student = a percent of full-timeness toward a doctorate, taken by a graduate student in one academic year.

- Annual Graduate FTE, Professional and Doctoral II; Level of Instruction is equivalent to annual graduate FTE level of student.

Level of Instruction

The level of offering for instructional courses. The following three categories constitute level of instruction:

- Lower Division - course numbering system usually associated with the first two years of undergraduate study.

- Upper Division - course numbering system usually associated with the last two years of undergraduate study.

- Graduate (and Professional) - course numbering system usually associated with post-baccalaureate students in graduate or professional programs.

Level of Student

The total accredited work by a student which reflects his level of progress towards a degree, diploma, certificate or credential.

Included are the following categories:

Undergraduate Student

A student who does not hold an acceptable baccalaureate degree or its equivalent.

- Lower Division: Includes students who are enrolled in programs leading to an associate degree (including three year associate degree programs) or in undergraduate occupational or vocational programs of three year duration or less leading to a certificate or diploma; and other undergraduate students who have earned less than fifty percent of the number of academic credits or program requirements normally required for a bachelor's degree (typically freshmen or sophomores).

Lower Division: 59.9 or less semester units
89.9 or less quarter units

Freshman: 0.0 - 29.9 semester units
0.0 - 44.9 quarter units

Sophomore: 30 - 59.9 semester units
45 - 89.9 quarter units

- Upper Division: Includes all undergraduate students who are not enrolled in associate degree or occupational-vocational certificate programs and who have successfully completed fifty percent or more of the academic credits or program requirements normally required for a bachelor's degree (typically categorized as juniors and seniors). Includes students in years three, four, and five of five-year bachelor's degree programs.

  Upper Division: 60 or more semester units
  90 or more quarter units

  Junior: 60 - 89.9 semester units
  90 - 134.9 quarter units
  Senior: 90 or more semester units
  135 or more quarter units

Post-Baccalaureate Student

Includes students who have returned after completion of at least a bachelor's degree to achieve further educational objectives and who are not enrolled in a graduate degree program.

Graduate Student

Graduate students are those students holding a bachelor's degree or its equivalent who are enrolled in a graduate degree program.

- Master's: Includes students enrolled in a master's degree program.

- Doctoral I: Includes all students who hold a bachelor's degree or the equivalent (or first professional degree) and (a) are enrolled in a doctoral degree program, but have not earned a master's degree and have fewer than the equivalent number of credits normally required for a master's degree, or (b) are enrolled in a special, unclassified, visitor, or non-degree seeking status, or (c) are enrolled in an educational specialist certificate, degree, or coordinate intermediate level degree program, whether or not they possess an earned master's degree.

- Doctoral II: Includes all students who are enrolled in a doctoral degree program (excluding "professional") except those who are doctoral I students by the definition provided above.

- Professional: Includes all students who are enrolled in any one of the following "first professional" degree programs: M.D., D.O., L.L.B., or J.D., D.D.S., D.V.M., O.D., B.D., M. Div., Rabbi, Pod.D., P.M. Students enrolled in undergraduate "pre-professional" curricula and students in the first two years (corresponding to the undergraduate freshman and sophomore year) of integrated professional degree programs are lower division, and not first professional students.

Weekly Student Contact Hours

Aggregate of the number of hours spent in class per week by the enrollees in the class.

Full-Time Undergraduate Student

For any given term, a student with twelve or more semester or quarter units attempted on census date.

Full-Time Graduate Student

For any given term, a student with at least 75% of Full-Time Equivalency or 75% of a normal load required to complete a student program or course of study within the normal time.

Part-Time Undergraduate Student

For any given term, a student with less than 12 semester or quarter units attempted on census date.

Part-Time Graduate Student

For any given term, a student with less than 75% of Full-Time Equivalency or less than 75% of a normal load required to complete a student program or course of study within the normal time.

Enrollment Projection in the Department of Finance,

the University of California, and

the California State University and Colleges

APPENDIX C

STATE OF CALIFORNIA EDMUND G. BROWN JR., Govern

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE
SACRAMENTO

August 1, 1976

Dr. Horace Crandell, Principal Higher Education Specialist
Postsecondary Education Commission
1020 Twelfth Street
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Dr. Crandell,

Walter Hollmann has asked me to respond to the questions in your letter of July 26, 1976.

(1) and (2) The Population Research Unit uses two basic demographic methods to project fall headcount enrollment in the University of California and California State University and Colleges systems. With very slight variations the two segments are treated the same methodologically. One method is the student flow model, which uses historical progression rates, continuation rates and projected graduates of California high schools and the other is an age/sex participation model, which uses a history of participation rates and projected California population by age and sex. Currently both segments are projected systemwide only and include fall headcount only, a category which does not appear in the Governor's budget. There is projected "annual average headcount" shown for the UC, and all other enrollment projection tables are expressed in terms of FTE, which we do not project.

All of the projections shown in the Governor's Budget come from the segments. Technically, neither of our fall headcount enrollment projections for the UC or CSUC are used in any of them. For neither system are our updated projections available in time for the budget preparation.

We work with both segments in the preparation of the projections, but especially so with CSUC. The Department of Finance projections are not used directly in the Budget, but as a control factor. We generally have to give approval of the segments projected enrollments.

(3) There is virtually no difference in methodology used in the two segments. There can be different assumptions based on policy considerations. We project graduate students for CSUC but not for UC, for example.

(4) a. "projected enrollment" refers to any future year where there is no hard indicator data.

b. "estimated enrollment" refers to any year where we have some hard indicator data but the actual enrollment was or is not available at the time of the estimate.

(4) c. "budgeted enrollment" would be the budget year enrollment either estimated or projected appearing in the Budget. I know of no common usage of this term, and I suspect that most people using it would mean "budgeted FTE."

(5) Methodologies would be changed if the basic enrollment categories used in budgeting were revised.

Let me know if I can provide any further detail.

Sincerely,

Donald E. Hills

Donald E. Hills, Associate Demographic Analyst
Population Research Unit
1025 P Street, Room 328
Sacramento, CA 95814
916-322-4651

DEH:skh

cc: John G. Harrison

PROSPECTS FOR THE 1970s

New demographic trends and related shifts in the levels of fiscal resources are the primary changes affecting the environment and the planning needs of the University of California in the 1970s.

Enrollment Projections

The University's 1966 and 1969 Academic Plans were based on much higher projections of student enrollment than are currently expected. The earlier projections assumed a continuation of the demographic trends and the pattern of in-migration to California experienced in the 1950s and early 1960s. But the 1970 Census disclosed sharply downward shifts in both the birth rates for the nation as a whole and the in-migration rates for California. The University's Growth Plan Task Force reported in mid-1971 that demographic data indicated that the University would need to grow -- but at a declining rate -- during the 1970s to accommodate future students still in high school or elementary grades, but that growth might cease altogether for a time in the decade of the 1980s. More recent data have indicated the need for scaling enrollment projections downward somewhat further than was done in the Growth Plan Task Force Report.

Tables 1 and 2 show the University's most recent ten-year projections for general campus enrollments and health sciences enrollments. The tables taken together project a total enrollment growth for the University of about 20 percent over the decade of the 1970s. By contrast, actual University enrollment growth between 1960 and 1970 amounted to 119 percent.

The University's 1969 Academic Plan, anticipating a continuation of rapid enrollment growth, established "planned maximum enrollments" of 25,000 to 27,500 students each for the growing campuses -- Irvine, Riverside, San Diego, Santa Barbara, and Santa Cruz -- and estimated that these ceilings would be reached between 1980 and 2000. The current Academic Plan does not attempt to set maximum enrollments for these campuses. But it is clear that the high figures of the 1969 Plan are no longer relevant for planning purposes on these campuses. Instead, campus planning will be based on the current ten-year projections, and kept sufficiently flexible so that a campus can adapt as needed to changes downward or upward in the projections as they are revised and extended year by year.

New ten-year projections are prepared by the University each spring. Each campus makes a tentative projection which incorporates its own plans and expectations, and the Office of the Vice President - Planning prepares a projection for the University as a whole and for the campuses, using State Department of Finance demographic data, information on application trends, estimated results of redirection among the campuses, and other materials. Differences between Universitywide and campus projections are discussed and usually resolved, and the Universitywide Enrollment Advisory Committee then reviews the projections and makes its recommendations to the President, who establishes and issues the University's official ten-year enrollment plan. The near-year figures are used for preparation of the University's Operating Budget. The long-term projections are used for preparation of the Capital Outlay Budget. In addition, the projections are used for planning purposes by the APPR Board and other groups throughout the University, and to some extent by governmental bodies and civic and commercial interests in the surrounding communities.

Table 1

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

GENERAL CAMPUS ENROLLMENTS[1]

Ten Year Enrollment Projection[2] (3-Term Headcount[3])

	1970-71 Actual	1971-72 Actual	1972-73 Actual	1973-74 Estimate	1974-75 Budget	PROJECTED (Rounded to the Nearest 100) 1975-76	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83
BERKELEY													
Undergraduate	18,361	18,101	18,874	18,781	19,032	19,000	19,000	19,000	19,000	19,000	19,000	19,000	19,000
Graduate	9,068	8,528	8,483	8,181	8,166	8,200	8,200	8,200	8,200	8,200	8,200	8,200	8,200
Total	27,429	26,629	27,357	26,962	27,198	27,200	27,200	27,200	27,200	27,200	27,200	27,200	27,200
DAVIS													
Undergraduate	9,651	10,045	10,927	11,075	11,500	12,100	12,100	12,100	12,100	12,100	12,100	12,100	12,100
Graduate	2,504	2,658	2,835	2,835	3,000	3,200	3,300	3,600	3,800	3,900	4,000	4,100	4,100
Total	12,155	12,703	13,762	13,910	14,500	15,300	15,400	15,700	15,900	16,000	16,100	16,200	16,200
IRVINE													
Undergraduate	4,743	5,050	5,576	5,628	5,755	6,000	6,200	6,400	6,600	6,700	6,900	7,000	7,100
Graduate	736	882	904	950	1,000	1,000	1,100	1,100	1,200	1,200	1,300	1,300	1,400
Total	5,479	5,932	6,480	6,578	6,755	7,000	7,300	7,500	7,800	7,900	8,200	8,300	8,500
LOS ANGELES													
Undergraduate	17,187	16,695	18,082	19,185	19,312	19,100	19,000	19,000	19,000	19,000	19,000	19,000	19,000
Graduate	8,227	7,484	7,538	7,697	7,605	7,800	7,900	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000
Total	25,414	24,179	25,620	26,882	26,917	26,900	26,900	27,000	27,000	27,000	27,000	27,000	27,000
RIVERSIDE													
Undergraduate	4,428	4,535	4,062	3,615	3,393	3,800	4,200	4,600	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800	4,800
Graduate	1,289	1,345	1,173	1,210	1,300	1,300	1,400	1,400	1,400	1,500	1,500	1,500	1,500
Total	5,717	5,880	5,235	4,825	4,693	5,100	5,600	6,000	6,200	6,300	6,300	6,300	6,300
SAN DIEGO (Includes Marine Sciences)													
Undergraduate	4,174	4,635	5,183	5,604	6,169	6,800	7,300	7,600	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000
Graduate	1,149	987	1,155	1,141	1,248	1,400	1,500	1,600	1,700	1,800	1,900	2,000	2,100
Total	5,323	5,622	6,338	6,745	7,417	8,200	8,800	9,200	9,700	9,800	9,900	10,000	10,100
SANTA BARBARA													
Undergraduate	11,232	10,578	10,078	10,079	10,224	10,600	10,900	11,200	11,500	11,800	12,000	12,000	12,000
Graduate	1,777	1,661	1,750	1,772	1,776	1,900	2,000	2,100	2,200	2,300	2,400	2,500	2,600
Total	13,009	12,239	11,828	11,851	12,000	12,500	12,900	13,300	13,700	14,100	14,400	14,500	14,600
SANTA CRUZ													
Undergraduate	3,446	3,903	4,349	4,965	5,210	5,600	5,800	6,000	6,200	6,400	6,600	6,800	6,800
Graduate	267	305	282	390	450	500	500	600	600	700	700	700	700
Total	3,713	4,208	4,631	5,355	5,660	6,100	6,300	6,600	6,800	7,100	7,300	7,500	7,500
TOTAL GENERAL CAMPUS													
Undergraduate	73,222	73,542	77,131	78,932	80,595	83,000	84,500	85,900	87,200	87,800	88,400	88,700	88,800
Graduate	25,017	23,850	24,120	24,176	24,545	25,300	25,900	26,600	27,100	27,600	28,000	28,300	28,600
Total	98,239	97,392	101,251	103,108	105,140	108,300	110,400	112,500	114,300	115,400	116,400	117,000	117,400

[1] Health Science and Extended University enrollments are excluded.

[2] Subject to annual review during March.

[3] 3-term headcount is the average of enrollments for the Fall, Winter and Spring Quarters. Peak enrollments occur during the Fall Quarter.

March 8, 1974

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

HEALTH SCIENCE ENROLLMENTS

Ten Year Enrollment Projection (3-Term Headcount)

	Actual[1] 1970-71	Actual[1] 1971-72	Actual[1] 1972-73	PROJECTED[2] 1973-74	1974-75	1975-76	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	Steady State Beyond 1979-80
BERKELEY											
Optometry	203	223	231	240	240	245	258	272	282	289	292
Public Health	253	267	284	313	345	375	400	415	415	415	415
Total	456	490	515	553	585	620	658	687	697	704	707
DAVIS											
Family Nurse Practitioners	-	18	32	65	65	65	65	65	65	65	65
Medicine	356	516	639	665	790	830	905	980	1,065	1,100	1,100
Veterinary Medicine	420	464	482	486	521	540	583	633	688	738	747
Total	776	998	1,153	1,216	1,376	1,435	1,553	1,678	1,818	1,903	1,912
IRVINE											
Community & Public Health Programs	-	-	-	2	2	8	14	24	32	44	44
Medicine	580	613	661	708	729	773	876	905	939	981	1,011
Total	580	613	661	710	731	781	890	929	971	1,025	1,055
LOS ANGELES											
Dentistry	376	400	420	449	487	501	509	513	513	513	513
Medicine	1,477	1,646	1,798	1,883	1,913	1,943	1,943	1,943	1,943	1,943	1,943
Nursing	218	214	258	258	258	270	285	297	307	316	330
Public Health	308	364	385	425	433	438	443	448	458	468	478
Total	2,379	2,624	2,861	3,015	3,091	3,152	3,180	3,201	3,221	3,240	3,264
RIVERSIDE											
Medicine	-	-	-	-	-	21	42	42	42	42	42
SAN DIEGO											
Medicine	353	455	618	660	724	767	798	829	860	860	860
SAN FRANCISCO											
Dentistry	382	400	418	437	450	458	500	538	562	588	588
Human Biology	-	-	-	-	80	110	140	170	200	230	230
Medicine	1,300	1,357	1,421	1,444	1,478	1,509	1,534	1,559	1,584	1,584	1,584
Nursing	469	485	545	560	543	545	547	549	551	552	552
Pharmacy	400	405	425	443	460	483	505	527	539	551	551
Total	2,551	2,647	2,809	2,884	3,011	3,105	3,226	3,343	3,436	3,505	3,505
UNIVERSITYWIDE TOTAL	7,095	7,827	8,617	9,038	9,618	9,881	10,347	10,709	11,045	11,279	11,345

[1] Statistical Summary.

[2] Approved Feb. 28, 1973, later revisions not included.

1/28/74

Tables 1 and 2, then, are the projections which were issued in the spring of 1973 (with some minor revisions). A new set of projections will be available shortly after this Academic Plan is issued. It should be emphasized that the figures do change somewhat each year and are not to be read as long-term commitments. Actual enrollments may reveal unexpected shortfalls or may considerably exceed estimates, and projections are revised annually to reflect actual enrollment experience and other factors.

Undergraduate Enrollments - The University admits all qualified undergraduate applicants from California (on their preferred campus, if possible, or on an alternate campus through the redirection process), and offers admission to exceptionally able applicants from outside the State. State demographic trends are a major determinant of undergraduate enrollments. About 90 percent of the University's entering first-year students are recent graduates of California high schools. The Population Division of the State Department of Finance provides the University each year with projections of State high school graduates by county. These projections, when combined with trends in applications from individual California counties and similarly derived information for transfer students and for out-of-State applicants, are used in projecting enrollments for each campus. Where the resultant campus totals are projected to exceed either temporary capacity or permanent enrollment ceilings, the projected excess applicants are distributed to campuses where facilities are available. Past experience with redirection indicates that only about 30 percent of redirected applicants register at the new campus, as compared with 50 percent of applicants who actually enroll at the campus of their first choice. The University hopes to improve its redirection process, especially through redirection earlier in the year, with the expectation that earlier redirection will result in higher rates of acceptance of new campus assignments.

Table 3 (see following page) shows the Department of Finance "Provisional Projections of Public High School Twelfth Grade Graduates" for California for the current planning period. Two sets of figures are given; those dated April 1972 which were used in preparing Table 1 in March of 1973, and those dated July 1973 which will be used in the University's preparation of the next set of ten-year projections in March of 1974. It should be noted that the more recent figures project lower numbers of high school graduates throughout every year of the planning period than did the April 1972 data. Both sets of figures show 1979 as the peak year for high school graduates, with numbers declining thereafter and by fairly large amounts in the early 1980s. These data are reflected in the undergraduate projections in Table 1, which show much slower growth after 1980-81. It is possible that actual declines will occur in the mid-1980s, when the full effects of declining numbers of high school graduates are felt.

The University's undergraduate projections (Table 1) assume that the application rate of high school graduates will remain about the same during the 1970s. It is possible that the University's student clientele will be broadened over time (see discussion of this topic in the later section on "Some Special Concerns for the 1970s"). At present, the numbers involved in this area, when compared to the total enrollments at the University, do not warrant changes in the current projections.

Table 3
PROVISIONAL PROJECTIONS OF CALIFORNIA PUBLIC SCHOOL TWELFTH GRADE GRADUATES

Total for Year ending June	As revised April 1972	As revised July 1973
1972	294,175	291,496
1973	296,375	287,075
1974	303,850	294,800
1975	312,150	303,375
1976	310,250	303,075
1977	313,275	307,850
1978	318,475	313,425
1979	322,375	317,725
1980	318,600	313,875
1981	311,750	306,575
1982	305,725	301,475
1983	289,825	284,650
1984	--	268,500

Source: Population Division, California State Department of Finance

Undergraduate admissions may be constrained at campuses either because of established enrollment ceilings or temporary limits on capacity. The following planning ceilings for three general campuses are currently in effect:

	Three-term Headcounts		
	General campus	Health Sciences	Total
Berkeley	26,900	600	27,500
Davis	16,200	2,000	18,200
Los Angeles	27,000	3,000	30,000

An enrollment limit of 7,500 for the Santa Cruz campus is in effect for the present ten-year projection period.

Davis is rapidly approaching its ceiling and both Berkeley and Los Angeles are at their ceilings. Table 1 indicates that current projections for general campus enrollments at Berkeley are slightly in excess of established ceilings, and Table 2 shows a similar excess in projections of health sciences enrollments at Berkeley and Los Angeles. These campuses are expected to adjust actual enrollments to conform to ceilings as soon as possible. It should be noted that actual enrollments may never agree precisely with ceilings because of annual variations in the percentage of students offered admission who actually enroll.

Temporary constraints on undergraduate enrollments may be required at one time or another either because of lack of capacity, or because slower rates of growth are deemed advisable to assure high academic quality. In determining their rates of growth, the campuses take into account their physical, economic, and social impacts on their surrounding communities.

One other important question, and one that is resolved by the Office of the President after consultation with campus administrators, is the distribution of campus total enrollment capacities between undergraduate and graduate enrollments.

Graduate Enrollments - Graduate enrollments are determined separately and somewhat differently from undergraduate enrollments. The University has exclusive responsibility among the State's public institutions for instruction at the Ph.D. level and in certain professional fields, and it shares responsibilities for training at the Master's degree level and in other professional fields. Graduate students are drawn in considerable numbers from other states as well as from California. Demographic factors have their effect on graduate enrollments, both directly and indirectly through their effect on undergraduate enrollments and thus on the level of future demand for doctoral degree holders as teachers of undergraduates in colleges and universities. The Growth Plan Task Force in 1971 suggested a substantially smaller growth rate for graduate enrollments than had been envisioned in earlier Academic Plans, and noted several causes: prospective lower employment demand for individuals with Ph.D. and some other postgraduate degrees; decline in financial aid for graduate students; and the effects of increased educational fees and of higher tuition fees for out-of-State students; along with limited availability of non-resident tuition waivers.

The graduate enrollments in Table 1 have been established by the Office of the President after consultation with the campuses, and reflect estimated student demand, developments in the various fields, program costs, placement opportunities in the fields, and campus and Universitywide program priorities at the graduate level. The graduate enrollments are considerably lower than those of the 1969 Academic Plan and somewhat lower than those contained in the Growth Plan Task Force Report. Both they and the undergraduate projections are, of course, subject to change annually in March.

Factors That May Change Projections - The current projections assume that certain policies and conditions will remain relatively constant. But it is possible (and likely) that unexpected changes will occur. Slightly less than half of the California students eligible to attend the University of California do in fact enroll, and this proportion could increase (or decrease) over the next decade. The following are illustrative of the range of possible changes:

1. Proportions of students seeking college education may change. Social pressures for attending college seem to be weakening somewhat, and pressures for vocational training increasing. These pressures may cause a decrease over time in the proportion of high school graduates seeking admission to the University. Or, again, policies further encouraging the attendance of minorities and women might raise these proportions measurably. Increased enrollment opportunities for part-time or older students and reliance on some non-traditional criteria for their admission might add to the numbers.

2. Tuition and educational fee policies may change. If the University fees are raised, enrollment demand will fall somewhat. If, however, tuition or substantial educational fees were to be introduced in the State University and Colleges, some students who now go to these institutions because of the absence of such fees might elect to attend the University.

3. Financial aid patterns may change. For example, the federal government's new Basic Opportunity Grants are now funded only to a limited extent. Full funding, as recently requested by President Nixon, might enable some students to attend the University who now attend community colleges primarily for financial reasons.

4. Basic demographic trends might change if, for example, the energy crisis should persist and should encourage a wave of new in-migration to California because of the State's mild climate.

The University has the obligation to choose from among the many possibilities those that seem to be the most realistic assumptions about the future, to project its enrollments according to those assumptions, and to formulate its future academic plans and its budgets in the light of current projections.

Fiscal Outlook

State support is always related in some measure to enrollments, and the prospect for slower enrollment growth means also the prospect for slower growth in fiscal resources. Beyond that, the University in recent years has not received general fund support from the State commensurate with the growth of enrollment. Instructional support per student on the University's general campuses, in terms of 1972-73 dollars, declined by 27 percent, from approximately $2,830 per student in 1960-61 to $2,080 per student in 1973-74. There was some falling off of instructional support per student prior to 1966, but the major downturn has occurred since then. One effect of this fiscal situation has been a steady deterioration in the student/faculty ratio, as the University has been unable to add faculty to keep pace with the rise in enrollments.

The fiscal situation faced by the University is not unique among institutions of higher education in the 1970s. The costs of higher education everywhere have risen rapidly, both because of inflation and because higher education does not have the same ability as most of industry to offset rising costs with rising productivity -- there seem to be few shortcuts to the production of a highly educated individual. At the same time, state legislatures are besieged by pressures to meet other social needs with high priorities, in such areas as health and welfare and environmental protection. This means that the University must make special efforts to use its resources as wisely and efficiently as possible. The University must also seek to demonstrate to the State that the need for a highly educated citizenry is as important as many other social goals and that the University will return invaluable economic and social benefits in exchange for the State's investment.

PLANNING FOR RESOURCES IN THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY AND COLLEGES

The several planning activities of The California State University and Colleges (curricular, budgeting, facilities) cannot be accurately described as separate entities since they are inescapably interrelated; changes in the curricular plans have direct consequences with regard to budgets and facilities planning. In like fashion, revisions of facilities plans or budgetary resources have a direct influence on curricular plans.

The annual revision of the Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) enrollment allocations for the system and each campus is the "starting point" for the annual planning cycle. These annual enrollment revisions provide a basis for the various planning activities, ranging from budget year adjustments in areas such as faculty staffing to 10-year adjustments in such areas as long-range capital outlay projections.

Those areas which are particularly relevant to curricular planning are discussed in the following pages, namely enrollment, faculty staffing, facilities, library development and instructional computing. Current procedures for curricular planning, and the relation of these other planning activities to curricular planning, are also discussed. In addition to outlining the procedures now in use, a summary of possible future developments in each of these planning areas is provided.

Enrollment Projections

Projected allocations of Full-Time Equivalent Enrollments for a period of ten years are updated and revised annually. Most adjustments result from changes in the experience data which form the basis for three components of Full-Time Equivalent Enrollment projections: population projections, participation rates, and average student unit load.

1. Population projections

These are computed by age category by the Population Research Unit of the State Department of Finance. Projections pertinent to higher education for 18 years in advance are based on existing population data. It is known on the basis of these data that the number of individuals in the 18-24 year old age group – the major source of the college population – will peak about 1971 or 1982 and then decline. This projection is based upon births that began to decline after 1964 and is now subject only to variations arising from changes in migration patterns or death rates. How long this decline will last beyond the observable period depends upon fertility behavior, which is a consequence of constantly changing economic and social influences. The Population Research Unit, California Department of Finance, has prepared two estimates that appear to be plausible planning alternatives, as follows:

Completed Fertility Rate of 2.8, net in-migration of 150,000 (Series C).

Completed Fertility Rate of 2.1, zero net migration (Series E, the replacement level of population growth).

The U.S. Bureau of the Census has noted a downward trend in completed fertility rates and is utilizing an upper limit of 2.8 births in its high projections and a rate of 1.8 in its low projections. Even under the Series C assumptions, the 18-24 age group will peak in 1981, decline by approximately 16 percent through 1991, and not reach the 1981 level again until about 2000. Under Series E assumptions the peak occurs in 1982 and the decline is approximately 20 percent through 1995; the 1982 level is not regained until after the turn of the century.

2. Participation rate

The number of students in the entire civilian population, by age category, is the base for the participation rate. This is used to convert population projections into estimates of student

enrollment. For The California State University and Colleges, participation rates in the 18-24 year old age group have increased in recent years as indicated in Table I:

TABLE I

Participation Rates (Rate per 1,000) in The California State University and Colleges*

Year	18-24 Year Old Population	First-time Freshmen	Transfers	Continuing & Returning	Total Undergraduates
1967	2,200,500	7.7	13.3	43.9	64.9
1968	2,290,500	8.7	15.3	47.9	71.8
1969	2,379,200	7.7	14.5	51.5	73.2
1970	2,264,500	8.7	15.4	59.2	83.3
1971	2,371,400	8.4	16.6	61.4	86.4
1972	2,430,200	9.5	17.7	61.9	89.0
1973	2,492,400	9.3	17.5	62.7	89.5
1974	2,556,300	9.4	17.0	61.9	88.3
1975	2,613,300	9.4	18.3	63.9	91.5

Projected student enrollments are derived by applying expected participation rates to total civilian population projections.

3. Average student load

Estimates of average student load are used within the system to convert projections of student enrollments to Full-Time Equivalent Students (FTES). The average number of units taken by students in all categories has consistently declined since 1970, as shown in Table II.

TABLE II

Average Number of Units For Which Students Enroll By Class Level, Fall Term*

Year	Freshman	Sophomore	Junior	Senior	Graduate	Total
1965	13.8	13.5	12.6	12.0	6.4	11.4
1966	13.9	13.6	12.7	12.3	6.9	11.6
1967	13.8	13.6	12.7	12.6	7.2	11.7
1968	13.9	13.6	12.9	12.7	7.4	11.9
1969	14.2	13.9	13.2	13.0	7.8	12.1
1970	14.0	14.0	13.3	13.2	8.4	12.4
1971	13.7	13.6	12.7	12.7	8.1	11.9
1972	13.7	13.3	12.5	12.5	7.9	11.8
1973	13.7	13.2	12.3	12.4	8.0	11.7
1974	13.6	13.2	12.3	12.1	7.7	11.5
1975 (Preliminary)	13.4	13.0	12.2	12.0	7.6	11.4

Expectations about slowed enrollment growth and eventually no growth are based primarily on the first of these three elements, population projections. Consistent declines in average student load, the third element, do not alter these expectations as far as Full-Time Equivalent enrollment projections are concerned. It is the second of the two elements, namely participation rate, which accounts at present for unexpected enrollment developments. In the fall

*Source: Division of Institutional Research, March 1976.

of 1975, FTE enrollment in The California State University and Colleges and in many other institutions across the country exceeded projections. While the reasons for this are not entirely known, preliminary data indicate that the increase was *not* due to increases in average student unit load (this continued to decline), nor was it due to errors in population projections. It seems to have been caused exclusively by a sudden increase in participation rates, especially those of continuing students.

Given that the unexpected FTE increase was caused by an increase in participation rates, and given that there were *not* unexpected changes in the other two variables, some assumptions can be made about the effects of this recent development on future enrollment projections.

First, if the participation rates hold at or slightly below the new levels and the two other variables continue as anticipated, the effect will be growth at essentially the same *rate* as previously projected but starting with a higher base. This is in fact the assumption underlying current revisions in enrollment allocations. Table III shows past rates of FTE growth. The rate of growth has slowed considerably and is expected to remain at lower levels until 1983-84, when a systemwide enrollment decline is projected. Adjustments currently being made in the FTE projections for the system are shown in Table IV.

TABLE III

Reported Annual Full-Time Equivalent Students for the Academic Years 1966-67 through 1974-75*

Campus	1966-67	1967-68	1968-69	1969-70	1970-71	1971-72	1972-73	1973-74	1974-75
Bakersfield	233	281	358	475	852	1,495	1,941	2,296	2,268
Chico	5,835	6,759	7,431	8,712	9,661	10,036	11,112	11,455	11,612
Dominguez Hills	118	403	890	1,586	2,262	2,941	3,314	3,847	4,491
Fresno	7,406	8,187	9,305	11,294	12,334	12,666	13,169	13,135	13,041
Fullerton	5,290	6,438	7,913	9,526	10,656	11,406	12,649	13,327	14,005
Hayward	4,153	5,253	6,675	7,686	9,149	9,702	9,597	8,906	8,315
Humboldt	2,971	3,460	4,168	4,840	5,253	5,428	5,955	6,458	6,591
Long Beach	14,550	16,090	18,361	19,027	19,854	19,954	20,086	20,633	20,884
Los Angeles	11,934	12,452	13,441	14,684	15,348	15,254	15,282	14,992	15,026
Northridge	10,339	11,684	13,471	15,639	17,843	18,065	18,281	17,992	18,171
Pomona	4,882	5,390	6,345	7,183	17,835	8,755	9,079	8,747	9,249
Sacramento	7,570	8,980	10,491	11,962	12,639	14,146	14,670	15,002	15,225
San Bernardino	515	807	1,128	1,611	2,003	2,151	2,268	2,592	2,843
San Diego	14,073	15,557	17,529	18,672	20,035	20,184	21,758	22,517	23,297
Calexico Center	138	167	154	188	212	(255)*	(291)*	(283)*	(251)*
San Francisco	13,635	13,585	13,285	13,688	14,446	14,152	15,848	16,228	15,850
San Jose	16,491	17,464	18,316	18,758	19,074	19,383	20,177	20,197	19,337
San Luis Obispo	7,457	8,102	9,303	10,702	11,777	11,437	11,566	12,429	13,606
Sonoma	1,145	1,634	2,527	3,154	3,866	4,712	4,880	5,150	5,172
Stanislaus	706	934	1,347	1,867	2,355	2,357	2,342	2,175	2,302
System Totals	129,441	143,627	162,438	181,254	197,454	204,224	213,974	218,075	221,285
Total FTE Increase, By Year	13,079	14,186	18,811	18,816	16,200	6,770	9,750	4,101	3,210
Percent Increase, By Year	11%	11%	14%	12%	9%	3%	5%	2%	2%

* Calexico Center data included as part of San Diego State University figures.

TABLE IV

Comparison of February 1975 Annual FTE Projections with March 1976 Annual FTE Projections*

	1975-76	1976-77	1977-78	1980-81	1983-84
February 1975	223,900	226,700	229,600	240,800	241,000
Allocations					
Growth Rate (from previous year)	+1.0%	+1.3%	+1.3%	+0.8%	-0.2%
March 1976	230,340	232,700	237,320	249,660	252,570
Allocations	(estimated)	(budget)			
Growth Rate (from previous year)	+4.1%	+1.0%	+1.9%	+1.6%	-0.2%

*Source: Division of Institutional Research, March 1976.

It is consequently not anticipated that the enrollment increase experienced in the 1975-76 academic year will provide enduring relief from the difficulties caused by slow or no enrollment growth. These difficulties result from the practice of using FTE as the basis for generating resources and the reliance on growth to generate *new* resources annually. The effects of this decline in growth rate are discussed in each of the individual planning areas following.