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Introduction

Background and purpose
Public and private universities are under intense scrutiny with regard to their cost and perceived value. A number of books have been published echoing the themes in the title of Hacker and Dreifus's book *Higher Education? How Colleges are Wasting our Money and Failing our Kids*. The pressures come from several sources: the rising costs of education, the national need for more college graduates prepared to meet specific workforce demands, and media interest in the ways universities and colleges are reinventing themselves to shore up strength.

The University of California’s Accountability Report was introduced by President Mark G. Yudof upon his appointment as president in 2008. It prepares the University to be responsive to precisely these pressures. Covering a wide range of topics, it measures how well and at what cost the University is meeting its goals. It looks at how its core functions are affected by changes in internal and external environments. It also supports strategic planning and informs budgetary decision making; helps ensure responsible stewardship of the institution; and promotes and reflects the University’s commitment to be open and accountable to all Californians.

Key findings
This year we highlight the following key findings, which reflect substantive changes in the data or present new data for the first time.

► In 2011-12, for the first time, the tuition and fees paid by students will be greater than the contributions made by the state. This is the result of continued reductions in state funding. (Indicator 1.5)

► While the University continues to offer each eligible undergraduate student a place somewhere in the system, undergraduate access for Californians to the University is strained at the very time demand is increasing. This strain on the Master Plan promise of access is reflected in the reduction in the size of the freshmen class since 2008 (Indicator 2.1) and by the 11,000 California residents UC has enrolled without any state funding.

► The proportion of undergraduate students paying nonresident tuition has increased to 5 percent. It is expected to grow as UC pursues strategies to replace lost state revenue. (Indicator 2.7)

► By enrolling, and graduating, more low-income (Pell grant recipients) and first-generation students than any other leading research university, UC serves as a vehicle for social mobility. (Analytic Essay, Indicators 3.5 and 2.6)

► The inflation-adjusted net cost paid by low-income students for their University education has actually declined since 2004–05, primarily due to UC’s strong financial aid programs. Meanwhile, the inflation-adjusted net cost for lower-middle-income students has been flat during the last five years but has risen substantially for upper-middle-income and wealthier students. (Indicator 3.2)

► While graduation rates of entering freshmen continue a decade-long trend of improvement, graduation rates of transfer students appear to have leveled off. (Indicators 4.1 and 4.2)

► Faculty hiring fell in 2009–10 in response to fiscal pressures while separations remained about the same as in the recent past. Together, these actions resulted in a 2 percent decline in the number of full-time ladder- and equivalent-rank faculty between fall 2009 and fall 2010. (Indicators 6.1 and 6.2)

► Staff numbers have fallen during the past two years by 4 percent as UC has responded to budget cuts. (Indicator 7.1)

► UC doctoral degree production per faculty member is higher overall than the AAU public and AAU private averages. (Indicator 6.4)

► A high proportion of doctoral degree recipients (58 percent) stay in California after receiving their degrees, reflecting UC’s role in attracting and keeping many of its students in the state. (Indicator 5.4)
► New survey data on campus climate show that most students feel respected by others on their campuses. Certain groups, however, including African Americans, Chicano/Latinos, and lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) students, feel less respected than others. (Indicator 8.3)

► UC receives $4.8 billion in annual research funding from state, federal, philanthropic and other external sources, but does not recover from those sources the full costs of housing and administering this research. (Indicator 10.2)

► UC falls behind other AAU public universities both in the proportion of graduates who participate in alumni giving and in the average value of the gifts made by those alumni that do participate. (Indicator 12.4)

Audience

As a management tool, this report is written for the University's leadership, faculty and staff. But it is also intended to be a public document, written for the broad range of University stakeholders: state legislators, prospective donors, parents, teachers and contribute so much to the maintenance of this institution. All of these groups have a need and a right to know how well UC is performing.

Scope

The report assesses the University's performance in achieving key goals across a wide spectrum of activity from undergraduate access, affordability and success to the University's budget and finances. It is divided into three parts: an analytic essay (Part I) takes a more in-depth look at an issue of timely importance to the University; the body of the accountability report (Part II) uses data to assess progress in specific areas; and a comprehensively revised appendix (Part III) that presents the data used in Part II as well as information about sources and methods.

The analytic essay is a new feature. It uses data gathered from a recent survey of UC alumni who graduated in 1989, 1999 and 2004 to evaluate the University's continued performance and future challenges as an engine of social mobility for the people of California.

Part II is divided into 13 chapters, each focusing on an aspect of the academic enterprise. Chapters use a common format. They begin with a description of Universitywide goals, then identify key themes and trends that emerge from the data that illuminate progress in achieving those goals. It includes 100 unique indicators (some in multiple parts), 33 of them new since last year. Graphs, tables and charts are comprehensively reformatted since last year, making them easier to interpret, and more explanatory text has been provided, including headlines that focus on key issues and trends.

Methodology

Three kinds of data are used in Part II: longitudinal data that track campus trends over time; systemwide data that compare the UC campuses collectively to averages for the 28 non-UC public and 26 private U.S. research universities that, in 2009–10, belonged to the American Association of Universities (AAU); and individual data that allow UC campuses to be compared to one another and to eight research universities — four public (Illinois, Michigan, SUNY Buffalo and Virginia) and four private (Harvard, MIT, Stanford and Yale) — that UC historically has used to benchmark faculty salaries.

Conventions were adopted for Part II to ensure the report’s accessibility to a general audience as well as its integrity and internal consistency:

► Indicators are based on data that are publicly available and may be reproduced.

► Preference is given to indicators that are commonly used nationally or internationally.

► Indicators are primarily presented graphically so that their meaning is visually apparent, with tabular data available in the Part III appendix.

► Trend data for UC and its comparison institutions are preferred over single year snapshots.
UC as an Engine of Social Mobility: Successes, Challenges and Concerns

“The University of California has been a beacon of hope, the state's best mechanism for economic growth and social mobility for two decades.”

Terry Hartle
Senior Vice President, American Council on Education
April 2011

INTRODUCTION

Historically, U.S. public education has served as an engine of social mobility. That at least has been the claim of its proponents through successive generations since the public education movement began in the United States. While the mission has evolved over the years, its thrust has remained fundamentally the same: to give opportunities to students from diverse backgrounds while fueling the nation’s economic growth with a more educated workforce.

Introducing the Third Annual University of California Accountability Report, this essay examines the successes and challenges that the University of California faces in continuing this historic public mission. In three sections, it evaluates the extent to which UC undergraduates are drawn from disadvantaged backgrounds and the extent to which they succeed during and after their university careers. The essay also discusses how some of the fiscal challenges currently facing the University, such as proposed reductions in student financial aid at both the federal and state level, could significantly reduce the University’s ability to admit and graduate large numbers of disadvantaged students. Disadvantaged students are defined as those from low-income families, those whose parents have not earned a college degree, and those who come from underrepresented minorities (URMs). These are the students who historically, and today as well, have had less access to higher education and less likelihood of graduating from college once admitted.

This essay makes extensive use of corporate data, some of which are included in the body of this accountability report. It also introduces an extensive survey that was conducted in 2010 of UC alumni that graduated in 1989, 1999 and 2004, respectively. Wherever possible, comparisons are made with elite public and private research universities that constitute the Association of American Universities.1

1The Association of American Universities (AAU) is a nonprofit organization of 60 U.S. and two Canadian leading public and private research universities; of the 34 U.S. public research university members, six are UC campuses: Berkeley, Davis, Irvine, Los Angeles, San Diego and Santa Barbara.
WHO COMES?
ACCESS TO THE UNIVERSITY
The University of California seeks to enroll, and
graduate, on each of its campuses a student body
that demonstrates high academic achievement or
exceptional personal talent and that encompasses
the broad diversity of backgrounds characteristic of
California. One of the major goals of the University,
in fact, is to ensure that all qualified and
academically well-prepared high school graduates,
regardless of race, ethnicity or social class, are
afforded the opportunity to earn a baccalaureate
degree.

Enrollment of low-income students
Pell grants are the cornerstone federal program for
low-income students in higher education, and the
number of students receiving Pell grants is often
used as a proxy for the number of low-income
students on a campus. Eligibility for a Pell grant has
changed over the years; in 2010–11 students were
eligible for a Pell if their family income was less
than about $50,000. In fall 2010, almost 40 percent,
or 70,000, of all UC undergraduates were Pell
recipients, the largest percentage in the
University's history.

The proportion of Pell recipients is significantly
higher at UC than at any of its public or private peer
comparison institutions. Overall, 31 percent of
undergraduates at UC received a Pell grant in
2008–09 compared to 17 percent at the non-UC
AAU publics and 13 percent at the AAU privates
(Indicator 3.5). The proportion of Pell recipients at
individual UC campuses ranged from 25 percent (at
Irvine and Santa Barbara) to 42 percent (at Merced
and Riverside). But percentages alone do not tell
the whole story; to do that, one must also look at
the number of students involved. In 2009–10, for
example, four UC campuses — Los Angeles, Davis,
San Diego and Berkeley — each enrolled more Pell
grant recipients than the entire Ivy League
combined. As President Yudof has stated, the large
number of low-income students enrolled at UC
demonstrates that UC remains true to its charter as
a public institution.

UC's exceptional success at enrolling low-income
students is due, in part, to a combination of two
strong need-based aid programs: the University's
own institutional aid program and the state's Cal
Grant program. UC's need-based grant program is
funded, in part, by returning a share of new fee
revenue back to financial aid in the form of UC
grants. More than 50,000 UC students also
currently receive a Cal Grant, which typically covers
recipients' systemwide tuition and fees, including
tuition and fee increases. Indeed, the existence of
this generous state-funded program enables the
University to provide grants and scholarships to
other students who may not be eligible for a Cal
Grant. While students at other institutions often
benefit from either a strong institutional aid
program or a strong state aid program, UC students
benefit from both.

While the total cost of attendance (which includes
tuition and fees as well as living expenses) has risen
at UC over the past eight years (Indicator 3.1), the
amount of financial aid given to UC students has
tripled. In 2009–10, for example, UC students
received more than $1.5 billion in financial aid: this
included $443 million in UC grants; $425 million in
Cal Grants funded through the state; and $286
million in federal Pell grants. More than 90 percent
of these awards were made to undergraduates,
both low- and middle-income students, with
financial need. As a consequence, the net cost of
attending the University has actually declined for
low-income students in inflation-adjusted dollars
since 2004–05 (Indicator 3.2).

Students' financial aid packages are often an
amalgam of grants, scholarships, parental support,
earnings from students' jobs, and student and
parent loans, all coming from different sources with
different stipulations for repayment (or not), and
varying by state and institutional policies; the very
complexity of it all may deter some students from
even applying for aid in the first place. So it is no
surprise that reliable, simple and predictable
financial aid is important, especially for low-income
students who may come from families that believe
that a college education, especially at an elite
university, is simply beyond their financial reach.
In part to assure low-income students that they indeed can afford the University, in 2009 the University put in place its Blue and Gold Opportunity Plan, which is a model of simplicity and clarity. Under the Plan, the University in 2011–12 will ensure that California residents whose families earn less than $80,000 will receive grant and fellowship support to fully cover their systemwide in-state tuition and fees, up to their financial need under federal guidelines.

Enrollment of first-generation students
A first-generation student comes from a home where neither parent holds a college degree. First-generation status matters: having parents with college degrees can provide students with the role models, family expectations, life experiences and financial resources that ease a student's transition from high school to college and that contribute to their success. Indeed, many studies have shown that first-generation students are less likely to enroll in college and, once enrolled, less likely to graduate compared to students who have a parent with a college degree.

Many first-generation students also come from low-income families as well. At UC, for example, almost two-thirds of first-generation students came from families with incomes below $40,000, and another 22 percent from families with incomes between $40,000 and $80,000; together these two groups account for seven out of eight of all first-generation students. Like low-income students, the proportion of first-generation students is also larger at UC than at any of its comparison institutions. In 2007–08, 42 percent of undergraduate students at UC were first-generation compared to 34 percent at a set of very selective public research universities and 24 percent at very selective private research universities (Indicator 2.5). At individual UC campuses, the proportion of first-generation students ranged from 31 percent at Berkeley to 49 percent at Merced and Riverside.

Enrollment of URM students
In fall 2008, 21 percent of UC's undergraduates came from underrepresented minorities (American Indian or Alaska Native, African American, and Hispanic) compared to 12 percent at UC's AAU public peers and 15 percent at its private peers. Enrollment of URM students, especially at public institutions like UC that primarily admit in-state students, is shaped to some extent by state demographic profiles. The largest growing minority population in the country, Hispanics, is heavily concentrated in sunbelt states, such as California, Texas, Arizona and Florida. However, among AAU publics, Berkeley and UCLA rank medium (in the 15–20 percent range) in terms of the proportion of underrepresented minority students; public flagship universities in Arizona, Florida and Texas, all of which also have substantial Hispanic populations, enroll more than 20 percent underrepresented minority students.

According to the 2010 census, Hispanics constitute almost 38 percent of the population of California, and African Americans 6 percent. However, the proportion of underrepresented minority students is lower at UC than at some of its peer institutions in part because proportionately fewer URM students are academically well prepared for college (and hence do not meet UC's admissions criteria), and in part because of legal restrictions. Beginning with the entering class of 1998, Proposition 209 prohibited the University from considering race and

---

1 Information comes from 18 (of 28) non-UC AAU publics and 21 (of 26) AAU privates that provided enrollment breakdowns by race/ethnicity to the U.S. Department of Education's Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS).

2 Following UC policy, this essay uses the term “Chicano/Latino” when referring to UC students; following AP style and Census Bureau conventions, it uses the term “Hispanic” when discussing population dynamics or college students nationally.
ethnicity in admissions. In addition, highly talented students from underrepresented minorities are highly sought after by elite private universities that do not face the same legal restrictions on affirmative action that UC does and can offer very generous financial aid packages. Despite these challenges, the proportion of UC’s enrolled freshmen who come from underrepresented minorities has increased steadily from the low point in 1998. A new freshman admissions policy, effective fall 2012, is designed to broaden the pool of students whose applications will receive a comprehensive review and to possibly increase the number of underrepresented students admitted to UC.

Although historically among the highest in the nation, California’s investment in higher education has eroded substantially over the past 20 years. State funding for instruction at UC has declined 50 percent per student since 1990 (Indicator 1.5). Student tuition and fees have been increased in response, but have only partially compensated for the loss of state dollars. Despite substantial reductions in state support, the University has maintained, and in many cases extended, access to disadvantaged low-income, first-generation and underrepresented minority students. Certainly, the increased availability of financial aid dollars explains some of this trend, as does UC’s commitment to opening up doors of opportunity to all students. Middle-income students, however, are less likely to qualify for need-based grant programs that have offset some or all of recent cost increases for low-income students. Indeed, the share of students from middle-income families has declined slightly (Indicator 3.5). Although more analysis is needed to determine the reasons for this decline, it may be that UC is less attractive to middle-income students than it has been in the past. To address this, the University is considering ways to improve both its message about financial aid for middle-income students and the amount of aid available to those students.

WHO SUCCEEDS?
CLOSING THE ACHIEVEMENT GAP

Student success can be defined in different ways: as learning outcomes, job and career success, civic participation, social and economic well-being, a commitment to lifelong learning, or simply as life satisfaction. Most commonly, student success in higher education is defined and measured in terms of graduation rates, with six years being the national standard for freshmen cohorts entering four-year colleges and universities.

Graduation rates are important. Educationally, completing a baccalaureate degree provides recognition that a student has achieved mastery over a specific subject matter and acquired a basic set of social and cognitive skills, such as the ability to think critically, communicate clearly, and work collaboratively with others — all skills that are needed in an increasingly global economy. Psychologically, college graduation symbolizes a student’s ability to begin a program and see it through to the end, and in this sense is a measure of persistence. Economically, students who complete a baccalaureate degree have higher annual salaries and greater lifetime earnings than those who do not. According to a 2010 report from the College Board, the median earnings of a bachelor’s recipient working full-time year-round were $55,700 in 2008 — or $22,000 more than the median earnings of a high school graduate — and the unemployment rate of high school graduates in 2009 was 2.6 times higher than that for college graduates.

UC’s six-year graduation rates are very good, especially compared to peer institutions. Universitywide, 82 percent of the freshmen who entered UC in fall 2002 graduated within six years compared to 75 percent of freshmen who entered the other public research universities that constitute the Association of American Universities. Nationally, only about 55 percent of all freshmen who entered a public four-year college or university in fall 2004 graduated within six years.

Important differences in graduation rates exist, however, among students from different demographic groups. In Crossing the Finish Line:
Completing College at America’s Public Universities, William Bowen, Matthew Chingos and Michael McPherson (2009) found that 83 percent of high socio-economic (SES) students at the AAU public flagship universities they studied — that is, at UC’s peer public institutions — graduated within six years compared to 68 percent of low SES students — a gap of 15 percentage points. They also found significant gaps in graduation rates by race/ethnicity and gender: Asian and white women, for example, were the most likely to graduate in six years, followed by white males, Hispanic females and African American females, and last by Hispanic and African American males.¹

Similar trends were found in a 1999 report, Charting a Necessary Path, released by the Education Trust. That report found that about 45 percent of low-income and underrepresented minority students entering as freshmen in 1999 at 24 public university systems (including the CSU system in California but not the UC system) had received bachelor’s degrees six years later compared with 57 percent of other students — a gap of 12 percentage points. There are similar gaps in the educational attainment of students by family income, parental education, race/ethnicity, and gender at UC as well. However, the overall graduation rates are higher, and the gaps in graduation rates between more advantaged and less advantaged students, are not as great at UC as they are at peer universities, indicating that a higher proportion of disadvantaged low-income, first-generation and URM students graduate from UC than from peer institutions.

**Graduation rates by family income**

Graduation rates correlate with family income — the higher the family income, the more likely a student is to graduate, and to graduate in four years rather than six. As Table 1 shows, 80 percent of the lowest-income students at UC graduated in six years compared to 86 percent of the highest-income students — a gap of 6 percentage points. However, as Table 2 shows, at the comparison 21 public AAUs that Bowen et al studied, 70 percent of the lowest-income students graduated in six years compared to 83 percent of the top-income students — a gap of 13 percentage points. Lower-income students at both UC and the 21 AAU publics also took somewhat longer to graduate than higher-income students as measured by four-year graduation rates, but again, the four-year graduation rates for the lowest-income students were significantly higher at UC than at the 21 AAU publics (52 vs. 40 percent) and the gap between the lowest- and highest-income group was less at UC than at the AAU publics (12 vs. 18 percentage points).²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Income Range</th>
<th>UC 4 years</th>
<th>UC 6 years</th>
<th>AAU 4 years</th>
<th>AAU 6 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0–$40,000</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000–$80,000</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000–$120,000</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$120,000 and higher</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Bowen et al collected demographic and graduation rate data for the 1999 entering freshman cohort from 21 research-intensive flagship universities, all of which were members of the Association of American Universities. The institutions reflected a mix of geographic diversity and other characteristics, including differences in racial composition and selectivity. The 21 universities included two UC campuses: Berkeley and UCLA. Other participating universities were: Maryland-College Park, Michigan-Ann Arbor, North Carolina-Chapel Hill, Virginia, Penn State, Rutgers, Florida, Illinois-Urbana-Champaign, Texas-Austin, Washington-Seattle, Wisconsin-Madison, Iowa State, Ohio State, Purdue, Stony Brook, University of Iowa, Minnesota-Twin Cities, Nebraska, and Oregon.

² The federal government does not collect national data on college graduation rates by income and first generation status in its IPEDS reporting system. Bowen’s database from the 1999 entering freshmen cohort at 21 public AAU flagships is thus the best and most recent comparative data available. Not only does it come from a large group of public AAU research universities that are UC’s peers, but it includes data from two UC campuses — Berkeley and UCLA — which have very high graduation rates overall. Although we reported 2004 graduation rate data for UC since it is the most recent available, the basic trends reported here would hold up if one were to compare 1999 graduation data for UC to 1999 data for the 21 AAU publics.
Table 2: Four- and six-year graduation rates
By family income
Entering freshman cohort, 21 public AAUs, fall 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Income</th>
<th>4 years</th>
<th>6 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bottom quartile</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second quartile</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third quartile</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fourth quartile</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is remarkable. But why does a gap in graduation rates between high- and low-income students exist at all? Graduation rates are correlated with academic preparation — the higher students' academic preparation levels (based on high school GPAs and SAT/ACT scores), the more likely they are to graduate, and to graduate more quickly, in four years rather than six. Family income is also correlated with academic preparation, and low-income students tend to be less well prepared academically than higher-income students. When UC students are divided into thirds based on their levels of academic preparation, for example, disproportionately more low-income students (47 percent) fall into the bottom third, and disproportionately fewer (20 percent) fall into the top third in terms of academic preparation. However, as Table 3 shows, when academic preparation levels are controlled, differences in six-year graduation rates between high- and low-income students at UC almost completely disappear, especially for the top students.

Table 3: Six-year graduation rates
By academic preparation and family income
Entering freshman cohort, UC, fall 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Preparation</th>
<th>Bottom Third</th>
<th>Middle Third</th>
<th>Top Third</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0–$40,000</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000–$80,000</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,000–$120,000</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$120,000 and higher</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UC's generous financial aid programs help level the playing field between high- and low-income students by enabling a large number of low-income students to enter the University, keep the number of hours they work during the academic year under 20 per week, and graduate with generally manageable levels of student loan debt. However, lower levels of academic preparation reduce graduation rates slightly for low-income students and slightly increase their time-to-degree.

Graduation rates by parental education
First-generation status is also correlated with college graduation rates. As Tables 4 and 5 both show, students whose parents are college graduates are more likely to graduate than students who do not have parents who graduated from college. At UC, 86 percent of students whose parents were college graduates graduated in six years compared to 79 percent of first-generation students. However, a higher proportion of first-generation students graduated from UC compared to the 21 public AAUs in Bowen's sample (79 vs. 70 percent).

Table 4: Four- and six-year graduation rates
By family parental education
Entering freshman cohort, UC, fall 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parental Education</th>
<th>4 years</th>
<th>6 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First generation</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not first generation</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The number of hours UC students work during the academic year is relatively low and does not vary by family income. According to the 2010 University of California Cost of Attendance Survey, 55 percent of low-income students did not work at all, and only 7 percent worked more than 20 hours per week, which is beyond the upper bound of what the University considers manageable (University of California 2009–10 Annual Report on Student Financial Support, Figure 1-21, p. 30).

2 According to the 2009–10 Annual Report on Student Financial Support, about 60 percent of low-income students (family incomes below $50,000) graduated from UC with student debt; however, the level of that debt, on average, did not rise between 2003 and 2009 and was below $17,000 (Figure 1-27, p. 36). In contrast, using data from the National Postsecondary Student Aid Study, the Project on Student Debt estimated that among graduating seniors who ever received a Pell grant, 87 percent had student loans in 2008. Those Pell grant recipients, who graduated from both public and private colleges, had an average debt of $24,800 (“Quick Facts about Student Debt,” January 2010).
Like low-income students, first-generation students also tend to be less well prepared academically and consequently take longer to complete their degrees. But again, 52 percent completed their degrees in four years at UC compared to 42 percent at the public AAUs in Bowen’s sample. Clearly UC is doing a very good job graduating the first-generation students it admits, especially compared to its peers.

**Table 5: Four- and six-year graduation rates**  
By parent education  
Entering freshman cohort, 21 public AAUs, fall 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent Education</th>
<th>4 years</th>
<th>6 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No college</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College degree</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graduation rates by race/ethnicity and gender**

Graduation rates also vary significantly by race/ethnicity and gender. Across the country, Asians and whites are more likely to graduate from college, and graduate more quickly, than African Americans or Hispanics; women also are more likely to graduate, and graduate more quickly, than men. At UC, proportionately more Asians and whites (86 and 84 percent) in the entering 2004 freshman cohort graduated in six years than African Americans or Chicano/Latinos (76 and 75 percent), and proportionately more women than men (85 and 81 percent).

Gender interacts with race and ethnicity. As **Table 6** shows, six-year graduation rates at UC are substantially higher for Asian and white women (88 and 86 percent) than for African American and Chicano/Latino men (72 and 70 percent), producing a six-year graduation rate gap of 18 percentage points between Asian women and Chicano/Latino men. Asian and white men, and African American and Chicano/Latino women, fall in between (84, 81, 78 and 78 percent).

**Table 6: Four- and six-year graduation rates**  
By race/ethnicity and gender  
Entering freshman cohort, UC, fall 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicano/Latino</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Like first-generation students, underrepresented minorities tend to come from low-income families and to be less well prepared academically, characteristics which, as we have already seen, tend to be associated with lower graduation rates and longer time-to-degree. Despite this, both four- and six-year graduation rates for all combinations of race/ethnicity and gender are higher at UC than at the 21 AAU public peers. Six-year graduation rates for African American men are especially strong at UC compared to the 21 AAU public peers (72 vs. 59 percent).

**Table 7: Four- and six-year graduation rates**  
By race/ethnicity and gender  
Entering freshman cohort, 21 AAU publics, fall 1999

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The education gap that exists for African American and Hispanic men is well known. Nationally, only about 15 percent of African American men in the 25–29 age group have earned bachelor’s degrees, a function of low high school graduation rates, low college enrollment rates, and low college graduation rates. However, as Bowen et al found, African American males with GPAs below 3.0 were more likely to graduate from more selective institutions than less selective ones. The impact of being held to high academic standards, and to peer and institutional expectations that they will succeed and graduate, is a powerful one.

California’s Master Plan for Higher Education, the landmark 1960 legislation that divided public responsibility for postsecondary education among three segments — the University of California, the California State University System, and the
California Community Colleges — requires UC to admit freshmen from the top 12.5 percent of California’s public high school graduates. While academic preparation levels certainly vary across the UC campuses, the Master Plan requirement to admit high school students from the top eighth of their high school graduating class guarantees that the University will admit only students who are academically well prepared for college. Only three other states — Arizona, Florida and Texas — guarantee admission to a top percentage of high school graduates.

In addition, UC requires that all incoming freshmen complete a rigorous set of high school college preparatory courses that the University has reviewed and approved, and that they maintain a minimum high school GPA of 3.0 in these courses. Academic preparation levels at UC also have risen substantially over the past decade, and a very high percentage of incoming freshmen far exceed minimum admissions requirements (Indicator 2.3). For fall 2010, for example, a third of incoming freshmen had taken 25 or more year-long “a-g” courses (a minimum of 15 is required for admission); three-fifths had weighted high school GPAs of 3.8 or more (weighted GPAs give extra credit for succeeding in difficult courses, such as Advanced Placement courses); and almost three-fifths (57 percent) had SAT scores above 1200. The very high levels of academic preparation that characterize incoming freshmen at UC help explain UC’s very high graduation rates for all students — high- and low-income, first-generation and non-first-generation, and URM and non-URM students alike — especially in relationship to UC’s AAU peer institutions. Certainly, there are differences among students and across campuses — average SAT critical reading and math scores in 2008 across the UC campuses, for example, ranged from 1042 at Merced to 1319 at Berkeley — nonetheless, UC still admits, and enrolls, a more academically homogenous and higher-performing group of students than most of its AAU public peers.

Six-year graduation rates at the UC campuses ranged from 92 percent at Berkeley for the incoming 2004 freshman class to 71 percent at Riverside. The July 2009 Accountability Sub-Report on Student Success described differences in characteristics of incoming freshmen that help explain differences in six-year graduation rates across the UC campuses. Despite campus (and student) differences in academic preparation, the broader point of this essay is that all entering freshmen at UC are very well prepared academically, especially compared to entering students at other public AAUs, which is why UC’s graduation rates for advantaged and less-advantaged students, in general, are higher than those for its AAU public peers.

Institutional context, that is, matters. The high expectations that characterize the academic environment at the UC campuses — expectations of success, achievement and contribution — raise expectations for all students, regardless of family income, parental education, race/ethnicity and gender. Low-income, first-generation, and URM students do take longer to graduate from UC, and their six-year graduation rates are slightly lower than those of more advantaged students, but their overall graduation rates and time-to-degree are higher at UC than at UC’s peer institutions, and if Bowen et al are correct, significantly higher than what they would have been had they attended a less selective institution. Enroll at the most challenging university that will accept you, Bowen urges all students, because this is where you are most likely to succeed.

AND HOW DO THEY DO?

In May 2010, UC’s Office of the President surveyed University of California baccalaureate degree recipients 5, 10 and 20 years after receiving their degrees. A total of 86,439 undergraduate alumni — bachelor’s degree recipients from the classes of 1989, 1999 and 2004 — were contacted; 6,628 responded, for an overall response rate of 8 percent.1 Among other issues, the survey asked...
respondents where they lived, what they did for a living, how satisfied they were with their undergraduate experience and with their current job, and what their current income was. As previous sections of this essay have shown, UC admits, and graduates, students from very diverse backgrounds. But how, looking back, do they perceive their undergraduate education and its impact on their life? Does graduation from college help reduce disparities in income and occupational achievement that their parents experienced? And does it help level the playing field for students from both high and low SES backgrounds? To answer these questions, data from the survey were linked to students' race/ethnicity, gender, family income and first-generation status; this section reports initial findings.

**Satisfaction with overall academic experience**

In general, UC alumni are highly satisfied with their overall academic experience. As Figure 1 shows, 91 percent of respondents from the three graduating classes of 1989, 1999 and 2004 reported being either satisfied or very satisfied with their overall academic experience at UC. They also reported higher levels of satisfaction than UC seniors surveyed in 2010 (Indicators 4.4 and 4.5). Satisfaction increases slightly the farther away alumni are from their undergraduate years; presumably life, time and distance increase satisfaction with one’s undergraduate years, though it is also possible that the student experience was genuinely better for those who attended in years past than for those who attended more recently.

![Figure 1: Satisfaction of UC alumni with overall academic experience](image)

Satisfaction levels are also uniform across student groups. Overall, low-income, first-generation, and underrepresented minority students from the classes of 1989, 1999 and 2004 were just as satisfied with their UC education as other students. Satisfaction with one’s undergraduate education, however, does vary depending upon the issue. Figure 2, which combines survey responses from the graduating classes of 1989, 1999 and 2004, shows that survey respondents were most satisfied with their overall academic experience and the quality of faculty instruction at UC and least satisfied with their access to small classes.

![Figure 2: Percent of UC alumni satisfied or very satisfied with](image)

grant recipient status. This suggests that the sample is representative of graduating cohorts, at least in terms of basic demographic characteristics. We have no way of ascertaining whether the sample might be biased in other ways, for example, whether UC alumni who were employed, earning relatively high salaries, or highly satisfied with their undergraduate education were more likely to respond, or not.
WAS IT REALLY WORTH IT?

Survey respondents were also asked whether the benefits of attending UC were worth the cost. About 83 percent of respondents from the class of 1989 strongly agreed compared to about 70 percent from the class of 2004; not surprising, costs indeed were lower in 1989. More striking is the fact that 90 percent or more of students from all three graduating classes agreed (strongly or somewhat) that the benefits of attending UC were worth the cost.

Figure 3: Were the benefits of attending UC worth the cost? UC classes of 1989, 1999 and 2004

Although certainly positive, the level of satisfaction reported by UC graduates does not appear to be unique to UC. In early 2010, about the same time that UC undertook its alumni survey, the American Council on Education surveyed a random sample of 400 recent college graduates (25–39 years old) from two- and four-year institutions about their undergraduate experiences. Among recent graduates, 89 percent believed their education was worth it, even considering the time and money required to attend, and nearly 80 percent reported they would attend the same institution. Although the results varied by institution, clearly recent — as well as not-so-recent — college graduates recognize, and appreciate, the many social and economic benefits that accrue to their college education. This is as true for UC alumni as it is for alumni from other kinds of colleges and universities.

More striking than data on alumni satisfaction is that bearing on UC students’ post-graduation employment and income. Here we combined data from all three graduating cohorts into two categories: low SES (first-generation students from low-income families) and high SES (students from middle- or upper-income families whose parents had college degrees). Since the data for the two intermediate categories (low-income/not first-generation, and higher income/first-generation) are basically similar, we present results for just the low SES and high SES students. Table 8 summarizes the results.

Table 8: Employment outcomes of low vs. high SES students UC classes of 1989, 1999 and 2004

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Low SES Students</th>
<th>High SES Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employed full- or part-time</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking for work (unemployed)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied or very satisfied with course of career so far</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working in same or related field as undergraduate major</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal income $50,000–$100,000</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal income over $100,000</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although there are some differences between these two groups of students who entered UC from widely different socio-economic backgrounds, what’s striking 5, 10, and 20 years after graduation is how similar they look. More than four-fifths of both groups were currently employed and satisfied with the course of their career to date; about three-quarters were living in California; almost two-thirds were working in the same field as their undergraduate major or one related to it; and three-quarters reported personal incomes above $50,000 (in a state where the per capita personal income was $42,325 in 2010). Not surprising, respondents tended to hold professional positions — in health care, teaching, law, computer technology, sales and marketing, and management.

Granted, there were some small differences between the high and low SES student alumni: Students from lower SES backgrounds were slightly more likely to be employed than students from high SES backgrounds (88 vs. 84 percent) and slightly more likely to be looking for work (4 vs. 3 percent); they were also somewhat less likely to earn more than $100,000 (21 vs. 29 percent). Despite these
differences, what's most remarkable is how similar these two vastly different groups of students look after college graduation — a similarity that speaks to the ability of a UC education not only to erase some of the most obvious social class differences that characterized its entering students, but also to promote the social and economic mobility of its least-advantaged students. Unfortunately we do not have access to comparable data to assess the extent to which UC graduates are similar to, or different from, those of peer institutions in this regard.

DISCUSSION

Study after study has shown that college graduates earn significantly more than high school graduates, both on an annual basis and cumulatively over their lifetimes. There are exceptions to this generalization, but more important, there are significant differences in earnings potential of college graduates across college majors. A May 2011 report, What's it Worth: The Economic Value of College Majors, from the Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce, used Census Bureau data from more than 3 million bachelor's degree holders in the United States to explore the median salaries and career paths of college graduates over the past 40 years. Some of the results were to be expected. Science, engineering and business majors tended to be better off financially than liberal arts and humanities majors. In addition, the study found that women and underrepresented minority students tended to cluster in low-paying fields that had few opportunities for advancement, such as education and social work; some undergraduate majors also essentially required a graduate degree to secure a good job. This is not altogether surprising, at least for students from underrepresented minorities who are also first-generation college goers. Historically, social mobility has been a multi-generational phenomenon, and some low-paid professional careers, such as teaching, have served as important stepping-stones for the first upwardly mobile generation.

Although data from UC's Undergraduate Alumni Survey are not detailed enough to allow us to explore how students from different racial/ethnic, class and educational backgrounds allocated themselves across different majors and what impact this had on their earnings, they do show some difference in income distribution among graduates from lower and higher socio-economic backgrounds.

Additionally, there are wide disparities by race/ethnicity in terms of how students distribute themselves into both UC's undergraduate and graduate and professional degree programs. African American and Chicano/Latino students, for example, are less likely to enter some of the higher-paying graduate and professional degree majors such as business, engineering and the physical and life sciences and more likely to be found in education, which is one of the lower-paying professions. Medicine is a major exception: in 2008, almost 20 percent of UC's first-year medical students were under-represented students compared to a national average of 14.5 percent (Indicator 8.7). How the differential allocation of students by race/ethnicity, class and first-generation status into both undergraduate and graduate majors affects their future earnings, and their socio-economic mobility in general, is a question for further analysis.

The data are clearer about how UC's selectivity and the relatively rich availability of student financial aid support the success of students from low-income families and underrepresented minorities. UC selects its freshman admits from the top eighth of all California high school graduates and admits qualified community college transfer students. It also defines the curricular pathways students must
follow to achieve an offer of admission. In this regard, UC defines its pipeline more rigorously than its peer public institutions; this in turn helps contribute to the relative success of UC’s graduates compared to its public peers, at least as measured by their time to degree.

Sustained commitments to student financial aid at the state, federal and institutional levels have also been essential to maintaining access for, and supporting the success of, low- and middle-income students, especially as costs to attend the University have increased in recent years. Pell grants represented $286 million (or about 20 percent) of the grants and scholarships available to UC undergraduates in 2009-10. A range of proposals to scale back the federal Pell grant program to varying degrees could put at risk financial support to low-income students.

At the state level, the Cal Grant program contributed $425 million (or another 30 percent) of all grants and scholarships available to UC undergraduates in 2009-10. That program too is at risk owing to the state’s continuing structural financial challenges. Should either of these programs be scaled back significantly we would likely see higher levels of student debt, more hours of student work, or a reduction in the number of highly talented but financially needy students aspiring to attend UC. If this were to happen, UC’s ability to promote the social mobility of large numbers of disadvantaged students — and their ability to rise above the cumulative weight of race, class and social disadvantages — could be severely compromised.

***

Increasing access and graduation rates for low-income, first-generation and underrepresented students is a societal issue; no single institution can do it alone. But to the extent that UC is able to continue to open its doors to underprivileged students in California and foster their success, it helps promote social and economic equality. And to the extent that the disadvantaged students it admits graduate in significant numbers and go on to achieve occupational and professional success, it demonstrates to the state of California, and to the people of California, what can be accomplished by a very high quality public research university. To succeed in that mission, the University needs continuing high levels of support both for its very successful student financial aid programs, and for its academic programs in general. Academic preparation of students from underrepresented and low-income families is also vital since UC’s effectiveness as an engine for social mobility can only really be felt by students who are admitted to, attend and graduate from the university.
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Chapter 1. Size and Shape of the University

The University of California was founded in 1868. With 10 faculty members, it enrolled its first class of 38 undergraduates the following year. From these beginnings, UC has evolved into a university with 10 campuses, five medical centers and numerous other facilities. Its budget is more than $20 billion annually, and the University has about 234,000 students, 33,000 faculty and academic employees, 98,000 staff, and nearly 1.6 million alumni.1

Through a few key quantitative measures, this chapter presents an overview of the size and shape of the University. It demonstrates the challenges that confront the University today: enormous growth in enrollment, steady declines in state support, reductions in the average expenditures for education and increases in student tuition and fee levels.

The indicators in this chapter also show the continuing vibrancy of the University as a wide and diverse community of students, faculty, staff and alumni. They show the complex array of revenues that the University relies upon to maintain its diverse enterprise. Together, they paint a picture of a strong institution, but now at significant risk. They also set the backdrop against which subsequent sections are framed.

1 Counts above are unduplicated: 5,400 medical residents included with students, 25,000 student staff employees excluded from staff and 28,000 student academic employees excluded from academic employees. In total, UC has about 174,000 employees when faculty, staff and student employees are included.
1.1 STUDENT ENROLLMENT

Student enrollment at the University has quadrupled in the past 50 years.

1.1 Undergraduate and graduate student enrollment with campus opening date
Universitywide
Fall 1869 to 2010

![Graph showing student enrollment growth from 1869 to 2010](image)

Enrollment growth, especially in the number of undergraduates, has been driven by continued commitment to the Master Plan during a period of dramatic growth in California’s population. The Master Plan guarantees a place at UC for the top 12.5 percent of the graduating high school class in California and to all eligible community college transfers.

The growth in undergraduate students has greatly outstripped the increase in graduate and professional students. In 1961, UC enrolled 68 percent undergraduates compared to 32 percent graduate and professional students. In 2010, the University enrolled about 78 percent undergraduates compared to 22 percent graduate and professional students.

---

1 Does not include medical residents.
The UC community consists of more than 234,000 students, 132,000 faculty and staff, 50,000 retirees and nearly 1.6 million living alumni.

The University of California system encompasses 10 campuses, 5 medical centers, 17 health professional schools, five law schools and the state’s only public veterinary school. UC also offers professional and enrichment courses and agricultural and natural resources programs that extend learning and apply knowledge throughout California.

The broader UC community includes millions of California residents and visitors. The patients at UC’s hospitals annually account for 3.8 million outpatient clinic visits and more than 850,000 inpatient days. UC Extension enrolls 300,000 annually. Numerous farmers and agriculturalists work with UC Cooperative Extension agents. Entrepreneurs and employees in industries use findings from UC’s research. Many others attend concerts, movies and lectures at UC and visit its varied museums, libraries, botanical gardens and natural reserves.

1 Counts above are unduplicated: 24,834 student staff employees excluded from staff and 28,142 student academic employees excluded from academic employees. Also, counts exclude 300,000 University Extension enrollments (extension enrollments are duplicated so it is unknown how many unique students these enrollments represent).
1.3 REVENUES

In 2009–10, the University generated nearly $21 billion in revenues from a wide range of sources. Most of the University’s revenues are restricted in the way that they may be used.

1.3 Operating revenues by source
Universitywide
2000–01 to 2009–10

In addition to providing instruction for more than 234,000 students annually and maintaining a multibillion-dollar research enterprise, the University engages in a broad spectrum of ancillary activities. These include the operation of teaching hospitals, maintenance of world-class libraries, development of academic preparation programs and provision of auxiliary enterprises such as student residence halls and dining services. The University is also involved in the management of three Department of Energy (DOE) labs: Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and Los Alamos National Laboratory.

1 Excludes DOE Laboratories. Other revenues include state financing appropriations, investment income and other miscellaneous revenues; more information can be found in the audited financial statements at www.universityofcalifornia.edu/transparency. Private gifts listed here are from the audited financial statements which do not count pledged funds and reports campus foundations separately; figures in Chapter 12 University Budgets and Private Giving do include these funds.
1.4 STATE SUPPORT

The University’s share of the state’s general fund dropped from 8.1 percent in 1966–67 to 3.0 percent in 2011–12.

1.4 UC share of state budget
Universitywide
1966–67 to 2011–12

Between 1966–67 and 2010–11, the share of the state budget for Corrections and Rehabilitation grew from about 4 percent to about 10 percent. The relative decline in funding for higher education while prisons receive increases reflects a fundamental realignment of public priorities, with major consequences for higher education.

Historically, state funding has been the largest single source of core support for the University. Together with UC general funds¹ and student fee revenue, state funding has provided permanent funding for the core costs of instruction, including faculty salaries and benefits, academic and administrative support, student services, facilities operation and maintenance, and student financial aid.

¹ 2010–11 estimated and 2011–12 projected by UC Budget Office. Figures exclude federal stimulus funds passed through the state budget.
² UC general funds are mostly nonresident tuition revenue and indirect cost recovery from research grants and contracts.
1.5. EXPENDITURES PER STUDENT

Since 1990–91, the total cost of a UC education has declined by 19 percent per student. Students and their families have borne an ever increasing share of that cost, surpassing 50 percent for the first time in 2011–12.

1.5 Per-student average expenditures for education
Universitywide

Since 1990–91, average inflation-adjusted expenditures for educating UC students have declined 19 percent. During the same time period, the state’s share of expenditures has fallen even more steeply, by more than 51 percent. The share of expenditures borne by students in the form of fees has tripled, from 13 percent to 40 percent.

In other words, students and their families are bearing a growing proportion of the cost of their education. Increases in student fees have made up some (but not all) of the reductions in state support.

1 2010–11 is an estimate and 2011–12 is a projection; both by UCOP Budget Office. Figures have been adjusted for inflation.
Chapter 2. Undergraduate Students — Admissions and Enrollment

Goals

Accessibility, to all Californians who meet the University’s eligibility (admissions) standards, and affordability are two key goals for the University of California. Nowhere are they better defined than in California’s Master Plan for Higher Education. The Master Plan assigns each of the three public higher education segments — the University of California (UC), the California State University (CSU) system and the California Community Colleges (CCC) — its own distinctive mission and pool of students. Under the Master Plan, UC admits all eligible freshmen in the top 12.5 percent of California’s public high school graduates, determining how that pool is defined. It also has a well-defined transfer route for students who choose to attend a California Community College after high school.

Narrative

Indicators in this chapter describe the freshman and transfers who apply, are admitted and enroll in the University, in terms of their academic preparedness, their socio-economic status, and their geographic origins. Presented to show changes over time, they demonstrate the continuing challenges the University faces meeting its Master Plan obligations.

Specifically, the indicators show that despite state budget cuts and tuition increases, demand for a UC education continues to grow among California families. Campuses that used to admit almost every applicant are becoming more selective, and the students admitted are more academically prepared than a decade ago.

UC has shrunk the size of the freshman class in response to state budget cuts, but those reductions have been partially offset by increases in the enrollment of new community college transfer students. In addition, UC has begun to increase the proportion of nonresident students at its campuses, but their proportion remains extremely low compared to other public and private institutions in the Association of American Universities.

Looking forward

The indicators in this section have been watched closely by the University for many years. In the next few years, they will be monitored to discern the impacts of student tuition increases and how they are mitigated by student financial aid. The University will also monitor any changes that may be attributed to new eligibility criteria that will be introduced to select freshmen beginning in 2012.1 Finally, UC campuses will be recruiting additional nonresident undergraduate students to enrich and diversify their student bodies while preserving institutional capacity in the absence of adequate state funding.

For more information

The University maintains an extensive website with information on admissions at www.universityofcalifornia.edu/admissions. Additional information on the California Master Plan for Higher Education is at http://ucfuture.universityofcalifornia.edu/documents/ca_masterplan_summary.pdf.

1 Under these eligibility criteria, more California applicants will be fully considered for admission to UC.
During the past 16 years, applications to UC have nearly doubled. UC enrollments have grown 58 percent during the same period, but are still falling short of demand.

Enrollment targets are established annually by the University and are driven by the availability of state funding. In fall 2004, new freshman enrollment targets were reduced by 10 percent in response to state budget cuts that were later restored. Freshman enrollments were curtailed again in fall 2009 and 2010 in response to state budget cuts, though transfer enrollment targets were increased to partially offset the decline in freshmen.

Approximately 90 percent of transfer students at UC come from a California Community College (CCC). Transfer applicants from the CCCs are given priority in the admissions process over transfer applicants from other institutions.

Despite reductions in state support, UC continues to maintain its obligations under the Master Plan by admitting all eligible Californians. As a result, in 2010–11, UC enrolled nearly 13,000 California students, including 11,000 undergraduate students, for which it received no state support.
Every UC campus has experienced tremendous growth in applications and admissions since 1994. Trends in campus yield rates (the proportion of admitted students who actually enroll) have been more stable over time.

2.2 Freshman applicants, admits and enrollees
UC campuses
Fall 1994 to 2010

Source: UC Corporate Student System

1 Applicants here include the “referral pool”, which comprises eligible applicants who are not offered admission at the campus they applied to are admitted to another campus where there is sufficient capacity. In the recent past, these campuses have been Riverside and Merced. Some campuses admit fall applicants for a subsequent term (winter or spring). These “rollover” admits and enrollees are excluded in the graphs here. See the appendix for details.
**2.3 FRESHMAN PREPARATION**

**Freshmen who entered the University in fall 2010 were better prepared academically than those who entered in fall 2000.**

2.3.1 A-G (college preparatory)\(^1\) courses, “weighted” grade point average (GPA) and standardized test scores of entering freshman

**Universitywide**

**Fall 2000 and 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year-long “a–g” courses</th>
<th>HS weighted GPA</th>
<th>Test scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall 2000</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fall 2010</strong></td>
<td><strong>Fall 2000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;25 courses</td>
<td>&gt;25 courses</td>
<td>4.2 and above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.0 – 24.9</td>
<td>20.0 – 24.9</td>
<td>3.8–4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;20</td>
<td>&lt;20</td>
<td>3.4–3.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** UC Corporate Student System\(^2\)

For admissions purposes, the University computes two different high school GPAs — weighted and unweighted. The weighted GPA (shown here) provides extra credit for succeeding in difficult courses, such as those in the College Board’s Advanced Placement programs. An A in such a course receives 5 points, a B 4 points, and so forth. In other college preparatory courses, an A counts for 4 points, a B for 3, and so forth.

---

\(^1\) A-G Courses refer to those high school courses that UC has reviewed and approved as college preparatory.

\(^2\) San Francisco does not enroll freshman. Grades shown here are weighted such that a grade in a UC-approved honors class, such as Advanced Placement, is given an extra grade point (e.g. a grade of “A” receives 5 grade points instead of the usual 4 grade points). Fall 2000 test scores are the sum of SAT I Math and Verbal scores and fall 2009 are the sum of SAT Critical Reading and Math scores. Unknowns are excluded.
2.3 FRESHMAN PREPARATION

A-G courses, incoming freshmen
UC campuses

High school weighted GPA, incoming freshmen
UC campuses

2.3.2 SAT Reading and Math scores, 25th to 75th percentile
UC campuses and comparison institutions
Fall 2008

Source for SAT scores is IPEDS. Other data are from UC Corporate Student System.

1 Data for the SAT Writing Test are not available for comparison institutions. *Merced did not open until 2005.
2.4 TRANSFER APPLICANTS, ADMITS AND ENROLLEES

UC prioritizes transfer enrollment. Since 1994, the fall enrollment of new California Community College (CCC) upper-division transfers has increased 79 percent (from 8,681 to 15,572) and is approaching UC’s stated goal of one transfer for every two freshman.

2.4.1 Transfer applicants, admits and enrollees

UC campuses
Fall 1994 to 2010

The Master Plan calls for UC to accommodate all eligible California Community College (CCC) transfer students. It specifies that the University maintain a 60:40 ratio of upper-division (junior- and senior-level) to lower-division (freshman- and sophomore-level) students in order to ensure spaces for CCC transfers. Students transferring into the upper-division from the CCC’s are crucial to maintaining this balance. To do so, UC should enroll one new transfer student for each two new freshmen.
2.5 TRANSFER PREPARATION

Like freshmen, UC transfer students in fall 2010 were better prepared academically than their counterparts in earlier years, as measured by their grades.

2.5 College grade point average (GPA)\(^1\) of entering transfer students
Fall 2000 and 2010

**Universitywide**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2000</th>
<th>Fall 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.6-4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 to 3.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.80 to 3.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UC campuses**

Source: UC Corporate Student System

---

\(^1\) The transfer GPA is based on grades for college-level academic courses from the college(s) where students were previously enrolled. *Merced did not open until 2005.
2.6 DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF UC UNDERGRADUATES

UC enrolls a higher proportion of first-generation students than other very selective public and private universities, reflecting its continuing accessibility to all Californians.

2.6.1 First-generation undergraduate students

A first-generation student is one for whom neither parent holds a college degree. Having parents with college degrees can provide students with the role models, family expectations, know-how and financial means that ease a student’s transition from high school to college and that contribute to students’ success in college. Students whose parents have not graduated from college may lack these resources and cannot benefit from the advantages they can confer.

2.6.2 First generation undergraduate students
UC campuses Fall 2008

Source: NPSAS and UC Corporate Student System

Source: UC Corporate Student System

1 NPSAS data group institutions in the categories shown. Individual universities cannot be identified. NPSAS data are headcount; UC data are fall headcount.
UC has a substantially lower proportion of out-of-state undergraduates than other AAU universities. In fall 2010, nearly 6 percent of UC undergraduates were out-of-state, compared to 27 percent and 75 percent for AAU publics and AAU privates respectively.

2.7.1 Geographic origin of entering freshmen
UC and comparison institutions
Fall 2000 to 2010

Nonresidents provide geographic diversity to the student body. They also pay the full cost of their education. In 2010–11, average tuition and fees for a UC nonresident undergraduate was $34,164, compared to $11,285 for resident students.

Nonresident applicants must meet higher criteria to be considered for admission. The minimum high school GPA for nonresident freshmen is 3.4, compared to 3.0 for California freshmen. The minimum college GPA for nonresident transfer students is 2.8, compared to 2.4 for California residents.

UC's priority is to enroll eligible California residents for whom the state has provided funding. Campuses enroll nonresident students based on excess physical and instructional capacity and the campus's ability to attract qualified nonresident students.

Not all nonresident students pay nonresident tuition. Some have statutory exemptions, such as AB540 students¹, children of UC employees and others designated by the state. The proportion/percentage of students paying nonresident tuition is in the chart below.

2.7.2 Percentage of full-time-equivalent enrollment paying nonresident tuition
Universitywide
2002–03 to 2009–10

¹ AB540 students are considered California residents by tuition purposes as established by Assembly Bill 540 passed in 2001.
2.7 GEOGRAPHIC ORIGINS OF ENTERING UNDERGRADUATES

High school graduates from rural regions of the state are less likely to attend UC than those from urban regions.

2.7.3 Statewide enrollment of California resident freshmen by region of home location

Universitywide
Fall 2010

Fall 2010 freshman enrollees from each region

and

Enrollees per thousand high school graduates in 2009 in each region (in square brackets and denoted by the darkness of the color for each region)

Source: UC Corporate Student System and California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC)¹

¹ Enrollments are normalized by the number of high school graduates the year before enrolling at UC. All high school graduates, including those from public, private and charter schools, are included.
2.7 GEOGRAPHIC ORIGINS OF ENTERING UNDERGRADUATES

Transfer students tend to attend a campus near their home.

2.7.4 Statewide enrollment of California resident transfers by region of home location
Universitywide
Fall 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Enrollees</th>
<th>Enrollees per thousand high school graduates in 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inland Empire</td>
<td>35 [8.8]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior California</td>
<td>53 [16.3]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Coast</td>
<td>38 [12]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Sacramento Valley</td>
<td>35 [8.8]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacramento-Tahoe</td>
<td>1,052 [382]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco Bay Area</td>
<td>3,805 [55.8]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North San Joaquin Valley</td>
<td>437 [14.7]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego-Imperial</td>
<td>1,223 [36.2]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inyo-Mono</td>
<td>8 [24.1]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Coast</td>
<td>38 [12]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Coast</td>
<td>890 [52.8]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey Bay</td>
<td>323 [40.6]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>4,005 [40.8]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td>1,832 [52.9]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego-Imperial</td>
<td>2,223 [36.2]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange County</td>
<td>1,832 [52.9]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UC Corporate Student System and California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC).1

Fall 2010 transfer enrollees from each region

and

Enrollees per thousand high school graduates in 2007 in each region (in square brackets and denoted by the darkness of the color in each region)

1 Enrollments are normalized by the number of high school graduates three years before transfer students enroll at UC. All high school graduates, including those from public, private and charter schools, are included.
Chapter 3. Undergraduate Students — Affordability

Goals
UC seeks to ensure that financial considerations are not an obstacle to eligible students who seek to complete a University degree. Its student financial aid program is designed with this goal in view.

Narrative
UC closely monitors the impact of its pricing decisions and its financial aid program with a variety of affordability indicators. For example, it routinely assesses the cost of attending UC for families at different income levels. It also monitors the enrollment of low- and middle-income students, how much students need to work during a term and how much money they borrow to pay for their education.

The indicators in this section show that the University remains accessible to students from all income groups, despite the increases in student tuition and fees that are forced on the University by the withdrawal of state funding. Despite continuing upward pressure on student tuition and fees, the proportion of lower-income students enrolled in UC grew in 2010. Due to the availability of student financial aid programs, the inflation-adjusted net cost paid by low-income students for their University education has declined since 2004–05.

Meanwhile, the inflation-adjusted net cost for lower middle-income students has been flat during the last five years, but the cost for upper-middle income and wealthier students has risen substantially. The balance of students from low-middle-, and high-income families has changed during the past decade, with the largest decline in the proportion of upper-middle-income students. This chapter offers some explanations.

Looking forward
UC's commitment to affordability is especially important at a time when the University is forced by the withdrawal of state support to raise student tuition and fees. Evidence of that commitment is the University's Blue and Gold Opportunity Plan, which ensures that needy students with household incomes below a threshold level receive gift aid to cover their tuition and fees. For 2011–12, the threshold was raised to $80,000; the threshold was set at $70,000 in 2010–11 and $60,000 in 2009–10. Additionally, in 2011–12, UC will provide a grant to fully cover the cost of the 8 percent 2011–12 tuition increase for students with need from families earning incomes up to $120,000. The University also has started raising donations for Project You Can, a fundraising initiative that aims to raise $1 billion in private support during the next four years for student aid.

The indicators in this chapter provide important baseline measures that will help the University assess the impact of these programs and of tuition increases.

For more information
More information about UC costs and financial aid, including links to financial aid estimators provided by each campus, is available at www.universityofcalifornia.edu/admissions/paying.html.

Detailed information about trends in UC financial aid can also be found in the University's Annual Report on Student Financial Support, which is available at www.ucop.edu/sas/sfs/docs/regents_0910.pdf.

1 More information about the Blue and Gold Opportunity Plan, including details on eligibility criteria, can be found at: www.universityofcalifornia.edu/admissions/paying-for-uc/financial-aid/grants/blue-gold/index.html.
3.1 TOTAL COST OF ATTENDANCE

Due to state budget cuts, UC resident tuition and fees were raised to a level that now exceeds the national averages for AAU public institutions. Total costs have risen at all institutions (public and private).

3.1 Total cost of attendance
UC and comparison institutions
2002–03 to 2009–10

The total cost of attending college includes tuition and fees, as well as living expenses, books and supplies, transportation, health insurance and personal expenses.

In 2009–10, the University’s total cost of attendance for California resident undergraduates was $26,916. Tuition and fees composed 35 percent of this amount.

The total cost of attendance is higher at UC than at AAU Public comparison institutions because of the relatively high cost of living in California.

Source: IPEDS and UC Corporate Student System

1 A list of the 28 non-UC AAU public and 26 AAU private institutions in the comparison groups can be found in the appendix.
The net cost of attending UC has increased for many students since 1999–2000, yet the net cost of attendance for students from low-income families (families earning less than $50,000 annually), has actually declined since 2004–05.

A general measure of the University’s affordability is its average net cost of attendance. This represents the actual cost of attending the University for undergraduates after taking into account scholarships and grants.

Scholarships and grants reduce the net cost of attending UC for students at all income levels, but especially for students from low- and middle-income families and students who, under federal guidelines, are considered to be financially independent from their parents.

The availability of scholarships, grants, student financial aid and the Blue and Gold program has mitigated the impacts of cost increases on students from families earning below $99,000.

Since 2004–05, net cost for students with family incomes below $50,000 has fallen. Net cost for students with family incomes between $50,000 and $99,000 has leveled off.

Between 1999–2000 and 2009–10, increases to gift aid kept the average increase in inflation-adjusted net cost for low-income students to about $1,200, compared to about $6,500 for students in the highest income category. The average increase in inflation-adjusted net cost for all UC undergraduate students was approximately $4,300 during this time period.
### 3.3 COMPARATIVE NET COST

Comparatively higher costs of attendance at UC campuses are offset by higher than average amounts of gift aid awarded to very-low-income students.

3.3 Average gift aid, cost of attendance and net cost for very low-income students
UC campuses and public AAU institutions
2008–09

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Average net cost (income&lt;$30k)</th>
<th>Average gift aid (income&lt;$30k)</th>
<th>Average cost of attendance of all</th>
<th>Published cost ofattainment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>$2,366</td>
<td>$13,828</td>
<td>$16,194</td>
<td>$7,644 $18,692 $26,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>$3,188</td>
<td>$12,207</td>
<td>$15,395</td>
<td>$8,034 $9,077 $17,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>$3,337</td>
<td>$15,970</td>
<td>$19,307</td>
<td>$8,151 $10,536 $18,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Tech</td>
<td>$3,490</td>
<td>$12,562</td>
<td>$16,052</td>
<td>$8,170 $18,105 $26,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>$3,904</td>
<td>$16,584</td>
<td>$20,488</td>
<td>$8,171 $15,347 $23,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M</td>
<td>$4,902</td>
<td>$14,939</td>
<td>$19,841</td>
<td>$8,184 $13,463 $21,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State</td>
<td>$4,971</td>
<td>$14,959</td>
<td>$19,930</td>
<td>$8,283 $15,000 $23,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue</td>
<td>$5,285</td>
<td>$13,018</td>
<td>$18,303</td>
<td>$8,305 $14,249 $22,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>$6,144</td>
<td>$16,462</td>
<td>$22,606</td>
<td>$8,825 $15,774 $24,599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>$6,246</td>
<td>$12,612</td>
<td>$18,858</td>
<td>$9,071 $14,362 $23,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marylsland</td>
<td>$6,444</td>
<td>$14,387</td>
<td>$20,831</td>
<td>$9,376 $16,499 $25,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>$6,739</td>
<td>$16,297</td>
<td>$23,036</td>
<td>$9,576 $8,266 $17,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>$6,743</td>
<td>$13,783</td>
<td>$20,526</td>
<td>$10,119 $13,142 $23,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>$6,963</td>
<td>$17,617</td>
<td>$24,580</td>
<td>$11,254 $9,223 $20,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>$7,003</td>
<td>$11,005</td>
<td>$18,008</td>
<td>$11,661 $7,736 $19,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>$7,118</td>
<td>$10,664</td>
<td>$17,822</td>
<td>$12,826 $5,656 $18,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY Stony Brook</td>
<td>$7,174</td>
<td>$10,387</td>
<td>$17,561</td>
<td>$13,131 $12,706 $25,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY Buffalo</td>
<td>$7,343</td>
<td>$9,341</td>
<td>$16,684</td>
<td>$14,460 $12,282 $26,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>$7,495</td>
<td>$17,230</td>
<td>$24,725</td>
<td>$19,949 $4,246 $24,195</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IPEDS

The total cost of attendance is higher at UC campuses than at most other public AAU institutions because of the high cost of living in California and because UC counts more student expenses in its cost-of-attendance calculations than many other comparison institutions.

UC provides among the highest levels of gift aid ($14,000 to $19,000) of all AAU public institutions.

---

1 Low-income students shown here have family income below $30,000. Published Cost of Attendance = Tuition + Published Living Expenses. Living expenses vary depending on a student’s housing choices and on the housing market around a campus. This leads to the slightly different averages shown in this chart for the different UC campuses.
More gift aid is available to UC students than to students at other AAU public institutions. That is why UC is able to attract, support and graduate a sizable proportion of high-achieving students from low-income families.

3.4 Per capita gift aid for new freshmen
UC campuses and public AAU institutions
2008–09

Institutional gift aid accounts for the lion’s share of financial support available to UC students. The primary source of institutional gift aid is the nearly one-third of all tuition and fee revenues that UC sets aside for financial aid.

Institutional gift aid also includes merit-based scholarships. One in four UC undergraduates receives a merit-based scholarship. In 2009–10, the average merit-based scholarship was about $3,600. Funding for these scholarships comes from federal, state and institutional sources.

One remarkable aspect of UC’s financial aid awards is the high level of gift aid compared to other AAU public institutions. While federal Pell Grants are available to low-income students at any institution, UC students currently benefit from the combination of a strong state financial aid program (Cal Grants) and a strong UC aid program. AAU institutions in other states generally have either a strong state aid program or a strong institutional aid program, not both.

1 Figures include gift aid given to all students, while the data in Indicator 3.3 shows gift aid to very-low-income students only. Pell grants are the main source of federal gift aid. For California students, Cal Grants are the main source of state gift aid.
3.5 INCOME PROFILE

UC enrolls a higher percent of Pell Grant recipients than any other top research university in the country.

3.5.1 Undergraduate Pell Grant recipients
UC and comparison institutions
2008–09

The percent of undergraduate students with Pell Grants provides a useful means to compare different institutions in terms of how accessible they are to low-income students. It is also a useful indicator for comparing the socio-economic diversity of an institution’s undergraduate students.

The data shown above are those for the most recent year that data on comparison institutions are available. The proportion of UC undergraduates receiving Pell Grants went up from 31 percent in 2008–09 to 39 percent in 2010–11. This is primarily a result of increased federal spending, as well as the economic downturn which caused family incomes to drop generally.

Source: IPEDS

1 Percentage reported is that of students who received Pell Grants at any time during the 2008–09 year as a percentage of all undergraduates. Note that Pell Grant eligibility criteria change annually, both as a result of the federal appropriations process and from other formula changes. Thus, trend analysis of Pell recipients would not be a valid measure of changes in low-income students but rather would reflect the changes in eligibility criteria. The numbers of students receiving Pell Grants at each institution can be found in the appendix. A list of the institutions in the AAU comparison groups can be found in the appendix.
A large proportion of UC students come from low-income families.

3.5.2 Undergraduate income distribution
Universitywide and UC campuses
2009–10

Source: UC Corporate Student System

Source: UC Corporate Student System

1 Unknown values not shown.
3.5 INCOME PROFILE

UC tuition and fees have increased 32 percent in inflation-adjusted dollars during the past decade. At the same time, the proportion of students from low- and high-income families has grown, while the proportion from middle-incomes families has declined.

3.5.3 Number and proportion of dependent undergraduate students by family income
Universitywide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0 to $50k</td>
<td>33,513</td>
<td>42,730</td>
<td>53,961</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50k to $99k</td>
<td>30,078</td>
<td>35,771</td>
<td>37,415</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$99k to $149k</td>
<td>27,026</td>
<td>31,192</td>
<td>28,423</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $149k</td>
<td>23,281</td>
<td>32,642</td>
<td>40,454</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UC Corporate Student System

1 Income ranges have been adjusted for inflation.

The growth in the proportion of students from low-income families is made possible by the combination of federal, state and institutional aid that is available to UC students.

The decline in the proportion of students from middle-income families may be caused by a number of factors. It will be the subject of more intensive analysis in the coming years as the University watches this trend. It may be caused by a general decline in the proportion of middle-income families in California, from whom UC draws 41 percent of its undergraduate students. Evidence may exist in the fact that middle-income applications have declined even though middle-income admit rates and middle-income yield rates have followed the trends for other income groups.

Alternatively, the decline in applications from students of middle-income families, leading to proportionally fewer enrollments, could be due to middle-class families perceiving that UC is no longer affordable (the net cost of attending UC has increased by $4,300 between 1999–2000 and 2009–10).
Except on one campus, the proportion of students not working for pay increased from 2006 and 2010. The proportion working more than 20 hours a week decreased from 2006 to 2010 except on two campuses.

The trends in undergraduate work patterns may result from a combination of factors, including the growing proportion of students from high-income families (see 3.5.3) and diminished job opportunities for students due to the recession. UC expects all students to help finance their education through a combination of work and borrowing. Where student work is concerned, the University's goal is for students to work at a reasonable level that does not impede progress toward completion of the baccalaureate degree. Working more than 20 hours per week during the academic term is considered excessive.\(^\text{1}\)

\(^1\) See the University Annual Report on Student Financial Support, www.ucop.edu/sas/sfs/docs/regents_0910.pdf (pg 6)
While the proportion of students graduating with student loan debt has fallen slightly (from 52.7 percent in 2000–01 to 49.1 percent in 2009–10), the average inflation-adjusted debt at graduation of student borrowers has increased 6.9 percent (from $16,248 to $17,371).

3.7 Student loan debt burden of graduating seniors (inflation adjusted)
Universitywide
2000–01 to 2009–10

The average student loan debt among graduating UC borrowers in 2009–10 was almost $17,000. The monthly repayment for this amount is about $190 a month for 10 years at the 6 percent interest rate that typically applies to student loans. Longer repayment periods are available that lower the monthly payments.

Here, too, the growing proportion of UC undergraduates coming from relatively high-income families (see 3.5.3) may help explain the slight decrease in the proportion of students graduating with loan debt.

1 Figures adjusted for inflation.
Chapter 4. Undergraduate Student Success

Goals
The University of California supports students toward the successful and timely completion of their degrees and prepares them for roles as the next generation of leaders for California, the nation and the world.

Narrative
There are numerous ways to define and measure student success. This chapter looks at the amount of time, measured in years, that freshman and transfer students take to complete their undergraduate degrees. It also looks at evidence of the careers students embark upon after completing their undergraduate degrees, and at survey data on students' reported satisfaction with their undergraduate experience.

By many of these measures, UC's undergraduates are successful. Four-fifths of entering freshmen graduate from a UC campus within six years, and four years later, more than a quarter have enrolled in graduate or professional programs. Surveys show that large numbers of UC undergraduates plan to take professional and managerial positions in the California labor force. There are continuing challenges, however: graduation rates vary by campus and tend to be lower for socio-economically disadvantaged students, who are disproportionately African-American and Chicano/Latino.1 The University will continue to monitor these trends going forward.

Looking forward
As a result of continuing budgetary pressures, UC is faced with having to teach an ever-growing number of undergraduates (Indicator 1.1) with fewer faculty (Indicator 6.1.1). The impacts of this on student success, whether measured in terms of student time-to-degree or student satisfaction, are something that will be monitored in the years to come through data presented in this chapter.

Additionally, UC will continue improving the information it has about the roles its graduates occupy after leaving the University. In 2009–10, UC launched a comprehensive survey of baccalaureate recipients who graduated five, 10 and 20 years ago (in 2004, 1999 and 1989). Data from this survey are presented in this chapter, in the analytic essay and in the introduction to this report. These data will make an important contribution to our understanding about the role the University plays in the course of students' lives.

For more information
The University periodically prepares an Accountability Sub-Report on Student Success that provides a more in-depth look at this topic, at www.universityofcalifornia.edu/accountability/report.html#subreports.

1 July 2009 Accountability Sub-Report on Student Success, www.universityofcalifornia.edu/accountability/report.html#subreports
4.1 FRESHMAN GRADUATION RATES

UC freshman graduation rates have improved substantially since 1995. They are better than the average graduation rates of students at AAU public institutions and approach those at AAU private institutions at some campuses.

4.1 Freshman graduation rates
Cohorts entering fall 1995 to 2006

UC and comparison institutions

Overall, four-year graduation rates increased from 41 percent for the 1995 cohort to 60 percent for the 2006 cohort, while six-year graduation rates increased from 77 percent to 83 percent during this same time period.

The steady improvement in graduation rates could be due to many factors, including campus programs to encourage 4-year completion, the academic preparation of students, the University's selectivity in admissions, the rising total costs of a UC education and the economic pressures that compel students to complete their educations and enter the workforce. Evidence reported in the introduction to this report emphasizes the significant role of student academic preparation and/or University selectivity in admissions.

Source: UC Corporate Student System and IPEDS

1 IPEDS data are only available for more limited years for comparison institutions. A list of institutions included in the AAU comparison groups can be found in the appendix.
Transfer graduation rates steadily grew for classes entering between 1994 and 2004, but leveled off for subsequent classes. These classes, of transfers entering since 2004, have a 50 to 52 percent two-year graduation rate and an 85 to 86 percent four-year graduation rate.

It is premature to conclude why transfer graduation rates have leveled off. It may be that they have reached a natural ceiling.

1 National data on graduation rates for transfer students are not available.
4.3 GRADUATE SCHOOL ENROLLMENT

An estimated 26 percent of UC students who graduated in 2004–05 with a bachelor’s degree enrolled in a graduate academic or professional degree program within four years.

4.3 Proportion of UC baccalaureate recipients who enroll in a graduate or professional degree program within four years
Universitywide and UC campuses
Graduating class of 2004–05

Overall, an estimated 11 percent of 2004-05 graduates enrolled in a UC graduate academic or professional degree program. The balance (15 percent) enrolled at another institution.

Since data on graduate and professional school enrollment are not supplied by all institutions, the numbers presented here likely underestimate the proportion of UC students that go on to graduate or professional schools.

---

1 Percentages represent the proportion of UC graduates who were enrolled at a four-year college or university for at least two terms on a half-time basis or more after earning their baccalaureate degrees. Presumably these are students who have gone on to seek postgraduate degrees.

2 There are other reasons why the National Clearinghouse data are likely an underestimate. First, students can block their information going to the Clearinghouse by using FERPA privacy protections. Second, the matching of UC records with Clearinghouse records is not necessarily a perfect process; when employing this matching algorithm UC follows a conservative rule that may not accept matches that are in fact valid.
Survey data collected from seniors every two years suggest that students’ overall satisfaction with their campus has remained fairly steady and is largely consistent across campuses.

4.4. Student satisfaction, graduating seniors
Universitywide and UC campuses
Spring 2006 to 2010

Source: UCUES

*Merced’s 2006 data are not displayed because the campus had very few seniors that year.
4.5 ALUMNI SATISFACTION

UC students who graduated in 1989, 1999, and 2004 report higher levels of satisfaction with their UC education than UC seniors who were surveyed in 2010. Student satisfaction seems to grow slightly with time away from UC.

4.5 Long-term alumni academic satisfaction
Universitywide
2010

The reasons for the differences in satisfaction among the classes are not clear. Students graduating five, 10 or 20 years ago may have been more satisfied with their UC education than students graduating in 2010. Satisfaction may grow with time away from UC, upon reflection and as students settle into careers.
Chapter 5. Graduate Academic and Professional Degree Students

Goals

The California Master Plan for Higher Education charges the University of California with the responsibility for preparing graduate academic students to help meet California’s and the nation’s workforce needs.\(^1\) Graduate academic students are in master and doctoral degree programs in the sciences, social sciences, humanities and engineering.

UC is also responsible for preparing professional degree students to enter a wide variety of careers that are critical to California, such as law, medicine, business, architecture, public policy and the arts. Included among UC’s professional school offerings is the largest health sciences instructional program in the nation. The doctors, nurses, dentists, pharmacists, optometrists and veterinarians the University trains deliver essential health care services to California.

Narrative

The main themes identified in this chapter are somewhat different for graduate academic and professional degree students. For graduate academics they revolve around two factors: the size of the graduate academic student body and the availability of financial aid to support them. During the last 50 years, undergraduate enrollment growth far outpaced that for graduates, as the University accommodated California’s burgeoning number of high school graduates. As a result, the proportion of graduate students at UC has decreased from about 30 percent of all enrollment in the mid-1960s to 22 percent in fall 2010. Offering financial support necessary to recruit the best students continues to be a challenge for UC’s graduate academic programs. Given the vital role that graduate academic students play in contributing to the quality and effectiveness of UC’s research and teaching enterprises, the trends documented here give cause for concern over the long run, even while Chapters 10 (Research) and 13 (Rankings) demonstrate that the University’s research enterprise continues robustly at the present time.

For professional schools and their students, the story is told against the same backdrop of declining state support. Historically, UC’s professional schools offered a top-quality education at a reasonable price. In 1994, in response to state budget cuts, the University implemented professional degree supplemental tuition charges to build the resources necessary for professional schools to recruit and retain excellent faculty, provide an outstanding curriculum and attract high-caliber students. These charges are levied in addition to the mandatory tuition set by the Board of Regents and required from all students. Since 1994, the number of professional schools that charge supplemental tuition has increased steadily, as has the level of tuition. One result is that debt levels have increased for those graduating with a UC professional degree. Additionally, as is evident in Chapter 8 (Diversity), accessibility is becoming an issue. In 2011–12, 49 professional schools will charge supplemental tuition ranging from $4,002 to $35,148 over and above the mandatory rate that applies to all students.

The chapter begins with indicators showing the proportional contribution that graduate academic and professional degree students make to UC’s student body, by academic discipline and types of degrees awarded. It then takes up the issues of affordability and student success.

Diversity measures for graduate and professional students can be found in Chapter 8.

\(^1\) More information about the Master Plan can be found at: http://ucfuture.universityofcalifornia.edu/documents/ca_masterplan_summary.pdf
Looking forward

Indicators on graduate academic students directly affect the University's research competitiveness, and will be watched in the years to come. Data on professional degree students will also be monitored, though more with a view to determining the extent to which the University's professional degree programs remain competitive and accessible in light of their increased costs.

For more information

Information on graduate academic and professional degree student diversity can be found in Chapter 8 (Diversity). Additional details about health science students can be found in Chapter 11 (Health Sciences and Services). Some indicators in Chapters 9 (Teaching and Learning) 10 (Research) and 13 (Rankings) are also relevant, given the role that graduate academic students play in teaching and research.

Additional information may be found in the September 2010 Accountability Sub-Report on Graduate Academic and Professional Degree Students at: www.universityofcalifornia.edu/regents/regmeet/sept10/j2.pdf and at the UCOP Office of Research and Graduate Studies, at: www.ucop.edu/research/gs.
The proportion of graduate academic and professional degree students at UC is slightly lower than that at other AAU public universities and substantially lower than that at AAU private universities.

5.1 Graduate and professional degree enrollment compared to undergraduate enrollment
UC and comparison institutions
Fall 2002 to 2009

One reason for the enrollment differences is that graduate enrollment growth at UC has not kept pace with undergraduate enrollment, which has grown dramatically with the state’s burgeoning population (see Indicator 1.1). As a result, the proportion of graduate and professional students at UC fell from a high of 33 percent in 1963 to a low of 21 percent in 2000. It has remained in the 21–22 percent range since.

Enrollment data from other AAU institutions do not distinguish graduate academic and professional degree students.

Source: IPEDS and UC Corporate Student System

---

1 A list of the institutions in the AAU comparison groups can be found in the appendix.
5.1 GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL DEGREE STUDENTS

Historically, the proportions of doctoral, master's, and professional degree students have varied by campus. This reflects differences in the campuses’ academic programs.

5.1.2 Graduate and professional student enrollment as a percentage of total enrollments
UC campuses
Fall 1960 to 2010

Academic doctoral students are important to the University because they make a direct contribution to its teaching and research functions. In fall 2010, the proportion of academic doctoral students varied across the general campuses from 5 percent at Merced to 16 percent at Berkeley. At San Francisco, an exclusively graduate health sciences campus, academic doctoral students made up 26 percent of fall 2010 enrollments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Percent of Fall 2010 Students Who are Academic Doctoral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universitywide</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UC Corporate Student System and UC Statistical Summary of Students and Staff
5.2 AFFORDABILITY — ACADEMIC DOCTORAL STUDENTS

Except for California residents, UC is not able to offer competitive stipends to its doctoral students.

5.2.1 Average net stipend offered to graduate academic doctoral students admitted to UC compared to their first-choice non-UC schools
Universitywide
2004, 2007 and 2010

By residency

Source: UC Graduate Student Support Survey

1 2004 and 2007 dollars adjusted to 2010 dollars based on changes in the Consumer Price Index. Figures for 2010 are not directly comparable to those from prior years because they are based on a somewhat different definition of broad discipline that relies on federal Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) codes.

Doctoral students are crucial to a university’s research competitiveness. To attract the best, universities offer stipends to help offset tuition and living expenses.

Net stipend is the amount of competitive (non-need-based) aid that students have for living expenses after tuition and fees are paid. It is calculated by subtracting total tuition and fees from a student’s support package (which includes gift aid, and teaching or research assistantships). The “stipend gap” varies by discipline.
Generally, the proportion of doctoral students graduating with loan debt has increased between 2002 and 2009. The level of loan debt varies by discipline, with doctoral students in the physical and life sciences graduating with less loan debt on average than those in the social sciences, arts and humanities.

A number of factors help explain why doctoral students in the physical and life sciences graduate with less debt than those in other disciplines. Physical and life science students are more likely to be supported by research grants. They also take less time on average to complete their degrees than doctoral students in the social sciences or arts and humanities.

Source: Survey of Earned Doctorates

UC usually does not have data on undergraduate debt for its graduate students. The data presented here are from the Survey of Earned Doctorates. Because they are survey data that rely on respondents’ self-reported debt, the figures presented here should be considered illustrative but not necessarily definitive.

Figures are corrected for inflation. Data are for domestic students only. Average debt is for graduates with debt.
5.3 AFFORDABILITY — PROFESSIONAL DEGREE STUDENTS

Since the University began charging supplemental fees for students participating in professional degree programs in 1994, both the fees and the number of programs that apply them have grown considerably.

Professional degree supplemental tuition is approved by the Board of Regents for each program. The tuition rates consider the tuition level of peer programs, availability of financial aid, proposed use of the additional fees and other factors. The full Regent’s professional degree supplemental tuition policy can be found at: www.universityofcalifornia.edu/regents/policies/3103.html.

The graph shows total charges for professional degree programs that exist on two or more campuses, except for social welfare, which began charging professional fees in 2010–11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Year fee introduced</th>
<th>2010–11 average tuition and fees (resident)</th>
<th>2010–11 average professional degree fee</th>
<th>2010–11 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>94–95</td>
<td>$13,032</td>
<td>$23,122</td>
<td>$36,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>94–95</td>
<td>$13,739</td>
<td>$22,568</td>
<td>$36,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>94–95</td>
<td>$13,193</td>
<td>$28,601</td>
<td>$41,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>94–95</td>
<td>$13,411</td>
<td>$17,531</td>
<td>$30,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>96–97</td>
<td>$12,962</td>
<td>$4,764</td>
<td>$17,726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>96–97</td>
<td>$12,643</td>
<td>$17,155</td>
<td>$29,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>05–06</td>
<td>$14,684</td>
<td>$5,515</td>
<td>$20,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td>05–06</td>
<td>$14,230</td>
<td>$5,297</td>
<td>$19,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Welfare</td>
<td>10–11</td>
<td>$13,389</td>
<td>$4,600</td>
<td>$17,989</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Year fee introduced</th>
<th>2010–11 average tuition and fees (resident)</th>
<th>2010–11 average professional degree fee</th>
<th>2010–11 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architecture (UCLA)</td>
<td>10–11</td>
<td>$12,581</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$20,581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Design (UCB)</td>
<td>10–11</td>
<td>$13,775</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$19,775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Management (UCB)</td>
<td>10–11</td>
<td>$12,950</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$18,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Relations and Pacific Studies (UCSD)</td>
<td>05–06</td>
<td>$13,736</td>
<td>$5,248</td>
<td>$18,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optometry (UCB)</td>
<td>96–97</td>
<td>$12,860</td>
<td>$13,220</td>
<td>$26,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Therapy (UCSF)</td>
<td>10–11</td>
<td>$16,685</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
<td>$27,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preventative Veterinary Medicine (UCD)</td>
<td>09–10</td>
<td>$14,506</td>
<td>$4,280</td>
<td>$18,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theater, Film, and Television (UCLA)</td>
<td>96–97</td>
<td>$12,490</td>
<td>$7,954</td>
<td>$20,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Planning (UCLA)</td>
<td>10–11</td>
<td>$12,580</td>
<td>$5,199</td>
<td>$17,779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine (UCD)</td>
<td>94–95</td>
<td>$15,582</td>
<td>$14,664</td>
<td>$30,246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Average tuition and fees can vary by campus and program. See http://budget.ucop.edu/fees/201011/documents/2010-11-total-charges-campus.pdf for more information.
5.3 AFFORDABILITY — PROFESSIONAL DEGREE STUDENTS

5.3.1 Professional degree average student charges
Universitywide
1994–95 to 2010–11

Source: Regents Policy and UC Student Financial Support Annual Reports

1 Includes mandatory systemwide tuition, health insurance, campus-based fees, and professional degree and supplemental tuition charges; excludes nonresident tuition. Fees shown for programs at two more campuses, in years in which a professional degree supplement was charged.

Source: Regents Policy and UC Student Financial Support Annual Reports
In general, graduates with the highest debt levels come from professional schools that charge higher supplemental tuition and lead to careers with higher potential earnings (e.g., law, medicine, dentistry and optometry).

The increases since 2001-02 in inflation-adjusted debt levels of graduating professional degree students range from $7200 in Education to $36,000 in Medicine. Increases in graduate debt result from a combination of factors, including steady growth in the level of supplemental tuition and greater student reliance on federal student loan programs.

On average, about two-thirds of the aid awarded to professional degree students is awarded as loans rather than as fellowships or grants. In 2009–10, more than 95 percent of graduate and professional degree student loan balances were for federal loans.

By comparison, loans constitute only 9 percent of the aid awarded to graduate academic students. UC considers appropriate the greater reliance on loans made by professional degree students because their programs are of shorter duration and their incomes after graduation tend to be higher. Rates on federal loans can vary significantly and may impact their attractiveness to potential borrowers relative to other means that are not tracked here.

---

1 Data are for domestic and international students. Average debt is for graduates with debt.
Like other AAU universities, UC awards a high proportion of Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) degrees.

5.4.1 Graduate academic degrees awarded by discipline
UC and comparison institutions
2008–09

Source: IPEDS1

“Other academic disciplines” are interdisciplinary and others. Details appear in the appendix.

In STEM fields, research grant funding is more generally available from federal government agencies and other sources.

1 “Other academic disciplines” are interdisciplinary and others. Details appear in the appendix.
5.4 OUTCOMES — GRADUATE ACADEMIC STUDENTS

UC's six-year doctoral completion rates (eight-year completion rates for Humanities students) are in the same range as comparison institutions.

5.4.2 Six-year doctoral completion rates (eight-year completion rate for humanities) by discipline
UC campus and comparison institutions


¹ NRC data were used for both UC and comparison institutions. The charts exclude the following joint UC programs:
Since 2001, more than three-quarters of the students who earned a doctoral degree from UC had accepted an offer of employment or a postdoctoral training opportunity by the time they completed their degrees.

5.4.3 Post-graduation plans reported by UC doctoral degree recipients
Universitywide
2001 to 2009

The chart shows the growing prevalence of postdoctoral training, particularly in the sciences. The data reflect the variation in available opportunities for doctoral graduates. For example, post-doctoral positions are more common in the sciences, where there is more research support available from federal government agencies and other sources.
5.4 OUTCOMES — GRADUATE ACADEMIC STUDENTS

Since 2001, 58 percent of UC doctoral degree recipients planned to stay in California. This is twice the number of recipients that attended high school in California, representing a significant in-migration to California of highly skilled workers.

5.4.4 Geographic origins and destinations of UC doctoral degree recipients
Universitywide
2001–2009

Source: Survey of Earned Doctorates

This survey is given to all academic doctoral degree recipients; the completion rate for UC degree recipients was approximately 93 percent for this nine-year period. The data presented here are for survey respondents only.
5.5 OUTCOMES — PROFESSIONAL DEGREE STUDENTS

UC awarded 6,677 professional degrees in 2008–09: 30 percent in medicine and other health sciences, 28 percent in business, 17 percent in education and 14 percent in law.

5.5.1 Professional degrees awarded by discipline
UC and comparison institutions
2008–09

Source: IPEDS

UC Merced has no professional degree students.

1 UC Merced has no professional degree students.
5.5 OUTCOMES — PROFESSIONAL DEGREE STUDENTS

More than 80 percent of UC law school graduates pass the California Bar examination on their first attempt. This compares favorably with graduates of other California law schools.

5.5.2 California Bar Examination pass rates
UC and other California law schools
July 2010

Source: California State Bar Association

1 UC Irvine opened a new law school in 2009; their students have not yet graduated.
2 Hastings Law School in San Francisco is affiliated with the University of California.
5.5 OUTCOMES — PROFESSIONAL DEGREE STUDENTS

The proportion of UC medical students that pass the United States Medical Licensing Examination (USMLE) examination is higher than the national average.

5.5.3 United States Medical Licensing Examination (USMLE) pass rates
UC medical schools
2000–01 to 2009–10

Sponsored by the Federation of State Medical Boards and the National Board of Medical Examiners, the United States Medical Licensing Examination is the examination for medical licensure in the United States.

Step 1 assesses whether a student understands and can apply important concepts of the sciences to the practice of medicine, with special emphasis on principles and mechanisms underlying health, disease and modes of therapy.

Step 2 assesses whether a student can apply medical knowledge, skills and understanding of clinical science, including emphasis on health promotion and disease prevention. Step 2 has two components: Clinical Knowledge (CK) and Clinical Skills (CS).

---

1 Data presented here represent overall pass rates; students can take the MLE exams multiple times if they do not pass. The national average includes the United States and Canada. San Diego 09–10 Step 1 pass rates were not available at the time of publication and are expected to be between 96 and 99 percent.
Chapter 6. Faculty and Other Academic Employees

Goals
The academic caliber and reputation of the University of California are determined by the quality of its faculty. Accordingly, recruiting and retaining world-class faculty is one of the University's highest priorities. The presence at UC of highly talented faculty attracts other highly accomplished faculty, graduate students and undergraduates, who all serve to maintain the academic quality and reputation of the University.

Narrative
No other public institution can claim as distinguished a faculty as the University of California. The UC faculty includes 56 Nobel Prize laureates, 59 National Medal of Science recipients, 71 MacArthur (“Genius”) Grant recipients, 377 members of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and 271 members of the National Academy of Sciences. In the 2009 and 2010 classes elected to the National Academy of Sciences, 66 of the 144 new members came from public universities, 39 of them from UC.

UC faculty are engaged principally in teaching and research. They also participate in a wide range of University service and administrative functions. Other academic employees enhance the administrative, research, service and clinical activities of the University.

Faculty share in the governance of the University. The University's governing body, the Board of Regents, delegates to the faculty the authority to determine academic policy, set conditions for admission and the granting of degrees, authorize and supervise courses and curricula, and advise the administration on faculty appointments and promotions. The UC Academic Senate is the body through which the faculty exercise this authority, and through which it advises the administration in its management of the University.

This chapter focuses on the size, composition and age distribution of the academic staff of the University, and the competitiveness of faculty salaries. It shows that UC's faculty salaries are becoming less competitive compared to comparison institutions. In particular, faculty salaries have regressed to the level of the public comparison institutions, though historically UC and the state have set a goal for UC salaries to be midway between the comparison public and private institutions. The data also show an aging of the UC faculty. The numbers of faculty retiring each year will grow during the next decade. Less competitive salaries will make it harder to hire the faculty UC needs for the future.

Much more information about faculty is elsewhere in this report. Measures of faculty research productivity and teaching workload are in Chapter 9 (Teaching and Learning) and Chapter 10 (Research). Indicators on reputation are available in Chapter 13 (Rankings). Faculty gender and racial diversity are in Chapter 8.

Looking forward
The national economic recession has curtailed recruitment of high-performing faculty at UC and other universities across the country. It is critical that UC lead the academic recovery during the next few years, not lag behind it. Universities that start recruiting before others will have a historic opportunity to improve their faculty; those who are slow to act will move in the other direction.

How many of the National Academy's members elected in 2030 will come from the UC faculty? This will depend greatly on UC's ability to hire and retain top faculty during the next several years.
For more information

The UC Academic Senate maintains information and reports on current and historic faculty and academic policy issues at: www.universityofcalifornia.edu/senate. The UCOP Academic Personnel Department also maintains information and reports on the state of the academic workforce, including the systemwide Academic Personnel Manual, which governs faculty personnel policies across all the UC campuses. See: www.ucop.edu/acadpersonnel.

More information about trends in faculty composition and compensation can be found in the Accountability Sub-Report on Faculty Competitiveness from January 2011 and March 2009. More information on faculty diversity can be found in the Accountability Sub-Reports on Diversity from September 2010 and September 2009: http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/accountability/report.html#subreports
6.1 ACADEMIC WORKFORCE

Ladder- and equivalent-rank faculty composed 57 percent of the full-time equivalent UC faculty appointments in fall 2010.

6.1.1 Faculty workforce
Universitywide
Fall 1998 to 2010

Faculty are academic employees with student teaching functions. This includes general campus instruction as well as clinical instruction in the health sciences. Extension instructors are academic employees, but are not considered faculty.

Ladder-rank and equivalent faculty are tenured (have permanent appointments) or tenure-track (eligible to be considered for permanent appointments). They are nearly all members of the Academic Senate. Since 1998, the ladder- and equivalent-rank faculty have grown from 7,235 to 8,898 in FTE (displayed above), and in terms of headcount, from 9,032 to 10,886 (see the appendix for details).

Lecturer\(^2\) titles tend to be more common on the general campuses (the non-health science side of the UC campuses). Lecturers grew 50 percent, as measured by FTE, from 1998 to 2008, but fell 9 percent during the past two years due to budgetary pressures.

The category “visitors, adjuncts, and instructional assistants” includes other types of faculty, who do not have tenure or security of employment. Under budgetary pressures, campuses have reduced the employment of these faculty by about four percent over the past two years.

The “other faculty” category includes professors in residence, clinical professors, and health science clinical professors. Although there are exceptions, these faculty members are generally employed at the UC campuses with medical schools. These faculty are mostly supported by non-state dollars, that is, contract, grant and clinical revenues. This category of faculty has grown more quickly than the ladder- and equivalent-rank category, as the medical centers have grown relatively faster.

---

\(^1\) Data shown are full-time-equivalent numbers; for example two half-time employees equal one full-time-equivalent employee. Headcount figures are not presented in this Indicator because many academic employees do not have full-time positions.

\(^2\) Lecturers are also known as “Unit 18 Lecturers.” UC also employs “Lecturers with security of employment”; there are fewer than 200 of these systemwide, they are members of the Academic Senate and they are included in the “ladder- and equivalent-rank faculty” category throughout this report.
6.1 ACADEMIC WORKFORCE
The chart below displays the change over time in the different faculty groups presented in the chart on the previous page.

6.1.2 Faculty growth
Universitywide
1997–98 to 2009–10

Recent reductions in core teaching faculty resulting from budgetary pressures create challenges for UC in providing instruction to the growing number of enrolled students.

6.1.3 Other academics workforce
Universitywide
Fall 1998 to 2010

The increasing number of researchers at UC reflects continued growth in the external federal and other funding available for research, including funding in 2010–11 made through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA).
6.2 FACULTY RENEWAL

Responding to state budget reductions in the early 1990s, UC instituted a series of Voluntary Early Retirement Incentive Programs (VERIPs) that provided financial incentives for senior faculty and staff to retire early. This led to high departure rates of senior faculty through 1993–94, followed by many years of lower-than-average retirement.

6.2.1 New hires and separations of ladder- and equivalent-rank faculty
Universitywide
1984–85 to 2009–10

As shown on the following page, the UC faculty workforce is older in 2009–10 than it was in 1990.

In 2009–10, faculty hiring dipped in response to recent fiscal constraints.

Since 2003–04, faculty separations have exceeded 300 per year.

1 *Years with Voluntary Early Retirement Incentive Program (VERIP). Associate and full professors shown here are tenured faculty; Assistant professors are nontenured faculty.
The faculty workforce is significantly older in 2010 than it was in 1990.

Before 1994, UC and many other colleges and universities mandated that tenured faculty retire at age 70. Starting in 1994, this was no longer permissible under federal age discrimination statutes. As a result, in 2010, 714, or about 7.5 percent, of UC’s ladder- and equivalent-rank faculty are age 70 or above. A total of 41 percent in 2010 were older than 55, compared to 28 percent in 1990.

The age profile shows that separations can be expected to continue at a high level for some time to come.

Source: UC Corporate Personnel System
More than half of ladder- and equivalent-rank faculty (55 percent) are in STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics) and health science disciplines. Other faculty are found primarily in the health sciences.

About 37 percent of UC’s faculty are in the health sciences (medicine, dentistry, nursing, pharmacy, optometry, public health and veterinary medicine).

Source: UC Corporate Personnel System

1 Data shown are headcount numbers for all faculty members. Other academics listed here are only those with disciplines; there are an additional 2,914 without an assigned discipline code.
Overall, UC campuses confer more doctoral degrees per faculty member than the other AAU public institutions, and are on par with the AAU private institutions.

The data reflect favorably on the UC faculty’s role in producing doctoral degrees. However, these data do not necessarily suggest that UC faculty are more productive than faculty at other AAU universities. UC has proportionally fewer terminal masters degrees than other AAUs, meaning that UC faculty’s graduate instruction is more concentrated on doctorates. These data may also reflect differences in the way institutions define and count faculty in the data they report nationally.

---

1 The degrees awarded are the average of academic years 2001–02 to 2005–06. If no data were provided for a particular year, the average was taken during the years for which there were data. Faculty are the sum of “Core” and “New” faculty counts as reported to NRC for 2005–06. For a complete explanation of the methodology used to collect data, see A Revised Guide to the Methodology of the Assessment of Research-Doctorate Programs in the United States (2010) and A Data-Based Assessment of Research-Doctorate Programs in the United States (2010). Both of these publications can be viewed and downloaded at www.nap.edu/rdp. The NRC assessment excluded programs that did not award five or more doctoral degrees in the 2001–2006 time period.
6.5 FACULTY SALARIES

UC faculty salaries are between 13 and 16 percent below the benchmark that UC has historically used to assess their competitiveness. This may challenge the University's efforts to recruit and retain high-quality faculty.

UC historically has used eight universities — four publics and four privates — against which to benchmark its faculty salaries. The four publics are Illinois, Michigan, SUNY Buffalo and Virginia; the four privates are Harvard, MIT, Stanford and Yale. UC's faculty salaries fall below those of the comparison four privates and the comparison four publics.
6.5 FACULTY SALARIES

6.5.1 Average faculty salaries by rank
UC and comparison institutions
1997–98 to 2009–10

The AAUP data include full-time faculty in all series. Faculty who earn clinical pay are excluded. Figures are adjusted for inflation using CPI. More information can be found at www.aaup.org/AAUP/comm/rep/Z/ecstatreport09–10. The furloughs undertaken by UC in recent years are not included in the figures presented here.

Source: American Association of University Professors (AAUP)\(^1\)

---

\(^1\) The AAUP data include full-time faculty in all series. Faculty who earn clinical pay are excluded. Figures are adjusted for inflation using CPI. More information can be found at www.aaup.org/AAUP/comm/rep/Z/ecstatreport09–10. The furloughs undertaken by UC in recent years are not included in the figures presented here.
6.6 FACULTY TOTAL COMPENSATION

A study by Mercer and Hewitt showed that the total compensation in 2007 of UC faculty, including base salary and the value of health, welfare and retirement benefits (pension and retiree health) was closer to market levels than when salaries alone were considered.

6.6 Total compensation for faculty, by rank
UC and market averages
2009

UC faculty salaries may have lost ground relative to the market since 2007 due to changes in the UC Retirement System (UCRS) that require greater annual employee contributions.

1 Study can be found at: www.universityofcalifornia.edu/news/compensation/comparisons.html. Study excludes health sciences faculty and law school faculty. The focus of the study was on the Professorial Series, a subset of the ladder and equivalent ranks. The study covered 78 percent of all ladder-rank faculty.
Chapter 7. Staff

Goals

The University's goals for its staff are twofold: to build a workforce that reflects the diversity of the people of California, and to attract and retain the highest-quality workforce by offering competitive compensation, which includes salary and benefits.

The first of these goals is outlined in the University's diversity policy, which the Board of Regents adopted in 2007. The second goal was adopted by the Regents in 2005 as part of a 10-year plan to bring salaries and benefits for all employees to market levels. This goal recognizes that the quality of academic, management and staff personnel is essential for maintaining the excellence of the University and enabling it to achieve its mission of education, research and public service. Although the University was able to fund staff salary increases from 2005–06 to 2007–08, implementation of the broader Regents' plan to achieve comparable pay has been delayed for staff due to the ongoing state fiscal crisis.

Narrative

The indicators here parallel in many respects those in the previous chapter on faculty. They describe the size and composition of UC's staff workforce, its age distribution, and compensation.

For more information

A number of different sources provide more data and analysis of UC staff:

The 2011 Accountability Sub-Report on Staff provides systemwide information about staff and includes detailed data on staff at each campus: www.universityofcalifornia.edu/accountability/report.html#subreports.

Information on staff diversity is in the diversity chapter of this report, on the University's diversity website at www.universityofcalifornia.edu/diversity and in the Annual Accountability Sub-Report on Diversity: www.universityofcalifornia.edu/accountability/report.html#subreports.

The annual Staff Workforce Profile is at: http://at yourserv ice.ucop.edu/forms_pubs/misc/workforce_profile_2009.pdf. Aggregate workforce data are in the Statistical Summary of Students and Staff: www.ucop.edu/ucophome/uwnews/stat.
Campus staff reductions are a direct result of diminished state funding for the University and the resulting search for operating efficiencies.

7.1 STAFF WORKFORCE

7.1.1 General campus staff workforce

Universitywide
Fall 2004 to 2010

Source: UC Corporate Personnel System

1 Abbreviations used in this chapter are: PSS for Professional and Support Staff, MSP for Managers and Senior Professionals, and SMG for Senior Management Group. These are the general personnel programs; each has somewhat different terms and conditions of employment. They are detailed in the Regents’ Personnel Policies for Staff Members: http://hrop.ucop.edu/policies/welcome.html.
Unlike the general campuses, the medical centers have increased their staff, reflecting growth in their research, health care and public service activities.

Medical Centers

7.1.3 Medical center staff workforce
Universitywide
Fall 2004 to 2010

7.1.4 Medical center staff workforce growth
Universitywide
Fall 2004 to 2010

Medical center employees are funded primarily from revenues derived from patient services, not state funding or student tuition and fees.

---

1 The UC Corporate Personnel System excludes staff members at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Hastings School of Law and ASUCLA; these locations have stand-alone personnel systems. Figures are unduplicated headcount and include career and noncareer employees.
The proportion of unionized staff members (excluding student employees) grew from 55 percent in 1990 to 61 percent in 2000, and fell back to 56 percent in 2010.¹

The increasing professionalization of the UC workforce, leading to reductions in clerical and support staff, explains much of the decline in the proportion of unionized staff between 2000 and 2010.

¹ Since student staff employees are not eligible for unionization, the proportion of unionized staff is calculated based on nonstudent employees.
² Data from published tables in UC Workforce Profile for years indicated. See notes for Indicator 7.1 for more details.
7.3 STAFF RENEWAL

As with its faculty, the University staff are significantly older in 2010 than in 1998.

7.3 Age distribution of career staff
Universitywide
Fall 1998 and 2010

Twenty-six percent of career staff were 50 or older in 1998, compared with 36 percent in 2010.

Source: UC Corporate Personnel System

1 See notes for Indicator 7.1 for more details.
7.4 STAFF TOTAL COMPENSATION

Except for senior managers, the total compensation for UC staff is near market averages.

7.4 Total compensation of career staff by personnel program
Universitywide
2009

UC periodically evaluates how total compensation for various employee groups compares against competitor institutions. Total compensation includes cash compensation (base salary), health and welfare benefits and retirement benefits (pension and retiree health).

In future years, the total compensation of UC staff may deteriorate in comparison to market averages due to increases in employee contributions to health care costs and the UC retirement system.

As with previous studies, the 2009 assessment found that cash compensation for many employee groups is below market, most significantly for policy-covered (nonunion) staff, but that UC’s benefits currently are ahead of market for some staff groups.

1 Study can be found at: www.universityofcalifornia.edu/news/compensation/comparisons.html. Includes campuses and UCOP; does not include the Lawrence Berkeley National Lab, Hastings College of Law or medical center staff. Medical center staff total compensation is presented in the Chapter 11. Figures do not include salary reductions arising from a systemwide furlough.
7.5 STAFF SALARY GROWTH

Salary growth rates for UC staff has fallen behind market rates in the “Western region” benchmark\(^1\) and has also not kept up with the rate of inflation.

7.5 UC base salary increases compared to inflation and market averages
Universitywide
1998 to 2009

Source: UC Budget Office\(^2\)

\(^1\) The UCOP Budget Office, along with many other employers, uses a comparison to the “Western U.S. region” from the annual WorldatWork Salary Budget Survey. This survey is conducted by the WorldatWork association of human resource professionals.

\(^2\) Excludes medical centers.
Chapter 8. Diversity

Goals

UC is dedicated to achieving excellence through diversity in the classroom, research lab and the workplace. It strives to establish a climate that welcomes and promotes respect for the contributions of all students and employees.

In September 2007, the Board of Regents adopted the University of California Diversity Statement as UC policy. The statement renews the University’s commitment to recognize and nurture merit, talent, and achievement by supporting diversity and equal opportunity in its education, services and administration, and research and creative activity. It also acknowledges the acute need to remove barriers to the recruitment, retention and advancement of talented students, faculty and staff from historically excluded populations who are currently underrepresented.

Diversity is essential to the University’s mission. The Diversity Statement defines this as “The variety of personal experiences, values and worldviews that arise from differences of culture and circumstance. Such differences include race, ethnicity, gender, age, religion, language, abilities/disabilities, sexual orientation, gender identity, socioeconomic status, and geographic region, and more.”

Narrative

The indicators in this chapter provide a broad overview of the University community — students, faculty and staff — by race/ethnicity and gender. Student survey data are provided to give an indication of the “climates” on campuses. Students’ reported experiences of feeling respected by others on their campus are presented by race/ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation and religion. Diversity by income, parental education and first-generation status is shown in other chapters of this report.

Throughout the chapter, attention is paid to the extent to which the University’s students, faculty, and staff are more or less diverse from the pools from which they are recruited. In the case of undergraduates, California high school graduates constitute the pool. In the case with faculty, the pools are national in scope. Faculty and graduate students are broken down into discipline groups to demonstrate differences among the disciplines.

Finally, a word about terminology. The 2010 Census shows that no single race/ethnic group claims majority status within the state of California — that is represents more than 50 percent of the population. All race ethnic groups are in the minority. As a result, this chapter does not use the term “minority” to describe any race/ethnic group. It uses the term “underrepresented” to refer to African Americans, Chicano/Latinos and American Indians — groups that are typically less represented in the University population than in the state population.

Looking forward

Changes in the state’s demographic composition and in various University policies will impact UC’s population in ways tracked by this chapter’s indicators. During the next several years, the data will be watched to evaluate the effect of tuition increases, changes to admissions policies (beginning in fall 2012, a larger number of students will be entitled to a full review of their application), and other programs and policies that are developed to ensure a diverse and respectful University environment.

This section will be developed in future years to track changes in campus climates. As a result of several bias-related incidents on various UC campuses during spring 2010, UC President Mark G. Yudof convened the President’s Advisory Council on Campus Climate, Culture and Inclusion consisting of...

1 In September 2010, the Regents adopted a recommendation from the Academic Senate, endorsed by...

2 These three groups — African Americans, American Indian and Chicano/Latinos — are the ones historically defined as underrepresented. This definition is linked to the fact that these three groups are below the average eligibility rates for UC.
of both UC and external community members. To achieve the charge of the Council, five working groups were created in December 2010, including one on metrics and assessment. The work of the Council will be reported to the Board of Regents in September 2011 and may influence this chapter in future years.

For more information

The Accountability Sub-Report on Diversity explores the issues highlighted in this chapter in greater detail. It includes a deeper analysis of campus climate and what UC is doing to support an inclusive climate on all its campuses. The Sub-Report also looks at student outcomes by race/ethnicity and gender, analyzing graduation rates for different groups: www.universityofcalifornia.edu/accountability/report.html#subreports.

Detailed information about the diversity of UC students, faculty and staff can be found on UC’s diversity website: www.universityofcalifornia.edu/diversity. It contains links to reports and initiatives both at the systemwide level and at each campus.

All UC campuses demonstrate their commitment to diversity, inclusivity and respect for differences among people by expressing these values in their Principles of Community; these statements can be found here: www.universityofcalifornia.edu/diversity/principles_community.html.
8.1 DIVERSITY OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

Of the groups that compose the University community, undergraduate students and professional and support staff have the highest proportions of underrepresented minorities; faculty have among the lowest.

8.1.1 Racial/ethnic distribution of the University community
Fall 2010

Universitywide

Source: UC Corporate Student and Personnel Systems. California data from CA Department of Finance¹

While the University’s population has become increasingly diverse, it has not kept pace with the demographic changes in California. For example, in 2008–09, the University community was 14 percent Chicano/Latino compared to 34 percent for California as a whole and 14 percent for the nation. African-Americans represented 5 percent of the University community compared to 7 percent for California as a whole and 13 percent for the nation (2009–10 figures are not comparable due to a change in the way the Census collects race/ethnicity data). The diversity of the pools from which UC draws its students and faculty partly explain this trend, which is considered later in this chapter.

The small number of Asian Americans in the Senior Management Group is in contrast to relatively larger numbers of Asian Americans in other categories.

¹The “other faculty” group includes professors in residence, professors-clinical, and health science clinical faculty. The “other academics” group includes only nonstudent employees and comprises many positions (e.g., librarians and administration categories) as well as academic researchers. The SMG and MSP groups exclude students in these positions. The PSS group includes both represented and non-represented employees, and excludes students.
8.1 DIVERSITY OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

Racial/ethnic distribution
Fall 2010

UC campuses

Faculty and academic employees

Non-student staff

Students

[Graphs showing racial/ethnic distribution for faculty, non-student staff, and students across different categories and departments, with color-coded bars for different racial groups.]
8.1 DIVERSITY OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

As with racial/ethnic diversity, gender diversity is also greater for students and staff than for ladder-rank faculty.

8.1.2 Gender distribution of the University community
Fall 2010

Women make up more than 40 percent of all groups except ladder-rank faculty and senior managers.

Undergraduates are now 53 percent female. There is a growing national discussion of why males, particularly underrepresented males, are declining as a proportion of college enrollments.

Source: UC Corporate Student and Personnel Systems¹

¹ See note on 8.1.1 for more details.
8.1 DIVERSITY OF THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY

Gender distribution
Fall 2010

Faculty and other non-student academic employees
UC campuses

Non-student staff
UC campuses

Students
UC campuses
8.2 UNDERGRADUATE DIVERSITY

Each year UC enrolls a larger proportion of its undergraduates from underrepresented groups, with new freshmen being slightly more diverse than new transfer students.

8.2 Racial/ethnic distribution of new undergraduates
Fall 1999 to 2010

New freshmen
Universitywide

New transfers
Universitywide

A number of reasons may explain why freshman are more diverse than transfer students. Academic preparation may play a role in inflating the transfer pool with disproportionately white middle-income students who are well prepared academically for UC after graduating from high school, but pursue the transfer path with a view to reducing the expense of their degree program or to entering a more prestigious campus. Finally, some evidence suggests that African American CCC students transfer to out-of-state universities at a high rate, whether in search of larger more vibrant African American undergraduate communities, of larger student financial aid packages or of offers from universities that are not bound by legislation prohibiting affirmative action.

Source: UC Corporate Student System
8.2 UNDERGRADUATE DIVERSITY
Racial/ethnic distribution of new undergraduates
Fall 1999 to 2010

New freshmen
UC campuses

New transfers
UC campuses

Source: UC Corporate Student System
8.3 UNDERGRADUATE CAMPUS CLIMATE

From 2008 to 2010, most race/ethnic groups shown below report about the same level of feeling respected/disrespected on campus.

8.3.1 Response to “Students of my race/ethnicity are respected on this campus”
Universitywide and UC campuses
2008 and 2010

Among race/ethnic groups, African Americans are least likely to feel that they are respected on campus.

1 Data are shown for all the years these questions were asked in UCUES.
8.3 UNDERGRADUATE CAMPUS CLIMATE

Among self-identified religious groups, Muslim and Jewish students feel less respected than other students.

8.3.2 Response to “Students of my religion are respected on this campus”
Universitywide and UC campuses
2008 and 2010

Among religious groups, Muslims are the least likely to feel that they are respected on campus. At the same time, fewer Muslim students strongly disagreed that they were respected in 2010 than 2008. Jewish students felt less respected on campus in 2010 than in 2008.

The University's goal is to assure all students are respected on campus. Multiple factors influence these findings, including the number of students in each group, the environment surrounding the campus and media attention.
8.3 UNDERGRADUATE CAMPUS CLIMATE

Undergraduates who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, queer, questioning/unsure or transgender or genderqueer are much more likely to report feeling disrespected on campus.

8.3.3 Response to “Students of my sexual orientation are respected on this campus”
Universitywide
2008 and 2010 combined

8.3.4 Response to “Students of my gender are respected on this campus”
Universitywide
2008 and 2010 combined

Source: UCUES¹

¹ The 2008 and 2010 data were combined because of the small number of respondents who chose some of the categories. The LGBQ category includes the following responses: Gay/lesbian, Bisexual, Self-identified Queer, and Questioning/Unsure. The Other category is its own category in UCUES; the data shown here do not include any other responses. Additional detail can be found in the appendix. Because the numbers for some of the groups listed above have small numbers, campus data are not reported separately.
During the past decade, the number of eligible Chicano/Latino high school graduates has grown significantly; this increase reflects growth in the proportion of California high school graduates who are Chicano/Latino, coupled with their improved high school performance.

Even though the pool of eligible Chicano/Latino students is growing dramatically, only 6.9 percent of Chicano/Latino high school graduates were eligible.
California Community College freshman students from underrepresented race/ethnicity groups are less likely to be “transfer ready” than other groups.

8.4.2 Transfer pipeline to UC by racial/ethnic group
Universitywide
2008 entering class

Many new CCC freshmen are not necessarily “transfer directed,” which means they enter the CCC system with other educational goals. Still, the differences between entering CCC freshmen and the number of all CCC students who are “transfer ready” two years later points to a challenge for the CCCs as well as UC and CSU: how to help more CCC students from underrepresented race/ethnic groups complete the requirements for transferring to a four-year college.

1 The CCC term “transfer ready,” potentially misleading, refers to students who have completed two years of transferable coursework, which includes transferable English and math courses, with a minimum GPA of 2.0. Students can take more (or less) than two years to complete these requirements, and for transfer to UC most would need a grade point average of 2.4 or higher, so the comparison of 2008 transfer-ready students to 2006 new CCC freshmen can only provide a rough indicator of how many students fall out of the four-year college pipeline at the community college level.
8.5 FACULTY DIVERSITY PIPELINE

UC hiring of new assistant professors from underrepresented race/ethnic groups has grown in each discipline. However, it remains slightly lower in the aggregate than the national availabilities.

8.5.1 New assistant professors compared to national availability for underrepresented minorities by discipline Universitywide


Data from the 2003–04 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF) show that UC hired a slightly higher percentage of new assistant professors in underrepresented minorities (10.3 percent) than other US research and doctoral institutions (7.7 percent). The trend was not uniform across all disciplines, however. The data show UC hired proportionally more underrepresented minorities into new faculty positions in education, arts and humanities, and social sciences, and life sciences and slightly fewer in physical sciences and engineering.

Because faculty careers span 30 years or more, faculty diversity evolves slowly. New faculty hiring has recently slowed due to the budget situation, which will impact UC’s efforts to diversify its faculty both in race/ethnicity and gender.

---

1 This analysis follows the campus practice required for federally mandated affirmative action plans; UC is required by Proposition 209 to satisfy federal reporting requirements in this area. See the appendix for additional details.

Underrepresented groups include African American (Black), American Indian and Chicano/Latino (including Puerto Rican, Mexican American, and other Hispanic). More detailed information on faculty diversity efforts can be found in the Accountability Sub-Report on Faculty Competitiveness: www.universityofcalifornia/accountability/reports.
8.5 FACULTY DIVERSITY PIPELINE

The proportion of females hired by UC at the assistant professor level has recently been much closer to national availability than in the prior period.

8.5.2 New assistant professors compared to national availability by gender and discipline

Universitywide

A notable exception to the overall trend in female faculty hiring is the disciplinary grouping of Arts/Humanities/History.

The national availability figures shown in these two charts are drawn from the nationwide population of new doctoral degree recipients. However, UC recruits a significant number of new faculty from its own graduate students and postdoctoral scholars, so the hiring pool may be different than the national availability shown here.

Comparative data exist in the 2003–04 National Study of Postsecondary Faculty (NSOPF). They show that in 2004 UC hired proportionally more women as new assistant professors (nearly 39.8 percent) than other US research and doctoral institutions (25.5 percent). Indeed, the 2004 data show that UC hired proportionally more women in all subject areas.

1 This analysis follows the campus practice required for federally mandated affirmative action plans; UC is required by Proposition 209 to satisfy federal reporting requirements in this area. See the appendix for additional details.
8.6 DIVERSITY OF GRADUATE ACADEMIC STUDENTS

UC is making very slow but steady progress in diversifying the domestic graduate academic students.

8.6.1 Racial/ethnic distribution of graduate academic students by discipline
Universitywide
Fall 2000 to 2010

The race/ethnic diversity of UC graduate academic students is comparable with that for research and doctoral institutions nationally, according to data from the National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS) 1999–2000 and 2007–08, conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics.

UC campuses have received funding from the National Science Foundation through its Alliance for Graduate Education and the Professorate (AGEP) grant program with the goal of increasing the number of students from underrepresented race/ethnic groups who acquire doctoral degrees in STEM fields (Science, Technology, Engineering and Math).

UC's graduate programs draw students from across the nation and around the world, including its own undergraduate students. Because of this, UC's efforts to diversify its undergraduate students can also help to diversify its graduate academic population.

Since Ph.D.s constitute the pool for new faculty hiring, a critical means for increasing the diversity of the faculty is to increase the diversity of the pool of doctoral degree recipients.

1 “Other” disciplines include interdisciplinary areas, miscellaneous fields such as criminology, and academic degrees in professional fields such as a Ph.D. in business or law.
Only in the life sciences does there appear to be a slight trend of increasing the proportion of graduate students who are female.

8.6.2 Gender distribution of graduate academic students by discipline
Universitywide
Fall 2000 to 2010

The proportion of graduate academic students who are women varies by discipline. Half or more of the graduate academic students in the life sciences, social sciences, humanities and other disciplines are women, compared to about 26 percent in the physical sciences.

There has been no progress during the last 10 years in increasing the proportion of women, except for in the life sciences. This is in contrast to the situation for undergraduates, where women now make up 53 percent of the student body.

The gender diversity of UC graduate academic students is comparable to research and doctoral institutions nationally, according to data from the National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS) 1999–2000 and 2007–08, conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics.

1 Other" disciplines include interdisciplinary areas, miscellaneous fields such as criminology, and academic degrees in professional fields such as a Ph.D. in business or law.
The professions continue to have very low numbers of students from underrepresented race/ethnic groups. Business schools in particular have very low proportions.

8.7.1 Racial/ethnic distribution of graduate professional degree students by discipline
Universitywide
Fall 2000 to 2010

Students from underrepresented groups (American Indian, African American and Chicano/Latino) constituted 12.1 percent of all professional degree students in 2009–10 compared to 11.2 percent in 2000–01. The proportion of students from underrepresented race/ethnic groups varies by professional degree program — lowest in business (5 percent) and highest in education (26 percent).

In 2008, almost 20 percent of UC’s first-year medical students were underrepresented students compared to a national average of 14.5 percent. Many of these students are enrolled in Programs in Medical Education (PRIME), designed to address the needs of underserved groups and communities.

The picture is comparable at research and doctoral institutions nationally. However, according to the National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS) 2007–08, UC enrolled fewer underrepresented minorities in business and medicine (4.5 percent and 10.7 percent, respectively) than did comparable programs at research and doctoral institutions nationally (12.8 percent and 14.7 percent, respectively).

1 “Other Health” includes dentistry, nursing, optometry, pharmacy, public health and veterinary medicine; “Other Professional” includes programs such as architecture, library and information science, public policy and social welfare, and other small programs. Medical residents are not included.
2 For further information about the PRIME program, see the January 2010 Accountability Sub-Report on Health Sciences and Services: www.universityofcalifornia.edu/regents/regmeet/jan10/j4.pdf.
Among professional programs, the gender distribution is most unequal in business (largely male) and education (predominantly female).

8.7.2 Gender distribution of graduate professional degree students by discipline
Universitywide
Fall 2000 to 2010

The trend since 2003 has been proportionally fewer women in the professional schools. According to the National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS) 2007–08, UC enrolled substantially more women in medicine (52.1 percent) than did medical schools at research and doctoral institutions nationally (43.1 percent), and substantially fewer in business schools (29.8 percent) for UC compared to 48.6 percent at MBA programs at research and doctoral institutions nationally.

Source: UC Corporate Student System

1 “Other Health” includes dentistry, nursing, optometry, pharmacy, public health and veterinary medicine; “Other Disciplines” includes programs such as architecture, library and information science, public policy and social welfare.
Chapter 9. Teaching and Learning

Goals
The University of California seeks to give its students a distinctive learning experience — one characterized by a learning environment created by faculty who are actively engaged in academic research. UC strives to ensure that all students have an opportunity to take small classes, seminars, and lab sections, and have access to faculty and others active in research. The ultimate goal is to ensure that students develop critical thinking, writing and other academic skills along with an in-depth understanding of their specific fields of study.

Narrative
This chapter includes indicators that illuminate aspects of the undergraduate teaching and learning experience: who teaches, and student access to ladder faculty, small classes and research. Using survey data, it reports students’ reflections on their undergraduate education — the extent to which they have developed mastery in their field or improved their critical thinking and other skills. The chapter concludes with a review of the educational opportunities that UC provides through its extension programs to hundreds of thousands of Californians, most of them in adult professional and continuing education.

While these indicators begin to get at the nature of the educational enterprise, they can only provide a very imperfect assessment of educational effectiveness and instructional quality. Therefore, at UC, individual academic departments and degree programs are responsible for defining learning objectives and for assessing students’ progress in meeting them. These objectives and assessments are subject to scrutiny by faculty from external institutions as part of routine program reviews conducted by the campuses. In recent years, academic objectives and assessments have become a major focus of reviews conducted by the regional accreditation agency (Western Association of Schools and Colleges) as well as reviews by many professional accrediting and related bodies. Information about program learning objectives is available on departmental websites, and each campus posts materials related to accreditation.

Looking forward
As evident elsewhere in this report, the University of California has undergone considerable and rapid changes in the last decade in its size and shape and in the level and source of funds that are available in support of instruction. These have led to increases in tuition, growth in average class sizes, reductions in course availability, and curtailment in faculty hiring. Some campuses are also rethinking curricular requirements and exploring new modes of instructional delivery, including online instruction and better use of summer sessions. How these changes affect students’ educational experience is not yet clear, but it may begin to emerge from the data reported in this section in the years to come.
Many groups including faculty, postdoctoral researchers and students contribute to instruction in proportions that vary by academic discipline.

Senate faculty participate in the “shared governance” of the University. They have multiple roles, including instruction, research and public service. In most disciplines, Senate faculty contribute more than half of the instructional workforce. There are two exceptions. Medicine relies more heavily for instruction on non-Senate faculty, who also have other clinical roles. Non-Senate faculty are also found in greater proportion in disciplines such as math, writing and languages, which have heavy “service teaching” loads owing to campus general education requirements.

“Other faculty” include clinical faculty, most lecturers, adjuncts, faculty in residence, and visiting faculty. “Other academics” include researchers, librarians, and administrators.

“Student instructional assistants” include students acting in supporting roles, such as teaching assistants, readers, and tutors. They are most numerous in disciplines catering to undergraduates.

1 Support staff, including students working in staff titles, are excluded. The Other academic category includes administrators and researchers who have instruction functions. *Medicine and other health science are excluded from general campus indicators presented later in this chapter. Data are for full-time-equivalent number of academic employees paid with instructional funds.
9.2 STUDENT CLASSROOM INSTRUCTORS

At UC, students have more contact with Senate faculty instructors in upper-division and graduate courses than in lower-division courses.

9.2.1 Student credit hours by faculty appointment and class type
Universitywide
2004–05 to 2008–09

Student Credit Hours (SCH) is one measure of faculty teaching workload. It is defined as the number of student enrollments in a course multiplied by the number of credits available from that course. A 4-credit class with 50 students generates 200 SCH; a 2-credit class of 15 students generates 30 SCH.

SCH is used in Chart 9.2.1 to show the kinds of instructors that students come into contact with at different levels of instruction.

At the lower-division level, students take more writing, language and other requirements that are most often taught by lecturers.

1 Data are for general campus courses only. See the appendix for additional details.
9.2 STUDENT CLASSROOM INSTRUCTORS

In 2008–09, only 3 percent of all lower-division credit hours were earned in a course taught by faculty with fewer than 50 students. For upper-division and graduate students, 21 and 73 percent of all credit hours, respectively, were earned in such classes.

9.2.2 Student credit hours by faculty appointment, class type and class size
Universitywide
2004–05 to 2008–09

Student credit hours can be used to get a sense of the size of classes taught by Senate faculty. Lower-division instruction is generally characterized by larger lecture classes populated by students fulfilling general education requirements and introductory courses for majors. For upper-division undergraduates, students’ contact with Senate faculty is fairly evenly distributed across classes of all sizes. Graduate academic students are almost uniformly taught by Senate faculty in classes with fewer than 50 students.
9.3 STUDENT-FACULTY RATIO

UC’s average student-faculty ratio, according to data provided to the National Center for Education Statistics, is about the same as the average for other AAU public institutions.

9.3 IPEDS student-faculty ratio
UC and comparison institutions
2008–09

The student-faculty ratio can reflect resources available for instruction and the average availability of faculty members to every student. The ratio presented here is an aggregate measure for the entire institution. It varies considerably, as will a student’s experience of it, by instructional level (lower-division, upper-division, and graduate) and by degree and major.

Student-faculty ratios are strongly influenced by an institution’s financial resources and the size of its graduate programs. Graduate programs are influential because their small class sizes bring down an institution’s student-faculty ratio. The average AAU private institution has about 52 percent graduate students, the average non-UC AAU public institution has 27 percent, while UC has about 22 percent.

1 The IPEDS student-faculty ratio varies from the traditional UC calculation because of methodological differences in how part-time faculty are counted. Generally, IPEDS underestimates the total number of instructional faculty FTE. However, the IPEDS data are used here because of the availability of other institutional data as benchmarks. The appendix presents the comparison of the traditional UC calculation and the IPEDS calculation. UC and AAU calculations are weighted by FTE enrollment.
9.4 THE UNDERGRADUATE RESEARCH EXPERIENCE

As a research institution, UC strives to provide research experiences for its undergraduate students and encourage interactions with faculty in small research-oriented seminars. The proportion of seniors reporting having these experiences in their senior year has remained stable for the past six years, as has the proportion that report taking a senior-year small research seminar with a faculty member.

9.4.1 Seniors who assisted faculty in research or a creative project
Universitywide and UC campuses

9.4.2 Seniors response to: “In this academic year have you taken a small research-oriented seminar with faculty?”
Universitywide

Data are derived from the University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES) which is conducted every two years to solicit student opinion about all aspects of the UC experience.

1 Research and creative projects statistics combines three items: “Assist faculty in research/creative project, with course credit”, “for pay without course credit,” and “as a volunteer, without course credit.”
9.5 UNDERGRADUATE LEARNING OUTCOMES

UC students report experiencing significant gains between their freshman and senior years in their critical-thinking skills, writing skills and understanding of a specific field of study.

Data from the 2008 UCUES survey show that undergraduate students feel they have benefited greatly from their UC education. In the spring 2010 survey, however, the reported gains in learning outcomes were not quite as large. This will be monitored after the next administration of the survey in 2012.
9.5 UNDERGRADUATE LEARNING OUTCOMES

9.5 Self-reported learning gains
Universitywide
Spring 2006, 2008 and 2010

Critical-thinking skills

Writing skills

Understanding a specific field of study

Source: UCUES
9.6 CONTINUING EDUCATION

UC is a significant provider of continuing education to Californians. Adult learners take nearly 300,000 courses each year from University Extension programs.

9.6 Continuing-education enrollments
Universitywide and UC campuses
2002–03 to 2009–10

UC Extension offers a highly diverse range of courses designed to serve the continuing-education needs of working professionals through both credit and non-credit programs. UC Extension is completely self-supporting. Each campus extension program addresses particular educational needs in its own geographic area.

Extension programs and activities have economic impacts that multiply throughout the regional economy of every campus. A recent study of UCLA’s extension programs, for example, estimated an annual contribution of $250 million to the regional economy, 70 percent of which was attributable to students’ increased earning power after completing an extension program.

1 “Degree Credit” courses lead to formal UC degree credit, developed and presented in partnership with campus faculty and graduate degree programs. “Professional Credit” courses provide Senate-approved academic credit but are not associated with a specific UC degree program. “Professional & General Non-Credit” courses are high-quality continuing education courses and workshops. These programs may satisfy continuing-education requirements of public agencies and professional associations but do not convey UC Senate-approved credit.
Chapter 10. Research

Goals
The California Master Plan for Higher Education designates the University of California as the primary state-supported academic agency for research. UC research contributes to the state and to the nation through discoveries that improve health, technology, welfare and the quality of life.

UC has more than 800 research centers, institutes, laboratories and programs, and spanning 10 campuses, five medical centers, a national energy laboratory and numerous specialized research facilities. It has established an unparalleled international reputation for innovative, leading-edge research. All academic disciplines are represented in the research enterprise, from telescopic explorations of the far reaches of the universe to advanced imaging technologies that map the workings of the human brain; from the development of new commercial strains of strawberries to the development of medical treatments through the use of stem cells; from the study of the art of ancient China to the analysis of the writings of Mark Twain. Research at UC expands knowledge in all dimensions. The extraordinary diversity and quality of research at UC is reflected in the uniformly high rankings assigned to UC campuses and programs by every published ranking of U.S. and worldwide universities (see Chapter 14).

Narrative
Performance toward achieving UC’s research goals may be measured in five ways: the quantity of research that is conducted; the academic quality and impact of UC’s research; the enhancement of the educational experience of UC students; the contribution to the public of research findings; and the economic and societal benefits that flow directly from research results. Measures of research quality and impact are notoriously difficult to generate, and there is little agreement on their validity or use. Accordingly, after a brief introduction to the composition of the University’s research workforce, this chapter focuses on measures of research quantity, including research expenditures and journal publication. Focusing on research finances demonstrates the increasing importance of research at UC, whose growth has outpaced all other categories of University expenditures and which now represents about one quarter of the annual budget. However, these fiscal and personnel measures do not present a comprehensive account of UC’s diverse research programs. They significantly under-represent research in the arts, humanities, social sciences and theoretical scientific disciplines, because work in these fields leaves less of a direct fiscal footprint.

Looking forward
UC faces numerous challenges in pursuing its research mission. Other chapters have dealt with the challenges inherent in recruiting and retaining a world-class faculty or remaining competitive in attracting graduate students. This one adds a new challenge—the University does not recover the full costs of research from the external agencies that sponsor that research that they support. Future accountability reports will assess the University’s ability to recover the full costs of research. They will also attempt to capture better measures of the quality of faculty research, in part through a deeper analysis of faculty citation indices.
For more information

Additional information on the academic quality of UC research can be found in the January 2010 Accountability Sub-Report on the Research Enterprise, at www.universityofcalifornia.edu/accountability/report.html#subreports.


The Office of the President’s Office of Research and Graduate Studies website, www.ucop.edu/research, contains a number of resources about UC’s research enterprise.
10.1 RESEARCH WORKFORCE

In 2009–10, funded research projects provided employment for more than 28,000 full-time-equivalent personnel. This represents more than 25 percent of the total UC full-time-equivalent workforce, including student employees.

10.1 Research workforce by discipline
Universitywide
2009–10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty and Other Academic</td>
<td>6,951</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Staff</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postdoctoral Researcher</td>
<td>2,839</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>1,232</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phys Sci, Math, Engineering, and CS</td>
<td>645</td>
<td></td>
<td>645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>223</td>
<td></td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sciences</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Health Science</td>
<td>328</td>
<td></td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sci &amp; Psych</td>
<td>1,503</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>1,424</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1,399</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>10,594</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,594</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student researchers (primarily graduate students) contribute significantly to research in all disciplines, composing more than one-third of the paid research workforce in the physical sciences and technology fields.

The employment shown above includes only staff and students directly paid by UC or an externally funded research program. It does not capture the effort of faculty and students who engage in research in the normal course of their work or the staff who provide administrative, facilities and equipment maintenance support as part of the overall University mission. In most disciplines without significant external research funding, such as the arts and humanities, this work contributes the lion's share of the total research effort.

---

1 UC has about 174,000 headcount employees including students; this represents approximately 97,700 full-time-equivalent employees.

2 Data shown here represents full-time-equivalent personnel receiving earnings from research accounts.
10.2 RESEARCH EXPENDITURES

Salaries and benefits represent nearly half of all research expenditures.

10.2.1 Research expenditures by type
Universitywide
2009–10

Millions of Dollars, Total = $4,749 Million

In addition to the $455 million in employee benefits noted here, UC accrued postemployment retirement benefit liabilities of $462 million in 2009–2010.
In 2009–10, research expenditures totaling $4.7 billion accounted for nearly a quarter of the University's entire operating budget. This proportion has not changed markedly during the past decade.¹

10.2.2 Direct research expenditures by source
Universitywide 1997–98 to 2009–10

Federally funded research accounts for the majority of all research expenditures at UC, representing nearly 58 percent of the 2009–10 total. About three quarters of federal research funds came from two agencies: the National Institutes for Health and the National Science Foundation.

Fluctuations in federal appropriations have a major impact on research expenditures. Cutbacks at key federal agencies during 2006, for example, accounted for the slight dip in research expenditures shown here, while the increase shown for 2009–10 is due largely to temporary American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funding. By the end of 2009–10, UC had been awarded more than $900 million in ARRA stimulus funds.

UC's share of all university research activity in the United States, as reported through IPEDS, has remained fairly constant over the last decade at just more than 8 percent. University support, which accounted for 19 percent of all direct research expenditures in 2009–10, comes from a variety of sources. These include UC general funds (which include a portion of the dollars returned as indirect cost recovery), student fees, state government specific appropriations, endowment income, and gifts from industry and foundations.

State-supported research would have declined significantly during the past several years had it not been for the California Institute for Regenerative Medicine, a state bond-funded agency that has awarded about $375 million to UC since 2008.

¹ Details on total budget appear in the appendix tables for indicator 12.2.
² Amounts have been adjusted for inflation and do not include accrual funds for postemployment retirement benefits or indirect cost recovery funds.
10.2 RESEARCH EXPENDITURES

Expenditures for research in the medical fields increased by 77 percent since 1997–98, compared to 46 percent for all other disciplines.

10.2.3 Direct research expenditures by discipline
Universitywide
1997–98 to 2009–10

Expenditures for research in all STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics) and medical fields represented about 95 percent of the total each year during the past decade.

Measures of research expenditures substantially under-represent research activity in the social sciences, arts and humanities, and professional disciplines that have relatively little access to external research funding.
Research in the STEM fields (Life and Physical Sciences, Technology, Engineering and Math) and Medicine is far more costly than research in social sciences, arts and humanities. It also attracts far more external research funding.

10.2.4 Average research expenditure per eligible principal investigator\(^1\) by discipline

Universitywide and UC campuses

2009–10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>(thousands of dollars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Hum</td>
<td>$13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>$37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>$47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Mgmt</td>
<td>$65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oth GC Prof</td>
<td>$67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sci &amp; Psych</td>
<td>$67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>$162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Sci</td>
<td>$304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>$348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oth Health Sci</td>
<td>$377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phys Sci</td>
<td>$399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng &amp; CS</td>
<td>$404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2009–10, there were $3.83 billion in research expenditures and 14,468 principal investigators, resulting in the Universitywide average of $265,000 per PI shown in the chart above.

Although more funds are expended for medical research at UC than in any other discipline, annual research expenditures per eligible investigator are highest overall in Engineering and Computer Science and in Physical Science.

\(^1\) A principal investigator is a person authorized by the Academic Personnel Manual to apply for and receive grants. Most are faculty, professional researchers or academic administrators. For more information, see the appendix.

\(^2\) Amounts in this chart were calculated by finding the total of direct research expenditures by discipline, then dividing that amount by the number of individuals in those disciplines on each campus that were eligible to serve as principal investigators.

Source: UC Corporate Personnel System and Corporate Financial System\(^2\)
10.2 RESEARCH EXPENDITURES

Budgets for externally funded research projects include both a direct cost component — the actual amount of salaries, benefits, equipment and materials needed to conduct the project — plus an overhead percentage to cover the facilities and administration required to house and support the research project. These overhead activities are the “indirect costs” of research.

10.2.5 Research indirect cost recovery by source
Universitywide
1997–98 to 2009–10

The “indirect costs” of research are substantial, and typically much higher than the rate that research sponsors are willing to pay to UC, or to other research universities, for that matter. They also vary among research sponsors that negotiate their indirect cost recovery rates separately with UC (again as with other universities). Rates negotiated with federal agencies are among the highest, but still estimated at between 5 and 18 percentage points below the true indirect costs of conducting research. Most nonfederal research sponsors, including corporations, non-profit organizations and the state of California, have policies that limit indirect cost recovery to well below federal rates. For these and other reasons the UC Commission on the Future set an annual goal of $300 million in additional indirect cost recovery.
10.3 RESEARCH OUTPUT

The number of faculty publications\(^1\) is a measure, imperfect, of faculty research productivity.

The charts on the following page show faculty publications across three broad academic disciplines: health and life sciences, physical sciences and engineering, and social sciences and humanities. Some important caveats guide its interpretation and use.

Within a given academic discipline, differences in the level of faculty publications are due to a number of factors, among them the nature of scholarship in a given field, size of departments and the number of faculty at each campus working in a particular field. Davis, Irvine, Los Angeles, San Diego and San Francisco, for example, all have large medical schools and associated faculty and researchers, and accordingly show disproportionately high levels of publications in the health and life sciences.

Published outputs cannot be used to compare faculty research productivity across disciplines. While all academic disciplines strive for excellence, different disciplines have different standards of merit and validation in terms of types, frequency and venues for the dissemination of research. Also, the number of newly hired faculty and researchers can affect a campus’s measure here, as it takes time for a new hire to publish articles.

Some disciplines favor shorter, multi-authored publications while other disciplines favor longer, sole-authored publications. Co-authorship, for example, is more common in the life and physical sciences, where credit is shared with a team of researchers, than in the social sciences and humanities, where papers tend to be sole-authored. Thus, faculty in the life and physical sciences may have more publications credited to them than faculty in the social sciences and humanities in part because of different publication norms.

Faculty in the social sciences and the humanities also publish books as well as scholarly articles; however, the 2008 SCOPUS database, from which the data for this Indicator are drawn, does not contain books. Thus, it underestimates faculty research contributions in the social sciences and humanities.

---

\(^1\) Faculty publications data come from SCOPUS, a database of abstracts and citations for scholarly journal articles. SCOPUS covers nearly 18,000 titles from more than 5,000 international publishers; it includes 16,500 peer-reviewed journals in the scientific, technical and medical and social science (including arts and humanities) fields. SCOPUS assigns each scholarly journal in its database to a particular academic discipline; articles appearing in a specific journal are considered to have been published in the academic discipline assigned to that journal.
10.3 RESEARCH OUTPUT

10.3 Publications by broad discipline and per eligible principal investigator (PI)\(^1\)

UC campuses

2008

Source: SCOPUS and UC Corporate Personnel System

\(^1\) Information on eligible principal investigators (PI) can be found in Indicator 10.2.
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Chapter 11. Health Sciences and Services

Goals
Under California’s Master Plan for Higher Education, the University of California is delegated primary responsibility in public higher education for doctoral education. For the health professions, this means that UC is delegated exclusive responsibility in public higher education for the following professional degrees: DDS (Doctor of Dental Science), MD (Doctor of Medicine), OD (Doctor of Optometry), Doctor of Pharmacy (PharmD), and DVM (Doctor of Veterinary Medicine). In nursing and in public health, UC is responsible in public higher education for doctoral education leading to the following degrees: PhD (nursing) and PhD (public health) and DrPH (public health).

UC health sciences programs have grown and emerged as national and international leaders in teaching, research and clinical care. In support of these programs, Health Sciences and Services (HSS) provides leadership and strategic direction to advance the missions of the University’s 16 health professional schools and 10 hospitals, collectively referred to as UC Health. HSS works within and across the system to advance operational initiatives at individual UC health sciences campuses and to develop system-wide initiatives that add synergy and value beyond the sum of individual campus contributions.

Narrative
The University of California operates the largest health sciences instructional program in the nation, enrolling more than 14,000 students annually in 16 schools located on seven health sciences campuses. These programs include five schools of medicine and four smaller medical education programs (located in Berkeley, Fresno, Riverside, and at the Charles R. Drew University of Medicine and Science); three schools of nursing; two schools each of dentistry, pharmacy and public health; and one school each of optometry and veterinary medicine. Active efforts are also underway to transition a medical student education program that has operated as a joint effort between UC Riverside and UCLA for more than 30 years to a fully independent UC medical school.

The University of California’s five academic medical centers (Davis, Irvine, Los Angeles, San Diego and San Francisco) provide a vast resource for the clinical training programs of UC health professional schools. It prepares future generations of health professionals, catalyzes major advances in biomedical and clinical research, and serves as California’s fourth-largest health care delivery system. UC staffs five major trauma centers, providing half of all transplants and one-fourth of extensive burn care in the state. In 2009–10, UC medical centers managed more than 850,000 inpatient visits and discharges, 265,000 emergency room visits and 3.5 million outpatient visits. Approximately, 40 percent of UC patients are uninsured or covered by Medi-Cal. Roughly 60 percent of all hospital days are used by Medicare, Medi-Cal or uninsured patients. In support of its teaching, research and public service missions, UC health programs also maintain active relationships with more than 100 affiliated Veterans Affairs, county and community-based health facilities located throughout California.

In view of the size and contributions of health-related programs across the UC system, select performance indicators related to students, faculty, and research are also included in the respective sections of this report that are devoted to those categories. For example, indicators related to students enrolled in UC professional degree programs are also included in Chapter 5 ( Graduate Academic and Professional Degree Students). Chapter 6 (Faculty and Other Academic Employees) includes indicators related to UC faculty appointments, headcounts and conference of doctoral degrees. Information regarding diversity is found in Chapter 8. Research workforce indicators for medicine and health sciences, as well as indicators for general funding and expenditures, are included in Chapter 10 (Research).
In addition, this chapter includes information and performance indicators for various aspects of the University's health sciences system, including information regarding health professional students; health sciences instruction and research expenditures; and the health science academic workforce. This section also includes a number of indicators and metrics related to the University's health care delivery system.

Looking forward
California's population is growing, aging, and increasing in diversity. Already the most populous state in the nation, California is expected to grow at nearly twice the national average by 2025. Statewide shortages of health providers exist in many health professions, and shortages loom in others. These challenges will grow as health reforms drive increasing demand for quality and accountability in the delivery of health services. At a time of unprecedented budgetary challenges, UC Health is working to support new initiatives and developments to help meet current and future health care needs. They include the opening of the new Betty Irene Moore School of Nursing at UC Davis, the creation of new programs in medical education that focus specifically on the needs of medically underserved communities at each UC medical school, and ongoing efforts to establish a new medical school focusing on the needs of California's Inland Empire at UC Riverside. Development of the California Telemedicine Network, a statewide initiative led by UC, with funding from the state's Proposition 1D, will provide needed infrastructure to expand access to specialty services through telemedicine. Similarly, the new UC Center for Health Quality and Innovation, launched by UC Health in 2010, is expected to promote and advance innovations in clinical care that will improve patient outcomes and quality of care with the UC system and beyond. These and other activities are among the many new initiatives that are now underway within UC to help improve quality, access and value in the delivery of health services.

For more information
The UC health sciences and services website, www.universityofcalifornia.edu/sites/uchealth, contains additional information about health sciences education, research and patient care activities. The January 2010 Accountability Sub-Report on Health Sciences and Services provides a fuller description of the broad sweep of the University's activities in health sciences and services: www.universityofcalifornia.edu/accountability/report.html#subreports.
In 2010, health science professional degree students made up more than a third (35.8 percent) of all professional degree students at UC, with the majority of them in medicine.

11.1.1 State-supported graduate health science professional degree students by discipline
Universitywide
Fall 2006 to 2010

Health sciences students are in professional programs, academic programs or residency programs. Professional programs lead to professional degrees such as doctor of medicine (MD) or doctor of veterinary medicine (DVM). Academic programs lead to academic degrees such as the Ph.D. Residents are medical school graduates who are participating in specialty or subspecialty training programs such as pediatrics or surgery.

In addition to the approximately 12,000 students represented above, there are approximately 2,000 academic health science students in life science disciplines such as biomedical science, bioengineering, neuroscience and epidemiology.

1 Academic/Professional students are in joint programs, one of which is considered an academic program and the other of which is considered a professional program. For instance, a joint Ph.D./MD degree would be considered an Academic/Professional program.
In 2009–2010, health science instructional expenditures ($1.2 billion) made up a quarter of all instructional expenditures at UC ($4.7 billion). Of the total health sciences instruction budget, nearly a quarter ($330 million) was made up from UC and state general funds.

11.1.2 Health science instruction expenditures
Universitywide
2009–10

The medical and dental care provided by UC health science faculty generate significant revenue, which helps support health sciences instruction.

Professional school fees charged to medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine, nursing, optometry, public health, physical therapy, and pharmacy students have increased steadily over the past ten years and also contribute to health sciences instructional program funding.

Academic and staff salaries and benefits constitute over three-quarters of all health sciences instructional expenditures.

1 For additional information, see: http://budget.ucop.edu/rbudget/201112/2011-12-budget-detail.pdf.
11.1 HEALTH SCIENCES

Health sciences contributed nearly a third (32.5 percent) of the entire academic workforce in 2009–2010, but not in equal measures to all types of faculty. For example, while health sciences faculty make up a fifth of all Senate faculty (20.7 percent) they contribute more than half of all other non-Senate faculty (54.5 percent).

11.1.3 Health science academic workforce by discipline
Universitywide
Fall 2010

As in other areas throughout the University, health sciences students and faculty are engaged in education, research and public service activities.

1 Other faculty are primarily clinical faculty. Other academics are primarily researchers.
11.1 HEALTH SCIENCES

In 2009–10, research expenditures in the health sciences made up nearly half (48.1 percent) of all UC research expenditures. The proportion has grown somewhat (from 43.4 percent) during the past 13 years as research expenditures in health sciences (except in nursing) have grown somewhat faster than in other areas.

11.1.4 Research expenditures by health science discipline
Universitywide
1997–98 to 2009–10

Source: UC Corporate Financial System, adjusted for inflation
11.2 HEALTH SERVICES

More than half of medical center operating expenses are for staff salary and benefits.

11.2.1 Medical center operating expenses
Universitywide
2007–08 to 2009–10

$6,000

Source: UC Medical Centers Audited Financial Statements
11.2 HEALTH SERVICES

The majority of medical center staff are unionized.

11.2.2 Medical center staff by personnel program
Universitywide
Fall 2004 to 2010

Source: UC Corporate Personnel System

Of the union-represented staff above, the largest unions are the AFSCME Patient Care Technical union, the California Nurses Association and the UPTE Health Care Professionals. These three unions represent more than 90 percent of the unionized medical center employees.

Source: UC Corporate Personnel System

1 This chart also appears in the Staff chapter of this report.
11.2 HEALTH SERVICES

Between 2003–04 and 2008–09 each of UC’s five medical centers experienced gradual growth in the number of in-patient days. The number declined in 2009–10 at two medical centers (San Francisco and Davis).

11.2.3 Hospital inpatient days
UC medical centers
2003–04 to 2009–10

The University's academic medical centers operate in urban areas. Three of the five centers are former county hospitals. Each medical center has several primary care and specialty clinics distributed in the communities they serve.

In addition to providing primary and specialty care, UC medical centers treat critically ill newborns, care for cancer patients, and treat half of all transplant patients and one-quarter of extensive burn cases in California. As tertiary and quaternary care centers, they also treat patients from other hospitals that have exhausted all other efforts.

“Inpatient days” represents the total number of days that all patients spend in a hospital bed. The graphs presented here display the total number of inpatient days at the five UC medical centers.

Source: UC Medical Centers Audited Financial Statements
# 11.2 HEALTH SERVICES

## UC medical centers conduct almost 4 million outpatient visits per year.

### 11.2.4 Outpatient visits

**UC medical centers**

- **2003–04 to 2009–10**

**Emergency Visits**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>San Francisco</th>
<th>San Diego</th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
<th>Irvine</th>
<th>Davis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03-04</td>
<td>37,807</td>
<td>35,185</td>
<td>36,703</td>
<td>38,486</td>
<td>39,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-05</td>
<td>58,686</td>
<td>57,855</td>
<td>60,769</td>
<td>60,023</td>
<td>60,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-06</td>
<td>68,373</td>
<td>69,665</td>
<td>69,389</td>
<td>67,181</td>
<td>66,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-07</td>
<td>32,415</td>
<td>34,808</td>
<td>34,648</td>
<td>31,229</td>
<td>32,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-08</td>
<td>49,341</td>
<td>46,196</td>
<td>47,906</td>
<td>52,937</td>
<td>55,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-09</td>
<td>54,938</td>
<td>55,238</td>
<td>54,938</td>
<td>55,238</td>
<td>54,938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-10</td>
<td>60,160</td>
<td>60,160</td>
<td>60,160</td>
<td>60,160</td>
<td>60,160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Outpatient Visits (Includes Home Health, Clinic, and Other Visits)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>San Francisco</th>
<th>San Diego</th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
<th>Irvine</th>
<th>Davis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03-04</td>
<td>836,864</td>
<td>863,394</td>
<td>885,111</td>
<td>871,262</td>
<td>737,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-05</td>
<td>483,803</td>
<td>484,151</td>
<td>479,649</td>
<td>464,804</td>
<td>473,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-06</td>
<td>562,351</td>
<td>560,854</td>
<td>523,199</td>
<td>496,129</td>
<td>492,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-07</td>
<td>836,864</td>
<td>863,394</td>
<td>885,111</td>
<td>871,262</td>
<td>918,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-08</td>
<td>918,923</td>
<td>918,923</td>
<td>918,923</td>
<td>918,923</td>
<td>915,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08-09</td>
<td>771,103</td>
<td>771,103</td>
<td>771,103</td>
<td>771,103</td>
<td>771,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09-10</td>
<td>788,287</td>
<td>788,287</td>
<td>788,287</td>
<td>788,287</td>
<td>788,287</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UC Medical Centers Audited Financial Statements

Outpatient visits are defined as visits during which patients see either a physician or nurse practitioner in a clinic. Visits to other units, such as radiology, laboratory and physical therapy, are not counted as outpatient visits.

The medical centers provide a full range of health care services and are sites for testing the application of new knowledge and the development of new diagnostic and therapeutic techniques.
When compared with the average for all California medical centers and hospitals, UC medical centers treat more complicated cases. The difference has grown during the past seven years.

11.2.5 Patient complexity
UC medical centers and California median
2003–04 to 2009–10

The “Case Mix” Index is a standard hospital metric for addressing the question: “How sick are our patients?” Hospitals with more seriously ill patients score higher on the index, which translates into more resources used by the hospital and higher cost. A patient of average complexity scores 1.0 on the index. The index has been rising at each of the medical centers, reflecting growth in highly complex care including complex surgical cases and transplants.

The patient mix at the UC medical centers reflects that the centers act as tertiary referral hospitals that often serve sicker patients and those with the most complex cases. As noted earlier, they treat critically ill newborns, care for cancer patients, and treat half of all transplant patients and one-quarter of extensive burn cases in California.

Source: UC Medical Centers Audited Financial Statements and the California Health Care Foundation

1 California state median data are from the California Health Care Foundation and are for the calendar years 2003 through 2007, while UC data are for the UC fiscal year (July to June) as shown in the legend. Additional details appear in the appendix.
11.2 HEALTH SERVICES

Patients at UC Medical Centers are more satisfied than the average for all California hospitals.

11.2.6 Patient satisfaction
UC medical centers, 12-month rolling average
September 2009 to October 2010

Percent of patients who would definitely recommend hospital to friends and family

Source: UC Enterprise Risk Management Information System

\(^1\) Statistics are 12-month rolling average ending in month shown. Data are from the Hospital Consumer Assessment of Healthcare Providers and Systems which is used by all hospitals receiving Medicare reimbursements.
Chapter 12. University Budgets and Private Giving

Goals

The University of California seeks to develop stable and growing sources of revenues — including a strong investment from the state — and to utilize these resources in a strategic and cost-effective manner to sustain its tripartite mission of teaching, research and public service, and to realize the goals of access, affordability and academic quality that are set out in this report.

Narrative

This chapter provides a brief overview of UC’s budgets for operations and capital resources and of its development efforts. Indicators for the operating and capital budgets show revenues by source and expenditure by function. These data focus on UC specifically and are not readily comparable with other peer institutions. Development data cover trends in private support at UC and comparison institutions, donor restrictions on support, and endowment per student.

Looking forward

The long-term downward trend in state funding challenges the University’s ability to meet its budgetary and financial objectives. In response, the University has sought to increase revenues from various sources and to reduce its expenditures by introducing operating efficiencies. In the years to come, this section will act as a useful summary of the financial challenges that the University faces and its performance in addressing them. Other sections in this report promise to measure the impacts the University’s budgetary performance has on its core mission activities of teaching, research and service, and on its ability to continue balancing its objectives of academic quality, access and affordability.

For more information

For more information on UC’s budget, refer to www.ucop.edu/budget/pubs.html.

More information about private support is available in the Annual Reports on University Private Support, at: www.ucop.edu/instadv/reports.html.
In the past 10 years, state educational appropriations have decreased from 24 percent of UC revenue to 13 percent. This reflects both a decline in state support (from $3.7 billion to $2.8 billion inflation-adjusted) and an increase in other revenues, especially from medical centers, contracts and grants, and student tuition and fees.

12.1 Operating revenue by source
2000–01 to 2009–10

The University's operating budget was over $20 billion in 2009–10. This represents funding for core mission activities — teaching, research and public service — as well as for a wide range of other activities, including hospitals, continuing education, student housing and dining services, and faculty and graduate student research funded by contracts and grants.

Between 2000–01 and 2009–10, state educational appropriations fell by almost $1 billion, while total student enrollment grew by 50,000 (see indicator 1.1).

Private gift funding has remained relatively stable with contributions between 3 percent and 4 percent of the University’s revenues.

Campuses rely in different proportion on revenues from various sources, as shown on the following page. The greatest difference exists between campuses with medical centers and those without.
12.1 REVENUE

Operating revenue by source
2000–01 to 2009–10

UC Campuses

Source: UC Audited Financial Statements

$0.0  $0.5  $1.0  $1.5  $2.0  $2.5  $3.0  $3.5  $4.0  $4.5  $5.0  $5.5  $6.0  $0  $1  $2  $3  $4  $5  $6

Los Angeles  San Francisco  Davis  San Diego  Irvine

Campuses with Medical Centers
(scale $0 to $5B)

Medical centers
Grants and Contracts
Other revenue
Private gifts
Auxiliary enterprises
Educational activities
Student tuition and fees

$0.0  $0.5  $1.0  $1.5  $2.0  $2.5  $3.0  $3.5  $4.0  $4.5  $5.0  $5.5  $6.0

Berkeley  Santa Barbara  Santa Cruz  Riverside  Merced

Campuses without Medical Centers
(scale $0 to $2.5B)

Grants and Contracts
Other revenue
Private gifts
Auxiliary enterprises
Educational activities
Student tuition and fees

State educational appropriations

$0  $0.5  $1.0  $1.5  $2.0  $2.5

03-04  05-06  07-08  09-10

03-04  05-06  07-08  09-10

03-04  05-06  07-08  09-10

03-04  05-06  07-08  09-10

03-04  05-06  07-08  09-10

03-04  05-06  07-08  09-10

03-04  05-06  07-08  09-10

03-04  05-06  07-08  09-10

03-04  05-06  07-08  09-10

03-04  05-06  07-08  09-10

Source: UC Audited Financial Statements

1 Figures are in billions of inflation-adjusted 2009–10 dollars; Department of Energy laboratories, including the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, are excluded. The Davis, Irvine, Los Angeles, San Diego and San Francisco campuses operate medical schools and teaching hospitals. In addition to the funds associated with medical school and teaching hospital operations, these programs help campuses attract additional contract and grant revenue.
While total expenditures have increased by 48 percent in the last decade, the distribution of expenditures by function has remained stable.

12.2 Operating expenditures by function
2000–01 to 2009–10

Universitywide

Source: UC Audited Financial Statements

Teaching, research and public service accounted for more than 40 percent of total expenditures during 2009–10.

Medical centers and auxiliary enterprises, such as housing and dining services, accounted for 30 percent.

Libraries and other academic support services, such as instructional technology, student services, administration and general campus (but not medical center) operation and maintenance of plant, accounted for 15 percent of total expenditures.

UC students received total grant and scholarship aid of almost $1.4 billion in 2009–10. This includes $544 million paid directly to students, which is the amount shown in the chart above. In addition, UC students received $856 million in grants and scholarships in 2009–10 to help pay their tuition and fees, campus housing, books and other campus charges. These dollars are not included in the chart above because auditing rules do not treat them as direct expenditures.

---

1 Figures are in billions of inflation-adjusted 2009–10 dollars. Medical centers include UC’s hospitals and other patient care activities; auxiliaries include operations such as food service, parking and student housing; other expenses include interest, depreciation and other miscellaneous expenses. Department of Energy laboratories, including the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, are not included in the data above. Statements are available at www.universityofcalifornia.edu/reportingtransparency.
12.2 EXPENDITURES

Operating expenditures by function
2000–01 to 2009–10

UC campuses

Campuses with Med Centers
(scale $0 to $5B)

Sources: UC Audited Financial Statements

1 Figures in billions of inflation-adjusted 2009–10 dollars; campus-level data not available before 2003–04. The Davis, Irvine, Los Angeles, San Diego and San Francisco campuses operate medical schools and teaching hospitals. In addition to the funds associated with medical school and teaching hospital operations, the programs help campuses attract additional contract and grant revenue.

Campuses without Med Centers
(scale $0 to $2.5B)

Source: UC Audited Financial Statements
12.3 CAPITAL PROJECTS

The bulk of UC’s capital project funding does not come from the state.

12.3.1 Sources of capital spending
Universitywide
1998–99 to 2009–10

State funds include state general obligation bonds, which require voter approval, and lease revenue bonds, which do not. These have been the primary sources of funding for core academic facilities (general campus and health sciences education facilities) since the mid-1980s.

Non-state funds come from gifts, grants, bonds and other sources. They support student and faculty housing, parking, athletics, recreation and other student-funded facilities, medical centers and sponsored research programs.

The University estimates that it will need more than $1 billion in capital funding each year during the next five years to address its most pressing facilities needs for core academic activities. The needs include new research and teaching facilities, correction or replacement of seismically deficient facilities, renewal or replacement of building systems, and improvements to campus utility systems.
12.3 CAPITAL PROJECTS

More than half of all capital funds spent between 2007–08 and 2010–11 were for projects addressing core academic needs. Such needs arise from student enrollment growth and from the establishment of new academic and research programs that require new buildings or the renovation of existing ones.

12.3.2 Types of capital projects
2007–08 to 2010–11

Universitywide

Enrollment growth has largely driven the University’s need for new laboratories, classrooms, student housing and recreational facilities.

Since 1998–99, the University has spent more than $1 billion on seismic corrections for earthquake mitigation. Of the space rated “poor” and that remains to be corrected as of September 2008, approximately 87 percent is located at Berkeley and UCLA. A study is under way to review campus plans for mitigating seismic risk and completing the remaining work.

As campus facilities age, they must periodically be renewed or upgraded. Heating, ventilation, electrical and plumbing systems, elevators and roofs all need to be replaced multiple times during the lifespan of a building. The University has a substantial backlog of deferred maintenance.

Academic, research and clinical priorities change over time. New initiatives in biomedical and energy research, for example, require new kinds of specialized space, involving renovation of existing infrastructure or construction of new.

---

1 All non-state funds for 2010–11 are proposed, not yet approved. Figures in inflation-adjusted 2009–10 dollars; includes both state-supported and non-state-supported capital projects.
The types of capital projects undertaken in the past four years vary considerably by campus in ways that reflect the campuses' local priorities, opportunities and challenges.

Types of capital projects
2007–08 to 2010–11

UC campuses

Since 2007–08, the majority of projects at Merced, Santa Cruz and Riverside focused on facilities needs resulting from growth in student numbers.

Berkeley and Santa Barbara spent more than three-quarters of their capital funds on seismic upgrades and facility renewal.

The five campuses with medical centers spent the majority of their capital funds on new program initiatives.

Source: UC Budget Office

1 All non-state funds for 2010–11 are proposed, not yet approved.
12.4 DEVELOPMENT

Except for the 2007–08 banner year, UC has typically raised between $1.3 and $1.4 billion annually in private gift funds. Most gift funds (98 percent in 2009–10) are restricted by donors in how they may be used.

12.4.1 Current giving by purpose
Universitywide
2000–01 to 2009–10

The relative stability in the level of private giving to UC during the last decade is not atypical of trends in higher education generally. Indeed, the trend line for year-on-year change for AAU publics (including UC) is better than it is for AAU privates even though privates continue to raise more money annually than their public counterparts.
A campus's ability to raise money is related to its age, the size of its alumni, and the number of health science programs it supports (health sciences programs attract nearly half of all private support at UC).

12.4.2 Total giving by type
UC campuses
2002–03 to 2009–10

Source: Council on Aid to Education (CAE)
12.4 DEVELOPMENT

In general, when compared to the other AAU institutions, a lower proportion of UC alumni contribute to their alma mater and contribute less on average than at the other AAU publics.

12.4.3 Percent of alumni who donate
Universitywide and comparison institutions
1999–2000 to 2009–10

12.4.4 Support from specific groups per alumni of record
Universitywide and comparison institutions
2001–02 to 2009–10

In the last decade, alumni participation has been declining at institutions across the country, both public and private. College graduates (at UC and elsewhere) are giving back to other charitable organizations other than their alma mater — often due to the belief that higher education institutions are wealthy and may not need their support. UC and other institutions are engaged in efforts to combat this trend.

Alumni: While UC has a significant number of very generous alumni, historically, the importance of private support has not been emphasized with current students. As a result, alumni giving has stayed at a low level.

Foundations: UC’s preeminence in numerous academic areas results in considerable support from private foundations, especially in the areas of medical and scientific research.

Other sources: UC does better on a per-alumni basis from other sources than the other AAU publics. These are donors such as corporations, non-profit organizations, faculty, staff, parents and current students.
In aggregate, UC's has slightly more endowment per alumni than the average for AAU public universities, and significantly less than the average for AAU private ones.

12.4.5 Endowment per alumni of record
UC and comparison institutions
1999–2000 to 2009–10

In 2009–10, UC’s $8.6 billion endowment paid out a total of $346 million.

A university’s endowment includes money or property that has been donated over the years, usually with the stipulation that the principal be maintained. The interest from endowment funds supports a range of activities, including faculty salaries (e.g. in endowed professorships), student financial aid and research.

UC endowment funds, like the gifts UC receives, are typically restricted. Donors require that the interest generated by the endowment be used for specific purposes. In 2009–10, only $28 million (8 percent of all endowment distributions) were unrestricted.

As the University’s state appropriation continues to decline, the importance of endowment funding grows. However, it will not readily replace state support. The University’s endowment would have to increase two and half times from its current value (from $8 billion to more than $20 billion) in order to cover the $500 million reduction in state funding proposed for 2011–12 alone. Restrictions on the use of endowment funds would also have to be eliminated.

University endowments have decreased in value from their high-water mark in 2007–08, as a result of the global economic downturn and its impact on stock markets.

1 Figures for each campus appear in the appendix. Alumni numbers are not available for all the AAU private schools in 2000–01.
Chapter 13. Rankings

Although limited in scope and often biased in one direction or another, rankings of colleges and universities can give an indication of their overall academic quality and allow institutions to assess their performance relative to their peers in a public way. While they are often criticized, rankings for higher education institutions are followed closely both nationally and internationally.

The University has no stated goals with respect to its position in any particular index, nor does it endorse any particular set of rankings. It cautions readers to consider the differing methodologies employed by the ranking indices. They result in substantial differences among indices and across years. This summary is offered as a guide to seven prominent and closely followed ranking systems routinely publicized in the media.

The seven rankings selected for publication are:

- Shanghai Academic Ranking of World Universities
- *Times of London* Higher Education World University Rankings
- *U.S. News* Graduate Program Rankings
- National Research Council Assessment of Research Doctorate Programs
- Center for Measuring University Performance Top American Research Universities
- *Washington Monthly* National University Rankings
- *U.S. News* America’s Top National Universities
The Academic Rankings of the World’s Universities (ARWU) was originally produced by Shanghai Jiao Tong University in China in 2003 to determine the global standing of Chinese research universities. Since 2009, the rankings have been published by the Shanghai Ranking Consultancy. See www.arwu.org/aboutARWU.jsp.

The ARWU ranks the top 1,200 universities worldwide and is based entirely on measures of research strength and faculty honors and awards. English-speaking universities and especially those in the United States tend to dominate these rankings. Further, institutions with strong research programs, especially in the sciences, tend to score higher than those whose major strengths are in the humanities and social sciences.

This ranking system emphasizes research outputs (e.g. total research expenditures) an area where UC does well by comparison to other institutions. Because research outputs are not normalized for example represented on a “per faculty member” basis, larger UC campuses rank more highly than smaller ones.

13.1 Academic Rankings of World Universities, Shanghai Ranking Consultancy 2006 to 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY Buffalo</td>
<td>201–300</td>
<td>203–304</td>
<td>201–302</td>
<td>201–302</td>
<td>201–300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>102–150</td>
<td>102–150</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13.2 THE TIMES OF LONDON

*The Times of London* rankings of world universities have been published annually since 2004, with significant revisions in the ranking system in 2010.

The system used here emphasizes international reputation and research and accordingly favors older more established universities (international reputations take time to establish and to change) and large science and health science campuses (because they attract more research funding). Accordingly, in the *Times Higher Education* ranking, older UC campuses tend to rank higher than newer ones.

### 13.2 *Times Higher Education* World University Rankings 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>2010 Overall Ranking</th>
<th>2010 Reputational Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>nr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>nr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>51–60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>nr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY Buffalo</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>nr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>nr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

nr denotes not ranked
13.3 U.S. NEWS GRADUATE PROGRAM RANKINGS

U.S. News has ranked American universities’ graduate and professional programs annually since 1983. The methodology is similar to that used by U.S. News in its flagship ranking system (shown in Indicator 13.7), both in its influence and in methodology which emphasizes reputation, wealth and selectivity in admissions. U.S. News's ranking of professional programs gives even greater weight to reputation than does its general ranking of universities, which focuses on undergraduate measures.

Because of its emphasis on reputation, UC campuses with larger and more established programs do well in this ranking system.

UC Merced is not ranked because it does not have graduate professional programs in business, education, law or medicine; it does offer graduate study in engineering areas, but the programs are too new to have awarded degrees or to have been reviewed by U.S. News.
### 13.3 U.S. NEWS GRADUATE PROGRAM RANKINGS

#### 13.3 U.S. News Graduate Program Rankings

#### 2007 to 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>07</th>
<th>08</th>
<th>09</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>07</th>
<th>08</th>
<th>09</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Barbara</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>07</th>
<th>08</th>
<th>09</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Barbara</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffal</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>07</th>
<th>08</th>
<th>09</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Hastings</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buffalo</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>tier</td>
<td>tier</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:
- ‘-’ denotes years when programs were not evaluated.
- “nr” denotes the program was not rated in that year.
- Professional Programs are listed here by what they are evaluated.
- “tier” denotes years when programs were not rated in that year.
- “Notes: -’ denotes years when programs were not evaluated. “nr” denotes the program was not rated in that year. Professional Programs are listed here by what U.S. News calls the “ranked in” year. This is one year before the “edition” year. For example, the “ranked in 2011” rankings are published in the “2012” Edition.”
The National Research Council’s (NRC) assessments are the most comprehensive evaluations of Ph.D. programs in the United States. The most recent ranking, published in 2010 and revised in 2011, evaluated data for the 2005–06 academic year on about 4,838 doctoral programs at 212 universities.

The 2010 report was highly controversial and provoked significant debate and discussion within the academic community primarily because of the complex methodology that it used. The level of attention reflects the influence that the NRC rankings have over the public perceptions of the quality of universities’ doctoral programs and by extension their research enterprises.

UC graduate programs do well in NRC rankings, primarily because of the weighting the rankings assign to faculty research productivity, academic honors and awards — areas in which UC faculty do well by comparison to those at other institutions.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Top 1-10%</th>
<th>11-20%</th>
<th>21-50%</th>
<th>51-100%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yale</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>SUNY Buffalo</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Research Council Assessment of Research Doctorate Programs

1 The figures listed here are based on a lexicographic ordering of the S-Ranking; the weights for each field varied depending on the emphasis that faculty members in each field assigned the different variables collected by NRC. Additional information can be found here: http://sites.nationalacademies.org/pga/resdoc/index.htm. These rankings use the updated dataset released on April 21, 2011. Details for each ranked campus program appear in the appendix.
The Center for Measuring University Performance has ranked universities annually since 2000. While the Center’s rankings are not as well known as other systems presented in this chapter, its unique methodology warrants its consideration.

Other systems presented in this chapter gather and then weight data on specific criteria (e.g. faculty publications, research expenditure). The Center looks at nine areas and awards a point for each where an institution crosses a pre-determined threshold. The main areas are research activity, faculty honors and awards, student outcomes and resources; each of these areas account for 2 of the 9 points possible; the 9th possible point is awarded in the area of student selectivity. Thus, institutions receive a total “score” of between 0 and 9.

UC campuses tend to rank high in these rankings because of their strong science and technology programs and the high number of honors and awards garnered by UC faculty. As with Academic Rankings of World Universities and U.S. News ranking systems, the Center does not normalize the data it collects by faculty size. As a result smaller UC campuses rank less highly than larger ones.

13.5 Top American Research Universities, The Center for Measuring University Performance 2005 to 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY Buffalo</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Washington Monthly developed its ranking system in 2005 as an alternative to the rankings published by U.S. News published later in this chapter. Whereas U.S. News emphasizes universities’ resources and reputation, Washington Monthly includes information that bear on the contribution universities make to society. Its rankings are based on three elements: social mobility, research, and service. Each is weighted equally. Factors include the number of Pell Grant recipients, Peace Corp volunteers, Army and Navy ROTC programs, and community service activities of students and staff. The proportion of courses offered that incorporate some form of service is another factor.

13.6 National Research Universities, Washington Monthly 2004 to 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY Buffalo</td>
<td>nr</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[1\] Washington Monthly did not publish rankings for 2008.
The *U.S. News* has been ranking U.S. universities annually since 1983 and was the first ranking system to have a national audience. The rankings are widely regarded as the most influential of all college rankings. At the same time, they are widely criticized for emphasizing a university’s reputation, wealth and selectivity in admissions rather than research productivity. Larger and older UC campuses rank highly in the *U.S. News* rankings, especially when measured against other public universities, as shown in the second table below.

### 13.7.1 *U.S. News* America’s Top National Universities 2007 to 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY Buffalo</td>
<td>3rd tier</td>
<td>3rd tier</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 13.7.2 *U.S. News* America’s Top National Public Universities 2007 to 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>07</th>
<th>08</th>
<th>09</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY Buffalo</td>
<td>&gt;50</td>
<td>&gt;50</td>
<td>&gt;50</td>
<td>&gt;50</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 *U.S. News* labels its undergraduate rankings for the prospective year; the 2010 rankings were published August 2009. San Francisco is not ranked because it is a graduate health sciences campus and Merced, which opened in 2005, is not ranked by *U.S. News* because it has interim accreditation.
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