University of California
Accountability Framework

As a public entity, the University is accountable to the people of California and it must and it shall remain accountable to them for its actions, past and present, and for its future developmental trajectories. Accountability will be demonstrated in a variety of ways:

. by the transparency of the decision-making processes that govern the University and its campuses, medical centers, and laboratories; and

. by the manner in which key performance indicators are disclosed to and discussed with the broader public.

UC 2025: The Power and Promise of Ten
The University of California Long-Range Guidance Team Report
November 2006
**UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ANNUAL ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT**

**Table of Contents**

**PART I. Introduction**

**PART II. Key Themes and Trends**

**PART II. Universitywide Indicators with Campus Comparisons**

**Section 1. Undergraduate Student Success**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1.1</td>
<td>Graduation Rates for Entering Freshmen – UC and Comparison Institutions, Fall 1999 Cohort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1.2</td>
<td>Graduation Rates for Entering Freshmen, Fall 1997 to 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1.3</td>
<td>Graduation Rates for Entering Freshmen by Race/Ethnicity – UC and Comparison Institutions, Fall 1999 Cohort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1.4</td>
<td>Graduation Rates for Entering Freshmen by Race/Ethnicity, Fall 1997 to 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1.5</td>
<td>Graduation Rates for Entering Freshmen by Gender – UC and Comparison Institutions, Fall 1999 Cohort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1.6</td>
<td>Graduation Rates for Entering Freshmen by Gender, Fall 1997 to 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1.7</td>
<td>Graduation Rates for Entering Upper-Division California Community College Transfer Students, Fall 1997 to 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1.8</td>
<td>Graduation Rates for Entering Upper-Division California Community College Transfer Students by Race/Ethnicity, Fall 1997 to 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1.9</td>
<td>Graduation Rates for Entering Upper-Division California Community College Transfer Students by Gender, Fall 1997 to 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1.10</td>
<td>Retention of New Freshmen – UC and Comparison Institutions, Fall 2005 to 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1.11</td>
<td>Retention of New Students (Freshmen and CCC Transfers), Fall 1997 to 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1.12</td>
<td>Undergraduate Degrees Awarded by Discipline – UC and Comparison Institutions, 2006-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1.13</td>
<td>Undergraduate Degrees Awarded, 2000-01 to 2007-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator 1.14</td>
<td>Degree Aspirations of Seniors, Spring 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 2. Undergraduate Affordability

Indicator 2.1  Estimated Total Cost of Attendance – UC and Comparison Institutions, 2007-08
Indicator 2.2  Average Cost of Attendance, 2000-01 to 2007-08
Indicator 2.3  Estimated Average Gift Aid and Net Cost of Attendance for Need-based Aid Recipients – UC and Comparison Institutions, 2007-08
Indicator 2.4  Undergraduate Pell Grant Receipt – UC and Comparison Institutions, 2007-08
Indicator 2.5  Average Amount and Percent of Undergraduates Receiving Gift Aid, 1999-00 to 2007-08
Indicator 2.6  Average Net Cost of Attendance by Family Income, 1999-00 to 2007-08
Indicator 2.7  Distribution of Undergraduates by Parent Income – UC and Comparison Institutions, 2004
Indicator 2.8  Distribution of Undergraduates by Parent Income, 1999-00 to 2007-08
Indicator 2.9  Number of Hours Undergraduates Worked Per Week by Family Income – UC and Comparison Institutions, 2004
Indicator 2.10 Number of Hours Undergraduates Worked Per Week by Family Income, 2007-08
Indicator 2.11  Percent of Graduating Seniors With Student Loan Debt – UC and Comparison Institutions, 2006-07
Indicator 2.12  Cumulative Debt of Graduating Seniors – UC and Comparison Institutions, 2006-07
Indicator 2.13  Cumulative Debt of Graduating Seniors, 1999-00 to 2007-08

Section 3. Undergraduate Access

Indicator 3.1  Freshman Applicants, Admits and Enrollees, Fall 1995 to 2008
Indicator 3.2  Percent of Minority Students in the Freshman Class Compared to California High School Graduates, Fall 1989 to 2008
Indicator 3.3  Freshman Applicants, Admits and Enrollees by Race/Ethnicity, Fall 1994 to 2008
Indicator 3.4  Upper Division California Community College Transfer Applicants, Admits and Enrollees, Fall 1994 to 2008
Indicator 3.5  Upper-Division California Community College Transfer Applicants, Admits and Enrollees by Race/Ethnicity, Fall 1994 to 2008

Indicator 3.6  Middle 50% of SAT Math and Critical Reading Score Range for Entering Freshmen – UC and Comparison Institutions, Fall 2006

Indicator 3.7  Average SAT Scores for Entering Freshmen, Fall 1994 to 2008

Indicator 3.8  Middle 50% of SAT Score Range for Entering Freshmen, Fall 2008

Indicator 3.9  Average High School GPA of Entering Freshmen, Fall 1994 to 2008

Indicator 3.10  Average College GPA for Entering Upper-Division California Community College Transfer Students, Fall 1994 to 2008

Section 4. Undergraduate Student Profile

Indicator 4.1  Entering Freshman and Transfer Students, 2000-01 to 2007-08

Indicator 4.2  Full-Time and Part-Time Undergraduate Enrollment, Fall 2000 to 2008

Indicator 4.3  Undergraduate Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity – UC and Comparison Institutions, Fall 2007

Indicator 4.4  Undergraduate Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity, Fall 2000 to 2008

Indicator 4.5  Undergraduate Enrollment by Gender – UC and Comparison Institutions, Fall 2006

Indicator 4.6  Undergraduate Enrollment by Gender, Fall 2000 to 2008

Indicator 4.7  Geographic Distribution of Undergraduate Students, Fall 2000 to 2008

Indicator 4.8  Age of Undergraduate Students, Fall 2000 to 2008

Indicator 4.9  First-Generation Undergraduate Students, Fall 2008

Indicator 4.10 First Language Spoken at Home for Undergraduate Students, Fall 2008

Section 5. Undergraduate Student Experience and Proficiencies

Indicator 5.1  Group Learning Experiences, Spring 2008

Indicator 5.2  Active Learning Experiences, Spring 2008
Indicator 5.3 Satisfaction with Institutional Commitment to Student Learning, Spring 2008

Indicator 5.4 Satisfaction with the Academic Experience, Spring 2008

Indicator 5.5 Experiences with Diverse Groups of People and Ideas, Spring 2008

Indicator 5.6 Interactions with Campus Faculty and Staff, Spring 2008

Indicator 5.7 Gains in Thinking Skills, Writing Skills and Understanding a Field of Study, Spring 2008

Section 6. Graduate and Professional Degree Student Profile

Indicator 6.1 Graduate and Professional Degree Enrollment – UC and Comparison Institutions, Fall 2006

Indicator 6.2 Graduate and Professional and Undergraduate Enrollment, Fall 2000 to 2008

Indicator 6.3 Graduate and Professional Degree Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity – UC and Comparison Institutions, Fall 2006

Indicator 6.4 Graduate and Professional Degree Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity, Fall 2000 to 2008

Indicator 6.5 Graduate and Professional Degree Enrollment by Gender – UC and Comparison Institutions, Fall 2006

Indicator 6.6 Graduate and Professional Degree Enrollment by Gender, Fall 2000 to 2008

Indicator 6.7 Geographic Origin of New Graduate and Professional Degree Students, Fall 2008

Indicator 6.8 Graduate, Professional and Undergraduate Degrees Awarded – UC and Comparison Institutions, 2006-07

Indicator 6.9 Graduate Degrees Awarded by Discipline – UC and Comparison Institutions, 2006-07

Indicator 6.10 10-Year Ph.D. Completion Rates, Students Entering in Fall 1992 to 1994

Indicator 6.11 Time to Degree for Ph.D. Students – UC and Comparison Institutions, 2003-04 to 2005-06

Indicator 6.12 Time to Degree for Ph.D. Students, 1995-97 to 2005-07

Indicator 6.13 Plans at Time of Ph.D. Completion, 2005-06

Indicator 6.14 Average Net Stipend Offered to Ph.D. Students Admitted to UC Compared to Their First-Choice Non-UC Schools, 2004 and 2007

Indicator 6.15 Average Net Stipend of Ph.D. Students, 1998-99 to 2007-08
Indicator 6.16 Professional Degrees Awarded by Discipline – UC and Comparison Institutions, 2006-07

Indicator 6.17 United States Medical Licensing Examination Pass Rates, 2000-01 to 2007-08

Indicator 6.18 Professional Degree Students Graduating with Debt, 2001-02 to 2007-08

Indicator 6.19 Average Debt of Professional Degree Students at Graduation, 2001-02 to 2007-08

Section 7. Faculty

Indicator 7.1 Full-Time Ladder-Rank Faculty, Fall 1989 to 2007

Indicator 7.2 Full-Time Ladder-Rank Faculty by Race/Ethnicity – UC and Comparison Institutions, Fall 2007

Indicator 7.3 Full-Time Ladder-Rank Faculty by Race/Ethnicity, Fall 1993 to 2007

Indicator 7.4 Full-Time Ladder-Rank Faculty by Gender – UC and Comparison Institutions, Fall 2007

Indicator 7.5 Full-Time Ladder-Rank Faculty by Gender, Fall 1993 to 2007

Indicator 7.6 Average Faculty Salaries – UC and Comparison Institutions, 2007-08

Indicator 7.7 Average Faculty Salaries – UC and Aggregated Comparison Institutions, 1997-98 to 2007-08

Indicator 7.8 Student-Faculty Ratios, 2002-03 to 2007-08

Indicator 7.9 Student Credit Hours by Course Level and Faculty Appointment, 2003-04 to 2006-07

Indicator 7.10 Faculty Recipients of National and International Awards, Cumulative

Indicator 7.11 Total Faculty Memberships

Indicator 7.12 Annual Faculty Awards and Honors, 2003-04 to 2007-08

Section 8. Staff Profile

Indicator 8.1 Staff by Personnel Program and Union Representation, October 2004 to 2008

Indicator 8.2 Staff Appointment Type, October 2004 to 2008

Indicator 8.3 Career Staff by Personnel Program and Race/Ethnicity, October 1996 to 2008
Indicator 8.4  Career Staff by Personnel Program and Gender, October 1996 to 2008

Section 9. Research

Indicator 9.1  Total Research and Development Expenditures, 1996-97 to 2007-08
Indicator 9.2  Total Research and Development Expenditures, 1996-97 to 2007-08
Indicator 9.3  Rankings of Total NSF Research and Development Expenditures, 1996-97 to 2006-07
Indicator 9.4  Federal Research and Development Expenditures, 1996-97 to 2007-08
Indicator 9.5  Research and Development Expenditures by Source, 1997-98 to 2007-08
Indicator 9.7  Number of Patents and Inventions, 1997-98 to 2007-08
Indicator 9.8  Number of Active Licenses, 1997-98 to 2007-08
Indicator 9.9  Licensing Income, 1997-98 to 2007-08

Section 10. Libraries

Indicator 10.1  Association of Research Libraries Rankings of Campus Libraries – UC and Comparison Institutions, 2005 to 2007
Indicator 10.2  Library Holdings in Volumes by Campus – UC and Comparison Institutions, 2007
Indicator 10.3  Use of Interlibrary Loan (ILL) within the UC System, 2000-01 to 2007-08
Indicator 10.4  Electronic Journal Usage within the UC System, 2005-06 to 2007-08
Indicator 10.5  Students Participating in Library Classes, Tours and Presentations – UC and Comparison Institutions, 2004-05 to 2006-07

Section 11. Campus Rankings

Indicator 11.1  National Research Council’s Ratings of Doctoral Programs – UC and Comparison Institutions, 1995
Indicator 11.2  The Top American Research Universities from The Center for Measuring University Performance – UC and Comparison Institutions, 2005 to 2007
Indicator 11.3 U.S. News and World Report’s Professional Program Rankings – UC and Comparison Institutions, 2000 to 2009

Indicator 11.4 U.S. News and World Report’s America’s Best National Universities – UC and Comparison Institutions, 1999 to 2009

Indicator 11.5 U.S. News and World Report’s America’s Top 50 Public National Universities – UC and Comparison Institutions, 1999 to 2009

Indicator 11.6 Shanghai Jiao Tong University’s Academic Rankings of World Universities – UC and Comparison Institutions, 2006 to 2008

Section 12. Budget, Finance and Development

Indicator 12.1 Revenue by Source, 2003-04 to 2007-08

Indicator 12.2 Expenditures by Function, 2003-04 to 2007-08

Indicator 12.3 Per-Student Average Expenditures for Education, 1998-99 to 2007-08

Indicator 12.4 Endowment Funds per Student – UC and Comparison Institutions, 2007-08

Indicator 12.5 Total Endowment and Endowment Funds per Student, 1996-97 to 2007-08

Indicator 12.6 UC Endowment Restrictions, 2008

Indicator 12.7 Total Gifts – UC and Comparison Institutions, 2003-04 to 2007-08

Indicator 12.8 Total Annual Private Support, 1997-98 to 2007-08

Indicator 12.9 New Gifts, 2007-08

Section 13. Capital Resources and Sustainability

Indicator 13.1 Space and Facilities, Fall 2001 to 2008


Indicator 13.3 Seismic Retrofitting Progress, 1979 – 2008

Indicator 13.4 Greenhouse Gas Emission Levels and Reduction Targets

Indicator 13.5 Energy Use in State-Maintained Buildings, 1999-00 to 2006-07

Indicator 13.6 Green Buildings – Completed and Planned, Cumulative to 2008

Indicator 13.7 Waste Diverted From Landfills, 2007-08
Section 14. Health Sciences and Services

Indicator 14.1 Hospital Inpatient Days, 2003-04 to 2007-08
Indicator 14.2 Outpatient Visits, 2003-04 to 2007-08
Indicator 14.3 Patient Complexity, 2003-04 to 2007-08

Section 15. Educational Extension

Indicator 15.1 Number of Continuing Education Programs, 2002-03 to 2007-08
Indicator 15.2 Continuing Education Registrations, 2002-03 to 2007-08

PART IV. Campus Profiles

Berkeley
Davis
Irvine
Los Angeles
Merced
Riverside
San Diego
San Francisco
Santa Barbara
Santa Cruz
PART I Introduction

Background and Purpose
This first University of California Annual Accountability Report is part of the comprehensive framework announced by President Yudof in July 2008 to ensure greater accountability across the UC system. It measures campus and Universitywide performance in meeting core goals that reflect our teaching, research and public service mission, and it will be published annually in May.

The measures or “indicators” that are used in this report cover a wide range of topics, from undergraduate access, affordability and success, through research, budget and financial information, to the extent and impacts of selected UC public services. Because coverage in any one area is necessarily limited, accountability sub-reports will be published periodically to take up specific issues in greater detail.

Together with other progress reports that are routinely produced by the campuses, the Academic Senate, and the systemwide administration, this progress report and its associated sub-reports will be used to understand how well—and at what cost—the University is meeting its goals. They will also

- support strategic planning and inform budgetary decision-making;
- help ensure responsible stewardship of the institution; and
- promote and reflect the University’s commitment to be open and accountable to all Californians.

Audience
As a management tool, this report is written to be used by system leadership, Senate and campus administration, faculty and staff. But it is also intended to be a public document, written for the broad range of University stakeholders, from state legislators and prospective donors to the parents, teachers and counselors who routinely coach, encourage and mentor the next generation of UC undergraduates, and for current and former students worldwide. And it is written for California’s taxpayers who ultimately 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.

Accordingly, the report is written for a general audience. Those wanting more detail or greater nuance about a particular aspect of the University will turn to the sub-reports or to reports prepared routinely by the campuses.

As these more specialized materials are produced, links to them will be made available from an accountability Web site, making it a one-stop shop for anyone interested in the size, shape and progress of the University of California.

Scope
This report assesses the University’s performance achieving key goals that are distilled from several sources: the California Master Plan for Higher Education, the Board of Regents’
policies and budget priorities, the Academic Senate, the campuses’ strategic and academic plans, and the ongoing discussions of the Board of Regents.

It also includes brief profiles of each of UC’s 10 campuses. Here, campuses document their specific long-range or strategic objectives and the progress they are making towards achieving them.

The report results from the confluence of several creative streams:

- the campus and Universitywide long-range planning processes that have evolved in coordination as a means of determining Universitywide strategic and budgetary goals;
- efforts to be more open with and accountable to the state and to rebuild trust and strengthen its relationship with the people of California; and
- growing state and national momentum for greater accountability in higher education.

It is intended to contribute to, not substitute for, other accountability efforts in which the University is engaged. For example:

- UC annually reports to the state governor on a variety of measures responding to interest in student and institutional performance and expenditure of public funds.
- Each campus has prepared its own accountability template modeled closely upon the Voluntary System of Accountability.
- The University supports the development of a statewide higher education accountability bill and will be responsive to one, if and when it passes.

Furthermore, the report will continue to evolve with the University’s understanding of its own goals and increasing sophistication with the use of accountability measures.

**Methodology**

The report was compiled at the Office of the President but results from the work of staff at campus and systemwide administrative offices too numerous to mention. It has also benefited enormously from review and input of the University’s Academic Senate. We wish to thank the literally hundreds of people who commented on or contributed to this report. Without their expertise, their energy and their continued good will, this report could never have been produced.

Campuses prepared their profiles according to an agreed outline and determined what data to use and how to present it.

Much greater standardization was by necessity applied to the Universitywide indicators that are presented in Part III. There, the report draws upon performance data that are routinely prepared by the campuses and managed at a system level in support of a variety of objectives. Three kinds of data are used:

- longitudinal data that tracks campus trends over time;
- systemwide data that compares the UC campuses collectively to averages for the 34 public and 26 private research universities that constitute the elite American Association of Universities (AAU);
individual data that allows each UC campus 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.

A number of conventions also were adopted to ensure the report’s accessibility to a general audience as well as its integrity and internal consistency:

1. Indicators are based on data that are publicly available and may be reproduced.
2. Preference is given to indicators that are commonly used nationally or internationally.
3. Indicators are presented graphically rather than in tabular form so their meaning is visually apparent immediately; tabular data will be available on UC’s accountability Web site.
4. Campus data are presented on a common scale in order to standardize data presentation. Although the campuses share common values, they differ in size, scope and complexity depending upon their programmatic mix, their funding structures, their founding date and other factors. A common scale highlights these differences and is a first step toward developing understandings about why these differences exist and what they mean.
5. For consistency, repeated use is made of a small number of standard graph and chart types. Because it can be difficult to figure out exact percentage differences from charts and graph, a Web-based version is being developed that will link directly to the underlying data.
6. Indicators are presented first as trend data for the system as a whole then for each of the 10 campuses. Comparative data follow where these are available.
7. Data that compare UC or its campuses to other research universities are drawn from publicly accessible national data sources, such as the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). To ensure neutrality in their presentation, comparative data are presented for UC campus and comparison institutions arranged alphabetically.
8. Interpretive text is used only sparingly with the Universitywide indicators in Part III. The indicators are presented in 15 sections, each of which begins with a brief introduction describing the goals for that area as well as their source or rationale. Indicators are introduced with brief descriptive titles. In some cases, additional information is supplied, typically in bulleted form, again in order to provide new or essential context that assists in the data’s comprehension.

A final note to readers
Institutional assessment is an inexact science. Comparable data are difficult to come by for good and legitimate reasons. A graduate student at one institution, for example, may be considered a professional school student at another. In addition, there are no national databases or reporting conventions for certain kinds of data—transfer students or faculty teaching workloads are two examples—so comparative data in these areas do not exist at all.

Even where data are seemingly robust—a University does or does not receive $550 million in federal research funds in a given year—their interpretation is rarely beyond dispute. Some federal research funds, for example, may be sub-contracted to another university, and thus double-counted in national statistics.
Finally, the report is limited by the data available. We can only report data that are available, but the available data, however valuable, cannot convey the full complexity of what students learn or the value of the University to the state.

For these reasons, the reader is urged to not read too much about the University into any single measure. Rather, use indicators in combination with one another to gain a feel for the University as a whole.
PART II Key Themes and Trends

This section presents a number of highlights that emerge from the University indicators in Part III of this report. It has two aims:

- to identify strengths and challenges in key areas and flag trends that require our careful attention; and
- to identify weaknesses or gaps in institutional data that will focus our efforts to improve the report in the years to come.

The highlights are presented as brief essays, each focusing on a particular theme or topic.

There are, of course, many themes that may be addressed and there are many different ways to interpret the data in this report. We encourage readers to explore all possible avenues. Indeed, our hope is that routine publication of an annual accountability report will encourage just this kind of thinking and that it will stimulate discussion about the University’s progress, its challenges and its contributions to California and the nation.

In this regard, it is not our intention here to constrain but to provide a jumping-off point; an entrée into a wealth of statistical material, and a model as to how that material may be utilized, interpreted and read.

1. Undergraduate Student Success. More than 80 percent of all UC freshmen graduate in six years, compared to 74 percent at the 34 public research and 89 percent at the 26 private research universities that make up the elite American Association of Universities. Differences in graduation rates between UC and other AAUs can be explained, in part, by the fact that UC attracts a somewhat different and more diverse student body than is typical of AAU public and private universities in general. Fully 37 percent of UC undergraduates are first-generation college-goers whose parents, lacking a college education, may only be able to offer limited assistance in advising their sons and daughters about how to navigate the course of their college careers. About half grew up in families where English was not the first or only language spoken at home. A third receive Federal Pell Grants which are reserved for low-income families earning less than $45,000 a year. In addition, the University’s entering freshman class is more diverse, racially and ethnically, when compared to peer public and private institutions. For example, 18 percent of all UC’s undergraduates come from underrepresented groups, primarily African American and Chicano/Latino, compared with 13 percent for the AAU publics and 16 percent for the AAU privates. Nationally, students who come from wealthier families and whose parents are college-educated graduate from college in greater numbers than first-generation, low-income, minority and non-native English speakers. Yet the University of California educates a higher proportion of these students than many of its peers.

Also, unlike the private research universities which are able to restrict entry to applicants with the highest grade point averages and standardized test scores, UC is a public university with a commitment to serve California’s high school graduates. Under the terms of the California Master Plan for Higher Education it offers a place to the top 12.5 percent of California high
school graduates. In this regard, UC is very much California’s public research university (more than 90 percent of its undergraduates are California residents). As such, it serves both the state and an increasingly diverse student body well by ensuring its constituents’ success in achieving an undergraduate degree in a timely fashion.

2. Affordability of an Undergraduate Education. The cost of a UC undergraduate education has increased over the past decade. Between 2000-01 and 2007-08, student fees grew by 59 percent in inflation-adjusted dollars. In the same period, the state’s contribution to UC declined substantially when adjusted for enrollment growth and inflation. UC’s total cost of attendance (including fees as well as expenses such as housing and books) was about $22,000 in 2007-08. This is generally comparable to costs at UC’s four public comparison institutions—the universities of Illinois, Michigan, Virginia and SUNY at Buffalo. The actual cost for most UC students and their families, however, is greatly reduced by the availability of scholarships and grants, which help make UC accessible to students at every income level without their having to amass extraordinary debt or to work an unreasonable number of hours. In 2007-08, over half of all UC undergraduates received scholarships and grants worth an average of $10,300 to help cover fees and other expenses.

UC recently launched the Blue and Gold Opportunity Plan to address concerns about rising costs among prospective students from low-income families who may be unaware of UC’s extensive financial aid programs. Under the Plan, UC undergraduates will receive, at a minimum, enough scholarship and grant aid to fully cover systemwide fees if they have incomes below $60,000 and meet other basic eligibility requirements (see www.universityofcalifornia.edu/blueandgold).

The University, parents and policy-makers alike are concerned about rising costs. The University is carefully monitoring these trends and this annual progress report will continue to measure among other things the impact of federal, state and Universitywide policy and budget decisions on the cost and accessibility of a UC education.

3. Undergraduate Education. At UC, the undergraduate educational experience is enormously varied. It is shaped by many things: campus location, major emphasis of study, the combination of societies and athletic and other extracurricular activities in which a student chooses to participate. Some common features are nonetheless apparent. UC’s faculty have intentionally designed a curriculum which builds foundational skills that enable a student to master a field of knowledge and progress systematically to where he or she is capable of engaging in critical and creative independent work. The curriculum purposely brings students into contact with pioneering research and the people who do it. It is also highly regarded by students; a significant majority of them report that their analytic and critical thinking skills, their ability to write clearly and effectively, and their understanding of a specific field of study have all increased significantly during their undergraduate years.

Indicators the University will continue to closely monitor include

- the student-faculty ratio (a measure of students contact with faculty);
- the use made, especially in freshman and sophomore classes, of lecturers and other adjunct instructors—that is, teachers on term-limited contracts who are neither tenured
members of the Academic Senate nor on a track to becoming so. While many lecturers are excellent teachers, they do not normally participate in UC’s research activity; and

- the proportion of students who have had an opportunity to engage with research-active faculty at some point during their undergraduate careers, a feature of a UC education much heralded by faculty and students alike.

Given that the undergraduate curriculum is oriented towards developing critical-thinking capacity and inspiring independent inquiry, it is not surprising that more than three-quarters of UC’s undergraduates aspire to further professional or graduate school. How UC prepares undergraduates to participate in the workforce—where and in what sectors they are employed—is a subject requiring further investigation. We do not know exactly how many UC undergraduates complete graduate and professional programs and what careers they enter into, or create, for themselves. What little evidence we have suggests that the University succeeds as an engine of social mobility, gathering students from a wide variety of backgrounds and training them for careers in education, law, medicine and business, and as leaders in both public and private pursuits.

4. UC’s Graduate and Professional School Programs. Almost 50,000 students enroll each year in UC’s graduate and professional programs. They come from all over the United States and around the world. More than 90 percent of business (M.B.A.) and law (J.D.) students complete their degrees. The picture for academic Ph.D. students is somewhat different but comparable to that of Ph.D. students at other leading research universities. A total of 57 percent of UC Ph.D. students complete their degrees; on average, they take slightly less than six years to do so. After graduation, most take jobs in business and industry, teach the next generation of college students, and join the ranks of entrepreneurs and scientists upon which the state relies for new industries. UC awards nearly 70 percent of California’s new science and engineering Ph.D.s, over 60 percent of all M.D. degrees, and a quarter of all master’s degrees in engineering. In this regard, UC’s graduate and professional school programs play a critical role in meeting California’s workforce needs.

A number of challenges exist:

- the extent to which sufficient graduate-student financial support can be offered to enable UC to compete with other top universities and attract the very best graduate students;
- the diversity of graduate and professional students, which continues to fall short of our goals; and
- completion and time-to-degree rates among doctoral candidates, especially in the arts, humanities and social sciences.

5. California’s Public Research University. UC is first and foremost California’s public research university. It is, by any measure, a world-class research institution. Faculty are recruited from leading universities worldwide and they contribute disproportionately to the most highly regarded scholarly publications. Their work attracts a large proportion of the research funding that is available from federal and other agencies. And it attracts a sizeable portion of exceptionally well-qualified graduate students who come to UC to participate with faculty on
the cutting edge of their disciplines. The number and scope of UC inventions is large, as is the number of start-up companies that have emerged as a result of UC-based innovation.

Yet none of these facts even begin to convey the significance that UC research has for the people of California. We need better indicators that demonstrate how UC research stimulates economic development, creates jobs and fosters innovation that materially benefits the lives of Californians. We need to demonstrate more effectively the vital role that UC plays, along with only a very small handful of peer institutions, in carrying out the foundational science upon which governments and industry increasingly rely as they progressively abandon their bench scientists and their labs to the research university. And we need to document how research in the arts, humanities and social sciences contributes directly to the quality of life and the civil nature of our society.

The greatest single challenge, however, to the University’s research capability is its ability to maintain a sizeable cadre of graduate students. Graduate students are essential to the research enterprise, making it possible to attract and retain good faculty and to enable faculty to acquire external grant funding. Too small a proportion of graduate students also threatens UC’s distinctive, research-oriented, undergraduate instruction, since graduate students often give undergraduates first-hand exposure to research and evolve as their mentors. Despite this, the proportion of UC graduate students has dropped from about a third in 1966-67 to around 17 percent today. The decline reflects UC’s success enrolling eligible undergraduates during a period when their numbers grew rapidly. It is also due in part to continuing funding constraints. If not reversed, the trend could challenge fundamentally UC’s viability as a research university.

6. Health Sciences and Services. About half the University’s operations are health related. They include 15 schools providing professional training (in medicine, nursing, dentistry, optometry, pharmacy, veterinary medicine and public health) and five medical centers (at Davis, Irvine, Los Angeles, San Diego and San Francisco).

UC’s health science programs attract almost half of all private support the University receives, account for the lion’s share of federally funded research and development expenditures annually at UC, and are responsible for leading-edge research in treatment, patient care and patient safety. Crucially, they also train 60 percent of California’s M.D.s.

The medical centers constitute the fourth-largest health care delivery system in California. They record 3,500,000 outpatient visits and 850,000 inpatient days every year, and deal with cases that are far more complex than those seen by the average hospital. They play an important role treating the state’s low-income patients and, owing to the quality and sophistication of their care, they treat patients transferred from other hospitals that have exhausted all efforts and consider UC medical centers to be hospitals of last resort.

The UC medical centers are financially self supporting, and, along with auxiliary services, they accounted for 30 percent of the University’s total revenues in 2007-08. By way of comparison, research contracts and grants and student fees accounted for 28 percent and 25 percent, respectively, of the University’s total revenues.
7. Public Service. Public service is a hallmark of UC and is built upon the very foundations that support research and instruction. Nine University extension programs, the oldest of which dates back to 1891, provide lifelong learning opportunities for 300,000 people annually. Cumulatively, the extension programs annually offer more than 20,000 courses and provide instruction to a diverse student body seeking career-related professional development, general interest courses, or credit toward a UC degree.

More than 100 libraries and museums have emerged in the University to support the academic enterprise. Most are open to the public, often making their holdings accessible to anyone with an active Internet connection. And the campuses have emerged as important cultural magnets in their respective regions with public programming that ranges from the visual and performing arts to public lecture series and sporting events.

Historically, the University’s Cooperative Extension programs have developed and applied scientific research to protect and shepherd California’s natural resources and to foster the state’s emergence as a global leader in agricultural production, innovation, and economic value. While absent from this first edition of the annual accountability report, we plan to include a section on Cooperative Extension services and the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources in which they are located in future reports. Future editions will also refer to work conducted at UC to prepare California’s high school students for a college education and more generally to improve public education throughout the state.

8. Staff. UC is one of the largest employers in California, employing about 185,000 people in a great variety of academic and staff roles. The workforce is as complex as it is large. And while its ethnic and racial composition does not fully parallel that of the state of California, it is nonetheless diverse. In terms of academic employees, 41 percent are women and about 9 percent are from underrepresented minorities; in terms of staff, 63 percent are women and 25 percent are from underrepresented minorities. Figures for ladder rank faculty are 30 percent women and about 9 percent for underrepresented minorities.

While a great deal of information exists about the size and structure of the staff workforce, we need to systematically gather and analyze more data about the University as an employer. Job for job, how do UC salaries compare to those paid in other universities and in other sectors? What turnover rate exists? What opportunities are provided for staff development? What is the rate and pace of career progression? These are areas where the accountability framework needs to evolve in the coming years.

9. Faculty. UC’s faculty are the bedrock of its academic excellence. Their quality is irrefutable—in terms of the research funding they have garnered, the publications they have produced and the national and international honors and awards they have received. In a very fundamental sense, the success of our students, our research and our health care system depend upon the quality of the faculty. Still, some long-term and slow-moving trends give cause for concern:

- Faculty salaries continue to lag the average compared to salaries at UC’s comparison institutions.
• The average age of faculty continues to increase in a manner that suggests 40 percent turnover in the UC faculty by 2020.

• Average start-up costs for constructing laboratories for newly hired faculty to do their research are high. Five years ago, the average start-up cost was about $250,000. Today, it can average as much as $340,000 or more at a single campus. Given the aging profile of UC faculty, the University needs to anticipate a substantial investment in faculty succession.

• Financial impacts could be mitigated to some extent, for example, by hiring more non-ladder-rank faculty or increasing faculty teaching loads. However, this would threaten UC’s academic quality by undermining undergraduate education oriented toward regular contact with research faculty, and it would diminish the University’s overall capacity to generate the external grant funding that supports the research and academic enterprise.

10. Diversity. In September, 2007, the Board of Regents adopted as a matter of policy a commitment “to the full realization of its historic promise to recognize and nurture merit, talent and achievement by supporting diversity and equal opportunity in its education, services and administration, as well as research and creative activity.” In particular, it “acknowledge[d] 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.”

In addition to the University’s annual accountability report, a more detailed sub-report on diversity will be published in September 2009, and will establish a baseline against which to measure progress in achieving the University’s diversity goals. As these pages demonstrate, there is a great deal to do. UC’s freshman class contains proportionately fewer underrepresented minorities—primarily African-American and Chicano/Latino students—than the general population of high school graduates. And these students are less likely to complete their degrees than Asian-American and white students. Underrepresented minority groups also contribute proportionately fewer students to UC’s graduate and professional schools and to its faculty than Asian-American or white groups. Among UC staff, they are concentrated in professional and support staff positions. Gender balance is also a challenge, with proportionately fewer women among UC’s faculty and senior management groups in particular.

The campus profiles that make up Part IV of this report show how campuses are responding to these challenges with strategies that deal specifically with very different local circumstances. Common to all is a commitment to the leadership, coordination and funding necessary in order to meaningfully address some of the profoundly challenging issues that contribute to the racial, ethnic and gender imbalances that are documented on these pages.

11. Budget and finance
The University seeks to develop stable and growing sources of revenues and to utilize these in a strategic and cost-effective manner in order to maintain the quality of its teaching, research and public service activities, meet the state’s workforce and other needs, and remain accessible to all eligible California students independent of their financial means.
Revenues are derived from a variety of sources—state appropriations, student fees, medical centers, research contracts and grants, and auxiliary enterprises, such as parking and student housing. Of these sources, the state appropriation is the most important. Totaling nearly $3 billion annually, it is the largest single fund source, paying for almost 60 percent of the University’s instructional needs. And it acts as seed money that attracts billions more in federal and private dollars that support research, public service and health care. For every state dollar specifically invested in research, UC leverages nearly $5 more from the federal government and other sources. Without the state’s core investment, the dollars that UC attracts from other sources would go elsewhere.

Despite this, the state’s contribution to the University has declined precipitously and its overall share of the University’s operating expenditures in inflation-adjusted dollars has plunged 40 percent since 1990. The results of diminished state investment are evident in the funding available to support education—the state’s share of expenditures per student, for example, has fallen from $15,860 per student in 1990 to $9,560 in 2007 (figures for both years are in 2007-08 constant dollars). This decline in the state’s funding at UC has been partially addressed by increases in student fees. As a consequence, the student share of the cost of education, net of financial aid, has more than doubled, from 13 to 31 percent. Inadequate capital funding, meantime, has resulted in a backlog of work necessary for addressing seismic and other life-safety issues on the one hand, and capital renewal and deferred maintenance on the other.

In response to diminished state investment, the University has also sought aggressively to increase revenues from other sources, such as private gifts from industry and individuals. Still, the gap is too wide to be closed with non-state fund sources. It is unrealistic to assume that cuts of this magnitude sustained over time will not undermine the University, the California economy, and individual students’ chances for educational advancement.

For these reasons, this annual accountability report is doubly important. It establishes baseline measures that will help evaluate budgetary impacts on the University in the years to come. At the same time, it provides the public with a new level of transparency about the University’s performance and gives elected leaders a clearer view of the return on their investment in the University.
Section 1. Undergraduate Student Success

Goals
The University of California aims to prepare students to assume roles as the next generation of leaders for California and the nation. UC graduates leave the University with the foundations upon which they can build rewarding and successful lives as engaged citizens and productive workers contributing to the social and economic well-being of the state.

Measures
The data that follow illustrate UC undergraduates' progress in earning their degrees compared to students at other institutions. They show how many students who enter UC complete their degrees and the areas of study in which their degrees are earned. Graduation data are presented for entering freshmen and upper-division community college transfer students, and by race/ethnicity and gender. In addition, two tables display students' post-graduation plans and aspirations. The high level of success for UC undergraduates is evident across the campuses, across disciplines and across freshman and transfer entrants.
Indicator 1.1
Graduation Rates for Entering Freshmen – UC and Comparison Institutions, Fall 1999 Cohort

UC and Comparison Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Graduate in 4 Years</th>
<th>Graduate in 5 Years</th>
<th>Graduate in 6 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universitywide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAU Public Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAU Private Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) Graduation Rate Survey.

- Six years is the national standard used by the U.S. Department of Education for measuring college graduation rates.

Note: The Fall 1999 cohort is the latest for which the six-year graduation rate is available. The Association of American Universities (AAU) is a nonprofit association of 60 U.S. and two Canadian preeminent public and private research universities; six UC campuses are members (Berkeley, Davis, Irvine, Los Angeles, San Diego and Santa Barbara).
1.1 (continued) Graduation Rates for Entering Freshmen – UC and Comparison Institutions, Fall 1999 Cohort

Note: Merced opened in Fall 2005. San Francisco has no undergraduates.
Graduation rates at UC are improving steadily. Four-year graduation rates, in particular, have risen rapidly, from 36 percent for freshmen who entered in 1992 to 59 percent for the 2004 entering cohort. Likewise, six-year graduation rates have risen from 76 percent in 1992 to 82 percent in 2002.

Note: UCOP graduation rates include inter-campus transfers, which IPEDS graduation rates do not. UCOP graduation rates also do not include degrees awarded retrospectively, which campus graduation rates do, and so may vary slightly from graduation rates published elsewhere.
1.2 (continued) Graduation Rates for Entering Freshmen, Fall 1997 to 2004

(Merced opened in 2005.)

(San Francisco has no undergraduates.)
Six-year graduation rates vary by race/ethnicity. Universitywide, 68 percent of African-Americans, 83 percent of Asian-Americans, 74 percent of Chicano/Latino and 81 percent of white students graduated in six years.

This follows trends at other AAU research universities as well, where graduation rates of Asian-Americans are highest, followed by white, Chicano/Latino and African-American students.
1.3 (continued) Graduation Rates for Entering Freshmen by Race/Ethnicity – UC and Comparison Institutions, Fall 1999 Cohort

**African-American**

- Berkeley
- Davis
- Irvine
- Los Angeles
- Riverside
- San Diego
- Santa Barbara
- Santa Cruz
- U of Illinois
- U of Michigan
- SUNY at Buffalo
- U of Virginia
- Harvard
- MIT
- Stanford
- Yale

**Asian-American**

- Berkeley
- Davis
- Irvine
- Los Angeles
- Riverside
- San Diego
- Santa Barbara
- Santa Cruz
- U of Illinois
- U of Michigan
- SUNY at Buffalo
- U of Virginia
- Harvard
- MIT
- Stanford
- Yale

**Chicano/Latino**

- Berkeley
- Davis
- Irvine
- Los Angeles
- Riverside
- San Diego
- Santa Barbara
- Santa Cruz
- U of Illinois
- U of Michigan
- SUNY at Buffalo
- U of Virginia
- Harvard
- MIT
- Stanford
- Yale

**White**

- Berkeley
- Davis
- Irvine
- Los Angeles
- Riverside
- San Diego
- Santa Barbara
- Santa Cruz
- U of Illinois
- U of Michigan
- SUNY at Buffalo
- U of Virginia
- Harvard
- MIT
- Stanford
- Yale
(this page intentionally left blank)
Universitywide, six-year graduation rates for entering freshmen have increased slightly or have been stable across all racial/ethnic groups.
Indicator 1.5  
Graduation Rates for Entering Freshmen by Gender – UC and Comparison Institutions, Fall 1999 Cohort

- Universitywide, a higher proportion of women graduate in six years than men. This follows similar trends at AAU public and private comparison institutions.
1.5 (continued) Graduation Rates for Entering Freshmen by Gender – UC and Comparison Institutions, Fall 1999 Cohort

**Females**

- Berkeley
- Davis
- Irvine
- Los Angeles
- Riverside
- San Diego
- Santa Barbara
- Santa Cruz
- U of Illinois
- U of Michigan
- SUNY Buffalo
- U of Virginia
- Harvard
- MIT
- Stanford
- Yale

**Males**

- Berkeley
- Davis
- Irvine
- Los Angeles
- Riverside
- San Diego
- Santa Barbara
- Santa Cruz
- U of Illinois
- U of Michigan
- SUNY Buffalo
- U of Virginia
- Harvard
- MIT
- Stanford
- Yale
Universitywide, six-year graduation rates have increased slightly for women and men over the past eight years; however, the proportion of students that graduate in four years has grown significantly.
Indicator 1.7
Graduation Rates for Entering Upper-Division California Community College Transfer Students, Fall 1997 to 2006

A total of 87 percent of transfers to the University of California are upper-division students from the California Community Colleges (CCC).

Graduation rates for upper-division community college transfer students parallel those for entering freshmen—52 percent of CCC transfers graduate in two years, 81 percent graduate in three years and 86 percent graduate in four years.

National data on graduation rates for transfer students are not available.

Note: Upper-division CCC transfer students are those who enter UC with 60 or more transferable units.
1.7 (continued) Graduation Rates for Entering Upper-Division California Community College Transfer Students, Fall 1997 to 2006

Note: Graduation rates at Merced are unstable due to the small number of transfer students at this campus.
Universitywide, graduation rates for upper-division CCC transfer students have increased for all racial/ethnic groups (African-American, Asian-American, Chicano/Latino and white students) over the past eight years.

However, graduation rates for upper-division CCC transfer students vary by race/ethnicity, with Asian-American and white upper-division CCC transfer students having higher graduation rates than Chicano/Latino and African-American transfer students.
Universitywide, graduation rates for upper-division CCC transfer students have increased for men and women over the past eight years.

A higher proportion of women upper-division CCC transfer students graduate in two or three years than men.
Indicator 1.10
Retention of New Freshmen – UC and Comparison Institutions, Fall 2005 to 2006

UC and Comparison Institutions

Source: U.S. News and World Report’s America’s Best Colleges. Retention data for Merced are from UC StatFinder.

- First-year retention is the proportion of entering freshmen who return for their sophomore year.

Note: San Francisco has no undergraduates. Average retention rates for the entire group of AAU publics and AAU privates are not readily available.
Retention of New Students (Freshmen and CCC Transfers), Fall 1997 to 2007

Universitywide

Source: UCOP StatFinder files.

- Retention of new freshmen and new upper-division California Community College transfer students has held steady at about 92 percent for the past ten years.
1.11 (continued) Retention of New Students (Freshmen and CCC Transfers), Fall 1997 to 2007
**Indicator 1.12**

Undergraduate Degrees Awarded by Discipline – UC and Comparison Institutions, 2006-07

Source: IPEDS Completions Survey.

- Approximately 31 percent of all undergraduate degrees awarded at UC are in the physical and life sciences, technology, engineering and math fields, compared to 28 percent at the AAU public comparison institutions and 27 percent at the AAU private institutions.

Note: Degrees are based upon first degrees awarded as reported to IPEDS; double- or triple-majors are counted as one degree. “Interdisciplinary & Other” includes students who earned two or more degrees in majors that cross disciplinary groups (e.g., Economics and Math); students who earned two or more degrees in one disciplinary group (e.g., English and History) are counted in that disciplinary group, in this case Humanities.
1.12 (continued) Undergraduate Degrees Awarded by Discipline – UC and Comparison Institutions, 2006-07

Campuses and Comparison Institutions

Note: San Francisco has no undergraduates. Merced awarded a small number of degrees in 2006-07.
Indicator 1.13
Undergraduate Degrees Awarded, 2000-01 to 2007-08

The number of undergraduate degrees awarded at UC has grown almost 4 percent per year on average since 2000-01.

Note: Double and triple majors are counted as one degree.
1.13 (continued) Undergraduate Degrees Awarded, 2000-01 to 2007-08

Berkeley

Davis

Irvine

Los Angeles

Merced

Riverside

San Diego

(San Francisco has no undergraduates.)

Santa Barbara

Santa Cruz
Indicator 1.14
Degree Aspirations of Seniors, Spring 2008

Source: Spring 2008 University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES).

- Comparable national data on the degree aspirations of seniors are not available.

Note: Students were asked, “What is the highest academic degree or credential that you plan to eventually earn?” Data include all students identified as seniors by their campus whether in the first, second or third term of their senior year.
1.14 (continued) Degree Aspirations of Seniors, Spring 2008

Berkeley
- Bachelors: 18%
- Masters: 22%
- Business: 13%

Davis
- Bachelors: 21%
- Masters: 25%
- Business: 11%

Irvine
- Bachelors: 20%
- Masters: 25%
- Business: 11%

Los Angeles
- Bachelors: 19%
- Masters: 23%
- Business: 11%

Merced
- Bachelors: 17%
- Masters: 23%
- Business: 11%

Riverside
- Bachelors: 19%
- Masters: 25%
- Business: 15%

San Diego
- Bachelors: 19%
- Masters: 24%
- Business: 6%

(San Francisco has no undergraduates.)

Santa Barbara
- Bachelors: 27%
- Masters: 27%
- Business: 12%

Santa Cruz
- Bachelors: 27%
- Masters: 25%
- Business: 7%
Students’ plans for the year following graduation are often in flux during their senior year.

Other surveys at UC show that as seniors approach graduation, the number planning to work full-time increases and the number planning to attend graduate or professional school the year immediately following graduation declines.

Note: Students were asked, “What do you plan to do when you graduate?” Data include all students identified as seniors by their campus, whether in the first, second or third term of their senior year.
1.15 (continued) Post-Graduation Plans of Seniors, Spring 2008

Berkeley
Grad/Prof school 32%

Take year off 8%
Intern/ volunteer 4%
Study/ work abroad 5%
Work full-time 42%

Davis
Grad/Prof school 39%

Take year off 8%
Intern/ volunteer 5%
Study/ work abroad 3%
Work full-time 36%

Irvine
Grad/Prof school 39%

Take year off 8%
Intern/ volunteer 3%
Study/ work abroad 4%
Work full-time 38%

Los Angeles
Grad/Prof school 40%

Take year off 8%
Intern/ volunteer 3%
Study/ work abroad 5%
Work full-time 35%

Merced
Grad/Prof school 61%

Take year off 10%
Intern/ volunteer 3%
Study/ work abroad 0%
Work full-time 17%

Riverside
Grad/Prof school 43%

Take year off 6%
Intern/ volunteer 4%
Study/ work abroad 2%
Work full-time 38%

San Diego
Grad/Prof school 39%

Take year off 8%
Intern/ volunteer 4%
Study/ work abroad 4%
Work full-time 36%

(San Francisco has no undergraduates.)

Santa Barbara
Grad/Prof school 30%

Take year off 7%
Intern/ volunteer 4%
Study/ work abroad 5%
Work full-time 44%

Santa Cruz
Grad/Prof school 30%

Take year off 9%
Intern/ volunteer 6%
Study/ work abroad 6%
Work full-time 36%
PART III. Universitywide Indicators with Campus Comparisons

Section 2. Undergraduate Affordability

Goals
The University is committed to ensuring that financial concerns are not a barrier to eligible students choosing to attend the University. To achieve this goal, UC has implemented a systemwide financial aid program that describes how families can finance a UC education, assesses the level of financial aid needed for students, determines how undergraduate financial aid is allocated across campuses, and guides campus awards to individual students.

Measures
UC 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. UC also evaluates its success in meeting its financial accessibility goals by monitoring the enrollment of low-income and middle-income students and students’ work and borrowing levels.

In addition to these measures, this section provides information on the affordability of a UC undergraduate education compared to UC’s peer institutions. In most instances, the University's standard eight public and private comparison institutions were used for comparison affordability indicators. In cases where data were not available for these institutions (e.g., student work hours by income level), comparisons were derived from data provided by the 2004 edition of the National Postsecondary Student Aid Study (NPSAS) for highly selective public and private research universities nationwide. More recent information from the 2008 edition of NPSAS will become available by late 2009.

Prospective students and parents may find more information about UC costs and financial aid, including links to financial aid estimators provided by each campus, at the web page Paying for UC (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 (www.ucop.edu/sas/sfs/docs/regents_0708.pdf).
The cost of attending college is more than just tuition and fees; it includes living expenses, books and supplies, transportation, health insurance and personal expenses.

In 2007-08, the University’s average total cost of attendance for California resident undergraduates was $22,151, with fees comprising 34 percent of this amount.

The University’s average total cost of attendance was generally comparable to that of its public comparison institutions. Compared to these institutions, UC’s relatively low fees were offset by higher non-fee costs (room and board, transportation, etc.), which partly reflect the high cost of living in the communities in which UC campuses are located.

The cost of attendance for individual students can vary widely due to several factors, including a student’s housing category (e.g., on campus, off campus, or living with relatives). The figures shown above represent an estimated weighted average cost of attendance across all housing categories.

Note: Figures include the cost of student health insurance plans for institutions that require insurance as a condition of enrollment. Fees shown for public institutions are for in-state residents.

* Campus data are in Indicator 2.2.
Indicator 2.2
Average Cost of Attendance, 2000-01 to 2007-08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Universitywide</th>
<th>Non-Fees</th>
<th>Fees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>$16,728</td>
<td>$11,996</td>
<td>$4,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>$17,666</td>
<td>$13,131</td>
<td>$4,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>$18,066</td>
<td>$13,427</td>
<td>$4,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>$20,082</td>
<td>$13,860</td>
<td>$6,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>$21,243</td>
<td>$14,343</td>
<td>$6,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>$21,657</td>
<td>$14,462</td>
<td>$7,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>$21,745</td>
<td>$14,701</td>
<td>$7,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>$22,151</td>
<td>$14,642</td>
<td>$7,509</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Annual student budgets published by the Office of the President.

- These figures represent the average annual total cost of attendance for a California resident undergraduate.
- In 2007-08, the average total cost of attendance at UC campuses was $22,151, before consideration of financial aid received by students.
- Since 2000, the total cost of attendance has increased by $5,423 (32.4 percent) in inflation-adjusted dollars. Of this amount, $2,777 came from fee increases and $2,646 came from increases in non-fee costs (room and board, books and supplies, etc.).
- Since 2000, annual increases in average Universitywide and campus-based fees have been sporadic, ranging from less than $40 in 2001 and 2006 to $1,500 in 2003. Throughout this period, non-fee costs have increased steadily and account for two-thirds of the total cost of attendance.
- Although Universitywide fees are the same at all campuses, the average total cost of attendance varies across campuses due to differences in campus fees, non-fee expenses and the percentage of students in different living categories (on-campus, off-campus and commuters).

Note: Figures are constant inflation-adjusted 2007-08 dollars.
2.2 (continued) Average Cost of Attendance, 2000-01 to 2007-08

Berkeley
- $4,861 $4,307 $4,422 $5,918 $6,511 $6,888 $6,840 $7,165
- $13,108 $13,909 $13,956 $14,546 $15,182 $15,316 $15,457 $14,910

Davis
- $4,891 $4,815 $4,905 $6,598 $7,582 $7,888 $7,788 $8,124
- $11,085 $12,101 $12,189 $12,607 $13,190 $13,422 $13,477 $13,092

Irvine
- $4,874 $4,772 $4,841 $6,328 $6,901 $7,161 $6,984 $7,556
- $10,975 $12,042 $12,843 $12,921 $13,640 $13,637 $13,847 $14,018

Los Angeles
- $4,446 $4,352 $4,415 $5,972 $6,589 $6,881 $6,705 $7,038
- $12,500 $13,703 $14,286 $14,759 $15,012 $15,107 $15,587 $15,276

Merced
- $7,035 $6,839 $7,148 $15,069 $14,308 $13,538

Riverside
- $4,632 $4,560 $4,633 $6,125 $6,704 $6,971 $6,775 $7,362
- $11,068 $11,891 $12,150 $12,554 $13,316 $13,661 $14,036 $14,369

San Diego
- $4,622 $4,546 $4,716 $6,209 $6,804 $7,071 $6,875 $7,456
- $11,876 $12,993 $13,332 $13,838 $14,058 $14,013 $14,182 $14,678

Santa Barbara
- $4,605 $4,518 $4,624 $6,327 $7,100 $7,401 $7,206 $7,896
- $12,392 $13,741 $13,777 $14,379 $15,117 $15,132 $15,705 $15,499

Santa Cruz
- $5,105 $4,551 $4,709 $6,381 $7,057 $7,350 $7,214 $7,646
- $11,981 $14,214 $14,608 $15,211 $15,145 $15,464 $15,373 $15,782

(San Francisco has no undergraduates.)
Gift aid (grants and need-based scholarships) dramatically reduces the cost of attending UC for students in need.

While need-based aid recipients at UC’s private comparison institutions generally received more gift aid than at UC, the larger awards did not fully compensate for the much higher cost of attendance at these institutions.

Note: The Common Data Set (CDS) is a statistical survey designed collaboratively by college guidebook publishers and higher education institutions for collecting standardized information from higher education institutions.
 Indicator 2.4
Undergraduate Pell Grant Receipt – UC and Comparison Institutions, 2007-08

Source: Enrollment figures are from 2007-08 IPEDS and exclude non-resident aliens, who are not eligible to receive Pell Grants; data for SUNY-Buffalo are from 2006-07. Pell Grant recipient counts were obtained from the U.S. Department of Education Common Origination and Disbursement website.

- Pell Grants are awarded by the federal government to low-income students—generally those whose parent incomes are below $45,000 or who are considered to be financially independent from their parents.

- The percentage 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 useful in comparing institutions in terms of their undergraduates’ socioeconomic backgrounds.

- As a system, the University enrolled a higher percentage of Pell Grant recipients in 2007-08 (33 percent) than any of its public or private comparison institutions.
More than half of all UC undergraduates received some form of gift aid (grants or scholarships) in 2007-08. These awards were worth an average of $10,279.

Systemwide, the percentage of UC students receiving gift aid has changed little in recent years. The modest decline in the percent of students receiving gift aid since 2003-04 reflects the phase-out of the Governor’s Scholarship Program, a state program that awarded scholarships to high-achieving high school students for use once they enrolled in college. State funding for new awards was eliminated in 2003.

Increases in the average value of students’ gift aid since 2002-03 can be attributed primarily to additional support from the state’s Cal Grant program and from UC’s own institutional aid program. Cal Grant awards generally cover recipients’ systemwide fees, and have increased in tandem with UC fees since 2002-03. The University also augments its own institutional aid program by setting aside a portion (currently 33 percent) of new fee revenue for need-based grants.

Note: Figures are in constant inflation-adjusted 2007.
2.5 (continued) Average Amount and Percent of Undergraduates Receiving Gift Aid, 1999-00 to 2007-08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>99-00</th>
<th>00-01</th>
<th>01-02</th>
<th>02-03</th>
<th>03-04</th>
<th>04-05</th>
<th>05-06</th>
<th>06-07</th>
<th>07-08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

San Francisco has no undergraduates.
Indicator 2.6
Average Net Cost of Attendance by Family Income, 1999-00 to 2007-08

Source: UCOP Corporate Student System.

- Net cost of attendance represents the average cost of attending UC for undergraduates after taking into account scholarship and grant assistance (i.e., total student expense budget less scholarship and grant aid). It represents what students must contribute, whether from parent contributions or their own resources (e.g., student savings, work or borrowing).

- Scholarships and grants reduce the “sticker” price of attending UC at all income levels, but especially for students with few parental resources (i.e., low-income dependent students and students who, under federal guidelines, are considered to be financially independent from their parents).

- Between 1999-00 and 2007-08, augmentations to grant aid kept the average increase in net cost for low-income students to about $2,000, compared to $4,800 for students in the highest income category.

- Additional grant aid did not fully cover cost increases for low-income students in part because non-fee costs (room and board, books and supplies, etc.) have increased without augmentations in grants to offset them.

Note: Figures are in constant inflation-adjusted 2007 dollars.
### 2.6 (continued) Average Net Cost of Attendance by Family Income, 1999-00 to 2007-08

(San Francisco has no undergraduates.)
As a system, UC enrolls a higher percentage of low-income independent and dependent students than comparably selective institutions.

The larger enrollment of high-income students at UC than at comparable public institutions may reflect state-to-state differences in parent incomes of academically eligible students.

Students at comparable private institutions are more likely than UC students to be from upper- and upper-middle-income brackets, consistent with those institutions’ generally higher costs.

Note: The NPSAS survey is conducted every four years; 2008 NPSAS results will be available by late 2009.
Indicator 2.8
Distribution of Undergraduates by Parent Income, 1999-00 to 2007-08

Source: UCOP Corporate Student System.

- The trend in the income distribution of UC undergraduates is one indicator of how well the University's financial aid programs have enabled UC to remain financially accessible to students at every income level.

- Despite increases in both the University’s total cost of attendance (see Indicator 2.2) and net cost of attendance (see Indicator 2.6), the income distribution of all UC undergraduates has changed little since 2000.

- More than 25 percent of undergraduates have parents with annual income below $46,000.

Note: Figures are in constant inflation-adjusted 2007 dollars. The decline in the number of unknown incomes since 1999-00 reflects improvements in the University's ability to consolidate parent income data from multiple sources and to estimate the income of students with missing data.
2.8 (continued) Distribution of Undergraduates by Parent Income, 1999-00 to 2007-08

(San Francisco has no undergraduates.)

Note: In years prior to 2007-08, figures for San Diego overstated the number of students in the $93,000 to $139,000 bracket and understated the number of students in the above $139,000 bracket due to limitations in the data provided to the UCOP Corporate Student System. These limitations have been fixed for 2007-08 and subsequent years, which contributes to the apparent increase in higher-income families in 2007-08.
(this page intentionally left blank)
Indicator 2.9
Number of Hours Undergraduates Worked Per Week by Family Income – UC and Comparison Institutions, 2004

The University monitors students’ self-reported work hours as one indicator of the University’s affordability.

At each income level, the percentage of UC students who work and the number of hours that they work compare favorably with the work patterns reported by students at other research universities, both public and private.

Overall, 44 percent of UC students reported that they did not work for pay during the 2005-06 academic year.

Note: The NPSAS survey is conducted every four years; 2008 NPSAS results will be available by late 2009. All incomes have been adjusted to 2006-07 dollars for comparability.
Indicator 2.10
Number of Hours Undergraduates Worked Per Week by Family Income, 2007-08

![Bar chart showing number of hours worked per week by family income.]

Source: University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES).

- In 2007-08, a large percentage of students at every income level did not work for pay during the academic year. This is consistent with parent survey findings that parents at all income levels feel responsible for covering their children’s college expenses so that they will not have to work while studying.

- Some students at every income level reported working more than 20 hours per week, which is beyond what the University considers manageable. Excessive work hours during an academic term are often associated with reduced course loads and lower GPAs.
2.10 (continued) Number of Hours Undergraduates Worked Per Week by Family Income, 2007-08

(San Francisco has no undergraduates.)
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Indicator 2.11
Percent of Graduating Seniors With Student Loan Debt – UC and Comparison Institutions, 2006-07

Just over half of all UC undergraduates who graduated in 2006-07 took out student loans while enrolled at UC.

UC undergraduates were more likely to graduate with student debt than students at seven of the eight UC comparison institutions (all but SUNY at Buffalo), consistent with UC’s enrollment of a high percentage of low-income students and the fact that low-income students are more likely to borrow than higher-income students.

Note: Figures for the 2007-08 graduating class are available for UC but are not yet available for comparison institutions.

* Campus data are in Indicator 2.13.
Indicator 2.12
Cumulative Debt of Graduating Seniors – UC and Comparison Institutions, 2006-07

UC and Comparison Institutions

Source: UCOP Corporate Student System and Common Data Set.

- UC students who graduated in 2006-07 with student loan debt had less cumulative borrowing, on average, than graduates from UC’s public comparison schools or graduates from two of UC’s four private comparison schools.

- The average debt among UC borrowers ($14,665) is equivalent to a monthly repayment schedule of about $170 per month for 10 years; longer repayment periods with lower payments are available.

Note: Figures for the 2007-08 graduating class are available for UC (see Indicator 2.13) but are not yet available for comparison institutions.

* Campus data are in Indicator 2.13.
Despite national reports of increasing student debt burden, the percent of UC undergraduates who graduate with student loan debt has declined slightly since 1999. At the same time, the income distribution of UC undergraduates has remained stable (see Indicator 2.8).

Average cumulative debt among graduating seniors has generally declined in constant dollars since 1999. This trend may partly reflect the relatively stagnant annual borrowing limits for federal student loan programs.

These figures reflect trends in students’ utilization of student loans. They do not, however, include parental borrowing from federal parent education, home equity or other types of loans. It is too early to tell how the recent economic downturn might affect access to these other loan sources and whether reduced access to parental loans may lead to increased student borrowing in the future.

Note: Figures are in constant 2008 dollars, adjusted for inflation.
2.13 (continued) Cumulative Debt of Graduating Seniors, 1999-00 to 2007-08

(Merced had no graduating seniors during the period covered.)

(San Francisco has no undergraduates.)
PART III. Universitywide Indicators with Campus Comparisons

Section 3. Undergraduate Access

Goals
The University’s undergraduate access goals are defined by the Master Plan for Higher Education in California. The Master Plan dictates that UC enroll freshmen from the top 12.5 percent of California’s public high school graduates, but allows UC to define that pool. UC has historically done this by establishing the academic criteria by which students can become eligible. UC guarantees admission somewhere in the system to the students who have satisfied these eligibility requirements.

The Master Plan also dictates that UC create a well-defined transfer route for students who choose to attend a California community college after high school. UC provides this route by establishing academic criteria by which students can become eligible to transfer and by guaranteeing admission somewhere in the system to all transfer students who have satisfied these eligibility requirements.

UC campuses give upper-division California community college students priority over other transfer applicants in their admissions selection processes. Nearly 90 percent of UC’s transfer students come from the California community colleges.

Measures
This section provides data about the students who apply, are admitted to, and enroll in UC. It includes information about their academic preparedness, such as their high school grade point averages and scores on standardized tests. By any measure, UC undergraduates enter with excellent preparation to engage in the learning offered by UC campuses.
Indicator 3.1
Freshman Applicants, Admits and Enrollees, Fall 1995 to 2008

Source: UCOP StatFinder files.

- UC freshman enrollment has increased rapidly in the past 10 years. Several factors account for this trend, including growth in the number of high school graduates and growth in the proportion of high school graduates who are meeting UC’s eligibility requirements and applying to, and attending, the University.

- Freshman enrollment dropped in 2004 when funding for enrollment growth was excluded from the 2004-05 state budget. Enrollment growth funds were later restored. By that time, however, UC had, in anticipation of a serious budget shortfall, denied an unusually large number of students for the Fall 2004 term.

Note: Universitywide data are unduplicated counts. Students typically apply to more than one UC campus so the sums for all of the campuses’ applicants will exceed the Universitywide totals.
3.1 (continued) Freshman Applicants, Admits and Enrollees, Fall 1995 to 2008

(San Francisco has no undergraduates.)
Indicator 3.2
Percent of Minority Students in the Freshman Class Compared to California High School Graduates, Fall 1989 to 2008

Source: UCOP Student Affairs Office.

- UC’s goal is to reduce the “enrollment gap,” or the difference between the race/ethnicity distribution of the incoming freshman class and the high school graduating class.

- UC has classified “underrepresented” students as those from groups whose presence in the top 12.5 percent of the state’s high school graduates is disproportionately small compared to their presence in the general population. At present, these include African-American, American Indian and Chicano/Latino students.

- In 1996, the voters of California passed Proposition 209, which prohibits public institutions from considering race and ethnicity in admissions. Although Proposition 209 went into effect with the entering class of 1998, UC saw a drop in applications from underrepresented students beginning in 1995, when the issue was first raised. This, combined with lower enrollment rates, led to a reduction in the absolute numbers as well as the proportion of underrepresented minority students in UC’s freshman class.

- The proportion of UC’s enrolled freshmen who are underrepresented minorities has increased steadily since the low point in 1996. However, most of this increase simply reflects growth in the proportion of those students among high school graduates. Since 2005, the gap between the proportion of underrepresented students among high school graduates and among UC freshmen has narrowed slightly.
Indicator 3.3
Freshman Applicants, Admits and Enrollees by Race/Ethnicity, Fall 1994 to 2008

Source: UCOP Corporate Student Systems data reported in StatFinder.

Note: Race/ethnicity data are drawn from UC admissions applications. Reporting of race/ethnicity is optional and the proportion of students who choose to provide this data fluctuates from year to year. For example, in Fall 1998, significantly more students chose not to report their ethnicity; this may be related to the fact that in the same year a smaller proportion self-identified as “white.” A smaller, but still noticeable decline was also observed that year in “Asian-American.”
Indicator 3.4
Upper Division California Community College Transfer Applicants, Admits and Enrollees, Fall 1994 to 2008

![Graph showing data for transfer students.](image)

Source: UCOP StatFinder files.

- Annually, transfer students make up approximately 30 percent of incoming students. These graphs show data for the transfer students who apply for admission in the fall term only. Additional transfer students matriculate in other terms.

- Approximately 90 percent of transfer students come to UC from the California Community Colleges. In accordance with California’s Master Plan for Higher Education, these students are given priority in admission over transfer applicants from other institutions.

- If offered admission, transfer students are more likely to enroll at UC than their freshman counterparts. This is because transfer students are often more focused—they have completed specific lower-division course work to prepare for admission to a specific UC campus.
3.4 (continued) Upper Division California Community College Transfer Applicants, Admits and Enrollees, Fall 1994 to 2008

(San Francisco has no undergraduates.)
Indicator 3.5  
Upper-Division California Community College Transfer Applicants, Admits and Enrollees by Race/Ethnicity, Fall 1994 to 2008

Source: UCOP Corporate Student Systems data reported in StatFinder.

Note: Race/ethnicity data are drawn from UC admissions applications. Reporting of race/ethnicity is optional and the proportion of students who choose to provide this data fluctuates from year to year. For example, in Fall 1998, significantly more students chose not to report their ethnicity; this may be related to the fact that in the same year a smaller proportion self-identified as “white.” A smaller, but still noticeable decline was also observed that year in “Asian-American.”
Indicator 3.6
Middle 50% of SAT Math and Critical Reading Score Range for Entering Freshmen – UC and Comparison Institutions, Fall 2006

Source: U.S. News and World Report’s America’s Best Colleges.

- The horizontal bars above represent the range of test scores for the middle 50 percent of new freshmen. The left-most number on each bar represents the 25th percentile; the right-most number represents the 75th percentile of the range.

Note: Data for the SAT Writing Test are not available for comparison institutions. San Francisco does not enroll freshmen.
Indicator 3.7  
Average SAT Scores for Entering Freshmen, Fall 1994 to 2008

Source: UCOP StatFinder files.

- The scores reported here represent admitted students’ highest total SAT scores from any single test administration. This is the score used in determining UC eligibility and in most campus selection processes.

- With the changes to the SAT in 2006 (the elimination of analogies and the addition of more critical reading passages and higher level mathematics questions), UC experienced a slight decline in the average test scores of Fall 2007 applicants. This dip has continued and has been reported by the College Board and other institutions around the country.

Note: Data is scored on a 1600-point scale. The old SAT scores were based on the Math and Verbal tests; the new SAT scores are based on the Math and Critical Reading tests.
3.7 (continued) Average SAT Scores for Entering Freshmen, Fall 1994 to 2008
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(San Francisco has no undergraduates.)
The horizontal bars above represent the range of test scores for the middle 50 percent of new freshmen. The left-most number on each bar represents the 25th percentile; the right-most number represents the 75th percentile of the range.
3.8 (continued) Middle 50% of SAT Score Range for Entering Freshmen, Fall 2008
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Indicator 3.9
Average High School GPA of Entering Freshmen, Fall 1994 to 2008

Universitywide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: UCOP StatFinder files.

- UC computes both weighted and unweighted high school GPAs.
- The weighted GPA displayed here assigns a bonus grade point for successful completion of advanced level courses, such as those in the College Board’s Advanced Placement program. An A in a UC-approved honors course receives 5 points, a B receives 4 points, etc. Thus average weighted GPAs for individual students may be higher than 4.0.
- In making admissions decisions, some campuses also consider the unweighted GPA. The unweighted GPA reflects grades earned in college preparatory courses without any additional bonus points and is calculated on a 4-point scale with an A receiving 4 grade points, a B receiving 3 grade points, etc.
3.9 (continued) Average High School GPA of Entering Freshmen, Fall 1994 to 2008

(San Francisco has no undergraduates.)
Indicator 3.10
Average College GPA for Entering Upper-Division California Community College Transfer Students, Fall 1994 to 2008

Source: UCOP StatFinder files.

- The maximum average GPA for entering transfer students is 4.00. Grades included are for college-level academic courses from the college(s) where students were previously enrolled.
3.10 (continued) Average College GPA for Entering Upper-Division California Community College Transfer Students, Fall 1994 to 2008
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PART III. Universitywide Indicators with Campus Comparisons

Section 4. Undergraduate Student Profile

Goals
As a public institution, the University of California has an historic commitment to providing admission for all eligible applicants who are residents of California. In accordance with the 1998 Regental Policy on Undergraduate Admissions, the University seeks to enroll “a student body that, beyond meeting the University’s eligibility requirements, demonstrates high academic achievement or exceptional personal talent, and that encompasses the broad diversity of cultural, racial, geographic and socioeconomic backgrounds characteristic of California.”

Measures
This section depicts the makeup of the University’s undergraduate population, which is measured across a variety of dimensions. UC undergraduate students are predominantly young, recent high school graduates enrolled full time in a residential setting. The vast majority of UC undergraduates come from California and together they begin to approximate the state’s socioeconomic, linguistic, and cultural complexion.
Indicator 4.1  
Entering Freshman and Transfer Students, 2000-01 to 2007-08

Source: UCOP Corporate Student System.

- Comparative data on the number of transfer students are not available nationally.

Note: Data include all transfer students, including both upper-division and lower-division CCC transfer students, inter-campus transfers from other UC campuses, transfers from other California 4-year institutions and 2- and 4-year transfers from out-of-state. The overwhelming majority (87 percent) of transfer students are upper-division transfers from California community colleges.
4.1 (continued) Entering Freshman and Transfer Students, 2000-01 to 2007-08

(San Francisco has no undergraduates.)
The number of undergraduates at UC has grown about 23 percent between 2000 and 2008, from 140,938 to 172,774 students.

By policy, UC expects undergraduate students to enroll full-time, although a small number of part-time enrollees are permitted in exceptional cases. Full-time enrollment is associated with higher graduation rates.

In 2008, approximately 97 percent of all UC undergraduates were enrolled full-time.

Note: Full-time students are those with 12 or more units; part-time students are those with fewer than 12 units. At Davis, part-time enrollment figures prior to Fall 2007 are inflated because some units earned in a basic writing course were not included in a student’s total number of units attempted per term. Consequently, the course loads of some students did not meet the minimum number of units needed to qualify them as full-time students, even though in terms of total actual units attempted their course load equaled or exceeded the required minimum. This oversight has been fixed as of Fall 2007.
4.2 (continued) Full-Time and Part-Time Undergraduate Enrollment, Fall 2000 to 2008
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Indicator 4.3
Undergraduate Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity – UC and Comparison Institutions, Fall 2007

Source: IPEDS Enrollment Survey.

Note: Universitywide data exclude San Francisco, which has no undergraduates. The Association of American Universities (AAU) is a nonprofit association of 60 U.S. and two Canadian preeminent public and private research universities; six UC campuses are members (Berkeley, Davis, Irvine, Los Angeles, San Diego and Santa Barbara).
4.3 (continued) Undergraduate Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity – UC and Comparison Institutions, Fall 2007
Indicator 4.4
Undergraduate Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity, Fall 2000 to 2008

Source: UCOP Corporate Student System.

Note: "Other/Unknown" includes students who declined to state their race/ethnicity.
4.4 (continued) Undergraduate Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity, Fall 2000 to 2008

(San Francisco has no undergraduates.)
Indicator 4.5  
Undergraduate Enrollment by Gender – UC and Comparison Institutions, Fall 2006

UC and Comparison Institutions

Source: IPEDS Enrollment Survey.
4.5 (continued) Undergraduate Enrollment by Gender – UC and Comparison Institutions, Fall 2006

UC and Comparison Institutions

[Bar chart showing undergraduate enrollment by gender for various UC and comparison institutions, including Berkeley, Davis, Irvine, Los Angeles, Merced, Riverside, Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz, U of Illinois, U of Michigan, SUNY at Buffalo, U of Virginia, Harvard, MIT, Stanford, and Yale. The chart compares male and female enrollment percentages for each institution.]
The higher percentage of female undergraduates at UC is consistent with nationwide trends showing higher college-going rates among female high school graduates.

Male/female ratios vary across ethnic groups. African-American and Latino/Chicano males have markedly lower rates of participation than white and Asian-American males.
4.6 (continued) Undergraduate Enrollment by Gender, Fall 2000 to 2008
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Indicator 4.7  
Geographic Distribution of Undergraduate Students, Fall 2000 to 2008

The overwhelming majority (91 percent) of UC undergraduates are from California.

Because of its commitment to serving California residents, the University enrolls very few non-resident and international undergraduate students.

Note: International students are defined in terms of their visa status; other U.S. residents are defined in terms of their fee-based residency status.
4.7 (continued) Geographic Distribution of Undergraduate Students, Fall 2000 to 2008
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(San Francisco has no undergraduates.)
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College students are classified as “traditional” (up to age 25) and “nontraditional” (age 25 and older). Nontraditional students are often working full time and/or raising families.

The average age of UC undergraduates in Fall 2008 was about 20 years and 4 months. More than 96 percent of all undergraduates at UC are under 25, compared to about 60 percent at all four-year institutions nationally. As these data show, UC enrolls very few nontraditional undergraduates; virtually all its undergraduates are traditional age students who are attending college on a full-time basis.

The average age of UC undergraduates has fallen slightly over the past eight years, primarily because students are graduating in less time. As shown in Indicator 1.2, the number of entering freshmen who graduate in four years has been increasing steadily over time.
4.8 (continued) Age of Undergraduate Students, Fall 2000 to 2008
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Indicator 4.9
First-Generation Undergraduate Students, Fall 2008

Universitywide

- Neither parent college graduate: 37%
- At least one parent college graduate: 55%
- Unknown/missing: 8%

Source: UCOP Corporate Student System

- A first-generation undergraduate is one for whom neither parent holds a four-year degree.
4.9 (continued) First-Generation Undergraduate Students, Fall 2008
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At least one parent is a college graduate
Neither parent is a college graduate
Unknown/missing
Indicator 4.10
First Language Spoken at Home for Undergraduate Students, Fall 2008

Universitywide

- English Only: 50%
- Other Language Only: 19%
- English and Other Language: 30%
- Unknown/ Missing: 1%

Source: UCOP Corporate Student System.
4.10 (continued) First Language Spoken at Home for Undergraduate Students, Fall 2008

Berkeley

- English Only: 28%
- English and Other Language: 23%
- Other Language Only: 2%
- Other: 2%

Davis

- English Only: 28%
- English and Other Language: 19%
- Other Language Only: 2%
- Other: 2%

Irvine

- English Only: 38%
- English and Other Language: 18%
- Other Language Only: 1%
- Other: 1%

Los Angeles

- English Only: 30%
- English and Other Language: 23%
- Other Language Only: 1%
- Other: 1%

Merced

- English Only: 33%
- English and Other Language: 17%
- Other Language Only: 3%
- Other: 3%

Riverside

- English Only: 40%
- English and Other Language: 18%
- Other Language Only: 2%
- Other: 2%

San Diego

- English Only: 33%
- English and Other Language: 23%
- Other Language Only: 2%
- Other: 2%

(San Francisco has no undergraduates.)

Santa Barbara

- English Only: 20%
- English and Other Language: 11%
- Other Language Only: 1%
- Other: 1%

Santa Cruz

- English Only: 20%
- English and Other Language: 10%
- Other Language Only: 1%
- Other: 1%
PART III. Universitywide Indicators with Campus Comparisons

Section 5. Undergraduate Student Experience and Proficiencies

Goals
UC is committed to ensuring the continued high quality of undergraduate education, reflective of the values and practices that are unique to a research university.

Measures
The University regularly collects and reports data on student experiences and proficiencies through the University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES). UCUES data reported in this section show that, on the whole, undergraduate students are satisfied with their experience at UC and feel they have benefited from it. Overwhelmingly, they rated their ability to appreciate, tolerate or understand racial and ethnic diversity as good, very good, or excellent. In terms of learning, they reported that their analytical and critical thinking skills, their ability to write clearly and effectively and their understanding of a specific field of study increased significantly. But there are gaps. Slightly less than half, for example, reported taking an independent research course or participating in an internship course; only slightly more than half had assisted faculty with research or a creative activity.

The UCUES survey uses a number of questions comparable to those found in the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). However, comparative data from the NSSE survey is not available for the most part, since most institutions consider their NSSE results to be proprietary information. Comparative data on undergraduate student experiences may become more available in the future as more institutions participate in, and publicly release, data from their student experience surveys.

Note: Indicators in this section are based on the Spring 2008 UCUES survey. San Francisco is omitted because the campus has no undergraduates. Additional notes appear at the end of this section.
Indicator 5.1
Group Learning Experiences, Spring 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>University-wide</th>
<th>Berkeley</th>
<th>Davis</th>
<th>Irvine</th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
<th>Merced</th>
<th>Riverside</th>
<th>San Diego</th>
<th>Santa Barbara</th>
<th>Santa Cruz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Worked outside of class on class projects or studied with classmates</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spent at least 6 hours per week participating in student organizations or clubs</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Served as an officer or leader in a campus organization or club</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped a classmate better understand course material</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Merced administered a shorter version of the Spring 2008 UCUES survey, which did not include this item.
### Indicator 5.2
Active Learning Experiences, Spring 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>University-wide</th>
<th>Berkeley</th>
<th>Davis</th>
<th>Irvine</th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
<th>Merced</th>
<th>Riverside</th>
<th>San Diego</th>
<th>Santa Barbara</th>
<th>Santa Cruz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Made class presentations</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spent at least 6 hours per week on studying and other academic activities outside of class</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled in at least one independent research course</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in a study-abroad program</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in an internship</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted faculty with research or a creative activity</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in community service in 2007-08</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Merced administered a shorter version of the Spring 2008 UCUES survey, which did not include this item.*
### Indicator 5.3
**Satisfaction with Institutional Commitment to Student Learning, Spring 2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>University-wide</th>
<th>Berkeley</th>
<th>Davis</th>
<th>Irvine</th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
<th>Merced</th>
<th>Riverside</th>
<th>San Diego</th>
<th>Santa Barbara</th>
<th>Santa Cruz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were satisfied with advising by faculty on academic matters</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were satisfied with advising by college staff on academic matters</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were satisfied with the availability of courses needed for graduation</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raised their standards for acceptable effort due to the high standards of a faculty member</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Indicator 5.4
Satisfaction with the Academic Experience, Spring 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>University-wide</th>
<th>Berkeley</th>
<th>Davis</th>
<th>Irvine</th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
<th>Merced</th>
<th>Riverside</th>
<th>San Diego</th>
<th>Santa Barbara</th>
<th>Santa Cruz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Were satisfied with the value</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of their education for the price</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>paid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were satisfied with their</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overall academic experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would choose to attend this</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institution again</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported that their campus</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has a strong commitment to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undergraduate education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Indicator 5.5
### Experiences with Diverse Groups of People and Ideas, Spring 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University-wide</th>
<th>Berkeley</th>
<th>Davis</th>
<th>Irvine</th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
<th>Merced</th>
<th>Riverside</th>
<th>San Diego</th>
<th>Santa Barbara</th>
<th>Santa Cruz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rated their ability to appreciate, tolerate or understand racial and ethnic diversity as good, very good or excellent</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rated their ability to appreciate cultural and global diversity as good, very good or excellent</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gained a deeper understanding of other perspectives through conversations with students of a different nationality</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gained a deeper understanding of other perspectives through conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Merced administered a shorter version of the Spring 2008 UCUES survey, which did not include these two items.*
Indicator 5.6
Interactions with Campus Faculty and Staff, Spring 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>University-wide</th>
<th>Berkeley</th>
<th>Davis</th>
<th>Irvine</th>
<th>Los Angeles</th>
<th>Merced</th>
<th>Riverside</th>
<th>San Diego</th>
<th>Santa Barbara</th>
<th>Santa Cruz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sought academic help from an instructor or tutor</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talked with an instructor outside of class about course material</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with a faculty member on a campus activity other than coursework</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 5.7
Gains in Thinking Skills, Writing Skills and Understanding a Field of Study, Spring 2008

Universitywide

- Students responded to the question: “Please rate your level of proficiency in the following areas when you started at this campus and now.”
5.7 (continued) Gains in Thinking Skills, Writing Skills and Understanding a Field of Study, Spring 2008

Percent Rating Skills as “Very Good” or “Excellent” When Started UC as a Freshman

Percent Rating Skills as “Very Good” or “Excellent” in Senior Year

(San Francisco has no undergraduates.)
Note: Administered biennially to all UC undergraduates since 2002, the University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES) is one of the primary tools at UC for assessing and reporting on student outcomes. UCUES contains items similar to those found in the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and the College Senior Survey (CSS) from the Higher Education Research Institute. In addition, it includes additional items on program evaluation, learning outcomes and civic engagement. UCUES data are used by individual campuses and Universitywide to support campus accreditation, decision making about student services and long-range planning.

The data presented in Section 5 are primarily based on responses from seniors to the Spring 2008 administration of the UCUES survey. Merced administered a shorter version of the 2008 UCUES survey, which is why a few items are blank for that campus. Responses to seven behavioral questions (worked outside of class on class projects or studied with classmates; helped a classmate better understand course material; made class presentations; raised their standards for acceptable effort due to the high standards of a faculty member; sought academic help from an instructor or tutor; talked with an instructor outside of class about course material; worked with a faculty member on a campus activity other than coursework) were scored on a six-point scale ranging from “never” to “very often.” Responses reported in this section are from students who reported that they “occasionally,” “somewhat often,” “often” or “very often” engaged in these activities.

The response rate for the Spring 2008 administration of UCUES was 39 percent overall. This compares favorably to NSSE’s 37 percent response rate. Male, minority and low-GPA students responded at lower rates to UCUES.
Goals
Graduate students are essential to the University’s success. They fuel the research enterprise, make it possible to attract world-class faculty and play an important role in undergraduate instruction. UC’s post-graduate programs also play a crucial role in helping to meet the state’s growing need for a highly educated and professional workforce.

Accordingly, in the coming decade, the University of California seeks, via a variety of means, to increase the proportion of graduate and professional school students, recruiting a diverse population from among the most talented individuals nationally and worldwide, encouraging their integration into campus communities and the completion of their degrees.

Measures
UC categorizes its graduate students into two types: graduate academic and professional degree students. Graduate academic students (here simply labeled graduate students) are in both master’s and doctoral programs in the sciences, social sciences, humanities and engineering. Graduate professional degree students (here simply labeled professional degree students) are in programs that lead to a professional degree, such as a J.D. (law), M.D. (medicine), or M.B.A. (business). The indicators displayed in this section show the size and diversity of graduate and professional school enrollment, types of degrees awarded, student outcomes and financial support measures for both graduate and professional degree students.

Most of the indicators in this section are separated into graduate and professional degree programs based on the common distinction used by the U.S. Department of Education’s Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). However, graduate and professional degree student measures and definitions vary across institutions and fields of study considerably more than those for undergraduates. Moreover, measures of graduate student characteristics and outcomes typically vary considerably by discipline, with broad categories often masking underlying variation. Future editions of this report will include additional indicators about graduate and professional degree student quality, access, affordability and success.
In Fall 2006, the 10 UC campuses enrolled about 46,000 students in their graduate and professional programs.

Graduate and professional enrollment at UC represented 22 percent of total enrollment in Fall 2006 compared to 26 percent at the AAU public and 48 percent at the AAU private institutions.
6.1 (continued) Graduate and Professional Degree Enrollment – UC and Comparison Institutions, Fall 2006

UC and Comparison Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Graduate &amp; Professional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Michigan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY at Buffalo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Since the mid-1960s, undergraduate enrollment has grown nearly three times faster than graduate and professional enrollment. As a result, the proportion of graduate and professional degree students has dropped from about one-third of all enrollments to 22 percent in Fall 2008.

- Undergraduate enrollment has represented over three-quarters of all UC enrollment since 2000.
6.2 (continued) Graduate and Professional and Undergraduate Enrollment, Fall 2000 to 2008

- Berkeley
- Davis
- Irvine
- Los Angeles
- Merced
- Riverside
- San Diego
- San Francisco
- Santa Barbara
- Santa Cruz
White students constituted 43 percent of UC’s graduate and professional degree enrollment in fall 2006 compared to 57 percent at the AAU publics and 46 percent at the AAU privates.

UC enrolled a larger share of Chicano/Latino students in its graduate and professional degree programs in Fall 2006 than either the AAU public or AAU private institutions, but a smaller share of African-American students.

In Fall 2006, international students comprised 16 percent of graduate and professional degree students at UC compared to 7 percent at the AAU public institutions and 11 percent at the AAU private institutions.

Source: IPEDS Enrollment Survey.
6.3 (continued) Graduate and Professional Degree Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity – UC and Comparison Institutions, Fall 2006
The proportion of graduate and professional degree students by race/ethnicity varies across academic disciplines. For example, underrepresented students (Chicano/Latino, African-American and American Indian) comprised 5 percent of all students in engineering/computer sciences in Fall 2008 and 16 percent in professional fields.

The proportion of underrepresented students has increased slightly since 2000, from 9.7 percent to 10.6 percent of the total.

Enrollment of new international students has fluctuated over the past few years in response to the changing climate for international student recruitment and the ability of departments to fund the higher costs associated with international students. Unlike domestic graduate students, international students continue to pay non-resident tuition after their first year.
6.4 (continued) Graduate and Professional Degree Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity, Fall 2000 to 2008
Women made up 48 percent of UC’s graduate and professional enrollment in Fall 2006 compared to 51 percent at the AAU public institutions and 48 percent at the AAU private institutions.

Source: IPEDS Enrollment Survey.
6.5 (continued) Graduate and Professional Degree Enrollment by Gender – UC and Comparison Institutions, Fall 2006

UC and Comparison Institutions

[Bar chart showing male and female enrollment by institution]
The proportion of graduate and professional degree students by gender varies across academic disciplines. For example, about 25 percent of graduate students in engineering/computer science are women compared to about 60 percent in the health professions.
6.6 (continued) Graduate and Professional Degree Enrollment by Gender, Fall 2000 to 2008
Source: UCOP Corporate System.

- Graduate and professional degree students who are U.S. (but not California) residents can meet California residency requirements after their first year of study in California. Since most of these students become in-state residents in their second year, focusing on newly enrolled graduate and professional degree students produces a more accurate representation of their geographic origin.

- Reflecting the University’s goal of drawing top academic talent from across the nation and the world, new academic graduate students are more geographically diverse than undergraduate students.
6.7 (continued) Geographic Origin of New Graduate and Professional Degree Students, Fall 2008

- **Berkeley**
  - CA Resident: 45%
  - Other U.S.: 34%
  - International: 21%

- **Davis**
  - CA Resident: 67%
  - Other U.S.: 18%
  - International: 15%

- **Irvine**
  - CA Resident: 63%
  - Other U.S.: 16%
  - International: 21%

- **Los Angeles**
  - CA Resident: 51%
  - Other U.S.: 32%
  - International: 17%

- **Merced**
  - CA Resident: 49%
  - Other U.S.: 6%
  - International: 45%

- **Riverside**
  - CA Resident: 60%
  - Other U.S.: 13%
  - International: 27%

- **San Diego**
  - CA Resident: 63%
  - Other U.S.: 19%
  - International: 18%

- **San Francisco**
  - CA Resident: 72%
  - Other U.S.: 26%
  - International: 2%

- **Santa Barbara**
  - CA Resident: 53%
  - Other U.S.: 18%
  - International: 29%

- **Santa Cruz**
  - CA Resident: 63%
  - Other U.S.: 21%
  - International: 16%
UC awarded almost 55,000 undergraduate, graduate and professional degrees in 2006-07, about 24 percent of which were at the graduate and professional levels. In contrast, about 30 percent of degrees at the AAU public institutions and 53 percent at the AAU private institutions were at the graduate and professional levels.
6.8 (continued) Graduate, Professional and Undergraduate Degrees Awarded – UC and Comparison Institutions, 2006-07

UC and Comparison Institutions

[Bar chart showing the percentage of undergraduate, professional, and graduate degrees awarded at various UC and comparison institutions, including Berkeley, Davis, Irvine, Los Angeles, Merced, Riverside, San Diego, San Francisco, Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz, U of Illinois, U of Michigan, SUNY at Buffalo, U of Virginia, Harvard, MIT, Stanford, and Yale.]
The 10 UC campuses awarded 7,300 graduate degrees in 2006-07, including 3,200 doctoral degrees and 4,100 master’s degrees.

Over 60 percent of UC’s graduate degrees were awarded in STEM fields, which include life and physical sciences, technology, engineering and mathematics.

Nearly two-thirds of all UC doctoral degrees were in STEM fields. These constitute nearly 70 percent of all STEM Ph.D.’s awarded in California.
6.9 (continued) Graduate Degrees Awarded by Discipline – UC and Comparison Institutions, 2006-07

UC and Comparison Institutions

![Diagram showing graduate degrees awarded by discipline across various institutions.](image-url)
Completion of a Ph.D. requires intensive study and original research and scholarship that makes a significant contribution to knowledge. In the lab sciences, this typically includes publication of research papers in scientific journals. In other fields, it generally requires completion of a book-length dissertation.

Overall, 57 percent of students who began doctoral studies between Fall 1992 and Fall 1994 had completed their Ph.D.’s 10 years later.

Over half of those who left without completing the Ph.D. did complete a master’s degree. Put another way, over three-quarters of all students who began doctoral study at UC completed at least one graduate degree (master’s or doctoral).

Data for all AAU institutions are not available; however, data from the Council of Graduate School’s Ph.D. Completion Project suggest that doctoral completion rates at UC are similar to those at similar institutions (see www.phdcompletion.org/quantitative/book1_quant.asp).

A separate analysis of UC students in professional master’s programs found that over 90 percent business (MBA) and law (JD) students completed their degree programs.

Note: Data include Ed.D. students.
6.10 (continued) 10-Year Ph.D. Completion Rates, Students Entering in Fall 1992 to Fall 1994

- All Fields
- Arts & Humanities
- Social Sciences & Psychology
- Life Sciences
- Physical Sciences
- Engineering & Computer Science
On average, UC doctoral students took about the same amount of time to complete their degrees as students at other AAU research universities.

Ph.D. students in the arts and humanities take longer to complete their degrees than Ph.D. students in other fields. This may be due to the additional time humanities students spend as teaching assistants, the more individual nature of humanities dissertation research or the fact that these students more often interrupt their studies for financial or other reasons.

Note: Data shown are for median elapsed time to degree; data include Ed.D. students.
6.11 (continued) Time to Degree for Ph.D. Students – UC and Comparison Institutions, 2003-04 to 2005-06
Indicator 6.12
Time to Degree for Ph.D. Students, 1995-97 to 2005-07

Overall, the time it takes UC doctoral students to complete their degrees has fallen from 6.3 years for those graduating in 1998-2000 to 5.8 years for those graduating in 2005-07.

Recent humanities Ph.D.’s are the one exception to this trend; they took about 6 months longer to complete their degrees than those who graduated 10 years earlier.

Note: Data shown are for median elapsed time to degree; data include Ed.D. students.
Indicator 6.13
Plans at Time of Ph.D. Completion, 2005-06

Universitywide

- Post-doctoral training is an integral part of the training of Ph.D. students in the sciences.

- Students who earn University of California doctoral degrees enter the labor market quickly. Seventy percent had already accepted an employment offer or were entering postdoctoral training at the time they completed their Ph.D.'s. Only 2 percent were not planning to work or study immediately after earning their degrees.

- Most new UC Ph.D.'s plan to remain in California for work or postdoctoral training.

Note: Data include Ed.D. degree recipients.

Source: Survey of Earned Doctorates sponsored by the National Science Foundation, National Institutes of Health, U.S. Department of Education, National Endowment for the Humanities, U.S. Department of Agriculture and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
6.13 (continued) Plans at Time of Ph.D. Completion, 2005-06

(Merced opened in 2005 and had awarded very few graduate degrees as of Spring 2006.)
Indicator 6.14
Average Net Stipend Offered to Ph.D. Students Admitted to UC Compared to Their First-Choice Non-UC Schools, 2004 and 2007

Source: University of California Graduate Student Support Survey.

- Net stipend is the amount of competitive (non-need-based) aid that students have to live on after tuition and fees are covered. It is calculated by subtracting total fees and tuition from a student’s total gift and assistantship support.

- The competitiveness of UC’s per capita graduate net stipend offers varies by campus and by academic field.

- In 2007, the UC per capita net stipend offer was $1,000 lower than that of competing institutions. This represented an improvement over the $1,500 competitiveness gap that existed between UC and competing institutions in 2004.

- The high cost of living in many California communities compared to other parts of the country can exacerbate the net stipend competitiveness gap between the UC campuses and non-UC schools in many cases.

Note: Figures are in constant inflation-adjusted 2007 dollars; data include Ed.D. students.
6.14 (continued) Average Net Stipend Offered to Ph.D. Students Admitted to UC Compared to Their First-Choice Non-UC Schools, 2004 and 2007

Note: Figures are in constant inflation-adjusted 2007 dollars; data include Ed.D. students.
Indicator 6.15
Average Net Stipend of Ph.D. Students, 1998-99 to 2007-08

The average net stipend increased 18 percent in inflation-adjusted terms between 1998-99 and 2007-08.

Note: Figures are in constant inflation-adjusted 2007 dollars; data include Ed.D. students.
6.15 (continued) Average Net Stipend of Ph.D. Students, 1998-99 to 2007-08
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The 10 UC campuses produced almost 5,700 degrees in professional fields in 2006-07. The largest share of UC’s graduate professional degrees were awarded in business (32 percent), followed by education (19 percent), law (14 percent) and medicine (11 percent). These proportions were relatively similar across both the public and private AAU institutions.

Note: “Other Health” includes all health science fields other than medicine, such as dentistry, nursing, optometry, pharmacy, public health and veterinary medicine. “Other Professional” includes interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary fields, as well as fields such as architecture, communications, divinity, library and information science, public policy and social welfare.
6.16 (continued) Professional Degrees Awarded by Discipline – UC and Comparison Institutions, 2006-07

UC and Comparison Institutions

[Graph showing professional degrees distribution by discipline for various institutions.]
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The United States Medical Licensing Examination is the examination for medical licensure in the U.S. and is sponsored by the Federation of State Medical Boards and the National Board of Medical Examiners.

The Step 1 examination assesses whether a student can apply concepts of science to the practice of medicine, with emphasis on the principles underlying health, disease and modes of therapy.

The Step 2 examination assesses whether a student can apply medical knowledge and skills to patient care, and emphasizes health promotion and disease prevention.

There are two components of the Step 2 examination: Clinical Knowledge (CK) and Clinical Skills (CS). Step 2 CK uses the multiple-choice examination format to test clinical knowledge. Step 2 CS uses standardized patients to test the ability of students and graduates to gather information from patients, perform physical examinations and communicate their findings to patients and colleagues.

Note: Data represent overall pass rates (students can take the MLE exams multiple times if they do not pass).
6.17 (continued) United States Medical Licensing Examination Pass Rates, 2000-01 to 2007-08

Note: The “Step 2CS” examination began in 2004-05. National data are not currently available for 2007-08.
Indicator 6.18
Professional Degree Students Graduating with Debt, 2001-02 to 2007-08

The percent of professional degree students who graduate with debt varies by discipline.

The recent increase in the percent of students in the “Other Non-Health” category who graduate with debt may reflect the recent introduction of professional degree fees in Public Policy and Pacific International Affairs.

Source: UCOP Corporate Student System.
Recent increases in borrowing among professional degree program students reflect a combination of factors, including increases to professional degree fees that have occurred since 2002-03 and increased access to, and awareness of, federal student loan programs.

In general, higher levels of student borrowing are found in disciplines with high levels of potential earnings (e.g., law, medicine, dentistry and optometry) and/or access to federal, regional or institutional loan repayment assistance programs.

Student indebtedness is one of several affordability indicators that is considered by the Regents as they review multiyear fee plans submitted by the University’s professional degree programs.

Note: Figures are in constant inflation-adjusted 2007 dollars.
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PART III. Universitywide Indicators with Campus Comparisons

Section 7. Faculty

Goals
The University of California’s faculty are crucial to its success as a leading research university and to the excellent educational experience it provides. Accordingly, the recruitment and retention of a world-class, diverse faculty are the University’s most important overarching goals.

UC faculty deliver excellence in academic programs, research productivity and public service to fulfill the University’s goals. They educate the workforce that keeps California’s economy competitive, create new jobs, and generate billions of tax dollars in state revenues. Their scientific discoveries, meantime, are translated into technological and other innovations and advances in healthcare.

Measures
As with graduate student data, data on faculty are disparate and complicated to aggregate. Accordingly, this section will receive a great deal of attention as the framework is developed in the years to come. In addition, the University will present a faculty accountability sub-report annually to the Regents, which will include a more detailed description of the faculty and emerging issues and trends.

The data presented here cover the size and diversity of the University of California faculty. The small percentages of women and minority faculty are a major challenge for the University. To respond to the challenge, efforts must be made to identify and overcome the barriers preventing women from obtaining faculty appointments and to expand the pipeline and pool of women and minority students entering graduate and professional programs.

This section also contains data on student-faculty ratios. The undergraduate educational experience is tied in part to the level of contact that students have with their teachers; a low student-faculty ratio is paramount. The section also contains data on the teaching activity of UC faculty and faculty salaries at UC and the comparison institutions.
Source: IPEDS Staff Survey.

- The drop in faculty numbers in 1993 and 1994 was due to a series of three Voluntary Early Retirement Incentive Programs between 1991 and 1994 that were instituted in response to state budget shortfalls.

Note: Counts of full-time ladder-rank faculty include professorial series faculty, agronomists, astronomers, acting faculty, faculty on sabbatical leave and lecturers with security of employment or potential security of employment.
7.1 (continued) Full-Time Ladder-Rank Faculty, Fall 1989 to 2007
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Indicator 7.2
Full-Time Ladder-Rank Faculty by Race/Ethnicity – UC and Comparison Institutions, Fall 2007

Source: IPEDS Staff Survey.

- The UC campuses have a higher proportion of minority faculty (Asian-American, Chicano/Latino, African-American and American Indian) than our public or private comparison institutions, reflecting UC’s commitment to increasing faculty diversity.
7.2 (continued) Full-Time Ladder-Rank Faculty by Race/Ethnicity – UC and Comparison Institutions, Fall 2007

![Graph showing the percent of faculty by race/ethnicity for UC and comparison institutions.]
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The graph compares the distribution of faculty members across different categories of race/ethnicity for various institutions, including UC campuses and comparison institutions such as Harvard, MIT, Stanford, and Yale.
The percentage of African-American, American Indian and Chicano/Latino faculty varies by discipline. Data on this variation will be included in the September 2009 Accountability Sub-Report on Diversity.
7.3 (continued) Full-Time Ladder-Rank Faculty by Race/Ethnicity, Fall 1993 to 2007
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Indicator 7.4
Full-Time Ladder-Rank Faculty by Gender – UC and Comparison Institutions, Fall 2007

Source: IPEDS Staff Survey.
7.4 (continued) Full-Time Ladder-Rank Faculty by Gender – UC and Comparison Institutions, Fall 2007

UC and Comparison Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Michigan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY at Buffalo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Faculty
Indicator 7.5
Full-Time Ladder-Rank Faculty by Gender, Fall 1993 to 2007

The proportion of women faculty varies by discipline. Data on this variation will be included in the September 2009 Accountability Sub-Report on Diversity.
7.5 (continued) Full-Time Ladder-Rank Faculty by Gender, Fall 1993 to 2007
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Indicator 7.6
Average Faculty Salaries – UC and Comparison Institutions, 2007-08

Source: American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Faculty Compensation Survey.

- In 2007-08, the average faculty salary at UC ($109,333) was between UC’s four private comparison institutions ($143,850) and four public comparison institutions ($102,240).

Note: The data presented in Indicators 7.6 and 7.7 come from the annual faculty compensation survey published by the American Association of University Professors. In addition to the AAUP survey, the University conducts other faculty salary comparison studies, such as the Faculty Salaries at Public Institutions report, which is submitted to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC). The average weighted faculty salaries reported here using AAUP data will not completely match average faculty salaries reported to CPEC due to differences in population definitions, time frames and methodologies. However, the general trends reported are comparable from one faculty salary survey to another.
7.6 (continued) Average Faculty Salaries – UC and Comparison Institutions, 2007-08
Indicator 7.7
Average Faculty Salaries – UC and Aggregated Comparison Institutions, 1997-98 to 2007-08

The gap in faculty salaries between private and public institutions has widened over the past 10 years for faculty at all ranks.

In 2007-08, the University implemented the first year of a four-year plan to raise faculty salaries, which slightly closed the gap between average faculty salaries at UC and its comparison private institutions.

Note: Figures are in constant inflation-adjusted 2007-08 dollars.
7.7 (continued) Average Faculty Salaries – UC and Aggregated Comparison Institutions, 1997-98 to 2007-08

UC and Comparison Institutions - Professor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>UC</th>
<th>Priv 170,201</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97-98</td>
<td></td>
<td>142,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98-99</td>
<td></td>
<td>112,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99-00</td>
<td></td>
<td>112,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-01</td>
<td></td>
<td>112,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-02</td>
<td></td>
<td>112,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-03</td>
<td></td>
<td>112,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-04</td>
<td></td>
<td>112,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-05</td>
<td></td>
<td>112,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-06</td>
<td></td>
<td>112,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-07</td>
<td></td>
<td>112,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-08</td>
<td></td>
<td>112,777</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UC and Comparison Institutions - Associate Professor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>UC</th>
<th>Priv 107,317</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97-98</td>
<td></td>
<td>107,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98-99</td>
<td></td>
<td>107,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99-00</td>
<td></td>
<td>107,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-01</td>
<td></td>
<td>107,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-02</td>
<td></td>
<td>107,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-03</td>
<td></td>
<td>107,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-04</td>
<td></td>
<td>107,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-05</td>
<td></td>
<td>107,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-06</td>
<td></td>
<td>107,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-07</td>
<td></td>
<td>107,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-08</td>
<td></td>
<td>107,317</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UC and Comparison Institutions - Assistant Professor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>UC</th>
<th>Priv 91,216</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>97-98</td>
<td></td>
<td>91,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98-99</td>
<td></td>
<td>91,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99-00</td>
<td></td>
<td>91,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00-01</td>
<td></td>
<td>91,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01-02</td>
<td></td>
<td>91,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02-03</td>
<td></td>
<td>91,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03-04</td>
<td></td>
<td>91,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-05</td>
<td></td>
<td>91,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05-06</td>
<td></td>
<td>91,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06-07</td>
<td></td>
<td>91,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07-08</td>
<td></td>
<td>91,216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 7.8
Student-Faculty Ratios, 2002-03 to 2007-08

Source: UC Budget and Capital Resources.

- The student faculty ratios reported here are computed by dividing full-year campus FTE student enrollment by estimated campus FTE faculty. The computations exclude health sciences faculty and enrollments.

- The National Center for Education Statistics is currently developing a national standard for computing student-faculty ratios. When the standard is available, UC will be able to provide data comparing student-faculty ratios across institutions.

Note: FTE refers to “full-time equivalent,” which is a standard unit of measurement for counting employees and students. For example, a full-time employee (or full-time student) constitutes 1.0 FTE; a half-time employee (or half-time student) constitutes .5 FTE. Two employees each working half-time (or two half-time students) together constitute 1.0 FTE.
7.8 (continued) Student-Faculty Ratios, 2002-03 to 2007-08

(San Francisco is a health sciences campus; these statistics are for general campus enrollment.)
Indicator 7.9
Student Credit Hours by Course Level and Faculty Appointment, 2003-04 to 2006-07

Source: University of California Annual Report to the Legislature on Faculty Instructional Activities.

- Student credit hours (SCH) is one measure used to assess faculty teaching activities.
- SCH is defined as the number of enrollments in a course times the number of units. A four-unit class of 50 students would generate 200 SCH; a two-unit class of 15 students would generate 30 SCH. In this respect, SCH is a measure of the amount of teaching faculty do across classes of different size and intensity.

Note: Senate faculty includes regular rank, recalled faculty, senate lecturers and health sciences faculty teaching general campus courses; lecturers refers to Unit 18 lecturers; other includes graduate student instructors and miscellaneous faculty. Data reported are for general campus classes only and exclude health sciences courses.
7.9 (continued) Student Credit Hours by Course Level and Faculty Appointment, 2003-04 to 2006-07
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7.9 (continued) Student Credit Hours by Course Level and Faculty Appointment, 2003-04 to 2006-07

(San Francisco is a health sciences campus; these statistics are for general campus enrollment.)
Indicator 7.10
Faculty Recipients of National and International Awards, Cumulative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award</th>
<th>Recipients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fields Medal</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Medal of Science</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nobel Prize</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulitzer Prize</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: University of California Higher Education Compact Performance Measures.

- National and international lifetime achievement awards, memberships in the nation’s most distinguished academic societies and other annual awards are one measure of the quality of the faculty.

- Of the 55 Nobel Prizes received by UC faculty, 22 have been awarded since 1995.

Note: Awards effective as of October 2008. The numbers include current, emeriti, retired, former and deceased faculty at the UC campuses, the Office of the President and the National Laboratories managed by UC.
### Indicator 7.11
**Total Faculty Memberships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Recipients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Academy of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Association for the Advancement of Science</td>
<td>585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Chemical Society</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Council of Learned Societies</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Geophysical Union</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Philosophical Society</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Physical Society</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Medicine</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Academy of Education</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Academy of Engineering</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Academy of Sciences</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: University of California Higher Education Compact Performance Measures.

---

**Note:** Awards effective as of October 2008. The numbers include current faculty at UC campuses, the Office of the President and the National Laboratories managed by UC. The list does not include emeriti, retired, former or deceased faculty.
### Indicator 7.12
Annual Faculty Awards and Honors, 2003-04 to 2007-08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Academy in Rome Fellowships</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American School of Classical Studies in Athens Memberships</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balzan Prize</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Scientist of the Year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford Foundation Fellowships</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulbright Scholars</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guggenheim Fellowships</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvey Prize</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Alexander von) Humboldt Awards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IEEE Fellows</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lasker Foundation Award</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E.O.) Lawrence Fund Fellowships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacArthur Fellowships</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Endowment for the Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Endowment for the Humanities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSF Early Career Development Program</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packard Fellowships</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidential Early Career Award for Science and Engineering</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency at the Getty Center for Arts and Humanities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency at the Institute for Advanced Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency at the National Humanities Center</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residency at the Woodrow Wilson Center for Scholars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revelle Medal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockefeller Fellowships</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searle Scholars</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sloan Fellows</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vannevar Bush Award</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Campus reports and University of California Higher Education Compact Performance Measures.

- UC's youngest faculty members are also leaders in their fields, as illustrated by the number who have earned Sloan Fellowships and NSF Early Career Development Awards.

Note: Awards effective as of October 2008. The numbers include current faculty at UC campuses, the Office of the President and the National Laboratories managed by UC. The list does not include emeriti, retired, former or deceased faculty.
Goals
The University of California’s staff workforce enables it to achieve its mission of education, research and public service. With over 85,700 career staff, UC is one of the largest public employers in California. As one of the largest employers in the state, UC aims to build a workforce that reflects the diversity of the people of California. The University also aims to attract and retain the highest quality workforce by offering competitive total remuneration, which includes salary and benefits.

In 2005, the Regents set a goal to achieve market comparability for salaries and benefits for all employees over a 10-year period. This goal recognizes the underlying objective 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.

Additionally and as a matter of Regental policy the University is committed to supporting diversity and equal opportunity, and it 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.” This commitment is consistent with the University’s long history of promoting the diversity of opinions, ideas and backgrounds of its students, faculty and staff, and with its obligations as a federal contractor. To achieve its diversity goals UC will need to develop new strategies for staff recruitment, retention and promotion, and for talent management and leadership development.

Measures
The data presented in this section provide an introduction to the composition of the University’s staff workforce, including the personnel program, the type of appointment status and gender and ethnicity demographics. The University has three staff personnel programs: Professional and Support Staff (PSS), Managers and Senior Professionals (MSP) and Senior Management Group (SMG). Appointment status refers to whether a staff employee is career, non-career or employed as a student.

More detailed views of the Universitywide workforce are found at: Statistical Summary and Data on Students, Faculty, and Staff (www.edu/ucophome/uwnews/stat/); Diversity Facts and Figures (www.universityofcalifornia.edu/diversity/facts_figures.html); and Workforce Profile (www.atyourservice.ucop.edu/forms_pubs/misc/workforce_profile_2004.pdf)

Future accountability reports will include data on staff market competitiveness for salaries and benefits. They will also address issues of concern facing the future of the staff workforce, such as the large number of retirement eligible staff, benefit cost liabilities, market salary lags, adequate succession planning for critical positions, shrinking resources, career development opportunities that keep pace with technology and the ever evolving educational environment.
The staff personnel program defines the terms and conditions of the employment relationship between staff and the University. The program includes Professional and Support Staff (PSS), Managers and Senior Professionals (MSP) and Senior Management Group (SMG).

In 2008, the University employed over 128,000 staff employees at ten campuses, five medical centers, the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources and the Office of the President. The majority (93 percent) of the workforce is in the PSS group, which is further delineated by bargaining unit representation. About 47 percent of the PSS workforce are in unions and covered by collective bargaining agreements. PSS staff provide administrative, professional, technical and operational support through independent judgment, analytical skill and professional or technical expertise, or are responsible for providing clerical, administrative, technical, service and maintenance support.

Managers and Senior Professionals comprise the next largest group in the staff workforce (6.8 percent). The smallest segment of employees (0.2 percent) is governed by the policies in the Senior Management Group. These groups provide leadership and professional expertise at the highest levels to major University units, programs or fields of work. Positions at these levels are responsible for identifying objectives, formulating strategy and policy, directing programs and managing resources and operations.

Note: Figures are unduplicated headcount, and do not include employees at the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory or academic employees. Figures include students in casual/restricted appointments.
8.1 (continued) Staff by Personnel Program and Union Representation, October 2004 to 2008
Appointment status refers to whether a staff employee is career, non-career or employed as a student. Hours of work help to define the category of a staff appointment and determine the terms and conditions of employment, which includes the benefit package.

While the majority (66 percent) of staff is in career appointments, non-career appointments (12 percent) fill critical roles in UC’s hospitals, in temporary positions and in helping to accommodate workload fluctuations.

Student employment is doubly important. It helps many campus departments accomplish essential tasks while providing the student employee with an income while enrolled at the University. Students comprise 22 percent of the staff work force. Student employment opportunities are specifically reserved for UC students and have limited hours to allow for the student’s class schedule.

Staff work force growth has been modest over the time period 2004-08, averaging 2.6 percent.

Note: The “non-career” category includes five appointment types: casual, per diem, partial year career, floater and contract. The numbers shown here are the headcount at the ten campuses, five medical centers, Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources and the Office of the President. These numbers do not include academic staff or staff at the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory. Students include casual/restricted appointments only and exclude students working in academic titles.
8.2 (continued) Staff Appointment Type, October 2004 to 2008
Indicator 8.3
Career Staff by Personnel Program and Race/Ethnicity, October 1996 to 2008

As Indicators 8.3 and 8.4 show, underrepresented minorities are concentrated at the Professional and Support Staff (PSS) levels but present in decreasing proportion among Managers and Senior Professionals (MSP) and the Senior Managers Group (SMG), respectively. Although less pronounced, the same pattern exists for women employees who are disproportionately concentrated at PSS levels and present in decreasing proportion at MSP and SMG levels.

These data demonstrate that an internal pipeline exists from which to recruit women and underrepresented minorities into MSP and SMG roles, and that UC may need to review what policy or institutional barriers may impede the movement of staff from one personnel program to another.

In addition, systemwide and local leadership is required to assure the University has diverse internal applicant pools and has created selection processes that reach out for qualified diverse candidates.

Note: The charts include all levels of career staff at the ten campuses, five medical centers, Agriculture and Natural Resources and the Office of the President. They do not include the career workforce at the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory.

Source: UCOP Corporate Personnel System. Race/ethnicity was based on employee self-identification information collected during the hiring process, as well as from periodic self-identification surveys.
8.3 (continued) Career Staff by Personnel Program and Race/Ethnicity, October 1996 to 2008
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Indicator 8.4
Career Staff by Personnel Program and Gender, October 1996 to 2008

Source: UCOP Corporate Personnel System. Gender classifications were based on employee self-identification information collected during the hiring process, as well as from periodic self-identification surveys.
8.4 (continued) Career Staff by Personnel Program and Gender, October 1996 to 2008
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PART III. Universitywide Indicators with Campus Comparisons

Section 9. Research

Goals
UC is first and foremost a research university. Among California’s public institutions, it is legally vested, via the Master Plan for Higher Education, with sole authority for doctoral education and the preparation of professionals.* It also is granted responsibility as the state’s primary academic agency for research.

Further, the vision of the University embraced by the Regents’ Committee on Long Range Planning is of a research-intensive institution which by 2025 has a marked increase in the multidisciplinary, cross-disciplinary, intercampus and global nature of its efforts. The first goal considered by the committee is unparalleled quality and breadth in the University’s research-intensive academic programs.

Measures
This section is an initial step at presenting the scope, size and quality of the University’s research endeavors. It shows UC’s total research expenditures, including both direct and indirect costs associated with research carried out by UC campuses. These data were used because they conform to the definitions used in the National Science Foundation Research and Development Expenditures survey (which is a national benchmark), and because they portray the total cost of research conducted at UC.

In addition, a second major measure of research output is the number of patents, inventions and licensing income resulting from UC research. Although these are currently widely used as indicators of research output, a national effort is under way to develop better metrics for demonstrating successful technology transfer outcomes that better reflect the important goal of fostering industry-university relationships.

The University is developing a detailed sub-report on Research, which will include additional metrics on research and technology transfer as they are developed.

*In 2006 the California Legislature authorized the California State University to offer the doctorate in education. All other doctoral education and degrees for professionals remain within the purview of the University of California.
Indicator 9.1
Total Research and Development Expenditures, 1996-97 to 2007-08

Source: National Science Foundation Research and Development Expenditures Survey.

- These charts show inflation-adjusted growth in expenditures for research and development (R&D) from year to year.
- The annual growth rate in total R&D expenditures at UC basically parallels that at other academic institutions.
- Although the growth rate in R&D expenditures rises and falls from year to year, in every year since 1996-97 it has been positive (above zero).

Note: Figures are in constant 2007-08 dollars, adjusted for inflation. Data include both direct and all indirect costs (without regard to the amount of indirect costs that were actually recovered). Direct costs are costs that can be identified with a particular sponsored research project relatively easily, such as the salary of the principal investigator. Indirect costs are referred to officially by the federal government as facilities and administrative (F&A) costs; they are sometimes simply called overhead. Data for all institutions were not available as of March 2009 when these charts were prepared. Audited Office of the President and campus financial schedules report direct research expenditures and do not include indirect costs.
9.1 (continued) Total Research and Development Expenditures, 1996-97 to 2007-08

* Prior to 2000-01, UCOP’s R&D expenditures were included in Berkeley NSF totals. From 2000-01 to 2003-04 they were included in Los Angeles’ NSF totals. Starting in 2003-04, they were reported separately for UCOP.
### Indicator 9.2
Total Research and Development Expenditures, 1996-97 to 2007-08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Year</th>
<th>Universitywide Total (thousands)</th>
<th>All Academic Institutions (thousands)</th>
<th>UC Total as % of All Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996-97</td>
<td>2,698,662</td>
<td>31,327,897</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>2,940,680</td>
<td>32,800,157</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>3,120,720</td>
<td>34,495,255</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>3,436,174</td>
<td>37,010,346</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>3,739,877</td>
<td>39,470,238</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>4,033,325</td>
<td>42,855,971</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>4,314,090</td>
<td>46,347,619</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>4,459,840</td>
<td>48,818,398</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>4,525,526</td>
<td>50,083,847</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>4,588,204</td>
<td>50,592,701</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>4,634,028</td>
<td>50,889,237</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>4,742,949</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Science Foundation Research and Development Expenditures Survey.

- Research expenditures at UC grew about two billion dollars in inflation-adjusted dollars between 1996-97 and 2007-08, increasing about 75 percent over that period.

Note: Figures are in constant 2007-08 dollars, adjusted for inflation. Data include both direct and all indirect costs. Data for all institutions were not available as of March 2009 when this table was prepared.
## Indicator 9.3
### Rankings of Total NSF Research and Development Expenditures, 1996-97 to 2006-07

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Illinois</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Michigan (all campuses)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY at Buffalo</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Virginia (all campuses)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Science Foundation Research and Development Expenditures Survey.
Indicator 9.4
Federal Research and Development Expenditures, 1996-97 to 2007-08

Source: National Science Foundation Research and Development Expenditures Survey.

- Changes in federal research and development (R&D) expenditures at UC closely track changes in federal R&D expenditures at all academic institutions.

Note: Figures are in constant 2007-08 dollars, adjusted for inflation. Data include both direct and reimbursed indirect costs.
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Funds from the federal government account for the majority of UC’s research and development (R&D) expenditures.

Institutional R&D expenditures come from a variety of sources, including state government appropriations, general-purpose awards from industry and foundations, endowment income and unreimbursed indirect costs.

All other sources include awards from nonprofit foundations and voluntary health agencies as well as gifts from individuals that are restricted by the donor to research.

Note: Figures are in constant 2007-08 dollars, adjusted for inflation. Data include both direct and all indirect costs.
9.5 (continued) Research and Development Expenditures by Source, 1997-98 to 2007-08
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The graphs show the Research and Development Expenditures by Source for various campuses from 1997-98 to 2007-08, with categories including All Other Sources, Industry, Institutional Funds, State and Local Governments, and Federal Government.
Indicator 9.6
Federally Funded Research and Development Expenditures by Agency, 2003-04 to 2007-08

Source: National Science Foundation Research and Development Expenditures Survey.

- The majority of federal funds comes from Health and Human Services (HHS) and represents National Institutes of Health (NIH) funding.
- A large percentage of NIH funding goes to institutions with medical schools. Five UC campuses (Davis, Irvine, Los Angeles, San Diego and San Francisco) have medical schools.

Note: Figures are in constant 2007-08 dollars, adjusted for inflation. Agency data include direct costs and reimbursed indirect costs. NSF began collecting information by federal agency in 2003-04.

Key: NSF (National Science Foundation), NASA (National Aeronautics and Space Administration), HHS (Health and Human Services), DOE (Department of Energy), DOD (Department of Defense), USDA (United States Department of Agriculture).
9.6 (continued) Federally Funded Research and Development Expenditures by Agency, 2003-04 to 2006-07
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Indicator 9.7
Number of Patents and Inventions, 1997-98 to 2007-08

Source: UCOP Office of Technology Transfer Annual Reports.

- UC research contributes to the economic prosperity of California. In fiscal year 2008, almost 1,500 new inventions were reported by researchers at UC campuses, more than four disclosures a day.

- Fifty-five new start-up companies were formed in 2008 based on technology from UC campuses. The majority of these were in the medical area.

- Four hundred and twenty four companies were started based on UC technology. Of these, approximately 30 are in the renewable/sustainable energy area.

- Inventions reported are those reported to each of the 10 campuses’ technology transfer office. Foreign patents are not reported here.

- Additional information about UC’s technology transfer programs is available at: www.ucop.edu/ott/genresources/documents/OTTRptFY08.pdf.

Note: These are currently the most readily available and widely used indicators of research output related to technology transfer. There is an effort under way nationally and at UC to develop additional measures of technology transfer success that better reflect the important goal of fostering industry-university relationships. As alternate metrics are developed they will be included in future accountability reports.
9.7 (continued) Number of Patents and Inventions, 1997-98 to 2007-08
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A license agreement grants a licensee access to a university’s invention in exchange for the licensee’s commitment to further develop and commercialize the invention. Utility licenses cover processes, machines, manufactured items and compositions of matter. Plant licenses cover sexually and asexually reproduced plant varieties.

The graphs show the number of licenses in effect at the end of each fiscal year. Each year new agreements are added to the portfolio and some expire or are terminated. In general, the total number of agreements continues to rise each year due to an increase in activity with industry.

Examples of commercialized products arising from UC inventions include Hepatitis-B vaccines, implants for the treatment for intracranial aneurysms, the nicotine patch, diagnostics for human cancer, AIDS virus diagnostics, web browser applets and plug-ins and several internationally distributed varieties of strawberries.
9.8 (continued) Number of Active Licenses, 1997-98 to 2007-08
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Indicator 9.9
Licensing Income, 1997-98 to 2007-08

Source: UCOP Office of Technology Transfer Annual Reports.

- Income from the 25 top-earning inventions accounted for approximately 75 percent of total royalty and fee income.
- By the end of fiscal year 2008, UC held equity in 102 companies acquired under licenses and other agreements involving UC technologies.

Note: Figures are in constant 2007-08 dollars, adjusted for inflation. Total licensing income for fiscal year 2008 does not include upfront payments and reimbursements of $42.6 million from the settlement of litigation. In fiscal year 2006, the University received a $100 million payment as a partial settlement of a patent infringement suit involving bovine growth hormone patents. In fiscal year 2000, the University received a $200 million payment as settlement for a long-standing infringement suit involving the University’s human growth hormone patent. Because of the unique nature and magnitude of these settlements, monies attributable to them are excluded from the Universitywide and San Francisco campus trend data shown here.
9.9 (continued) Licensing Income, 1997-98 to 2007-08

Note: San Francisco’s drop in licensing income since 1997-98 is due in part to the expiration of patents covering the Hepatitis B vaccine, Human Growth Hormone and Gene Splicing inventions.
PART III. Universitywide Indicators with Campus Comparisons

Section 10. Libraries

Goals
The University of California libraries provide access to the world's knowledge for the UC campuses and the communities they serve. In so doing, they directly support UC's missions of teaching, research and public service. For over a century, the goal of the libraries at each UC campus has been to build and manage distinctive collections and provide leading edge information services tailored to the needs of each campus. Over the last decade, libraries have taken advantage of the rapid advances in the development and use of new technologies to create, publish, store, search for and deliver information, with the aim of providing reliable and effective access to information on each campus without having to physically possess and store it.

Measures
These indicators measure library size, impact and vitality. They demonstrate that the University of California has an information resource collection that is truly unmatched in the United States. UC students and faculty are able to take advantage of these resources from any campus in the system, and they do so in larger numbers every year. While impressive, these measures provide an incomplete picture of the UC libraries. Most clearly underrepresented are electronic resources – electronic journals, eBooks, digital reference services and digitized collections – and the extensive use that is made of them online. Only an initial glimpse is available in the number of successful full-text article requests from electronic journals provided by the UC libraries. Future indicators will gauge this increasingly significant part of the UC libraries.
**Indicator 10.1**  
**Association of Research Libraries Rankings of Campus Libraries – UC and Comparison Institutions, 2005 to 2007**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Illinois</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Michigan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY at Buffalo</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Virginia</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The Association of Research Libraries (ARL) is a nonprofit organization of 123 research libraries at comprehensive, research-extensive institutions in the U.S. and Canada that share similar research missions, aspirations and achievements.

- The ranking shown above is an index that the ARL calculates as a summary measure of relative size among the university library members of the Association.

- Critics of the ranking have stated that it fails to account for digital assets, an increasingly important component of research libraries. The ARL rankings also fail to account for the transformative effect of membership in a consortium. Scholars at any one of the three UC campuses that are not ARL institutions — Merced, San Francisco, and Santa Cruz — can and do access the libraries of all the other UC campuses through online services and interlibrary loan.

Note: Stanford withdrew from the ARL in 2004.
Indicator 10.2
Library Holdings in Volumes by Campus – UC and Comparison Institutions, 2007

Source: ARL (Association of Research Libraries) Statistics. For Merced, San Francisco and Santa Cruz (the non-ARL campuses), data are from the UC Libraries’ Annual Statistics reports (www.slp.ucop.edu/stats).

- As a system, UC had almost 33 million volumes in 2007, including duplicates. As a point of comparison, the Library of Congress has more than 32 million cataloged books and other print materials.

- The numbers shown above include locally purchased electronic books. Electronic books are full-length books that are available for reading online. Typically, the books can also be printed for reading offline, based on purchase and licensing agreements.
Indicator 10.3
Use of Interlibrary Loan (ILL) within the UC System, 2000-01 to 2007-08


- ILL occurs when a student or faculty member identifies an information resource he or she wishes to use but which is physically located on another UC campus. The scholar can immediately request the item online. The item will be delivered to the scholar’s home campus, typically within two days.

- ILL is part of the strategy that puts the full depth and breadth of the UC libraries at the fingertips of our students and faculty at every campus.
### Indicator 10.4
**Electronic Journal Usage within the UC System, 2005-06 to 2007-08**

#### Usage of Electronic Journals (Partial Statistics)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005-06</th>
<th>2006-07</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Electronic Journals Represented</td>
<td>5,303</td>
<td>6,408</td>
<td>6,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful Full-text Article Requests from Selected Electronic Journals</td>
<td>16,349,822</td>
<td>22,216,183</td>
<td>22,683,504</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: California Digital Library.

- Electronic journals are digital publications that are licensed by the UC libraries and made available to students and faculty for online reading, downloading and saving.

- A successful full-text article request is a download of an article from an electronic journal onto a personal computer or other device. Students and faculty can read, download, save and print hundreds of thousands of scholarly articles using their own networked computers or library workstations.

- The numbers above, while large, are incomplete. They represent less than one third of the journals licensed systemwide by all 10 campuses. In addition, they do not include downloads of articles in journals that are not licensed by all 10 campuses.

- The Association of Research Libraries (ARL) is still in the process of determining its methodology for collecting these types of data. Once this is settled, it will be possible to provide comparative statistics across institutions.
Indicator 10.5
Students Participating in Library Classes, Tours and Presentations – UC and Comparison Institutions, 2004-05 to 2006-07

UC and Comparison Institutions


- Campus librarians teach research skills, provide library orientation tours and offer class presentations, either in or outside the library.

- Stanford is not listed because it withdrew from the ARL in 2004. Harvard is not listed because it declined to provide data for this particular measure.
PART III. Universitywide Indicators with Campus Comparisons

Section 11. Campus Rankings

Goals
Although limited in scope and often biased in one direction or another, indices that rank universities can give an indication of their overall academic quality. Rising in a particular ranking scheme is clearly not one of UC’s strategic goals, however, rankings do allow institutions to assess their performance relative to their peers in a way that is often very public.

Measures
This section reports college rankings for the UC campuses and their comparison institutions from six different ranking schemes: the 1995 National Research Council, The Center for Measuring University Performance at Arizona State University, U.S. News and World Report’s Best Graduate Programs, U.S. News and World Report’s Best National Universities, U.S. News and World Report’s Top 50 Public National Universities and the Academic Ranking of World Universities from Shanghai Jiao Tong University in China. Importantly, regardless of the purpose of a particular ranking scheme or its focus, methodology or underlying value structure, the academic strength and excellence of the UC campuses shines forth.
## Indicator 11.1
National Research Council’s Ratings of Doctoral Programs – UC and Comparison Institutions, 1995

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Number of Programs Rated</th>
<th>Number of Programs Ranked in Top 10 on Faculty Quality</th>
<th>Percent of Programs Ranked in Top 10 on Faculty Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total UC</strong></td>
<td><strong>229</strong></td>
<td><strong>78</strong></td>
<td><strong>34%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Illinois</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Michigan</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY at Buffalo</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Virginia</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Considered the “gold standard” of academic quality rankings, the National Research Council’s (NRC) assessments of research-doctorate programs are the most comprehensive and respected evaluations of Ph.D. programs in the United States.
- In 1995, the NRC assessed doctoral programs in 41 fields of study at 274 universities.
- The NRC data are not normalized for faculty size, resulting in lower rankings for smaller programs.
- The 1995 ratings are the most recent. The NRC plans to release updated ratings in 2009.
Indicator 11.2
The Top American Research Universities from The Center for Measuring University Performance – UC and Comparison Institutions, 2005 to 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Measures in Top 25 (max = 9)</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Illinois</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Michigan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY at Buffalo</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Virginia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The Center for Measuring University Performance at Arizona State University ranks the top American research universities (defined as those with at least $20 million in research expenditures) into two tiers: 1-25 and 26-50.

- The center constructs its lists by ranking institutions on nine measures: total research expenditures, expenditures on federally funded research, endowment assets, annual giving, National Academy members, faculty awards, doctorates granted, postdoctoral appointees and SAT/ACT scores. The center weights all nine variables equally and groups institutions into a tier according to how many times they rank in the top 25 (or top 50) on each of these measures. Those that score in the top 25 on at least one measure fall into the top tier.

- Unlike the National Research Council or *U.S. News and World Report*, the center relies exclusively on objective measures and does not include academic reputation in its ranking scheme. However, its rankings are biased toward institutions with large medical centers since these attract a disproportionate amount of funding from the National Institutes of Health which is responsible for the majority of research funding distributed by the federal government (see Indicator 9.6). The data also are not normalized by faculty size, resulting in lower rankings for smaller institutions.
## Business

**Ranking Among Top 20 Programs Nationally**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Michigan</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Virginia</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</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>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Education

**Ranking Among Top 20 Programs Nationally**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Michigan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Engineering

**Ranking Among Top 20 Programs Nationally**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Illinois</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Michigan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</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>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Law

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Michigan</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Virginia</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Medicine: Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Michigan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Medicine: Primary Care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Michigan</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Continued on next page.
11.3 (continued) *U.S. News and World Report’s* Professional Program Rankings – UC and Comparison Institutions, 2000 to 2009

- *U.S. News and World Report* (*USNWR*) has annually ranked professional programs in business, education, engineering, law and medicine since 2000.

- An institution may not be reported in the list above for a number of reasons: it may not have a program in the designated area, or its program may have fallen below 20 in *USNWR’s* graduate program rankings in 2009.

- *USNWR’s* professional program rankings are sometimes criticized for being somewhat arbitrary and relying on small sample sizes.

Note: *USNWR* labels its rankings for the prospective year; the 2009 rankings were published in March 2008. 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 be reviewed by *USNWR*. 
### Indicator 11.4

**U.S. News and World Report’s America’s Best National Universities – UC and Comparison Institutions, 1999 to 2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Among National Universities</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Illinois</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY at Buffalo</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Virginia</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- *U.S. News and World Report’s* college rankings are the oldest and most highly publicized of all college rankings. The rankings are based on seven major variables: peer assessment, graduation and retention rates, faculty resources, student selectivity, financial resources, graduation rate performance and alumni giving rate.

- *USNWR’s* Best National Universities’ rankings tend to favor wealthier private institutions over public research universities. Private universities tend to score higher than public universities on four indicators: graduation rates, faculty resources, financial resources and alumni giving rates, which count for 55 percent of a school’s total score.

- Historically, *USNWR* has only ranked institutions in its 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> tier (generally those ranked 100 or higher). In 2009, it published rankings for its 3<sup>rd</sup> tier schools as well.

- San Francisco is not ranked because it is a graduate health sciences campus, and Merced, which opened in 2005, is too new to be included in the rankings.

Note: *USNWR* labels its rankings for the prospective year; the 2009 rankings were published in August 2008.
### Indicator 11.5

*U.S. News and World Report’s America’s Top 50 Public National Universities – UC and Comparison Institutions, 1999 to 2009*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Illinois</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Michigan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY at Buffalo</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Virginia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- This ranking follows *USNWR*’s list of Best National Universities, only with the private universities excluded.
### Indicator 11.6

**Shanghai Jiao Tong University’s Academic Rankings of World Universities – UC and Comparison Institutions, 2006 to 2008**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ranking among World</td>
<td>Ranking among U.S.</td>
<td>Ranking among World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Universities</td>
<td>Public Universities</td>
<td>Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>4 1</td>
<td>3 1</td>
<td>3 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>42 16</td>
<td>43 16</td>
<td>48 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>44 17</td>
<td>45 17</td>
<td>46 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>14 3</td>
<td>13 2</td>
<td>13 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>102-150 31-40</td>
<td>102-150 31-40</td>
<td>101-151 31-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>13 2</td>
<td>14 3</td>
<td>14 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>18 6</td>
<td>18 6</td>
<td>18 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>35 11</td>
<td>35 11</td>
<td>36 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>102-150 31-40</td>
<td>102-150 31-40</td>
<td>101-151 31-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>25 8</td>
<td>26 8</td>
<td>26 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>21 7</td>
<td>21 7</td>
<td>21 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY-Buffalo</td>
<td>201-300 57-78</td>
<td>203-304 57-77</td>
<td>201-302 61-76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>102-150 31-40</td>
<td>102-150 31-40</td>
<td>95 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>1 n/a</td>
<td>1 n/a</td>
<td>1 n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>5 n/a</td>
<td>5 n/a</td>
<td>5 n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>3 n/a</td>
<td>2 n/a</td>
<td>2 n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale</td>
<td>11 n/a</td>
<td>11 n/a</td>
<td>11 n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Shanghai Jiao Tong University in China annually ranks the world's top 500 universities using several indicators of academic or research performance, including alumni and staff winning Nobel Prizes and Fields Medals, highly cited researchers, articles published in two leading scientific journals (*Nature* and *Science*), scholarly citation indices and the per capita academic performance of an institution.

- The ranking of World’s Best Universities has become increasingly more influential, in part because it relies upon carefully selected indicators and upon internationally comparable data that can be cross-checked and verified.

- The ranking is based almost entirely on measures of research strength. Institutions with strong research programs, especially in the sciences, tend to score higher than those whose major strengths are in the arts, humanities or social sciences.

- English-speaking, and especially U.S. universities, top this list of the World’s Best Universities.
PART III. Universitywide Indicators with Campus Comparisons

Section 12. Budget, Finance and Development

Goals
The University seeks to develop stable and growing sources of revenues, including a strong investment from the state, and to utilize these revenues in a strategic and cost-effective manner. These goals are critical; achieving them enables the University to maintain the quality of its teaching, research and public service activities, meet the state’s workforce and other needs, and remain accessible to all eligible California students independent of their financial means.

The University leverages billions of dollars in state, federal and private funding to promote discovery of new knowledge and fuel economic growth. Major financial strengths include a diverse source of revenues, including those from the state of California, student fees, federally sponsored grants and contracts, medical centers, private support and self-supporting enterprises.

Private support underscores the continued confidence among donors in the quality of the University’s programs and the importance of its mission.

Measures
Total revenue and expenditure data presented here come primarily from the University’s Corporate Financial Reporting System (CFR), which supports the University’s audited financial statements. Also provided are estimated per-student average educational expenditures. Additional information about the University’s budget may be found at:

www.ucop.edu/budget/pubs.html.

The development data cover trends in private support at UC and its comparison institutions, donor restrictions on support and endowment per student. The Treasurer of the Regents prepares an Annual Report on Endowment Investment that comprises Regents and campus foundation endowment funds; see www.ucop.edu/treasurer/foundation/foundation.pdf. More detailed information about private support will be forthcoming in the Annual Accountability Sub-Report on University Private Support, which will be presented to the Regents in January 2010.
University revenue consists of funds from a variety of sources. State support remains most crucial, representing a critical investment making it possible to attract funds from other sources, such as federal research grants and private gifts.

In 2007-08, 28 percent of University revenue was generated from contracts and grants, including the DOE laboratories. Another 30 percent was generated from medical center operations and auxiliary enterprises, while state appropriations and student fees generated 25 percent of total revenue.

Note: Figures are in inflation-adjusted constant 2007-08 dollars. Because of accounting changes, comparable data prior to 2003-04 are not available.
Note: The Davis, Irvine, Los Angeles, San Diego and San Francisco campuses operate medical schools and teaching hospitals, which are a source of additional funding and help these campuses attract additional contract and grant revenue.
Indicator 12.2  
Expenditures by Function, 2003-04 to 2007-08

The University’s core mission activities – instruction, research and public service – accounted for 39 percent of total expenditures during 2007-08.

More than half of the University’s instructional expenditures are funded from state support.

Support activities, including libraries, other academic support, student services, administration and operation and maintenance of plants, were 18 percent of total expenditures.

The medical centers and auxiliary enterprises, which are self-supporting, accounted for 28 percent of expenditures, while student financial aid was 2 percent of the total.

Note: Figures are in inflation-adjusted constant 2007-08 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. DOE Laboratories are expenditures associated with the University’s Department of Energy Laboratories. Beginning in 2007-08, changes in accounting rules for reporting retiree health benefits resulted in a significant increase in the University’s reported expenditures.
12.2 (continued) Expenditures by Function, 2003-04 to 2007-08

Note: The Davis, Irvine, Los Angeles, San Diego and San Francisco campuses operate medical schools and teaching hospitals, which help these campuses attract additional contract and grant revenues and generate corresponding expenditures.
Indicator 12.3
Per-Student Average Expenditures for Education, 1998-99 to 2007-08

Source: UC Budget and Capital Resources.

- Since 1998, average inflation-adjusted expenditures for educating UC students have declined 23 percent.

- Throughout UC’s history, the state subsidy has been the largest component of educational spending, providing a critical base of permanent support. However, since 1998, the state’s share of expenditures has fallen 31 percent.

- Over the nine-year period shown above, the student share of total educational expenditures, net of financial aid, rose from 26 to 31 percent. Since 1990 the student share, net of financial aid, has more than doubled, from 13 to 31 percent.

- The University has struggled to meet the challenges presented by this substantial decline in state funding. Certain elements of the educational, research, and public service functions have been steadily eroded in order to preserve the core missions of the University. It is unrealistic to assume that cuts of this magnitude sustained over time will not undermine the University, the California economy, and individual students’ chances for educational advancement.

Note: Figures are in constant inflation-adjusted 2007-08 dollars. Figures exclude health science instruction.
An institution’s endowment represents money or property that has been donated over the years, usually with the stipulation that it be invested with only the returns on the investment being spent. This allows the donation to have a much greater impact over a longer period of time than if it were spent all at once.

- The total value of an institution’s investments is referred to as the institution’s endowment. The payout rate refers to how much is spent annually. UC’s payout rate is set annually by Regents’ Policy.

- As of June 30, 2008, the Regents and the campus foundations together held approximately $9.6 billion in endowment funds for the University of California, resulting in approximately $45,000 in endowment funds per student on a systemwide basis.

- The elite private schools have sought gifts for endowment for generations and educate far fewer students, resulting in significantly greater number of endowment dollars per student.

- Public schools such as UC have relied on state support in the same way that private schools have relied on endowments. However, in the past 20 years the endowments at UC’s private comparison institutions have grown substantially while UC’s state support has failed to keep pace.
12.4 (continued) Endowment Funds per Student – UC and Comparison Institutions, 2007-08
Indicator 12.5
Total Endowment and Endowment Funds per Student, 1996-97 to 2007-08

Universitywide

Endowment Market Value (Inflation-adjusted dollars)
Endowment per Student (Inflation-adjusted dollars)

Source: UCOP Institutional Advancement Office.

- UC endowments, along with those of all public and private institutions, have declined substantially since June 30, 2008 when the data shown above were compiled.

- The Regents’ endowment spending policy uses average returns over a 60-month period when calculating the payout so that beneficiaries are not substantially affected by a single year’s market decline. This policy has the desired effect of smoothing the payout for beneficiaries during the coming year, although a sustained market decline would significantly reduce payout amounts.

- About 20 percent of UC’s endowment payout is directed for specific departments, 14 percent for research, 20 percent for instruction (including endowed chairs and professorships) and 25 percent for student financial support.

- Chair endowments have grown significantly; 30 percent of UC’s 1,370 endowed chairs have been established in the last four years.

Note: Figures are in constant inflation-adjusted 2007-08 dollars.
12.5 (continued) Total Endowment and Endowment Funds per Student, 1996-97 to 2007-08

[Graphs showing endowment and endowment per student for Berkeley, Davis, Irvine, Los Angeles, Merced, Riverside, San Diego, Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz, and San Francisco.]
About 98 percent of UC’s endowment funds have restrictions placed upon them by the donor. For example, 27 percent of UC’s total endowment dollars are restricted to student aid.

In 2007-08, UC received $376 million in new endowment gifts.

In 2007-08, payouts of about $350 million from UC’s endowments provided support to UC campus programs. For example, over $90 million was distributed to students from privately funded scholarships.

Note: Figures are endowment values as of June 30, 2008. In addition to the funds listed above, UC manages an additional $400 million in general endowment pool assets for a total endowment portfolio of about $9.6 billion as of June 30, 2008.
These data demonstrate the value of fundraising campaigns. In 2000-01, Berkeley completed a $1.3 billion campaign. In 2004-05, Los Angeles completed a $3 billion campaign and UCSF completed a $1.6 billion campaign. In 2006-07, San Diego completed a $1 billion campaign.

One of the goals of every campaign is to set a higher base level of support for the campus in the years following the campaign.

Gift volume at UC is influenced by the age of the campus, the size of the surrounding community and the number of health science programs, which attract almost half of all private support.

Campus development programs are at different states of maturity.

Note: The University of Illinois does not report separately for its campuses. Figures are in constant inflation-adjusted 2007-08 dollars.
Indicator 12.8
Total Annual Private Support, 1997-98 to 2007-08

Source: UCOP Institutional Advancement Office.

- Campus foundations are the fundraising arm of the University and operate under University policy. The first two were developed at Berkeley and UCLA beginning in the 1940s when their campus alumni associations began to raise funds for scholarships.

- In the 1960s, the missions of these two campus foundations were broadened to seek private support for all campus-related activities, and foundations subsequently were established at all campuses.

- Campus foundations may hold and invest endowments as well as funds functioning as endowments; gift funds and endowment payout must be transferred to the Regents for expenditures.

- As campus foundations have developed and matured, the balance of gifts, particularly for endowment, has been shifting from the Regents to the foundations.

Note: Figures are in constant inflation-adjusted 2007-08 dollars.
In 2007-08, UC received approximately $1.6 billion in new gifts. About 77 percent of that went to support current needs and 23 percent was designated to go into UC’s endowment.

Approximately 98 percent of gifts UC received in 2008 had donor restrictions; only 2 percent did not. In contrast, Harvard and Stanford received 8.9 and 4.6 percent in unrestricted gifts, respectively, according to the 2008 Voluntary Support of Education Survey. The limited amount of unrestricted gift support that UC receives may be influenced by donors’ preference to give to specific programs that may not be supported by state funds.

The percentage of gifts devoted to the different areas (research, capital improvements, etc.) varies from year to year. However, the percentages reflected in the chart above are typical.

Roughly half of all gift support received by the system is directed to the health sciences.
PART III. Universitywide Indicators with Campus Comparisons

Section 13. Capital Resources and Sustainability

Goals
The University is the steward of substantial capital resources and strives to be a good steward of all the resources entrusted to its care.

The state of California provides funds for facilities, such as classrooms and laboratories, which support the University’s core mission of teaching, research and public service. These facilities represent about half of the University’s capital resources. The other half of the University’s capital stock includes facilities for self-supporting enterprises, such as hospitals, dormitories and parking structures, which are not eligible for state support.

Environmental sustainability was recently established by the Regents as an institutional priority for the University of California. As expressed by the Regents, “sustainability refers to the physical development and institutional operating practices that meet the needs of present users without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs, particularly with regard to use and waste of natural resources.” Guided by these principles, the University of California is transforming its business practices to reduce its environmental impact.

Measures
This section includes measures on the amount of space maintained by the University, capital renewal needs, greenhouse gas emissions, energy use, green buildings and waste diverted from landfills. Sustainability impacts every area of university operations, so it is difficult to represent UC’s sustainability performance in a few indicators. Moving forward, better data collection systems will be launched that will allow for standardized information about campus sustainability performance and facilitate benchmarking between peer institutions.

Readers seeking a complete list of UC’s sustainability-related goals and implementation procedures may refer to the UC Policy on Sustainable Practices, which is posted on the UC systemwide sustainability website (www.universityofcalifornia.edu/sustainability/about.html).

For additional information on UC’s sustainability-related accomplishments, see the Annual Sustainability Report to The Regents, available at the systemwide sustainability website (www.universityofcalifornia.edu/sustainability/reports.html).
The state of California generally provides funding for the operation and maintenance of facilities that support the University’s core mission of teaching, research and public service. These facilities include buildings that house programs and departments classified as academic, professional, administrative, academic support, dedicated research and public service.

Currently, about half of the University’s facilities are eligible for state operation and maintenance support. However, as a result of its continuing fiscal difficulties, the state has not provided this support for much of the new state-eligible space that has come on line in recent years.

The remainder of the University’s facilities are either self-supporting auxiliaries (such as hospitals, student dormitories and parking garages), are supported by student fees (such as recreational facilities and student health services) or are supported on some other basis (such as alumni services and natural reserves).

Note: Data above include space leased by the University, which is about 3 percent of the total.
13.1 (continued) Space and Facilities, Fall 2001 to 2008
Indicator 13.2
Capital Renewal – Projected Needs and Actual Spending, 1998-99 to 2012-13

Source: UC Budget and Capital Resources and Facilities Infrastructure Renewal Model (FIRM).

- Capital renewal investment is required when a capital system (such as a building’s heating and air conditioning system, roof or plumbing system), or an infrastructure system (such as a campus utility distribution system) reaches the end of its projected useful life.

- The University’s capital renewal needs are expected to increase significantly over the next decade. At the same time, no ongoing systematic funding is available to address these needs. The state has provided no dedicated funding for capital renewal or deferred maintenance since 2001-02, though some campuses have allocated a portion of state capital construction funds for this need.

- In tracking capital renewal needs, campuses assess the condition of building systems as they reach the end of their projected useful life. Based on this assessment, the useful life of a system may either be extended or moved to the deferred maintenance backlog. Previous estimates put the backlog of high-priority deferred maintenance at $800 million. Analysis is being done to refine this estimate, which may be significantly higher. Without adequate capital renewal funding, the University’s deferred maintenance backlog will continue to grow.

Note: UC’s Facilities Infrastructure Renewal Model (FIRM) is a budget model that assumes standard life cycles and costs for renewing infrastructure and building systems and projects those costs for a 50-year period, with ongoing updates on the condition of facilities provided by the campuses. Data are for state-maintained and funded spaces only. Dollar figures have been adjusted for inflation.
The University has undertaken a comprehensive program of seismic evaluation and correction since 1979.

Corrective work has been completed in more than 230 structures comprising more than 16 million gross square feet (GSF). The cost of this work, in nominal dollars (not adjusted for inflation), has been about $1 billion, excluding Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) funding.

Seismic correction for another 3.8 million GSF is currently in progress, at a cost of more than $1.6 billion.
13.3 (continued) Seismic Retrofitting Progress, 1979 – 2008

Berkeley

- Completed: 62%
- In Progress: 5%
- Remaining Educational: 24%
- Remaining Auxiliaries & Other: 9%

Davis

- Completed: 51%
- In Progress: 43%
- Remaining Educational: 2%
- Remaining Auxiliaries & Other: 4%

Irvine

- Completed: 85%
- In Progress: 12%
- Remaining Educational: 2%
- Remaining Auxiliaries & Other: 3%

Los Angeles

- Completed: 67%
- In Progress: 5%
- Remaining Educational: 26%
- Remaining Auxiliaries & Other: 2%

Riverside

- Completed: 92%
- Remaining Educational: 0%
- Remaining Auxiliaries & Other: 3%

San Diego

- Completed: 92%
- In Progress: 7%
- Remaining Educational: 0%
- Remaining Auxiliaries & Other: 1%

San Francisco

- Completed: 16%
- In Progress: 9%
- Remaining Educational: 5%
- Remaining Auxiliaries & Other: 5%

Santa Barbara

- Completed: 66%
- In Progress: 27%
- Remaining Educational: 5%
- Remaining Auxiliaries & Other: 2%

Santa Cruz

- Completed: 68%
- In Progress: 32%
- Remaining Educational: 0%
- Remaining Auxiliaries & Other: 0%

(Merced opened in 2005-06 and has no retrofitting needs.)
Indicator 13.4
Greenhouse Gas Emission Levels and Reduction Targets

Through its Policy on Sustainable Practices, UC has pledged to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions to year 2000 levels by 2014, and to 1990 levels by 2020. These goals are consistent with the targets established by the Global Warming Solutions Act, which Governor Schwarzenegger signed into law in 2006.

UC campuses are developing plans to achieve these targets and the University will track progress on an ongoing basis.

Some UC campuses have committed to more aggressive reduction targets.

Campuses report emissions publicly through the California Climate Action Registry (www.climateregistry.org/CARROT/public/reports.aspx) and the American College and University President’s Climate Commitment (http://acupcc.aashe.org).

Note: These charts show the tons of carbon dioxide-equivalent (CO₂e) associated with purchased electricity and natural gas and onsite fuel combustion. This is an initial measurement; future inventories will also include greenhouse gas emissions generated from faculty/staff/student commuting and university-funded air travel. Year 1990 and 2000 baselines are estimates based on the best available data and calculation methods. Baselines are subject to refinement when better data become available or inventory protocols improve. Data are not available for 2005 and 2006 for all campuses; therefore a Universitywide statistic could not be computed for those years.
Note: Berkeley’s goal is to reach the 1990 level by 2014. Los Angeles’s emissions goal is to meet the 2000 level by 2011. Campus data include the medical centers (except Davis, which is campus only). Future data from Davis will include the medical center.
A building's energy consumption per square foot (also known as energy intensity) varies greatly depending upon its functional use. For example, laboratories, data centers and hospitals are inherently more energy-intensive than classrooms and offices. UC buildings are typically designed for a variety of functional uses, including laboratories classrooms and offices.

The proportion of energy-intensive space on UC campuses has increased over the last 10 years, masking the progress that campuses have made in reducing the energy intensity of existing facilities. Because the available data do not normalize for functional use, weather or growth, it should be used for gross comparisons only.

Per the UC Policy on Sustainable Practices, the University has set a goal of reducing its growth-adjusted energy intensity to 1999 levels by 2014. However, it is difficult to precisely determine how close a campus is to meeting this goal with current tracking methods. Development of new tracking methods have been initiated and will be included in future reports.

Note: kBTU is a measure of electric and natural gas energy usage. Data are self-reported by each campus. In future years, UC will extract data from the Purchased Utilities Database, which is currently under development. Data are for state-maintained and funded spaces only (i.e., excludes auxiliary and fee-supported space, such as parking, residential and medical facilities).
13.5 (continued) Energy Use in State-Maintained Buildings, 1999-00 to 2006-07
Indicator 13.6  
Green Buildings – Completed and Planned, Cumulative to 2008

Source: UCOP Budget and Capital Resources.

- Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) standards were developed by the U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC). They are the internationally recognized benchmark for high-performance “green” buildings.

- UC projects are third-party certified by the USGBC or are reviewed through an equivalent internal UC certification process.

- Per the UC *Policy on Sustainable Practices*, the University has committed to constructing and renovating all buildings to a LEED-certified level, or equivalent. New UC construction and renovation projects set LEED (or equivalent) targets at the time of budget approval.

Note: LEED is a registered trademark. Completed LEED projects are listed in the USGBC database of LEED-certified projects; green building targets for projects in design or construction are campus reported.
13.6 (continued) Green Buildings – Completed and Planned, Cumulative to 2008

**Completed Projects**

- Platinum Certified
- Gold Certified
- Silver Certified
- Base Certified (= UC Goal)

**Planned Projects - New Construction**

- Platinum Certified
- Gold Certified
- Silver Certified
- Base Certified (= UC Goal)

**Planned Projects - Renovation**

- Platinum Certified
- Gold Certified
- Silver Certified
- Base Certified (= UC Goal)
Indicator 13.7
Waste Diverted From Landfills, 2007-08

UC Campuses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>2008 Goal</th>
<th>2012 Goal</th>
<th>2020 Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Campus-reported waste diversion rates.

- The waste diversion goals are set by the UC Policy on Sustainable Practices. While voluntarily adopted by UC, these goals are consistent with the California State Agency Integrated Waste Management Plan.

- UC strategies employed to divert waste from landfills include composting, recycling and reuse.

Note: The waste diverted from landfills at each campus excludes hazardous waste and medical waste.
PART III. Universitywide Indicators with Campus Comparisons

Section 14. Health Sciences and Services

Goals
The University of California operates 15 health science schools and offers advanced professional degrees in medicine, nursing, dentistry, optometry, pharmacy, veterinary medicine and public health. The University also operates five medical centers at Davis, Irvine, Los Angeles, San Diego and San Francisco. Together, UC’s health sciences professional training programs and its associated hospitals constitute the fourth largest health care delivery system in California. Between UC’s health science training programs, direct patient care activities, health research and contracts and grants, about half of the University’s operations are health-related.

UC’s health sciences and services programs have the following goals:
- educate and train the next generation of healthcare professionals;
- conduct research to improve health care and advance life-saving technologies; and
- provide high-quality care to the people of California.

Measures
The measures in the following pages focus on the five UC medical centers and the patient care they provide. These metrics are standard performance indicators used by the health care industry to measure the amount of inpatient and outpatient services provided and the complexity of illnesses treated.

A number of other relevant indicators are located elsewhere in this report. Indicators about the University’s health care professional education programs are contained in Section 6, which focuses on graduate and professional students. Health science faculty awards are contained in Section 7. Rankings of top medical schools in research and primary care are in Section 9. Information on health science research expenditures and development activities are in Section 12.

Additional information about the Division of Health Sciences and Services at the Office of the President is available online (www.ucop.edu/hss). The Final Report of the Advisory Council on Future Growth in Health Professions provides information about health science enrollment planning (www.ucop.edu/hss/documents/rprt_jan2007.pdf). Future accountability reports will provide a fuller description of the broad sweep of the University’s activities in health sciences and services.
Indicator 14.1
Hospital Inpatient Days, 2003-04 to 2007-08


- “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 by the type of insurance the patient has.

- Statewide, UC’s five medical centers accounted for 4 percent of inpatient days of low-income patients, i.e., those with Medi-Cal or without insurance.

- Typically, low-income patients (i.e., those covered by Medi-Cal, under county health programs or uninsured) are cared for at county hospitals. The Davis, Irvine and San Diego medical centers are located in counties that have no county hospitals. Consequently, these three medical centers see many more low-income patients.

- The Davis medical center accounts for about 26 percent of low-income patient days in Sacramento County, the Irvine medical center accounts for about 16 percent of low-income patient days in Orange County, and the San Diego medical center accounts for about 10 percent of low-income patient days in San Diego county.
14.1 (continued) Hospital Inpatient Days, 2003-04 to 2007-08

- Davis Medical Center
- Irvine Medical Center
- Los Angeles Medical Center
- San Diego Medical Center
- San Francisco Medical Center
Indicator 14.2
Outpatient Visits, 2003-04 to 2007-08


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

- The 3.5 million outpatient clinic visits at the UC medical centers account for 8 percent of the state’s total number of outpatient visits.

- The five UC medical centers combined represent 5 percent of the visits by California’s Medi-Cal and uninsured patients. Because of their location in areas without county hospitals, some UC medical centers treat a higher percentage of the underserved in their home counties.
14.2 (continued) Outpatient Visits, 2003-04 to 2007-08

- **Davis Medical Center**
- **Irvine Medical Center**
- **Los Angeles Medical Center**
- **San Diego Medical Center**
- **San Francisco Medical Center**

The charts show the trend of outpatient visits from 2003-04 to 2007-08 for each medical center.

UC Annual Accountability Report  May 2009
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, and this translates to more resources used by the hospital and higher cost. An average hospital scores 1.0 on the index.

In addition to primary and specialty care, UC hospitals provide cancer care, burn care, minimally invasive procedures, organ transplants and robotic surgery. They also provide technologically sophisticated care, such as life-saving surgeries to treat brain tumors, procedures to repair heart damage and use of nanotechnologies in the treatment of children.

In addition, the UC medical centers treat patients transferred from other hospitals that have exhausted all efforts and consider UC to be hospitals of last resort.
PART III. Universitywide Indicators with Campus Comparisons

Section 15. Educational Extension

Goals
UC Extension programs complement the University's core research and teaching missions, disseminating research, facilitating technology transfer and promoting academic innovation, often in partnership with campus faculty. UC Extension goals are to contribute significantly to fulfilling the University's land-grant mission, presenting a diverse array of public educational programs and activities while remaining completely self-supporting. While the typical UC Extension student is a mid-career, degreed working professional seeking focused, career-related continuing education, the program also aims to provide extensive educational opportunities and access for California's diverse and multi-lingual population.

Measures
UC Extension uses qualitative as well as quantitative indicators to measure success. These include student reports of the impact of Extension educational programs on their professional and personal lives, regional impacts of university-community partnerships created by Extension professionals addressing community issues and value returned to teaching and research programs of other campus academic units through UC Extension programs and partnerships. Each campus Extension program addresses the needs for continuing and professional education in its own geographic region. The need varies in a way that is reflected in the data.

Note: The data reported in this section do not include either program or registration data on Continuing Medical Education (CME) programs, which are entirely separate from the campus Extension programs.
Indicator 15.1
Number of Continuing Education Programs, 2002-03 to 2007-08

- **Professional Credit**: Programs that provide Senate-approved academic credit, most often in the X400 and X300 professional course series.

- **Degree Credit**: Programs leading to formal UC degree credit, developed and presented in partnership with campus faculty and graduate degree programs.

- **Professional & General Non-Credit**: High-quality, specifically targeted 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 academic credit.
15.1 (continued) Number of Continuing Education Programs, 2002-03 to 2007-08

- Berkeley
- Davis
- Irvine
- Los Angeles
- Riverside
- San Diego
- Santa Barbara
- Santa Cruz

(Merced has not established an Extension program yet.)

(San Francisco does not have an Extension program.)
A substantial “economic multiplier” is associated with regional economic impacts from Extension programs and activities at every campus. A recent study of UCLA Extension programs, for example, estimated an annual contribution of $250 million to the regional economy, 70 percent of which is attributable to students’ increased earning power after completing an Extension program.
15.2 (continued) Continuing Education Registrations, 2002-03 to 2007-08

(Merced has not established an Extension program yet.)

(San Francisco does not have an Extension program.)
PART IV Campus Profiles
California’s Investment in Berkeley

Grand aspirations built this university more than 140 years ago when Berkeley, the flagship institution of the University of California system, was established. The goal was to create an institution with attributes “equal to those of Eastern Colleges,” what today are called the Ivy League schools. This new university not only would educate students but also serve and assist the people of California. As a public research university, Berkeley was charged with seeking new knowledge and discovery to serve the public interest, and providing Californians access to its excellent educational opportunities. Public research universities are pivotal in realizing society’s potential for opportunity, innovation, social justice, and prosperity — extending the public good for the benefit of all. Today, Berkeley is recognized as a leader among the world’s universities in offering true breadth, access, and comprehensive excellence.

As UC’s oldest campus, Berkeley is home to many historic sites, including South Hall (the first UC building, constructed in 1873), Hearst Greek Theatre (1903), California Hall (1905), Hearst Memorial Mining Building (1907), the Campanile (1914), Doe Library (1917), and Wheeler Hall (1917). The campus has many world-class research museums, field stations, and other research centers, along with a library collection that ranks as one of the best in the nation. In 2007 the Association of Research Libraries ranked Berkeley’s library among the top five university research libraries in North America. Its rare and specialized collections, such as the Bancroft Library’s Mark Twain Papers and Project (the world’s largest collection of Twain materials), serve educators and scholars from around the state and the world. In addition, the Berkeley Art Museum has diverse collections of more than 13,000 works, and the Pacific Film Archive includes 10,000 films. Berkeley also offers the Bay Area top-quality performing arts through Cal Performances and other theater and music programs, science programs for young people at the Lawrence Hall of Science, an athletics program with 27 intercollegiate sports and many Olympic athletes, and hundreds of workshops, lectures, and symposia that are free and open to the public.

California’s investment in Berkeley has paid off: the campus has been an engine of innovation. Breakthroughs and new ideas from Berkeley include the discovery of vitamins E and K; development of the flu vaccine; isolation of the human polio virus and the gene associated with breast cancer; design of the first cyclotron to support medical research; draft of the first no-fault divorce law; development of the UNIX computer operating system; the concept of open-source software; invention of the ground-fault interrupter to protect from electric shocks; and discovery of planets beyond our solar system. Berkeley also holds a place on the periodic table —
Berkelium is one of 10 transuranium elements first synthesized by Nobel laureate and later chancellor Glenn T. Seaborg — a distinction unmatched by any other university.

**Berkeley accomplishments in just the past year include:**

- Berkeley was ranked the top public university nationally for undergraduate education. (*U.S. News & World Report*, 2009)
- Berkeley provided access to more Pell Grant recipients (typically undergraduates from families with incomes below $45,000) than all the Ivy League schools combined.
- Berkeley awarded more Ph.D.s than any university.
- More graduate-student winners of prestigious National Science Foundation (NSF) Fellowships chose to attend Berkeley than any other university.
- Berkeley’s young faculty scientists tied with those at Harvard to win more Sloan Research Fellowships than professors at any other university. Also on Berkeley’s faculty today are seven Nobel laureates and several hundred members of the National Academies of Education, Engineering, and Sciences, plus recipients of other top national and international honors.
- In total research and development expenditures, Berkeley ranked second to MIT among institutions without a medical school.
- President Obama named Berkeley professors Steven Chu (Secretary of Energy) and Christina Romer (chair of the Council of Economic Advisers) to top posts in his administration.

**The Berkeley Difference**

Among Berkeley’s hallmarks are an unmatched breadth and depth of academic programs; comprehensive excellence is a campus priority, with academic and research programs consistently leading the nation in science and engineering, humanities and the arts, social sciences, and in a range of professional schools. Faculty members and students engage with great effectiveness in multidisciplinary, collaborative approaches across all of these fields, discovering new clean energy resources, abating global poverty, mitigating life-threatening diseases, reducing conflict, and exploring other frontiers not yet imagined. In addition, Berkeley supports and celebrates great individual scholarship, and basic research carried out at Berkeley yields discoveries whose impact is transformative, not just incremental.

Berkeley offers degrees in 14 schools and colleges, focusing on letters and science (arts, humanities, and physical, biological, and social sciences), business, chemistry, education, engineering, environmental design, information, journalism, law, natural resources, optometry, public health, public policy, and social welfare.
Undergraduate students may choose from more than 100 academic programs, each presenting different educational opportunities and experiences; each year, some 13,000 undergraduate classes, labs, and sections are taught. Berkeley’s undergraduate program has been ranked the best at any public university in the United States for more than 10 years by U.S. News & World Report. For Berkeley’s graduate students, 96 doctoral, 87 master’s, and 32 professional-degree programs span all schools and colleges, where each year more than 8,000 graduate courses are offered. In its comprehensive studies of American graduate programs, the National Research Council has consistently ranked Berkeley among the top in nearly every discipline. More recently, in U.S. News & World Report’s graduate-program rankings in business, education, engineering, and law, Berkeley placed in the top 10 in each discipline.

Berkeley’s faculty is among the finest in the world. With 20 Nobel laureates since 1939 among their numbers, Berkeley’s professors have garnered distinctions that cross disciplines, ranging from four Pulitzer Prize winners and a U.S. Poet Laureate to three recipients of the Fields Medal in mathematics. Though Berkeley has no medical school, its faculty includes 11 elected members of the Institute of Medicine and 13 Howard Hughes Medical Institute investigators. In addition, Berkeley honors its own with nearly 400 endowed chairs (25% of the faculty). The campus also hosts some 1,100 postdoctoral fellows, in the last five years a 50% increase of talented scholars choosing to study at Berkeley.

At Berkeley, all faculty — from the most junior to the most senior — teach, and students are the direct beneficiaries of the excellence of Berkeley’s programs and professors. They choose Berkeley for the opportunity to be taught by some of the world’s best. They can hear journalism professor Michael Pollan (author of The Omnivore’s Dilemma) discuss food politics, biochemical engineering professor Jay Keasling explain his breakthroughs in synthesizing an inexpensive cure for malaria, or MacArthur Foundation “genius” fellowship winner and history faculty member Maria Mavroudi outline Greek and Arabic cultural interaction in the Middle Ages. Such professors are among many at Berkeley who are creating new paradigms in their fields, and bringing that excitement to the classroom.

A Berkeley education, however, extends beyond coursework. Students also learn from the diversity of their peers, from the international mix of the campus community, and from the campus’s continuing tradition of cutting-edge activism. Home to the Free Speech Movement in the 1960s, Berkeley has also been a leader in disability rights and studies, ethnic studies, and gender and women’s studies. It is the first campus to have a vice chancellor dedicated to promoting equity and inclusion. And for many students, commitment to activism and service
does not end with graduation: as one example, more Berkeley graduates have joined the Peace Corps than graduates from any other college campus.

**Berkeley’s Mantra:**
**Access and Excellence**

Berkeley provides a unique educational experience that prepares students to live in an increasingly global and multicultural society. The campus is no ivory tower; it is part of the world, and it reflects an amazing breadth and diversity in its academic pursuits and in the students who come to Berkeley to prepare to be tomorrow’s leaders.

**Undergraduate student experience**

Berkeley lives up to its promise as a public university by providing access to this educational experience for more than 25,000 undergraduate students (more than three times the number educated by Stanford, Harvard, or Berkeley's other private peers). Berkeley graduates more undergraduates who go on to earn Ph.D.s than any other university in the nation. In educating such a large number of students so well — and at a fraction of the cost of attending its elite, private peer universities — Berkeley provides a transformational experience for its students and an effective conduit for economic advancement, both for individual students and for California.

Admission to Berkeley is highly competitive; 21.6% of its more than 48,000 freshmen applicants are admitted, as are 26.1% of approximately 12,300 transfer applicants. Of the 6,273 new students for Fall 2008, 68% entered as freshmen and 32% as transfers. Of the freshmen entrants, 87% graduated from public high schools, and 90% of transfers came from California community colleges. The students who enroll are the best of the best, often ranking at the top of their high-school class and community colleges, with a broad range of leadership and diverse life experiences that greatly enhance the academic experience Berkeley offers. In the UC Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES, Spring 2008), 89% of Berkeley’s graduating seniors said they were satisfied with their overall academic experience, 84% agreed Berkeley had a strong commitment to undergraduate education, and 85% were satisfied with the value of their education for the price they had paid.

Berkeley is proud of its multidimensional undergraduate diversity. Its pledge is to serve California students, and today 90% of its undergraduates are California residents. To expose these students to perspectives and experiences from beyond the state, 7% of undergraduates come from 48 other states, and 3% are international students, representing more than 80 countries. Berkeley undergraduates come from various ethnic backgrounds.
backgrounds: 42% are Asian/Pacific Islander, 31% white, 12% Chicano/Latino, 3% African American, and 1% American Indian. Within those categories is an even wider range of ethnicity and cultural diversity. In addition 53% of undergraduates are women.

Undergraduates also come from diverse economic backgrounds. Asked by UCUES in 2008 to characterize their own family economic status, 2% of undergraduates said they were wealthy, 29% upper-middle or professional-middle class, 37% middle class, 20% working class, and 11% low income or poor. Berkeley and UC are committed to providing access to qualified students, regardless of their means. As early as 1897, Berkeley offered financial aid to deserving students with financial need; today, nearly one-third of Berkeley’s undergraduates come from families earning less than $45,000 a year, and 30% will be the first in their families to graduate from a four-year college. Low-income students receive need-based scholarships and government grants.

As members of such a diverse student body, 86% of undergraduates say they feel they belong at Berkeley and believe students of different backgrounds are respected on campus. Berkeley’s diversity is an important element in educating students to be citizens and leaders in a complex state and global environment, and it is a unique aspect of the Berkeley experience. Reinforcing this educational value, every undergraduate must take at least one American Cultures course, offered in more than 40 departments to introduce students to the many cultures of the U.S. through a comparative framework. The American Cultures curriculum has been recognized as a national model for its integrative and comparative analyses of race, culture, and ethnicity in the United States. Its courses represent a unique departure from existing approaches to teaching about diversity in the United States. Instead of focusing on one or two ethnic groups, American Cultures courses at Berkeley explore the complexity of ethnicity, culture, and pluralism, and their influences on the ways that Americans think about themselves and approach the issues and problems that confront our society.

No matter where students are from or what experiences they bring, most succeed at Berkeley: the first-year retention rate for freshmen is 97%, for transfer students 94%, and the six-year graduation rate for freshmen and the four-year graduation rate for transfers both stand at 90%. (Graduation rates have increased significantly over time; 20 years ago, Berkeley’s was 74% for freshmen and 70% for transfers.) Of those who graduated in 2007–08, the freshmen time-to-degree was four years and for transfers 2.2 years, including students with both single and multiple majors. By the time they graduate, Berkeley students report significant increases in their understanding of a specific field and in their analytical and critical thinking skills (two measures that apply to all academic programs): 78% of graduating students surveyed in UCUES rated their understanding of a specific field as very good or excellent, up from 5% at entry, and 82% measured their analytical and critical thinking skills as good or excellent, up from 21% at entry.

Because of the diversity of Berkeley’s academic programs, it is difficult to develop a single set of metrics to measure educational outcomes. The campuswide Undergraduate Student Learning Initiative is supporting academic departments in establishing education goals and evaluation procedures for all undergraduate programs. Discipline-specific and faculty-driven, the initiative
provides a framework for each department to generate its goals organically, as part of the faculty’s ongoing dialogues about curricula. To date, 70% of programs have completed drafts articulating their desired outcomes for students, and another 20% are working on those drafts now.

In 2007–08, almost 7,000 students received a bachelor’s degree from Berkeley. Berkeley’s 2008 Career Destination Survey shows that 23% of graduates enroll directly in graduate school, 56% begin full-time employment, and 21% pursue other endeavors the year after graduation. Almost 80% intend to earn a higher degree at some point (24% doctorate, 20% master’s, 13% medical degree, 12% business, and 10% law).

The ultimate value of a Berkeley undergraduate education is the impact it has on the intellectual and personal lives of students. The unparalleled Berkeley campus environment reinforces people’s connections to one another, and Berkeley research, teaching, and service chart ways for students to give back to society and change the world. Asked to name their educational goals, Berkeley undergraduates say they want more than skills for future employment. UCUES responses show that students appreciate the opportunity to establish their personal values and code of ethics, and to learn the importance of service to their community. Last spring, 87% of undergraduates said that if they had to choose a university again, they would choose Berkeley.

**Graduate student experience**

Graduate students play a critical role in the success of research and undergraduate education at Berkeley, and their excellence is a key contributor to Berkeley’s worldwide prestige and leadership. The outstanding quality of Berkeley’s graduate students is a prime incentive in attracting the best faculty to the campus — and in keeping them at Berkeley despite frequent attractive offers from other top institutions. Engaged and innovative thinkers, Berkeley’s graduate students are prized by faculty as up-and-coming colleagues who collaborate on research and scholarly projects; as insightful young scholars whose ideas show professors new possibilities in their fields; as essential instructors to guide and engage undergraduates in labs and discussion sections; and as lively participants in advanced courses and seminars, where professors explore subject areas in greater depth. Graduate students routinely extend the boundaries of scholarly work with original insights, analyses, and creations. As researchers they often make significant advances in a given field, develop knowledge that has real-world applications, or lay the foundation for a major breakthrough that will come later in their careers. Eighteen Nobel laureates and 28 National Medal of Science recipients hold graduate degrees from Berkeley.

Berkeley’s graduate program is also highly competitive; only 16% of the more than 34,000 applicants are admitted, and several departments have an admission rate as low as 5%. Over half of those admitted choose
to enter Berkeley for graduate studies; their decision is based in part on the financial-aid package universities are able to offer, and Berkeley competes with better-endowed private peers in enrolling new Ph.D. students. In 2004 the UC Office of the President’s Admit Survey showed that only 45% of admitted doctoral students rated the level of financial support they were offered by Berkeley as excellent or good, compared to a 74% rating for peer universities. Furthermore, in the 2008 Graduate Division Midpoint Survey, only 59% of Ph.D. students said they were satisfied with the financial support they received at Berkeley. Berkeley is in the midst of an ambitious fundraising campaign to increase its endowment for graduate fellowships, allowing the campus to offer higher levels of financial assistance to recruit outstanding graduate students.

Berkeley graduate students make up about 30% of Berkeley’s total student body; 41% of them are master's students and 59% are doctoral students. They come from across the country and around the world: almost 20% of those in graduate programs are international students, from 95 countries. Of the domestic students, approximately 44% are white, 18% are Asian/Pacific Islander, and 10% are underrepresented students (African-American, American Indian, and Chicano/Latino). Women make up 45% of all graduate students at Berkeley.

Enthusiastic, engaged, and innovative, graduate students provide an important bridge between the faculty and undergraduates. Graduate students make a vital contribution as teachers and mentors to undergraduates, sharing their knowledge and insights in the classroom and in office hours. They assist in many lower-division courses for which they have a particular enthusiasm — courses that are usually among the core requirements for majors. This teaching collaboration between faculty and graduate students gives undergraduates a rich educational experience and launches many graduate students on teaching careers of their own. Spring 2008 UCUES data shows that 88% of graduating seniors were satisfied with graduate-student teaching, compared to a 93% satisfaction rate with faculty teaching.

Graduate students are also attentive mentors, helping undergraduates build self-confidence and discover their intellectual selves. They are role models for undergraduates looking toward academic and professional careers. It is not surprising that undergraduates often seek out their graduate-student instructors for one-on-one help with course matters, as well as with academic, career, and even personal advice.

Over the past 10 years, Berkeley has awarded more doctoral degrees than any other university (according to NSF statistics). In 2007–08, Berkeley awarded 865 Ph.D.s and 2,406 master’s and other professional degrees. Doctoral graduation rates have increased dramatically since the 1970s, from 49% to 61% today; master’s graduation rates have steadily improved from 75% to 88% over that same period. Time-to-degree
measurements have stayed relatively consistent since the 1970s, with recent rates at 6.8 years for those who earned Ph.D.s and 2.1 years for master’s recipients.

Berkeley placement data show that, while many graduate students come from other states or nations, many choose to stay in California for their first job. A net gain of 50% more Ph.D.s are in California, thanks to what some call the “brain gain” — non-Californians who earn a Ph.D. at Berkeley and stay to work in California. This influx of Berkeley doctoral-degree recipients is a huge benefit to the California economy, in terms of both taxes received from the higher salaries of workers with advanced degrees and of the multiplier effect of innovation, new businesses, and emerging technologies developed by these Berkeley graduates.

The NSF Survey of Earned Doctorates, which tracks career plans of doctoral students, shows that many doctoral students do not have jobs at graduation. However, Berkeley’s placement survey, administered a year after graduation, paints a fuller picture. For Ph.D. students graduating between 2001–02 and 2005–06, almost 60% were employed in an academic setting (a college, university, or national laboratory); 20% in business; 6% in government, K-12 education, or hospitals; 5% in other areas or self-employed; and 9% unknown. Of those employed in an academic setting, 40% were already in tenure-track faculty positions. For arts and humanities and social-science Ph.D. students, placement in academic careers was highest; in these broad areas, 72% were employed at a college or university in their first year, and 56% were already in tenure-track positions.

As with undergraduates, Berkeley graduate students report high satisfaction rates with their academic programs. The 2008 Graduate Division Midpoint Survey found that 88% of Ph.D. students were satisfied with their graduate academic program, and 89% indicated they would choose Berkeley again for graduate studies.

### Serving the Public and Our Community

Berkeley’s contributions to society can also be seen through the volunteer activities of its faculty and students.

**Student Service**

- EACH YEAR, more than 4,000 Cal students do volunteer work
- BERKELEY IS THE ONLY university that has produced more than 3,000 Peace Corps volunteers
- A QUARTER OF A MILLION Californians benefit from more than 200 community service programs at UC Berkeley and 300,000 public-service hours contributed annually

Along with teaching and research, public service is a cornerstone of the UC mission. Faculty members make a broad range of public-service contributions at the international, national, state, and local levels. They serve on government panels and committees, where their expertise aids in solving many of society’s most complex problems, from energy to transportation, and from public health and healthcare to urban design and planning, among many others. The Graduate School of Education plays an active role in K-12 education; faculty contribute to teaching at CAL Prep, Berkeley’s charter school in Oakland; the school runs the Principal Leadership Institute, preparing leaders for K-12 public schools; and the Cal Teach Program supports math, science, and engineering students interested in becoming K-12 math and science teachers. Public-service programs also abound in the arts at Berkeley; an example is the Young Musicians Program, providing year-round private music instruction to exceptionally gifted low-income students, at no cost to their families. Part of an array of programs reaching out to young people through Berkeley’s Center for Educational Partnerships, this program relies on support from the Berkeley music faculty.
Each year, thousands of Berkeley students do volunteer work. The Cal Corps Public Service Center connects students with many campus programs that serve the community and provide service-learning opportunities. Some examples include Berkeley United in Literacy Development (BUILD), which provides literacy and math tutoring to K-8 youth in Berkeley and Oakland; Coaching Corps, which trains students through youth sports organizations; and Greening Berkeley, inspiring student involvement in environmental issues through volunteer opportunities in local neighborhoods.

**Return on an Investment in Research**

In every field its people pursue, Berkeley is a leader in research. One measure of this leadership is the confidence placed in Berkeley’s faculty and research programs by federal, state, and private entities that award funds for research. These research dollars are expressed annually at all universities as “research and development expenditures.” Among universities with no medical school, Berkeley ranks second, behind the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, in total research and development expenditures. Among all universities, Berkeley ranks fourth in research and development expenditures, when medical research expenses are excluded and expenditures for Berkeley faculty that are administered through the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) are included. (Two caveats are necessary in considering R&D expenditures. First, figures for universities with medical schools combine both the medical-school and academic research expenditures; Berkeley does not have a medical school. Second, many Berkeley professors conduct their research through LBNL; those dollars are not included in standard reporting.)

Investment in university research is in large measure responsible for the phenomenal increase in output of the North American economy over the past five decades. Berkeley’s academic breadth and depth are a major advantage in its success at multidisciplinary research that both grows the California economy and addresses complex issues facing society. Basic research — the quest for new knowledge, new understanding, and new discoveries — will always be a staple of Berkeley’s endeavors. But equally exciting are the possibilities that have emerged through an assortment of interdisciplinary research efforts. Among them are programs with limitless potential for the public good; the following are a few of many:

- Energy Biosciences Institute, working to create clean, sustainable sources of energy and address climate change,
Blum Center for Developing Economies, examining real-world solutions to combat poverty,

QB3 (California Institute for Quantitative Biosciences), developing solutions to the world’s most urgent biological problems,

CITRIS (Center for Information Technology Research in the Interest of Society), creating IT solutions for pressing social, environmental, and healthcare problems,

Berkeley Stem Cell Center, uniting scientists, physicians, and humanities and legal scholars committed to this new technology,

Center for Computational Biology, supporting advances in computational methods and genomics that will aid the development of medical treatments,

Helen Wills Neuroscience Institute, advancing our understanding of the brain and disorders that affect it,

Berkeley Center for New Media, analyzing and helping shape new media from the perspectives of design, information technology, and communication,

Berkeley Diversity Research Initiative, focusing on the nature of multicultural societies and the ways they flourish and benefit their members,

Center for Global Metropolitan Studies, merging work in a dozen departments studying issues in cities around the world,

Berkeley Nanosciences and Nanoengineering Institute, expanding research and educational activities in this booming field,

Greater Good Science Center, working toward the scientific understanding of positive emotions and behaviors, including happiness, compassion, and altruism, and

Berkeley Institute of the Environment, bringing together hundreds of faculty and students who are addressing the planet’s most critical environmental challenges.

**Economic Impact**

California’s is the seventh largest economy in the world, and Berkeley has long been an engine for its growth. Its research, graduates, and public-service programs contribute to job creation, economic development, and a better quality of life for all Californians.

The economic impact of the campus is deep in the Bay Area. In 2007–08, UC Berkeley spent more than $1.6 billion in a combination of salaries ($933 million), goods and services ($444 million), and construction ($214 million) — 81% of this spending was in the Bay Area. A stable source of jobs for the region, the campus employed 25,700 people in 2007–08, making it one of the largest employers in the area and the
largest in the East Bay. Berkeley’s spending in the region has generated an additional 13,100 jobs for other Bay Area residents. In addition, Berkeley alumni have founded or lead hundreds of California companies, including Intel, Chiron, Google, Gap, PowerBar, and Sun Microsystems, and alumni are leaders in academia, the arts, industry and business, technology, and government.

Berkeley’s Challenge for the Future

Berkeley faces challenges to maintaining its leadership in higher education and research, and has identified five key goals for the coming years to help address them:

1. Twenty years ago, Berkeley received roughly half of its funding from the state, and today state support — the campus’s general funds — has dropped to less than 30% of the budget. Berkeley must develop a sustainable funding model to maintain its academic excellence, while continuing to provide access to students from all economic backgrounds. Private giving is one part of that model: The Campaign for Berkeley is on pace to raise $3 billion by mid-2013 to support faculty, research, student financial aid, undergraduate education, facilities, and programs.

2. Berkeley’s highest priority is to maintain its academic excellence, and that starts with continuing to recruit and retain the best faculty, in spite of competition from private peers such as Harvard, MIT, Princeton, Stanford, and Yale. Further, the campus must provide competitive salaries to its outstanding staff members, who play a key role in the success of campus programs and operations.

   Today, an additional $26.5 million per year would be needed to bring Berkeley’s faculty salaries up to the average of private peers. Additional monies are needed for facilities, laboratories, and other support when new faculty are hired; these start-up funds average $340,000, ranging from $65,000 to $1.325 million. In 2007–08, Berkeley had 1,480 ladder-rank faculty, significantly fewer than its budgeted number; the campus has had to leave faculty positions unfilled, using the money saved to pay competitive salaries to retain current professors and start-up costs to launch the careers of promising new scholars. A generous $113 million gift from the Hewlett Foundation is a major step toward addressing this issue; The Campaign for Berkeley is seeking matching funds to endow 100 faculty chairs, and by Spring 2009 the campus is half-way to that goal.

3. As a public university, Berkeley is committed to remaining financially accessible to qualified undergraduates, regardless of their means, and to providing financial support to graduate students, competitive with what they can receive at private universities. During this time of fiscal constraints, Berkeley chose not to cut its undergraduate enrollment, in order to provide access to California’s deserving students. Approximately 40% of undergraduates receive loans and have an average debt of $14,453 when they graduate. Projections show that without action, the amount undergraduates are expected to pay each year through loans, work-study, or family contributions (self-help) could nearly double in 10 years, from about $8,500 a year now to $16,400. Berkeley is working through several avenues to keep self-help in check.

   For doctoral students, their decision to enroll at Berkeley can be determined largely by the offer of financial support they receive. In a 2004 UC survey, of the newly admitted doctoral students who said that the amount of financial support offered was “extremely important,” only 19% enrolled at Berkeley when the campus’s offer of aid was $1,000 or less than that of a peer
institution. However, 88% chose Berkeley if the offer was $1,000 or higher than that of another top school.

The Campaign for Berkeley aims to raise $300 million to endow undergraduate scholarships and financial aid and $340 million to endow new graduate-student fellowships.

4. As the oldest UC campus, Berkeley must improve its aging physical infrastructure, including addressing seismic upgrades, deferred maintenance, and technology issues. Many seismic retrofits have been completed in the last decade, and the campus goal is to complete 63.6% of seismic projects by June 30, 2010. With more than 725 buildings, 17 million gross square feet of interior space, and 15 million square feet of land, Berkeley's instructional and research space and systems are in need of reinvestment. State formulas used in the past for capital funding are outdated and disadvantage older campuses like Berkeley. With a significant portion of the capital budget going to seismic upgrades, additional funds must be identified. Today, Berkeley is able to spend only $5 million a year on a list of $600 million in deferred-maintenance projects. In addition, today courses and research initiatives reach around the world through Web-based video, audio, and teleconferencing; to ensure all segments of the campus can reap future benefits of information technology, Berkeley needs a sustainable funding model that would provide $10 million annually for this need.

5. Berkeley has a long and proud tradition of supporting equal rights, and the campus has made equity and inclusion one of its highest priorities. The new Vice Chancellor for Equity and Inclusion is responsible for developing and implementing a 10-year strategic plan to address equity for women and underrepresented groups among faculty, students, and staff. Specific goals include eliminating inter-group disparities in enrollment, retention, and graduation rates of undergraduate and graduate students; reducing inter-group disparities in hiring and retention of faculty; improving knowledge-sharing between the university and local communities; and improving the perception and experience of the university by underrepresented communities in California.

As the top-ranked public university in the nation, Berkeley holds a singular place in American higher education. Its plans for the future are ambitious: maintain Berkeley's excellence and extend its leadership, broaden its interdisciplinary research contributions, assure equity and inclusion for all, and ensure access for qualified students. Even in difficult economic times, the campus will continue to do the hard, creative work to make progress on all of these fronts — and to sustain Berkeley as a precious asset for California and resource for the world.

Photos and quotes are courtesy of the “Thanks to Berkeley...” PhotoBooth project of The Campaign for Berkeley. The entire collection from the project is online at campaign.berkeley.edu.
Introduction

One hundred years ago, UC Davis was founded to reinforce the University of California's mission of creating new knowledge to address the vital needs of a growing state. From these pioneering roots in agriculture and food science to the comprehensive array of today’s academic disciplines and research interests, UC Davis has always honored its land-grant heritage. In the supportive character of its undergraduate education, its interdisciplinary graduate groups and research endeavors, and its innovative partnerships within the state, the nation and indeed the globe, UC Davis' leadership role as an exemplar land-grant research university is integral to the campus’s essence, its distinctions, and its international reputation. This commitment of doing what matters, strengthened by the campus’s breadth and prestigious academic caliber, defines its place as a transformational educational model and forms the backbone of its near-term and long-range goals. Indeed, today UC Davis touches everything that matters to us as human beings. From our health to the economy, to what we eat and drink, to how we experience and interpret life, UC Davis has impact through teaching, research and public service. For 100 years, we have prepared and inspired students and discovered solutions to some of society’s most pressing problems. As we look to the future, we address those things that matter most to California in order to transform the world.

Undergraduate Student Profile

UC Davis undergraduates are highly motivated students who actively embrace a foundation of learning, discovery and engagement. Our students are known for embracing their academic goals, engaging in learning internships and dedication to public service. They attach relatively high importance to acquiring a well-rounded general education and obtaining the knowledge and skills they need to pursue their chosen careers. UC Davis students are more likely to identify with students who are serious about getting good grades. Significantly, more than 50 percent of our students work on a research project with a faculty member in the course of their undergraduate education. Each year, more than 6,000 students complete internships locally, nationally and internationally, as they apply their academic experiences to “real-world” situations. Nearly 500 students study at 150 host institutions in 35 countries around the world, and the Peace Corps ranked UC Davis 21st among all large universities in producing Peace Corps volunteers.

Undergraduate Student Experience and Proficiencies

Today more than 31,000 of the brightest, most diverse and well-rounded students in the nation are studying at UC Davis. A typical student might spend the morning experimenting in a chemistry lab, the afternoon playing club lacrosse and the evening performing on the stage of the Mondavi Center for the Performing Arts. By taking advantage of one of the nation's largest university internship programs and our international education programs, our students are making the world their classroom.

UC Davis students are prepared for any post-baccalaureate choices, whether in the workforce, graduate studies or professional school. Most freshmen complete their bachelor’s degree in just over four years, and surveys show the majority of those pursuing a postgraduate degree
attending their first-choice or second-choice institution. UC Davis leads the nation in graduate and undergraduate education in the biological sciences, topping the charts in numbers of doctoral and bachelor's degrees conferred. One in every 276 Californians is a UC Davis graduate, and nearly 6,000 UC Davis alumni teach in our schools' classrooms.

To be sure, UC Davis students take their physical well-being as seriously as their academics. More than 45,000 people participate each year in group exercise classes and personal training sessions, and more than 20,000 people participate each year on more than 2,200 intramural sports teams.

**Undergraduate Access**

UC Davis is a highly selective campus. For Fall 2008, UC Davis had 40,625 freshman applicants with a 53 percent admit rate, and 8,220 transfer applicants with a 71 percent admit rate. UC Davis prides itself on accepting UC-eligible economically disadvantaged students; more than half of the 2008 admitted freshmen came from low income and/or are first-generation students. Almost 75 percent of the admitted transfer students are first-generation and/or from low-income families. UC Davis not only succeeds in recruiting a diverse student population, but it continues to improve the retention and success of its students. There is a 90 percent first-year retention rate for freshmen and 86 percent retention rate for transfer students. There is an 81 percent six-year graduation rate for freshmen and an 84 percent four-year graduation rate for transfer students.

UC Davis reviews all applications using our specific admission criteria. For freshman applicants, the strength of the high school record is the single most important component, followed by performance on standardized test scores and other criteria, such as demonstrated leadership, special talent and individual initiative. For transfer applicants, academic performance and preparation for the selected college and major are considered first and foremost. In some cases, personal characteristics, experiences and circumstances will be considered.

UC Davis offers a wide range of services, advising and retention programs that foster access to the university for prospective students, enable the academic success and timely graduation of current students and help smooth the transition from the university to the worlds of work, continuing education and civic participation. These activities include the campuswide Transfer Student Task Force; the development of additional housing options for transfer, graduate and international students; support for collaborative retail and student support programs with the Los Rios Community College District; and attaining support for student scholarships.

Diversity is one of our greatest strengths, and UC Davis combines all the benefits of a world-class university with a relaxed atmosphere. Student services support our students’ varied cultural, religious and personal backgrounds while more than 450 student organizations embrace a wide range of additional interests. From 26 NCAA Division I sports (14 for women, 12 for men) and the UC system’s most comprehensive breadth of recreation/leisure programming, to the arts and other creative pursuits, we’re proud of the balance our campus provides between academics and recreation. International students enrich the UC Davis campus community with their cultural and academic experiences. The campus attracts more than 450 undergraduate students from around the world.

**Undergraduate Affordability**

At UC Davis, our aim is to make a college education affordable for all students regardless of their families’ financial situations. Students and their parents will be expected to contribute a
certain amount toward fees and cost of living; we have a number of financial aid and scholarship resources available to assist in meeting expenses. Our Financial Aid Office provides information and resources to help students with their financial needs while they pursue their academic goals. Approximately 64 percent of all UC Davis undergraduates received some form of financial aid, including scholarships. UC Davis also offers many options for students who need to work while attending college. These include the Student Employment Center, the Internship and Career Center and the Associated Students of UC Davis (ASUCD) job listing service.

Undergraduate Student Success

UC Davis students compete successfully for coveted places in premier graduate programs throughout the world. Our biological sciences students have gone on to Harvard, our economics students have gone on to the London School of Economics, and our engineering students to MIT. From astronauts to a former U.S. Secretary of Agriculture to an editor at *Newsweek*, UC Davis alumni have built remarkable careers. According to recent surveys, 70 percent of working alumni report that they are in positions moderately or highly related to their chosen field. A large majority (90 percent) felt that they were more than adequately or very well prepared. Approximately 37 percent of 2004-05 graduates pursued a postgraduate degree or credential within one year of graduating from UC Davis. Nearly three-quarters of these felt more than adequately or very well prepared for their postgraduate education. Also, 53 percent of 2001-02 graduates pursued a postgraduate degree or credential within four years of graduating from UC Davis. About 64 percent of 2004-05 graduates were employed full-time within one year of graduating from UC Davis. An additional 12 percent were employed part-time by choice. Full-time employed graduates reported a mean salary of $40,500.

Transfer Student Success

In recent years, the campus has dedicated increased attention and resources to the matriculation of transfer students from California’s community colleges to the UC campuses. UC Davis plans to take advantage of its established partnerships with community colleges to grow the enrollment of these students over time. The campus will base its specific strategies on the upcoming recommendations of a joint Academic Senate and Administration Task Force on Transfer Students, whose preliminary findings focus on community college transfer programs and UC Davis/community college relationships, advising processes, increases in guaranteed student housing options, and targeted student support services. The campus also intends to use its unique relationship with the Los Rios Community College District to build the first-ever community college education center on a UC campus, as a part of the new West Village development. Discussions are underway regarding the potential for providing student housing and student service options to facilitate increased transfer rates of Los Rios students to UC Davis. Other community colleges within a 30-mile radius of UC Davis may also be included in these types of arrangements.

Graduate Student and Professional Student Profile

Graduate students are essential to UC Davis’ success as a preeminent research university. Engaged in innovative research and sharing their knowledge in the classroom, graduate students are at the heart of the university’s life and mission. Annual enrollments of more than 4,000 include a diverse and interactive student body of about 1,000 from around the world.
Known for its state-of-the-art research facilities, interdisciplinary research, productive laboratories and progressive spirit, UC Davis offers collaborative and interdisciplinary curricula through graduate groups and designated emphasis options – with nearly 90 dynamic degree programs. UC Davis grants among the largest numbers of doctoral degrees in the biological and life sciences among all U.S. universities. The Chronicle of Higher Education, the National Research Council and U.S. News & World Report consistently rank UC Davis’ doctoral programs among the top in the nation. UC Davis master’s and doctoral graduates become leaders in their fields – researchers, teachers, politicians, mentors, and entrepreneurs. Graduates go on to guide, define and enhance the creation of our social, cultural and scientific fabric and well-being.

**Faculty**

UC Davis students are taught by faculty members who are leaders in their respective fields and who address some of today’s most pressing challenges: West Nile virus, environmental stewardship, immigration issues, food safety, autism and cleaner fuel technologies. From building California into an agricultural powerhouse to melding dance and theatre into a new art form, our faculty members and their students continue to transform the state, the nation and the world.

And they have earned prestigious honors along the way. UC Davis is home to two Pulitzer Prize winners, 21 members of the National Academy of Sciences, eight members of the National Academy of Engineering, four members of the Institute of Medicine, a Howard Hughes Medical Institute Early Career Scientist, 14 members of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, two members of the American Academy of Arts and Letters and, internationally, three members of the Royal Society of London, two members of the North American Academy of the Spanish Language (affiliated with the Royal Spanish Academy), one member of the Academie de France and one member of the Academy of Athens.

Why have so many prominent faculty members chosen UC Davis? It is a great place to teach, a great place to learn, and a great place to learn more about teaching and learning. The campus takes pride in providing the highest quality education for students and in encouraging teaching effectiveness and instructional innovation. Across more than 8,000 classes a quarter, UC Davis instructors use a combination of traditional and new approaches to engage diverse students in challenging academic and professional study. The campus not only values and rewards good instruction, it also supports workshops, consultation, and faculty-to-faculty teaching networks necessary for continuing inquiry, evaluation and instructional improvement. The campus supports a much-utilized Teaching Resources Center (TRC), providing our faculty with one-stop shopping for pedagogical innovations. To support the teaching mission of our faculty, UC Davis offers what is believed to be the single largest teaching prize in the nation, the $40,000 annual prize in Scholarship and Teaching.

**Research**

The Office of Research is the chief administrative unit and a catalyst for advancing research at UC Davis. The vice chancellor is responsible for overseeing all leadership, establishment, development, management and quality of the research programs and for increasing the strength and effectiveness of UC Davis as a major research university. Setting a new record, UC Davis received more than $586 million in research funding in 2007-08, the fourth consecutive year that the total exceeded the half-billion dollar mark. A strong trend in sponsored research programs...
continues across a wide range of disciplines, reflecting the breadth of UC Davis research efforts.

There are four main administrative units within the office: Central Administration; Sponsored Programs; UC Davis InnovationAccess at 1850 Research Park Drive, Davis; and the Institutional Review Board at the UC Davis Medical Center in Sacramento. The Office of Research oversees more than 30 campus research centers, including the California National Primate Research Center, the UC Davis Cancer Center, the California Lighting Technology Center, the Center for Biophotonics Science and Technology, the Institute of Transportation Studies, the John Muir Institute of the Environment, and the UC Davis Energy Efficiency Center.

Rankings

From our undergraduate offerings to our professional schools to the research productivity of our faculty members, UC Davis fares well in nationally recognized rankings. UC Davis – one of 62 North American universities admitted into the prestigious Association of American Universities – is ranked 8th among U.S. universities based on their contributions to society (Washington Monthly), 10th in research funding among U.S. ranked public universities and 16th overall (National Science Foundation), and 12th among national public universities and 44th overall (U.S. News & World Report). Princeton Review included UC Davis as one of 100 higher education institutions on its list of “Best Value Colleges for 2009.” More specifically, UC Davis’ undergraduate program in biological and agricultural engineering is ranked 5th among large national research universities, and its overall undergraduate engineering program is ranked 35th, according to U.S. News & World Report’s 2009 “America’s Best Colleges.” In addition, the magazine acknowledges UC Davis for the diversity of its student body and for the strength of its undergraduate writing program. UC Davis’ student body is the 17th most racially and ethnically diverse among large national research universities, tied with UC Berkeley, according to the magazine. We are proud to be 4th among American universities in the number of international scholars (Open Doors 2008 Report on International Educational Exchange). And, for the 16th consecutive year, U.S. News & World Report has named the UC Davis School of Medicine as among the best in the country for primary care and research in the magazine’s annual list of America’s best graduate schools. Among medical schools, the publication ranks UC Davis as 26th in primary care, tied with Indiana University, Johns Hopkins University, the University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center and Yeshiva University; and 48th in research, tied with the University of Florida.

Finance, Capital and Development

Finance

The campus operating budget for 2007-08 was more than $2.5 billion, funded by revenues that same year of nearly $2.8 billion. The largest fund source was the medical center with a little more than $1 billion in annual revenue. State funds and student fees totaled more than $900 million and the balance of financial support was provided by the federal government, campus sales and service activities, local government and private gifts and grants. In the past 10 years, state support has increased but other fund sources have increased more quickly. Therefore, the percent of the overall budget supported by the state has declined. At present, the state represents about 22 percent of all revenue, or 35 percent of the UC Davis budget exclusive of the medical center. The state of California’s budget shortfall is creating significant challenges for UC Davis.
Capital

To accomplish campus goals, many programs require specialized land and building resources. The 5,300 acres of the Davis campus – the largest in the UC System – include not only core instruction and research buildings but also major structures for animals, greenhouse and other academic support facilities as well as agricultural land used for teaching and research. Because the Davis campus evolved within a rural setting where basic urban infrastructure was not available, the campus operates its own domestic and utility water systems, wastewater treatment plant, and solid waste landfill site in addition to electrical systems and central heating and cooling with related steam and chilled water distribution systems. The 2003 Long-Range Development Plan (LRDP) is the comprehensive policy and land use plan that will guide the development of the Davis campus through the horizon year 2015-16 in support of the teaching, research and public service mission of the University. The LRDP responds to anticipated growth in student enrollment, faculty and staff employment, and UC-affiliated activities on the campus. UC Davis is proud of its environmentally responsible approach to growth, and can claim 11 buildings that are LEED certified, including the UC Davis Tahoe Environmental Research Center at Incline Village, Nevada, which was one of the nation’s first laboratory buildings to achieve LEED Platinum certification. In recent years, we have transformed the campus’s messy olive trees from a waste product to a marketable product – gourmet olive oil.

Development

Founded in 1959, the UC Davis Foundation is led by a volunteer fundraising board that helps to raise and increase philanthropic support, advocates for the university and manages a portion of the university’s endowment. UC Davis received a record $216.8 million in philanthropic support in 2007-08. The foundation receives private gifts to benefit UC Davis, manages its endowed gift funds and other private assets, and advises university leaders in areas related to public trust and support. The endowed funds it manages provide faculty, student and program support in perpetuity.

UC Davis is celebrating 100 years of transforming California and the world. Philanthropic support has helped UC Davis throughout its history, and it is critical to helping the university meet the challenges of the next 100 years. To sustain and build upon our contributions to society, the Foundation is pursuing gifts that will allow us to (1) invest in tomorrow’s leaders; (2) foster unparalleled teaching and research; (3) transform programs and patient care; and (4) seize emerging opportunities.
History of the Campus and a Plan for the Future

The University of California, Irvine, admitted its first class in 1965 following the formal dedication of the campus by President Lyndon Johnson a year earlier. There were 119 faculty members and 1,589 students beginning work on a university still very much under construction on the 1,500-acre campus just three miles from the beach. Only a third of the central ring of buildings planned by architect William Pereira was complete; Irvine was still six years away from incorporation as a city; and the agrarian history of the region was evident in the local orange groves and the cattle grazing next to the campus.

Since then, UCI has enjoyed an unparalleled combination of rapid growth in enrollment and with an equally impressive increase in the size, quality and influence of our research programs, performing arts and professional schools in medicine, business and law. We have secured our place among the best public research universities in the United States with over 1,400 faculty, 22,000 undergraduates and about 5,500 graduate and professional students from California, across the nation, and around the world. UCI is the youngest institution in the Association of American Universities, gaining membership in our thirtieth year. Our faculty includes three Nobel Laureates (including two awarded in the same year, 1995), three recipients of the National Medal of Science, two Pulitzer Prize winners, three MacArthur Fellows, and many members of the most important scholarly, scientific and professional organizations. In 2008 alone, 20 UCI professors were elected Fellows to the prestigious American Association for the Advancement of Science, the most of any university in the United States.

The development of strengths in our academic core disciplines has been pursued through the strategic, differential allocation of resources associated with our growth. Those resources have supported the reinforcement of existing strengths,
encouragement of research and educational programs across disciplinary boundaries, and expansion into new fields. In the past five years, roughly half of our new faculty positions have been devoted to an initiative for Programs of Excellence, a competitive process overseen by a joint committee of the administration and faculty Senate designed to identify programs across the campus at the top of their fields or with the prospect of getting there in a few years. In the last allocation, for example, six proposals resulted in 36 faculty positions being allocated to nine programs. Another portion of our growth resources has been devoted to the creation of programs in selected areas including among others public health, pharmaceutical sciences, nursing, stem-cell research and our new School of Law.

The current budget crisis in the state has forced us to slow or suspend growth in most of these new programs in order to protect and reinforce our core strengths. There are only a few exceptions, such as the law school, where the campus has been reserving resources for years so we could continue the momentum of growth throughout bad economic times. Nevertheless, the eventual development of these new programs and continuing exploration of new fields is crucial to our role as a top-tier comprehensive public research university. These innovations help us and the University of California as a whole meet our commitment to serve the people of the state through the creation and dissemination of knowledge based on research and through the training and support of young researchers in the early stages of their careers. This combination of research and education is the defining characteristic of the University of California in the Master Plan, and it is the integrating principle that unites our whole campus from the laboratories, libraries, and studios of our faculty, post-doctoral scholars and graduate students to the small courses and lively discussions of our Freshman Seminars.

As we approach our fiftieth anniversary in 2015, the end of the rapid growth that has characterized our campus since its beginning will come to an end. Over the next decade, the pace of scholarly and scientific discovery on the campus will continue to accelerate, but increases in undergraduate enrollment will be replaced by growth in our graduate and professional programs as our new schools and degrees are established. Taking advantage of the huge demand for freshman admission to UCI—we have received over 44,000 applications for just over 4,000 spaces for Fall 2009—we aspire to increase the quality of
our student body. In the coming decade, we expect our total enrollment to increase to about 32,000 students, with 25 percent of them in our graduate and professional programs. That enrollment target supports the academic plan for our campus, expands training at the highest level in professional fields that are key to California’s future, and helps meet the enormous demand for admission to UCI. The quality of the new students will reinforce and enhance the high standards we have set and met with our current students, and they will further expand the diverse population of our campus to take advantage of the rich intellectual and cultural resources of California’s multicultural heritage.

Given the vagaries of our state-based funding as a public research university, the pace of this growth will inevitably wax and wane over the next few years. Furthermore, we have now established at least small programs in most of the fields designated for growth in our planning exercises over the past decade. We plan to spend the next few years reinforcing the academic core of the campus and developing strength in those new programs, reconfiguring them into departments and schools as their quality and our resources warrant. Nevertheless, the spirit of innovation that has characterized our campus for over 40 years remains alive and well, and the perception of UCI as meaning “Under Construction Indefinitely” is more apt than ever as the physical infrastructure of the campus expands to support our constantly evolving needs in research and teaching. We are well on our way to providing on-campus housing for most of our faculty, over half of our undergraduates and almost all of our graduate and professional students and post-doctoral scholars. Together, they are creating an intellectual and social community on campus as stimulating as any in the UC system, complementing the extraordinary cultural, social and economic opportunities available in our area.

While enhancing the quality of life on campus, we are also building on our strong collaborative relation with the city of Irvine and Orange County to make UC Irvine not just an educational center but an even more vital part of the social, cultural and economic life of the whole region. Our many lecture series, artistic exhibits and performances, and life-long learning programs attract increasing numbers of people from the community to our campus, and in 2008, UCI’s annual economic impact on Orange County was $4.2 billion. We employ nearly 21,000 people, making UCI the largest employer in Orange County. The recent completion of our new University Hospital—under budget and ahead of schedule—will enable us to improve the quality and accessibility of healthcare for our whole region while improving the education of healthcare providers and bringing new treatments, cures and preventive measures to people all over the world.

Our educational outreach programs touch the lives of all ages in our community. In the arts, for example, the outreach program Creative Connections partners with local schools and arts organizations to share talents and knowledge with students in every grade. Creative Connections introduces children to the arts, prepares middle and high school students for college, and provides adults with active experiential immersion in the arts to help enrich their lives. Another program, Humanities Out There, was founded by the School of Humanities in 1997 and has since been recognized nationally by a $250,000 grant from NEH and an article in Time magazine. HOT has provided graduate students with
opportunities to create lesson plans, shadow veteran teachers, mentor and manage undergraduate tutors, and implement assessment measures. Since 2001, 70 graduate student leaders, primarily from UCI’s Departments of History and English, have worked with over 2,200 undergraduates in delivering curriculum to over 5,100 Santa Ana middle and high school students. A new minor in Civic Engagement will provide additional opportunities for community interaction between our students and the world beyond our campus by offering an interdisciplinary program that seeks to provide students with the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values to engage as citizens and active community members in the 21st century.

To guide us through this important transitional period in the evolution of our campus, UCI initiated a campuswide planning process in 2004 that resulted in our current strategic plan, A Focus on Excellence: A Strategy for Academic Development at the University of California, Irvine, 2005-2015 (available in print and on the Web at http://www.strategicplan.uci.edu/). The plan describes the principal objectives for our campus, establishes specific goals and strategies for reaching them, and assesses the opportunities and challenges we will face in the coming years. More recently, A Focus on Excellence has been used as the basis for more specific planning for each academic unit. It also provided the basis for the strategic map for our current 10-year, $1 billion capital campaign, “Shaping the Future,” which was developed through extensive consultation with faculty and staff, administrative leadership, and community supporters 2005-07. As described in Chancellor Michael V. Drake’s presentation to the Regents in February, 2009, the campaign has identified four high-priority initiatives that build on existing strengths in research and teaching on the campus:

- Health
- Energy and the environment
- Global cultures and economies
- Educating tomorrow’s leaders

On campus, in the surrounding community and throughout the region as a whole, we strive in word and deed to become known for our values-based decision making, to have our values define and describe us, and to continually work to create a culture and atmosphere of rewarding those who live the values. The vision behind our plans for the future is comprehensive in the connections it establishes among the various activities that make up a great university. It is realistic in its assessment of diminishing public support for research universities nationwide but also in its appreciation of the deep generosity and sustained commitment of our supporters in the community. Most of all, it is ambitious, as it must be to build on the original vision and aspirations that made UCI what it is today. The future it portrays is clearly within the reach of a university that has already accomplished so much in its brief history and that is bold enough to declare that accomplishment only the beginning.
Undergraduate Student Success

(Remarks in this section and those below cite data from the following sources available on the Web from UCOP and/or UCI’s Office of Institutional Research: “Statistical Portrait of UC Irvine” (www.oir.uci.edu/campus/uci-statistical-portrait-v20080715-01.pdf); “UC Irvine College Portrait” (http://web.oir.uci.edu/portrait/2008-uc-irvine-profile.pdf); “UC Accountability Framework” (www.universityofcalifornia.edu/accountability/).

Distinctions—UCI has over 111,000 graduates. Our students regularly receive some of the nation’s most prestigious scholarships and fellowships: in UCI students have been awarded 26 Fulbright Scholarships, 25 Goldwater scholarships, 6 Truman awards, 6 Mellon Scholarships, and 40 National Security Education Program awards. In addition, in 2006-07, seven students won National Science Foundation graduate fellowships, and in 2007-08, three more students received the fellowships. After graduating, our students go on to distinguished careers; among our alumni are four Pulitzer Prize winners and the architect of the “HTTP/1.1” internet protocol used worldwide.

Retention and graduation—Almost all students who enroll as freshmen at UCI remain at the university and graduate. Our retention rate between the freshman and sophomore years is 94 percent. Students who enroll as freshmen graduate in an average 13 quarters, or just over four years. Over 80 percent graduate in six-years. Our four-year graduation rate ranks 9th among the 34 public universities in the AAU, and the six-year rate ranks 12th. Eighty-eight percent of students who transfer to UCI from another college or university go on to graduate, and their average time to degree is 7.4 quarters, or about two and a half years ("College Portrait").

Athletics—

- Over 63 Anteaters have won individual national collegiate titles; 42 have competed in the Olympics; and 400 have been named All-Americans in their sports.
- UCI teams have won 25 national titles in eight sports. In 2007, UCI won the NCAA national men’s volleyball title, and in 2008 our baseball team made it to the NCAA finals for the first time. UCI has also won 58 Conference titles.
- UCI won the Division I-AAA All-Sports Trophy, best all-around sports program (non-football), 2006-07.
- 2,894 Anteaters have been named Big West Conference Scholar-Athletes.

Vivek Mehta has a B.S. in Biochemistry and Molecular Biology. His thesis focused on the effects of environmental pollutants on the innate immune response. Vivek was named one of the top 20 undergraduate students in the United States by USA Today in 2006. He is now a medical student at Johns Hopkins and his current research focus is on the physiological and biomechanical factors that influence clinical outcomes after spinal fusion procedures.
Undergraduate Affordability

Relatively low fees make the University of California affordable for a wide range of students, and those who need additional financial aid at UCI usually receive it. In 2007-08, 60 percent of UCI students reported receiving some kind of financial aid, including loans to students and parents. Almost half of all UCI undergraduates received need-based scholarships or grant aid averaging $10,733 each; 28 percent of our students received Pell Grants. Among students graduating from UCI in 2006-07, 49 percent reported borrowing from sources other than parents, with a relatively low cumulative debt at graduation of $13,383. (“College Portrait”)

Undergraduate Access

Since UCI opened in 1965, we have greatly enhanced the quality of our students and held our student-faculty ratio relatively constant while rapidly increasing our enrollments. From Fall 1996 to 2006, the mean SAT-I score of our students rose from 1122 to 1182, reflecting roughly similar increases in both the Math and Verbal categories (“Statistical Portrait”). This growth with quality has been possible because of dramatic increases in the number of students applying to UCI over that same period, as indicated on the following chart from the “Statistical Portrait”:

Unfortunately, due to limitations in state funding, we will be forced to reduce the size of our incoming classes for the next two or three years to return the campus to its funded level of enrollment. Because the state did not fund previously authorized enrollment growth this year, we currently have about 1,800 unfunded students. Our student-faculty ratio has climbed beyond the
previous 19:1, making it difficult to maintain our historical level of access to smaller classes. (As of last year, 83 percent of UCI’s classes enrolled fewer than 50 students, and 74 percent enrolled fewer than 30 students.) Reducing enrollment to our funded level over the next two or three years will help us decrease our student-faculty ratio to a level more compatible with UC standards, and it will increase access to small classes for more of our students. When the budget crisis is resolved, we can then resume our growth at least for another few years to reach our target of 32,000 students in order to accommodate more of the demand for an education at UCI.

**Undergraduate Student Profile**

- UCI offers students with 81 different majors and 59 minors. Among those programs at the undergraduate level are new BA and BS degrees in Public Health and a new BS in Nursing Science, which will graduate its first class this spring. Among other new initiatives is the only undergraduate major in Literary Journalism in the U.S. With a faculty including four Pulitzer Prize winners, this program has grown quickly to enroll 300 majors since it began five years ago.

- For each of the past two years, UCI has awarded just over 5,500 bachelor’s degrees. Most students at UCI graduate in some field in the Social Sciences (51 percent), with the next most popular majors in Biological Sciences (15 percent), Engineering/Information and Computer Sciences (13 percent), Humanities (12 percent), Physical Sciences (5 percent), and Arts (4 percent) (“Campus Portrait”).

- UCI’s student body makes us one of the most diverse campuses in the United States. We have slightly more women than men in the student body, with the broad range of Asian/Pacific-Islander ethnicities constituting about half the population, Whites another quarter, and Hispanics, African Americans and American Indians being the next largest groups. (See the UCOP “Accountability Framework” for a more detailed account of the student population.) Even more important than these percentages is the positive impact of diversity on students’ educational experience. In our most recent UCUES survey (discussed below), 95 percent of the students reported a “good” or better rating for their “ability to appreciate, tolerate or understand racial and ethnic diversity,” and 62 percent reported that they had “gained a deeper understanding of other perspectives through conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity” (see the summary of UCUES in our “Campus Portrait”).

Jacqueline Chattopadhyay was named as one of Glamour Magazine’s Top 10 Women and she also received a Truman Scholarship. She is now working on a Ph.D. in Social Policy at Harvard.
Plans and aspirations of our undergraduate students vary over a wide range of opportunities, with over 60 percent planning to pursue a degree at the Master’s level and about one-third of them intending to pursue a professional or research doctorate. Over 90 percent of them plan to remain in California, using the knowledge, skills and values they obtained at UCI to contribute directly to the well-being and success of the state (see the 2008 Graduating Senior Survey in our “Campus Portrait”).

Undergraduate Student Experience and Proficiencies

Undergraduate research—The Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program (UROP) supports faculty mentored undergraduate student research. Its mission is to integrate undergraduate students into the research culture of the University by providing opportunities for faculty and students to work together on research and creative projects. UROP helps support both the research mission of the University and its educational programs while promoting an undergraduate research culture at UCI. We foster collaborations between students, faculty, corporate entities and government agencies to prepare the undergraduate researcher for the challenges of tomorrow. Over 7,300 students have participated in this program, which started in 1995 and now accommodates almost 2,000 students annually. Students present their research projects at the annual UCI Undergraduate Research Symposium and publish their results in The UCI Undergraduate Research Journal.

In addition to UROP, the School of Biological Sciences offers its own research opportunities for undergraduates, mentored by faculty from the Biological Sciences and the School of Medicine (some of these students are also involved in UROP). Again, the rate of participation has increased enormously, from 552 students working with 153 faculty in Spring 2002 to 952 students mentored by 214 faculty in Winter 2009.

First-Year Integrated Programs—First-year Integrated Programs provide freshmen with an instant academic and social community by offering them year-long sequences team-taught by a minimum of three faculty. Sequences offered have included Computer Games as Art, Culture, and Technology; Environmental Studies; Consciousness; and The Art of Persuasion. Courses are limited to 80 students each.

Study abroad—In the 2006 UCUES survey, 19 percent of UCI students reported having participated in a study-abroad program. Many of those students took advantage of opportunities available through UCI’s own Center for International Education, which helps students participate in programs abroad that allow them to progress toward their UCI degree while developing the academic, personal and professional skills necessary to be well-informed, engaged members of the global society. For students who wish to make study abroad part of a more formal educational program, UCI offers a Global Leadership Certificate Program, which also includes formal seminars and a capstone project along with two quarters of intercultural experience on campus or in the surrounding community.
Housing—The quality of student housing at UCI is truly exceptional. Our student housing has received a host of awards, including several for energy efficiency and environmental stewardship, and our residence halls were featured most prominently in Time magazine’s recent coverage of campus housing over the past half century – ours were shown as the best of modern on-campus living. The Vista del Campo student apartment complex alone has won several state and national awards, including “Best Student Housing Apartment Community” from the National Home Builders Association.

There are more than 10,500 bed spaces on campus (4,000 of which have been built since 2000) and approximately 2,750 off-campus spaces within walking distance; as a result, about 50 percent of students are housed on campus or within a short walk to Aldrich Park. For students meeting eligibility requirements, UCI guarantees two years of on-campus housing to all new incoming freshmen and one year of on-campus housing to all new incoming transfer students. (The campus also guarantees an offer of on-campus housing to every newly-admitted, full-time MFA, and PhD student. These students are guaranteed housing for most and in many cases all of their career at UCI. We also offer housing to our JD students and to some MD students.)

New minor in civic engagement—The new minor in civic engagement will launch in Fall 2009. The minor will encourage the mutually beneficial exchange of knowledge and resources between the university and the public and private sectors to enrich scholarship, research, and creative activity; enhance curriculum, teaching, and learning; prepare educated, engaged, and responsible citizens; and benefit the community at the local, regional, state, national and global levels.

Difficult Dialogues—One of only 27 universities in the country selected by the Ford Foundation’s Difficult Dialogues Project, UCI’s Imagining the Future program is a unique combination of academic courses, group research competition, projects, and community dialogues that seeks to raise awareness within the campus and the surrounding community of options for resolving some of the most difficult issues surrounding the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

Olive Tree Initiative—The Olive Tree Initiative grew from discussions at our School of Social Sciences’ Center for Citizen Peacebuilding, and featured students from Jewish, Muslim, Christian and other backgrounds traveling together to Israel and the West Bank to experience for themselves the texture of the Middle East conflict. They have returned to lead dozens of discussion groups in and around campus and throughout our community. This group of students has been honored by the Orange County Human Relations Commission for its “contributions to human relations in Orange County.”
UCUES—Students who are actively involved in their own learning and development are more likely to be successful in college. Colleges and universities offer students a wide variety of opportunities, both inside and outside the classroom, to become engaged with new ideas, people and experiences. Institutions measure the effectiveness of these opportunities in a variety of ways to better understand what types of activities and programs students find the most helpful. UCI measures that effectiveness biennially through the University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES).

Results from 2008 are not available yet, but in 2006 we found that well over 80 percent of students at UCI reported they are satisfied with their overall academic experiences, and that they appreciated the opportunities they have to work with and interact with faculty. Over 85 percent noted that they feel they are treated equitably and fairly by their faculty, and 88 percent said that they interacted with faculty outside of class to discuss course material. When asked to assess their gains in academic and life skills during their careers at UC Irvine, UCI students’ responses were overwhelmingly positive. Of particular importance as a measure of the “value-added” by a UCI education, 84 percent of the students “reported raising their standards for acceptable effort due to the high standards of a faculty member.” They were equally enthusiastic on a number of fronts.

(See UCI’s “Campus Portrait” for a more detailed summary of responses to the UCUES survey.)

### Student learning outcomes—UC Irvine holds to the fundamental principle that student learning outcomes and their assessment should be locally defined, discipline-specific and faculty-driven. Through periodic and systematic undergraduate program reviews, student learning outcomes are defined; methods of assessment for these outcomes are identified; evidence of student learning, retention and completion is presented; and analyses by program faculty are undertaken to demonstrate the extent to which students meet the defined outcomes. The faculty use the results of these analyses to improve curricula and pedagogy. In addition, results of these assessments are regularly reported to various external agencies as part of our systematic academic program reviews, including ad hoc external reviewers for our academic units and accreditation reviews by the Western Association of Schools and Colleges, ABET, American Medical Association, the American Bar Association and other professional organizations.)
Graduate and Professional Student Profile

UCI enrolled 5,393 graduate students in Fall Quarter 2008, including 4,278 on the general campus and 1,115 in the health sciences. Of students on the general campus, 942 students were enrolled in Master’s programs across the campus, including MFA programs in Humanities and the Arts, but most of the students were enrolled in the PhD programs offered in our academic units. UCI awarded 1,404 graduate degrees in 2007-08, including 942 Master’s, 370 PhDs/EdDs, and 92 MDs.

UCI offers 51 Master’s-level programs and 44 PhD programs in addition to doctoral-level programs in Medicine (MD), Education (EdD), and Law (JD). UCI’s graduate programs, already of very high quality, continue to improve and to grow each year. Major research initiatives, a broad range of academic and professional programs, and the impressive achievements of faculty all contribute to the exciting intellectual environment for graduate and professional students that defines the Irvine campus. UCI has been expanding its portfolio of graduate degree programs rapidly in the recent past, consistent with our strategic plan to increase the percentage of graduate and professional students on our campus. At the graduate level, nearly 20 new degrees have been established since 2000, including new academic and professional programs in public health (MPH), nursing science (MS), and Master’s of Public Policy (MPP), and Law (JD).

Our PhD programs are central to the research and educational mission of UCI, and the top strategic priority for Irvine is to increase the size, quality and diversity of the graduate student population. Many of our PhD programs are ranked in the top 20 of their academic fields: literary criticism and theory (#2); criminology (#4); behavioral neuroscience (#5); creative writing (#6); healthcare management (#9); organic chemistry (#9); information systems (#11); drama and theater (#12); third-world literature (#12); cognitive psychology (#13); English (#16); psychology – neurobiology & behavior (#16); and experimental psychology (#19). Another 24 programs appear in the top 21-50 of their fields. Our outstanding faculty and innovative research portfolio attract some of the best graduate applicants in the country and internationally. We successfully recruit the best applicants in our core academic disciplines and in our innovative interdisciplinary programs, such as the new gateway program in Medicinal Chemistry and Pharmacology, which provides a common set of courses to students who then move into disciplinary programs in Chemistry, Pharmacology, or Molecular Biology and Biochemistry; and the new PhD in Culture Theory in the School of Humanities, which provides a strong theoretical and critical approach to race, gender and sexuality studies.

The primary challenge to meeting our goal at the PhD level is the state and national budget crisis. Graduate students are supported by various funding sources, including teaching assistantships, fellowships, research assistantships and student loans. Some of these sources are state-budgeted, and some are federally funded, but competition for funding is increasing on all fronts. Furthermore, teaching assistantships are a critical source of support for graduate...
students, and are based upon undergraduate enrollments. As our growth in undergraduate enrollments level off, teaching opportunities for our graduate students decrease proportionately, a reduction that exacerbates the downward trends in other sources of funding.

Among our innovations in professional education are new doctoral-level degree programs in medicine and law. The Medical School is preparing to graduate the first cohort of students from PRIME-LC (Program in Medical Education – Latino Community). PRIME is a patient-centered initiative, designed specifically to train experts and community leaders who would specialize in the health needs of underserved populations, broadly defined. The curriculum was designed based on the needs of the patients in the target population, and students are chosen based on their commitment and ability to serve those patients. We are excited that the first students enrolled in this program will receive their MD degrees and be treating patients by July 1. PRIME-LC was so successful that it has now spawned similar programs at several other UC campuses.

Our newest professional doctorate is the JD: the UCI School of Law is currently reviewing applications for admission to the founding class in Fall 2009. (The UCI School of Law will admit its first class of 60 students in Fall 2009, building to a total enrollment of 600 JD students over the next few years.) The JD at UCI presents a significant opportunity to transform the approach to teaching and learning in law school with interdisciplinary breadth and an emphasis on experiential learning that will ensure significant opportunities for students to gain hands-on, real-world experience.

At the Master’s level, we offer a broad range of opportunities. In addition to the Master’s degrees offered in conjunction with our PhD programs, we offer Master’s degrees in fields where a PhD is not required or expected. Among such programs are our MBA program in the Paul Merage School of Business and a MAS degree in Criminology, Law and Society that was the first graduate degree in the UC system to be offered mostly online. Our long-standing MFA programs in fiction and poetry have long been considered among the best two or three programs in the country and have produced three Pulitzer Prize winning authors.

Post-doctoral scholars are an important part of our research mission and provide essential leadership and oversight in laboratories and, increasingly, in classrooms across the campus. UCI has recently taken steps to integrate them more fully into the life of the campus. One such effort is UC Irvine's newly-established Center for Graduate and Professional Students and Postdoctoral Scholars, which aims to enrich the experiences of our graduate and postdoctoral community by providing coordinated services, events, programs, information, and support. The center is designed to be a meeting place for students to relax, interact, plan events and meetings, share ideas, network and develop friendly relationships.

Faculty

By Fall 2008 UCI had 1,123 tenured/tenure-track faculty. Combining new positions associated with enrollment growth for the campus with existing positions vacated by retirement, resignations, or other reasons, we have been hiring an average of just over 70 faculty per year. About half of them have been appointed at the level of Assistant Professor, and the rest divided between the Associate and Full Professor ranks. As a result, slightly more than one-third of UCI’s faculty have arrived since 2002, bringing new perspectives, training and professional experience to complement the existing strength and experience of the campus.
Awards and Academy Members among current faculty:

- 2 Nobel Prize
- 3 National Medal of Science
- 2 Pulitzer Prizes
- 3 MacArthur Fellows
- 24 National Academy of Sciences
- 37 American Academy of Arts and Sciences Fellows
- 5 Institute of Medicine Members
- 12 National Academy of Engineering
- 7 American Philosophical Society
- 77 Fulbright Scholars
- 46 Guggenheim Fellows
- 58 Sloan Fellows
- 118 American Association for the Advancement of Science Fellows

**Diversity and the ADVANCE Program**—The UCI ADVANCE Program carries out the campus commitment to gender equity and diversity in the professoriate. Originally funded by a NSF Institutional Transformation award of $3.5 million in 2001, UCI has seen dramatic gains in the presence of women in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (i.e., the “STEM fields”). Based on the success of the Equity Advisor model initiated under the NSF grant, in July 2006 Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost Michael R. Gottfredson institutionalized UCI ADVANCE and extended its mission to include diversity. This commitment ensures that equity and diversity will remain essential priorities in advancing excellence in the multiple missions of UC Irvine.

Among the initiatives in the ADVANCE Program are:

- the establishment of endowed chairs for distinguished scholars who have also demonstrated a commitment to gender equity;
- creation of Equity Advisors in every School to advise on best practices to increase diversity in hiring, organize faculty development programs, and mentor faculty and students; and
- ADVANCE Dependent Care Awards, funded in part by the Provost and by the Elsevier Foundation New Scholars Program. This is an innovative pilot program for tenure-track faculty who are parents of children up to 36 months. Up to 60 qualifying faculty will receive travel awards to subsidize childcare costs associated with participation at conferences and research meetings.

The ADVANCE Program has had a notable positive effect on the number of women hired since 2001. Women faculty now comprise 30 percent of all ladder-rank faculty campus-wide, an increase of 5 percent since 2001. This effect has been particularly significant in the STEM fields, where the percentage of women among new hires went from 14 percent in 2001-02 to 41.7 percent in 2007-08. (See UCI Advance Program [Data and Reports](#).)
Research

Expenditures for extramurally funded research at UCI over the past decade increased dramatically. Comparative data from NSF for 1998 to 2006 shows an increase during that period in research and development expenditures at UCI of over 130 percent. That increase is the fastest rate of growth among UCI’s benchmark peers (which include five of the other nine UC campuses: Berkeley, Davis, Los Angeles, San Diego, and Santa Barbara). Since 2006, expenditures have continued to rise, reaching a campus record of $328 million in 2007-08. To date (March 2009), expenditures for 2008-09 are on line to exceed last year’s record by more than 10 percent. (Chart from “Statistical Portrait.”)

Among the research programs on campus are the following examples of centers, institutes, and projects across the campus:

The UCI Environment Institute: Global Change, Energy, and Sustainable Resources was created in April 2008 as a new research institute dedicated to the study of interactions between the environment and society. The Institute will enhance the already internationally recognized work in environmental and related studies now occurring across UC Irvine. It will bring together scientists from across campus to work on projects specific to these areas, such as studying how
climate change will alter public health and welfare; whether people will accept the living patterns of green cities; and the environmental impacts of new energy technologies.

The Sue and Bill Gross Stem Cell Research Center supports our stem-cell research program, which received $57 million in gift and grant funding over the past three years and which developed a stem-cell therapy that made paralyzed rats walk again. This therapeutic method recently became the world’s first embryonic stem cell treatment approved by the FDA for testing in humans.

The Urban Water Research Center’s mission is to advance the understanding of the distinct characteristics of the urban water environment in order to assist people and institutions in their effort to promote health, enhance the efficient use of water resources, and protect environmental values. The Center is a partnership with over 70 faculty members and a variety of departments at UC Irvine.

The Center for the Study of Democracy fosters academic research and education to provide a better understanding of the democratic process, and the steps that may strengthen democracy at home and abroad. The faculty and students of the Center study both democratizing nations and the expansion of the democratic process in the United States and other Western democracies.

The Beall Center for Art and Technology supports research and exhibitions that explore new relationships between the arts, sciences and engineering, and thus promotes new forms of creation and expression using digital technologies. The Beall Center aspires to redefine the museum/gallery experience, both in content and form, formulating answers to the questions of how technology can be used effectively, not only to create new forms of art, but also to connect artist to artist, and artist with audience.

The Advanced Power and Energy Program, directed by Scott Samuelsen, Professor of Mechanical, Aerospace and Environmental Engineering, provides education, research and development, beta testing and demonstration to bring new energy technologies to market. The project is supported by the National Fuel Cell Research Center at UCI, the first of its kind in the nation. This center provides a forum for fuel cell technology research and development.

The LifeChips program, directed by G.P. Li, also the Director of the Integrated Nanosystems Research Facility, Professor of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science and Professor of Biomedical Engineering, promotes the union of technology arts and life sciences through research and education at the micro and nano scales. The microscopic world provides a natural common ground for research in traditionally distinct disciplines of engineering, physical sciences, life sciences and medicine. Efforts that combine technology and life sciences will accelerate developments in both fields, bringing new innovations to solve problems of industry and the human condition.

The Geological Hazards and Disasters Research Group, part of the Program in Public Health, addresses natural hazards and disasters from a geologic perspective, with an emphasis on earthquakes as a major threat to public health. Results of their work are applied to disaster preparedness planning, structural design, land-use planning, seismic risk assessment and public education about earthquake hazards.

The nationally recognized Program in Geriatrics, directed by Dr. Laura Mosqueda, has recently received a $2 million grant from the Donald W. Reynolds Foundation to enhance the care of
older adults by integrating geriatric principles throughout the School of Medicine’s curricula, including the medical student program and postgraduate study.

The UCI Humanities Center supports research and debate on a wide range of issues that draw vital connections between culture, history, literature, technology, media and the arts. It has supported collaborative faculty research projects as diverse as a Symposium on Ancient Slavery and Human Trafficking, Reading the Digital: from Kabbala to Software Studies, and Museums and Modernity: Pacific Rim Urban Futures. The UC Humanities Research Institute, a UC-wide institute housed at UCI, offers opportunities for collaborative research on topics in the humanities to faculty from throughout the University of California.

AirUCI, the Atmospheric Integrated Research for Understanding Chemistry at Interfaces, is a premier institute in atmospheric sciences based at the UCI. It focuses on research into chemical reactions at the air/water interface and how they affect the atmosphere. Formally named an Environmental Molecular Sciences Institute (EMSI) in 2004, AirUCI represents a partnership between six faculty at UCI and international researchers from the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic, Hebrew University of Jerusalem in Israel, and the University of Canterbury, New Zealand, together with researchers from Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, and the Environmental Molecular Sciences Laboratory at Pacific Northwest National Lab.

**Staff and Administrative Innovation**

**Staff excellence**—Highly-skilled and dedicated staff support is essential to the success of any large organization, and especially to the complex structure of a public research university. Our research and teaching mission depends heavily on the solid infrastructure of administrative support. Efforts to attract and support the professional development of dedicated staff are a high priority at UCI, and we have been extraordinarily successful in recruiting and retaining a loyal and dedicated group of people, many of whom are national leaders in their fields. Their excellence has been recognized by 12 national awards for administrative best practices and innovations; no U.S. research university has received more awards of this type than UCI. The awards include the USA Today “Quality Cup” and the EDUCAUSE “Award for Excellence in Administrative Information Systems,” which is the top prize for administrative improvement from the National Association of College and University Business Officers.

Locally, the UCI Staff Assembly hosts a number of events and programs to recognize and encourage excellent performance by staff on campus, including

- the annual Excellence in Leadership Award for supervisors who, through outstanding leadership, enhance staff morale, build an enriching work environment, and serve as a mentor or otherwise support the career development of their staff;
- the Career Enhancement Scholarship Program, which helps career staff continue their education through enrollment in associate, bachelor’s, graduate, or continuing education programs (Extension) at community colleges, state colleges or universities while employed at UCI;
- seminars and forums with campus leadership;
- the Quarter Century Club, for staff with 25 years or more of service at UCI; and
- social events, including a campus-wide UCI Staff Appreciation Picnic every August.

**Sustainability and energy efficiency at UCI**—For nearly two decades, UC Irvine has been a leader in environmental stewardship, incorporating sustainability and energy efficiency into every aspect of its operation. UCI’s aggressive energy management program focuses on
reducing greenhouse gas emissions and energy waste by implementing best practices and harnessing emerging technologies. UCI is installing “smart” real-time air quality sensing in laboratories and pilot testing more than a dozen other pollution and energy reduction projects, which if successful, can be utilized at other institutions. In the last two fiscal years alone, energy efficiency initiatives saved an estimated 16 million kWh of electricity, 3.1 million therms of natural gas, and $3.8 million annually. UCI’s energy and water efficiency programs were recognized by Flex Your Power, California’s statewide energy efficiency campaign, with a best overall award in 2008.

UCI has the most efficient campus energy infrastructure of any North American campus. Our 18 MW, base-loaded co-generation facility employs five energy recovery methods to efficiently capture and utilize heat produced by electrical generation in order to supply the campus’s air-conditioning, power, and heating needs. UCI is further “greening” its power supply by installing the largest photovoltaic system in the UC (tie with UCSD), which is expected to offset up to 1 MW of peak electricity demand from the grid and generate more than 1,370,000 kWh of renewable energy annually.

Since 1992, buildings constructed at UCI have outperformed California’s Title 24 by 20 to 30 percent. Older buildings continuously undergo energy efficiency upgrades of mechanical and lighting systems, and new buildings are designed to meet or exceed LEED Silver standards (**LEADERSHIP IN ENERGY & ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN**). UCI’s first two projects to complete the LEED certification process were awarded LEED Gold. Thirteen other new construction projects, and one existing building, are in the queue for LEED certification. (See below under “Capital Planning” for more on this topic.)

UCI also boasts a comprehensive Sustainable Transportation program, which eliminates more than 39 million vehicle miles, over 18,000 tons of greenhouse gas emissions, and saves more than $21 million each year. Among the most visible components of this program is a 100 percent biofuel bus system carrying more than 1 million riders per year and saving 100,000 tons of carbon emissions. For its efforts to reduce congestion and air pollution, UCI was designated one of the Best Workplaces for Commuters by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and received the Governor’s Economic and Environmental Leadership Award for climate change in 2008.

For more about sustainability and energy efficiency at UCI, visit [www.sustainability.uci.edu](http://www.sustainability.uci.edu).

**Finance, Capital and Development**

**Annual budget**—UCI’s operating expenditures totaled approximately $1.6 billion in 2007-08. Instruction accounted for about 28 percent of that total; teaching hospitals 29 percent; and research 14 percent. In addition, capital expenditures totaled another $280 million, for total UCI campus expenditures in 2007-08 of $1.9 billion.

The campus budget is overseen by the Executive Vice Chancellor in consultation with the Budget Work Group, which includes leadership of the faculty Senate, the Staff Assembly and the heads of academic and administrative budget offices. The budget is managed according to a set of explicit budget principles that are reviewed and renewed before every budget cycle:

- UCI must continue to build the excellence of its academic and professional programs, accommodate enrollment increases, and offer students a high-quality education in an environment characterized by civility and diversity.
• UCI must continue to recruit and retain the highest-quality faculty and staff, maintaining an appropriate balance of staff capacity as new faculty hires occur.
• UCI must take into account the fundamental contributions of faculty, staff and support areas to its academic mission, and continue to make every effort to minimize layoffs as it develops budget plans.
• UCI must base strategic budgetary decisions on analysis, evaluation and appropriate consultation with campus constituencies.
• UCI must streamline organizational structures, processes and procedures to help reduce expenditures and mitigate workloads and delegate decisions to the lowest practical operational level.
• UCI must continue to seek new sources of revenue through fundraising, sponsored projects, public-private sponsorships and other sources.

Decline in state funding—Like all UC campuses, UCI has seen a dramatic decline in the percentage of its budget funded by the state over the past decade. Total state appropriations in 2007-08 were $239 million, or about 14.3 percent of total receipts for that year. (Tuition and fees totaled approximately $213 million, or 13 percent of total receipts. That decline in state funding as a percentage of our total revenues over the past decade is indicated by the following chart (“Statistical Portrait”).
The consequences of this decline have been severe. Just this year we have had to allocate about $14 million in budget cuts to academic and administrative units and an additional $1.8 million in increased assessments to campus support units. These reductions were made differentially based on campus priorities and strategic objectives in consultation with the Budget Work Group, the Deans’ Council and the Chancellor’s Cabinet.

Capital planning—In 2007-08, the university spent more than $281 million on capital projects for the general campus and at the medical center. Developed through our award-winning design/build method, more than $1.3 billion in capital projects is reshaping the campus community. As described on the UCI Website Construction Update, these projects include: Engineering 3, Social & Behavioral Sciences, Steinhaus Hall Renovation, Telemedicine, Stem Cell Research Center, Humanities Gateway, a third phase of East Campus housing, and a new UC Irvine Medical Center Clinical Laboratory Replacement Building.

The first phase of the new University Hospital project at the medical center was completed in September 2008, four months ahead of schedule and under budget. The $393 million, 482,428-square-foot research and teaching facility opened for patient care in March 2009. Construction of Phase 2 (the build-out of more than 63,000 square feet of shell space to house 45 additional patient beds, four additional operating rooms, 21 limited-stay beds and a radiology department) is now under way. This $163 million project will be completed in 2011. The university also has commenced construction on a $49.5 million clinical laboratory building, which will be completed in 2010. When these projects are complete, the medical center will be a modern, state-of-the-art health sciences campus. These state-of-the-art facilities will improve the quality and accessibility of healthcare for the citizens in our region of the state, and – through their impact on our education and research programs – train new healthcare providers and bring new treatments, cures and preventive measures to people all over the world.

For years, UCI has been a pioneer among university building programs, working with the U.S. Green Building Council to streamline the LEED certification process and to reduce administrative costs. These savings have been used to enhance environmental building design features. Our first two projects to complete the LEED certification process, Palo Verde 2 Student Apartments and the Anteater Instruction & Research Building, were awarded LEED Gold. Thirteen other projects are in the queue for possible LEED awards.

The ongoing state budget crisis has affected our capital planning for 2008-09, but fortunately many of the projects are being completed as planned, including Engineering Unit 3, Humanities Building, Steinhaus Hall Seismic Improvements, and Telemedicine/PRIME-LC Facilities. As of February 2009, funds are still frozen for two of the projects: the Arts Building and the Social and Behavioral Sciences Building.

Record year for fundraising—Annual giving to UCI reached a record level in 2007-08: $130 million in total giving, and the largest number of separate gifts that we have ever received. That amount broke the single-year fundraising record for all organizations and institutions in Orange County and represented the third consecutive year we have raised more than $100 million. At the end of fiscal 2008, our endowment had exceeded $250 million. The extraordinary rise in private support for UCI over the past decade is indicated by the following chart (“Statistical Portrait”):
The generosity of our friends and supporters is distributed across the whole campus, reflecting the broad range of the campus initiatives. The highlights of last year’s fundraising record include:

- $20 million from the Donald Bren Foundation for the UCI School of Law
- $10 million from Susan and William Gross for the Sue and Bill Gross Stem Cell Research Center
- $1.5 million from William J. Gillespie to support the William J. Gillespie Endowed Fund for Ballet Studies
- $1.4 million from ExxonMobil Foundation (through the National Math and Science Initiative) to support the UCI California Teach Science and Math Initiative

**UCI’s $1 billion campaign**—In October 2008, UCI launched its $1 billion “Shaping the Future” campaign to raise funds that will enable the university to solve some of the world’s toughest problems by focusing on high-priority initiatives in research and teaching and global opportunities related to the international character of our campus and surrounding community. By uniting UCI’s local and global communities, alumni and longtime supporters alike, the Shaping the Future campaign is dedicated to realizing the university’s mission, making a difference in individual lives and, in turn, transforming the world. Over $430 million has already been raised toward our goal.
Prologue

Four core principles provide overarching guidance for UCLA’s long-range goals and more immediate priorities.

1) **Academic excellence**: furthering UCLA’s tradition of world-class scholarship and teaching. Excellence is marked by path-breaking research, scholarship, creative endeavors, and teaching as well as a commitment to new ways of organizing the discovery, application, and translation of knowledge and creativity.

2) **Civic engagement**: drawing on the strengths of land grant institutions and modern research universities to create innovative and meaningful interactions among faculty, staff, students, and community on a scale ranging from local to global. Civic engagement at UCLA means directing the knowledge and skills of our students, faculty, staff, and senior leaders to address societal problems and improve the quality of life in Los Angeles. In so doing, we strive to work in partnership with community for mutual benefit. The lessons learned in Los Angeles are applicable to urban areas worldwide.

3) **Diversity**: fulfilling our commitment to Los Angeles and California to strengthen our academic excellence and civic engagement. We use the definition of diversity adopted by the Assembly of the Academic Senate (May 10, 2006) and endorsed by the UC President (June 30, 2006): “Diversity – a defining feature of California’s past, present, and future – refers to 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, socioeconomic status, and geographic region, and more.” We also focus on research, scholarship, and teaching/learning related to diversity in this plan. Thus, diversity is not only a community characteristic we value and strive for, but also an important topic of study.

4) **Financial security**: creating meaningful engagement with potential donors and building a compelling case for private support of a public institution.

These principles are complementary and inseparable. We make no trade-offs between high scholarly and educational aspirations, diversity, and public engagement. On the contrary, engagement and diversity strengthen our academic mission and overall quality; advances in scholarly knowledge enhance our community, state, nation, and global community. And none of this can be accomplished without financial security.

---

1 This definition is adapted from a definition offered by Thomas Erlich, Director of the Political Engagement Project at Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
UCLA’s principles reflect and leverage our competitive advantages. Our distinguishing characteristics include the following:

• Acclaimed academic standing in the College of Letters and Science, Professional Schools, and Health Sciences. Our reputation derives from disciplinary breadth and quality across the campus, as well as an established tradition of and appreciation for interdisciplinary scholarship.

• Strategic location. Sited in the city of Los Angeles, we are perched on the Pacific Rim and neighbor to Latin America. UCLA is surrounded by the major forces of global change. Our geographic location enables us – indeed, compels us – to take advantage of opportunities for engagement locally and internationally. These resources stimulate and strengthen research, teaching, and service.

• A compact campus where distance and climate do not pose barriers to interaction. An excellent health science enterprise operates in close proximity to other academic and professional fields of study. UCLA is making a remarkable transition from a commuter to a residential campus at the undergraduate level and is beginning to take the same steps for graduate students. The convenience of geography produces a unique academic community.

• Investment in campus-wide interdisciplinary ventures. These include initiatives through the California NanoSystems Institute, the Broad Stem Cell Institute, Center for Society and Genetics, the Arts, the International Institute, the Institute of the Environment, and UCLA in LA. An ambitious biosciences initiative is underway and has already taken significant steps toward strengthening UCLA’s research capacity in biomedical research. Our capacity for and commitment to interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary research and teaching are important competitive advantages.

• Outstanding scholarly resources on campus and within 30 miles of UCLA. These include libraries (Young Research Library, Clark, Getty, Huntington), research centers (California NanoSystems Institute, Broad Stem Cell Institute, Jonsson Comprehensive Cancer Center, Center for Embedded Networked Sensors, Institute of Pure and Applied Mathematics, Institute of Geophysics and Planetary Physics, Ethnic Studies Centers, etc.), museums (Hammer, Fowler, and Getty) and other universities and research organizations (California Institute of Technology, University of Southern California, Jet Propulsion Laboratory, RAND Corporation). These resources create unusually rich opportunities for collaboration in research, teaching, and service.

• Strong ties to the community. Throughout the Los Angeles area UCLA is involved in community partnerships; education; health services; arts; theater film and television; and many other areas. UCLA Extension is one of the finest and most comprehensive continuing education programs in the country, reaching 60,000 students a year and having taught 2 million students over its history. Notably, UCLA Extension’s new Figueroa Courtyard in downtown Los Angeles brings UCLA educational opportunities to traditionally underserved communities, augmenting UCLA’s strong tradition of student service and service learning.
• Strong donor and alumni bases. We are situated in one of the wealthiest urban communities; our opportunities for fundraising and for overcoming the uncertainties of state funding are extraordinary. We have taken the lead among public institutions in sustained fundraising and are well positioned to achieve even more in the future.

• A firm commitment to the values that are the lifeblood of higher education: academic freedom; open access to information; free and lively debate conducted with mutual respect and freedom from intolerance; shared governance; commitment to diversity among students, faculty, administration/staff, programs and curricula, in recognition that openness and inclusion produce true quality; civic engagement and responsibility to our community; and commitment to the highest ethical standards and values in research, training, and education.

The next sections of this report describe indicators of UCLA’s effectiveness in each of four core areas. They highlight areas where UCLA is distinctive, both within the UC and among elite public and private research universities.

**Academic Excellence**

UCLA’s academic excellence emanates from our students, faculty, educational programs, and research.

**Educational overview**

With an enrollment of 39,650 students in Fall 2008, UCLA remains the largest research university in California and one of the largest in the country. UCLA’s 26,536 undergraduates are enrolled in the College of Letters and Science (83 percent), the Henry Samueli School of Engineering and Applied Science (11 percent), the School of Arts and Architecture (4 percent), the School of Theater, Film and Television (1 percent), and the School of Nursing (1 percent). These and another seven professional schools (School of Education and Information Studies, School of Law, Anderson School of Management, School of Public Affairs, David Geffen School of Medicine, School of Dentistry, School of Public Health) enroll 11,684 graduate and professional students. In addition, 1,430 interns and residents and 900 postdoctoral scholars and fellows study at UCLA. UCLA offers 180 undergraduate majors and more than 190 graduate and professional degree programs. Undergraduates can select from among approximately 80 minors.

In 2006-07, UCLA ranked seventh in the nation for the number of degrees granted by non-profit higher education institutions. UCLA awards approximately 7,000 bachelor degrees, 2,500 professional degrees, and 700 doctoral degrees each year, more than any other UC campus.

**Undergraduate affordability and access**

Admission to UCLA is competitive. UCLA received 55,650 freshman applications this year, which may make it the most highly sought university in the nation. It also received more than 16,500 transfer applications.
Although it is a highly selective campus, UCLA is accessible to all Californians, regardless of income. Among undergraduates, 62 percent receive need-based financial aid, placing the campus well above the UC average and above the rates at far more expensive private institutions. One third of undergraduates receive Pell Grants. Approximately 60 percent of UCLA undergraduates report family incomes under $90,000 per year; over 40 percent report family incomes under $45,000.

The campus works hard to make access through the transfer route a reality. UCLA is a national leader in transfer student access: 3,220 transfer students entered UCLA in Fall 2008, 90 percent from community colleges. Over the past 15 years over 45,000 transfer students have entered UCLA. One-third of baccalaureate degrees are awarded to students who entered UCLA as transfer students. Currently the campus is developing new ways to connect transfer students with the particular services they need.

Like other UC campuses, UCLA enrolls large numbers of first-generation students (i.e., neither parent graduated from college). Approximately 44 percent of UCLA students are first generation, slightly below the overall UC rate of 46 percent.

**Undergraduate student success**

UCLA students show high rates of academic success. Of UCLA undergraduates who entered as freshmen in 2001, 89 percent graduated within six years, which is the highest graduation rate in the UC system and comparable to those of the top private universities. The three-year graduation rate for community college transfer students is approximately the same, also well above the UC average. Eventually, 90 to 91 percent of both groups graduate, and their final GPA in UC courses is essentially the same.

UCLA faculty has enhanced the undergraduate experience through the creation of freshman seminars, interdisciplinary programs, research opportunities, and more. For example, over 90 percent of freshmen enroll in a course with 30 or fewer students, many in one of approximately 200 *fiat lux* seminars, which give students the opportunity to interact with faculty in small groups. Between 40 percent and 50 percent of new freshmen in the College of Letters and Science enroll in one of several year-long, team-taught interdisciplinary “cluster courses” that draw on the expertise of faculty from a variety of departments, emphasize writing skills, and culminate in a seminar experience. In 2007-08, more than 6,000 undergraduates enrolled in research seminars and independent study courses. More than 1,000 students annually study abroad. The quality of undergraduate education is reflected in national rankings. In the 2008 issue of U.S. News and World Report’s *Best Colleges and Universities*, UCLA ranked third among public research universities.

At the same time, the faculty has recognized the need to increase access and efficient use of resources. They have established policies to speed time to degree and made sure enough courses were offered to do so. The chart below shows how successful they have been in this effort. Two-thirds of freshman entrants now graduate within four years. Transfer gains have been just as impressive. Most of those who continue beyond the fourth year need only one or two additional quarters to complete their degree programs.
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According to the 2008 UCUES survey, 78 percent of UCLA students aspire to an advanced degree and 47 percent plan to enter graduate school in the year following graduation. In fact, a national clearinghouse indicates that at least half of UCLA baccalaureates enroll in another higher education institution within five years of graduation. UCLA is ranked 10th in the world in the number of undergraduates who go on to earn doctoral degrees from U.S. universities.

Student feedback collected from surveys is taken seriously at UCLA and incorporated into program reviews. Overall, results indicate that students are highly satisfied with their UCLA experience. A Spring 2008 survey of graduating seniors indicates that over 90 percent felt intellectually challenged by their faculty. More than three-quarters of respondents reported strong growth in their writing, critical thinking, and analytical skills; more than two-thirds reported strong growth in quantitative reasoning skills. Looking forward, 82 percent described themselves as having a “strong” level of interest in and preparedness for life-long learning.

UCLA is known for its rich array of thriving co-curricular activities. In the midst of a long-running effort to convert UCLA into a residential campus, 94 percent of freshmen and 40
percent of all undergraduates live in university residence halls. Compared to students at other UC campuses, UCLA students spend more time on extra-curricular activities and are more likely to hold leadership roles.

Graduate student success

UCLA enrolls more graduate students than any other UC campus. Of 11,684 graduate students enrolled in Fall 2008, 39 percent were pursuing a doctoral degree, 32 percent were working toward a professional master’s, 17 percent were working toward a first professional degree (i.e., medicine, dentistry, law), and 11 percent were enrolled in academic master’s degree programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNDERGRADUATE DEGREES</th>
<th>7,083</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL DEGREES:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACADEMIC MASTER’S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Letters and Science</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Professional Schools</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ACADEMIC MASTER’S</td>
<td>949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL MASTER’S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library and Information Science</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Policy</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Welfare</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other professional masters degrees</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PROFESSIONAL MASTER’S</td>
<td>1,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOCTORAL</td>
<td>College of Letters and Science and all professional schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL DOCTORAL</td>
<td>752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRST PROFESSIONAL</td>
<td>Doctor of Dental Surgery (D.D.S.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor of Medicine (M.D.)</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juris Doctor (J.D.)</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL FIRST PROFESSIONAL</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL DEGREES</td>
<td>3,922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ALL DEGREES</td>
<td>11,005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UCLA grants about one-third of its degrees to graduate or professional students. Almost half of these are in STEM disciplines (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics).

Although rankings are an imperfect measure of quality, we note that UCLA’s graduate programs receive consistently high rankings from a variety of sources. Recent U.S. News rankings place many UCLA programs in the top 20, including clinical psychology (#1),
Most graduate programs are highly selective. In total, UCLA receives over 27,000 applications for graduate or professional degree programs. Academic masters’ programs received 10,315 applications for Fall 2007 and admitted 33 percent of the applicants. Doctoral programs received 8,650 applications; 23 percent were admitted. Another 8,000 applications came for programs in medicine, law and dentistry. A typical entering doctoral student had an undergraduate GPA of 3.7.

Financial support is critical to UCLA’s ability to recruit and retain top graduate students. In 2006-07, 89 percent of doctoral students received some support. The level of support varies by program, but it averaged $30,433 in 2006-07 for doctoral students who received support. Support packages have increased over time, but UCLA faces strong competitive pressures. The Bruin Scholars initiative aims to raise $500 million for graduate student fellowships and undergraduate scholarships by June 30, 2013.

Over the 10-year period from 1997-98 through 2006-07, median time to the Ph.D. degree was 6.33 years. Variation by program was significant, ranging from less than five years in some science fields to over eight years in some humanities programs. Almost half (47 percent) of doctoral students entering UCLA in 1997-98 completed their Ph.D. within 7 years or less.

A survey of graduating doctoral students indicates that between 2003-04 and 2006-07, 96 percent had published a paper or presented at a conference. Among those graduating in 2005-06, 38 percent had published a paper alone, 61 percent co-authored with faculty, and 72 percent presented a paper at a national scholarly meeting. Of these students, 28 percent were moving on to post-doctoral positions and another 13 percent had tenure track faculty appointments.

**Faculty and research**

UCLA faculty are highly distinguished. The table below summarizes some of the honors and awards faculty have received.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Honor or Award</th>
<th>Number of Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Academies &amp; Institute of Medicine members</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Academy of Arts and Science members</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nobel Prize winners</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Medal of Science winners</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presidential Medals of Freedom</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacArthur Foundation fellowships</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guggenheim fellowships</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulitzer Prizes</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fields Medal in mathematics</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pritzker Prize</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UCLA ladder faculty generate over 200,000 student credit hours at the lower-division level and over 300,000 at the upper-division level. They mentor almost 900 postdoctoral scholars and host colleagues from around the world who come to UCLA to conduct research projects using our libraries, laboratories, and studios.

UCLA is one of the most successful institutions in the nation with regard to extramural funding, consistently ranking in the top five for funded research expenditures. In fiscal year 2006-07, UCLA faculty were awarded $914 million in grants and contracts. Two-thirds of the funding was from federal agencies. The most recent report by the Center for Measuring University Performance ranked UCLA third among American research universities. Most of UCLA’s research funding is awarded in the life and biomedical sciences.

Some of these research grants lead to patents, start-up companies, or other commercial enterprises that benefit the state and the university. In 2007, UCLA faculty were responsible for 125 new U.S. patent filings and 252 invention disclosures. A May 2007 economic impact study found that UCLA had 498 inventions under license to 264 companies. Today, UCLA technologies are in 72 companies spanning the state of California, advancing medical care, energy efficiency, wireless technology, and more.

UCLA’s medical enterprise is world renowned. Comprised of Ronald Reagan UCLA Medical Center, Santa Monica-UCLA Medical Center and Orthopaedic Hospital, Resnick Neuropsychiatric Hospital at UCLA, Mattel Children’s Hospital UCLA, and the UCLA Medical Group with primary care and specialty care offices throughout the region, UCLA Health System is among the most comprehensive and advanced healthcare systems in the world. The medical center is consistently ranked one of the top five hospitals in the nation and the best medical center in the western United States by U.S. News & World Report. The medical school is ranked ninth for research and 12th for primary care.

The new state-of-the-art hospital for Ronald Reagan Medical Center has 520 large, private patient rooms and employs 1,500 full-time physicians and more than 2,500 support staff. The facility is one of the first total replacement hospitals built to meet California’s latest seismic safety standards.

Ranked among the top 10 academic libraries in North America, the UCLA Library houses one of the most comprehensive and highly used collections in the world, with more than 8 million volumes, tens of thousands of serial subscriptions, and extensive online academic resources to which the Library subscribes on behalf of the university community. The Association of Research Libraries ranks UCLA’s library ninth in 2006-07 based on the total number of volumes.

**Future directions in academic excellence**

UCLA’s emerging academic plan addresses a number of challenges and opportunities. Successful faculty recruitment and retention is essential to UCLA’s academic quality. In addition to the fierce international competition for top faculty, the cost of living in Los Angeles is a particular challenge for UCLA. Our success in developing a residential campus at UCLA for undergraduates argues that the best way to enhance our competitiveness in recruiting and retaining the best faculty and graduate students is to
make the UCLA campus the most desirable work environment in the country for faculty, staff, and students. UCLA's academic strengths, museums, performances, athletics and recreational programs, location, and campus aesthetics provide a strong base from which to work. We must also assure that UCLA remains competitive with respect to salaries, support, and fellowships.

Global ties are of increasing importance to academic excellence. In addition to maintaining longstanding international connections through student and faculty exchanges, Title VI research centers, and a wide variety of research and degree programs related to international studies, UCLA is deepening its relationships with foreign universities, especially but not exclusively in Asia and Latin America, to increase opportunities for exchange and collaboration.

The traditional academic paradigm has been based on the work of independent scholars. But that paradigm has been shifting — most visibly in the natural sciences but increasingly in the social sciences, arts, and humanities — to greater interaction and collaboration among scholars within and across disciplines. UCLA has long supported interdisciplinary scholarship in research and teaching, and is now moving to eliminate or mitigate unnecessary barriers to collaborative and interdisciplinary work so that we will remain at the forefront of research universities.

Diversity

Student, staff and faculty characteristics

UCLA is one of the most diverse institutions in the country. Distinctive characteristics of the student body include the following:

- Like all UC campuses, UCLA shows considerable ethnic diversity: More than one in five (21 percent) of entering freshmen in Fall 2008 was from an underrepresented minority group (Native American, African American, Latino, or Chicano), while 36 percent were Asian, 33 percent white, and 3 percent foreign (with the remainder other or unknown). Overall, the undergraduate student body was 3.5 percent African American; 38.2 percent Asian, 14.9 percent Chicano/Latino, 33.9 percent white, 4.5 percent foreign, and 4.6 percent other or unknown.

- The student body is diverse with regard to cultural and linguistic backgrounds. Results of a 2008 student survey indicate that 53 percent of UCLA respondents speak a language other than English at home at least some of the time. Two-thirds of respondents have a parent who was born in a foreign country.

- While 60 percent of freshmen come to UCLA from homes in Southern California, virtually every county in California is represented in the student body; 7 percent of new freshmen and 8 percent of new transfers come from other states or countries. Three-quarters of new freshmen attended public schools.

- Most UCLA undergraduates believe that their education has enhanced their understanding of and appreciation for diversity. Results of a 2006 student survey
indicate that 95 percent of UCLA respondents rated their ability to appreciate racial and ethnic diversity as good or better; 91 percent rated their ability to appreciate cultural and global diversity as good or better.

- Following national trends, graduate students show less ethnic diversity and more geographic diversity than do undergraduates. Of graduate students enrolled in Fall 2008, 48 percent are female and 13 percent are from under-represented minority groups. More specifically, 0.5 percent of graduate students are American Indian, 4 percent are African American, 19 percent are Asian, 9 percent Chicano/Latino, 39 percent white, 15 percent foreign, and the remainder unknown. African American and Chicano/Latino students are slightly more likely to enroll in master's programs (both professional and academic) than either doctoral programs or first professional programs—law, medicine, and dentistry.

- Most graduate students (64 percent) are from California. Another 21 percent are from other states and 15 percent are foreign.

- In Fall 2008, UCLA employed over 4,000 faculty members, of which 1,873 were ladder rank. Of ladder rank faculty, 27 percent are female and 24 percent are minority. Seventy-eight ladder rank faculty began work at UCLA in Fall 2008—of these, 43 percent are female and 41 percent are minority.

- There were 19,325 career staff members employed at UCLA in Fall 2008, 64 percent of whom are female. The ethnic distribution is 36 percent white, 24 percent Hispanic, 24 percent Asian, 15 percent African American, and .4 percent American Indian. As seen in most universities, diversity is lower in the executive levels: 62 percent of senior executives are male, and 82 percent are white.

- Diversity is also manifested in UCLA's programs and curriculum, notably but not exclusively through its ethnic studies centers, interdepartmental degree programs, and the departments of Chicana/Chicano Studies and Women's Studies. Diversity is also a topic of faculty research.

**Future directions related to diversity**

Although we adhere to the constraints imposed by Proposition 209, we can make progress and increase diversity of faculty, students, and staff. This includes but is not limited to gender, ethnicity, geographic, and socioeconomic diversity. Increasing diversity requires close attention to creating a welcoming and hospitable community at UCLA, ensuring equity in opportunities and salaries, offering mentoring and support as needed, and insisting on understanding and tolerance. In addition, diversity is a community responsibility. All campus leaders must become advocates for diversity and must assure that diversity remains a priority. The campus is currently developing a strategic plan for diversity, which will assess current status and establish measurable goals for increasing and sustaining diversity among students, faculty, staff, and programs.
Engagement in Los Angeles

UCLA’s contributions to and involvement in Los Angeles

As an urban public research university, UCLA has special responsibilities related to community-based, applied, and translational research – that is, scholarship that not only advances knowledge, but also directly benefits Los Angeles. It has responsibilities for civic education — through traditional classroom instruction, experiential and service learning, student participation in research, internships and professional training, and co-curricular activities.

UCLA contributes to Los Angeles across the spectrum of health services, education, social services and public health, volunteer activity, the arts, technology, policy and business expertise, and overall economic activity. A 2008 study estimates that UCLA generates over $9 billion of business revenue in the region each year, which in turn generates over $1 billion in state and local tax revenues. UCLA is the seventh largest employer in the Los Angeles region.

A student survey revealed that 54 percent of UCLA students – more than any other UC campus – provided some form of community service or other volunteer activity in 2005-06. More than 3,000 students participate in service-learning courses or internships each year, and UCLA is working to further infuse civic education into the curriculum.

In 2006, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching selected UCLA for its new Community Engagement classification. UCLA was the only university in the University of California system and the only research university in the Los Angeles region chosen for this designation. As the first university in the nation to offer a Civic Engagement minor, UCLA provides students with an analytical and theoretical framework for community-building, governance, and the use of civic resources.

Recognizing UCLA’s commitment to civic engagement, Washington Monthly ranked UCLA second in the nation in its 2007 list of socially responsible universities. This ranking reflects the number of students dedicated to public service as well as exemplary access for low-income students.

Future directions in community engagement

Virtually every academic unit in UCLA already provides research, scholarship, art, education, or other services that enhance Los Angeles. The challenges we face are coordinating and focusing such activities, making them more visible to the community, and elevating civic engagement to become a core institutional value and commitment.

Recently, UCLA has taken steps to increase its ties to Los Angeles. An important element of this effort is the Luskin Center for Innovation – a new interdisciplinary unit that brings together faculty from a variety of disciplines to address critical social issues, while also expanding educational opportunities in community scholarship. This work will improve the
quality of life for the communities we serve and stand as the centerpiece of academic research related to urban issues and needs.

The Bruin Community School, which is located in one of the most densely populated areas in California and inhabited predominantly by underserved and low income populations, will open its doors in Fall 2009. It will offer outstanding education to a diverse student body and stand as a symbol of UCLA’s commitment to the children of Los Angeles.

UCLA is also reaching out to the business community. We are strengthening close ties between private sector community leaders and UCLA professional schools and UCLA Extension is increasing its presence in downtown Los Angeles. A research incubator is bringing faculty inventors together with entrepreneurs, and discussion has begun about the possibility of a research park.

Financial Security

Recent trends indicate that the years ahead will be difficult for publically funded research universities. The “wealth” gap between public and private institutions, uncertainties about state and federal funding, dramatically rising costs, and a severe economic downturn threaten the vitality of the system of higher education and advanced research in the U.S. at a time when competition from foreign universities is heating up and foreign governments are starting to invest heavily in higher education and research. UCLA must understand this competitive environment so that it can develop strategies that will strengthen its place as a leader in the academic world.

As a mature campus, UCLA will not grow significantly in the foreseeable future. The total number of students at UCLA will remain roughly what it is today, but the mix of undergraduate, graduate and post-doctoral scholars can and should change, as enrollments shift from one discipline to another and as we seek to enhance graduate education overall.

Funding is one of UCLA’s great vulnerabilities. As a public university, UCLA has depended on the state of California for the resources necessary to make it a world-class university, but repeated rounds of budget cutting and the state’s continuing financial problems have constrained UCLA’s development and demonstrated the unreliability of state support. Balancing the university’s need for revenues from increased fees with our commitment to keeping the UC affordable to all socioeconomic groups is becoming more challenging. In the meantime, the basic cost of remaining competitive with our peers continues to rise, especially for the recruitment and retention of faculty, graduate students, and staff. Salaries, housing, schooling, childcare, and other family-friendly resources all enter into the equation.

Recognizing that limitations of the state budget no longer allow robust central investment, we must become more efficient and more entrepreneurial in order to enhance financial security. UCLA must search for ways to increase administrative efficiency. For example, improvements and collaboration in Information Technology across campus can significantly reduce IT costs.
Fortunately, UCLA has been highly successful in both extramural funding and private giving. UCLA’s $3 billion campaign, which concluded in 2004-05, was the largest and most successful public university campaign up to that point. Private giving continues to be strong, with over $1.5 billion raised during the five-year period 2002-03 to 2006-07. Gifts and pledges totaled $481 million in 2007-08 alone. In addition, UCLA is seeking innovative strategies to increase revenues and cut costs.

Finally, the development of UCLA’s academic plan will contribute to UCLA’s financial security and enable the campus to thrive despite financial constraints. The plan describes the strategic actions UCLA will undertake in each of the four areas described here.
About UC Merced

UC Merced, as the 10th campus in the University of California system, is the first new American research university in the 21st century and the first UC in 40 years. Just under four years old, having opened in Fall 2005, this student-centered research university expands access to a UC education to historically underserved populations across the state, including those in the San Joaquin Valley, where the campus is located. Six of the 11 counties in the Valley experienced increases in the college-going rates of public high school graduates to UC campuses between 2004 (the year before UC Merced opened) to 2007. For Merced County public high schools, the rate more than doubled (from 2 percent to 5 percent).

Taking advantage of its proximity to the Sierra foothills and Yosemite National Park, the campus has developed a unique partnership with the National Park Service, Yosemite National Park and Sequoia & Kings Canyon National Park. This partnership offers unrivaled experiences for faculty, students and park personnel to foster important research that impacts the Sierra and the San Joaquin Valley and, through programs like the Yosemite Leadership Program, to guide students to become better stewards of the natural environment.

UC Merced faculty offer academic programs and provide research opportunities that promote in students the excitement of discovery and investigation. With a 15-to-1 student-faculty ratio (Fall 2008) and small class sizes (more than 58 percent of classes are under 30 students; more than 75 percent under 50 students), UC Merced has all the advantages of a small, highly selective liberal arts college along with the resources and educational stimulation of a world-class research university.

Growing fast

Like sister UC campuses established many years ago (e.g., UC Berkeley, UCLA and UC Irvine), UC Merced was placed in the rural outskirts of a city, with the expectation that the campus will gradually become integrated with the surrounding community. The campus’s pioneering class

1 The campus actually opened in Fall 2004 with 13 graduate students who had come with the 65 founding faculty from other universities.
2 Data obtained from California Postsecondary Education Commission: www.cpec.ca.gov/StudentData/CaCGRTrendOptions.asp
Three years later (Fall 2008), the student population had more than tripled (from 875 to 2,718). Freshman applicants to UC Merced grew by over 35 percent (from 14,078 to 19,116), while transfer applicants increased by almost 22 percent (from 1,797 to 2,185). The campus opened with nine undergraduate degree programs and, by Fall 2008, more than doubled its offerings to 18. Long-range enrollment projections estimate that fall enrollments will exceed 5,000 by 2012 and 10,000 by 2020. In addition to its original three schools (Engineering, Natural Sciences, and Social Sciences, Humanities & Arts), the campus’s future will include professional education schools, such as management and medicine, which are in the early planning stages.

Achievements in first few years

From the beginning, the UC Regents expected the campus to use the most advanced techniques in energy and resource conservation. UC Merced’s commitment to environmental sustainability is reflected in its distinction as the first campus in the country with an expressed goal to achieve campus-wide LEED\(^5\) certification. As of April 1, 2009, the campus has one Silver and four Gold LEED-certified buildings, with an additional two building certifications pending for existing buildings. The new 2009 Campus Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) sets new standards for sustainability and environmental stewardship by raising the bar on UC Merced’s previously stated goal of achieving LEED Silver certification for all buildings on campus. The new LEED goal is a minimum of Gold for future projects. In addition, the 2009 LRDP adds a new “triple-net-zero” goal for the university: to consume no offsite or nonrenewable energy, to produce no net carbon emissions, and to produce no landfill waste by 2020. The campus also commits itself to minimizing water consumption and exploring the feasibility of achieving water neutrality. As a “green” campus, UC Merced is leading the way in environmental stewardship and research to preserve natural resources.

During the first two years, UC Merced went through a comprehensive WASC accreditation review and was granted candidacy in June 2007. The Initial Accreditation process is under way, with a decision target date of Spring 2011.

---

3 By contrast, UC Berkeley opened in 1868 with 40 students and 10 faculty. UCLA started in 1919 with only two-year programs (260 junior college students and 1,078 students in a teachers training program) before adding the third and fourth years in 1924.

4 Of the three UC campuses that started in 1965, only UC Santa Cruz increased enrollments faster (by 400 percent) in the first three years; UC Irvine and UC San Diego increased by over 200 percent.

5 Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) is a program of the U.S. Green Building Council that rates structures on various aspects of environmental performance.
In addition to the accumulation of over $61 million in grants and contracts awarded to UC Merced faculty, several faculty members have received highly competitive national awards: one Young Faculty Award from the Department of Defense’s Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), two Presidential Early Career Awards for Scientists and Engineers (PECASE), and the Crashaw Prize (an international poetry award). Already in UC Merced’s short history, students also have competed for and won prestigious national and state awards, including three Strauss Foundation Awards and one Truman Scholar.

Undergraduate Access and Preparation

First-time freshmen

UC Merced draws its freshman cohorts from the state’s UC-eligible applicants (top 12.5 percent of the high school graduates) as well as UC-qualified applicants from other states and countries. Fall 2008 freshmen averaged 1043 on the SAT (Critical Reading and Math), almost 30 points higher than the average for the state (1014). Their average high school GPA was 3.4 (middle 50 percent was 3.14-3.65). This freshman class had nine Regents Scholars. The prestigious Regents Scholarships are awarded to students based solely on their academic and personal achievements.

Part of UC Merced’s mission is to increase access to a four-year college education, especially UC education, to the previously underserved high school graduate population in the San Joaquin Valley. In Fall 2008, 30 percent of the freshman class came from the San Joaquin Valley, compared to 26 percent in Fall 2005. More than half of the class (52.9 percent) were first-generation college students. The campus admits a higher percentage of first-generation college freshmen than any other UC campus. Similarly, compared to the other UC campuses, Merced’s freshman class is more likely to come from low-income families (42 percent in Fall 2008 received Pell Grants). Many of these students also come to UC Merced as second-language learners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Freshman Characteristics</th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average SAT</td>
<td>1043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average HS GPA</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% First-Generation College</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% First Language Non-English</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Low Income (Pell Grant Recipient)</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Female</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-American</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% California Residents</td>
<td>97.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Live in Campus Housing</td>
<td>81.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 To meet the UC system Scholarship requirement, students must attain a minimum GPA of 3.0 in A-G courses (15 units of required subject course work in History/Social Science, English, Mathematics, Laboratory Science, Language other than English, Visual and Performing Arts, and College-Preparatory Electives).

7 Neither parent graduated from a four-year college.

8 Federal Pell Grants are awarded to families with low incomes and are based on formula that includes family income, other assets, and household size. Generally, students with family incomes up to $55,000 may be eligible, although most Pell awards go to students with family incomes below $20,000.
For about 17 percent of the new freshmen in 2008, English was not their first language. Their success, however, is critical to the future of the Valley and the state of California. UC Merced’s support services include mid-semester grades and academic success workshops, general and major advising, tutoring, peer mentoring, as well as career and psychological counseling. First-year retention rates (Fall 2005-Fall 2007 cohorts) for first-generation college students averaged about 79 percent, compared to about 83 percent for freshmen from families with at least one parent who graduated from a four-year college.

Transfers

Junior-level transfers from California Community Colleges come with 60 semester units of college credit and at least a 2.4 GPA, as well as all other course transfer and grade requirements. The average prior-college GPA for the 139 new transfer students in Fall 2008 was 3.03. Two of the Fall 2008 transfers received the distinguished Regents Scholarships. Most transfers (86.3 percent) came from California Community Colleges (CCCs) and, like the new freshmen, many were first-generation college students (43.9 percent), low-income (43 percent) and, for about 16 percent of them, English was not their first language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transfer Student Characteristics</th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Prior-College GPA</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% First-Generation College</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% First Language Non-English</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Low Income (Pell Grant Recipient)</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Female</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-American</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% California Residents</td>
<td>92.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Live in Campus Housing</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% From California Community Colleges</td>
<td>86.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On average, about 84 percent of the upper-division CCC transfers were retained after one year; almost 44 percent graduated within two years and 67 percent within three years. UC Merced transfer student support services include the Transfer Student Association, the Student Transfer Outreach Mentor Program (STOMP), the Student Ambassador Program, and a transfer student wiki where information is shared about student life and the transfer student experience at Merced and other campuses.
Undergraduate affordability

The goal of UC Merced’s financial aid program is to remove financial barriers and help ensure that every eligible student has the opportunity to pursue his or her educational objectives. In Fall 2007, 61 percent of Merced full-time undergraduates received need-based scholarship or grant aid, averaging $10,828. Of the financial aid dollars dispersed to undergraduates in 2007-08, 64 percent were gift aid (grants and scholarships), 32 percent were loans, 2 percent work study and 2 percent other fee reductions/waivers.

Undergraduate Student Profile

UC Merced draws undergraduate students from across the state: 31 percent from the San Joaquin Valley, 30 percent from the San Francisco Bay Area, 27 percent from Southern California, 10 percent from other parts of the state. Out-of-state and international students make up a small (2 percent) but growing portion of the undergraduate population. The undergraduate student body is very diverse, with no ethnic majority: 33 percent Asian, 30 percent Hispanic, 24 percent White, 6.5 percent African American, 6.5 percent Other (including Native American, International, and Unknown).  Counter to the trend at most other four-year colleges in California and in the nation, UC Merced has more male undergraduates (new and continuing) than female.  Almost half of the undergraduate programs offered are STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics) programs representing more than 50 percent of the declared undergraduate majors.
Undergraduate student success

While UC Merced already has awarded 139 bachelor’s degrees through Summer 2008 (mostly to transfer students), May 16, 2009 will mark the four-year graduation high point for UC Merced’s pioneering class of first-time freshmen. This event will be a very important milestone for the campus as well as these hard-working students. As this report goes to print, some students already have been accepted into graduate and professional programs; others have plans to work or travel. In a systemwide survey (UCUES) conducted in Spring 2008, 30 percent of UC Merced seniors indicated that they intended to pursue a doctoral degree after graduation. This was higher than any other UC campus. The system-wide average was 23 percent. In addition, 25 percent said they intend to pursue medical or other health professional degrees and 10 percent planned to earn law degrees. Results from a survey of undergraduate alumni this past year revealed that 43 percent already have enrolled in graduate degree programs: 28 percent master’s, 14 percent doctoral.

Undergraduate student experience

UC Merced participates in the UC Education Abroad Program (EAP), which gives undergraduates the opportunity to study in countries such as Israel, China, Spain, the United Kingdom, and more. At least 29 students have studied abroad (for a semester or a summer) in the last two years. Besides these international opportunities, Merced undergraduates also have taken advantage of special domestic programs. The UCDC academic program gives students the opportunity to continue their studies at the UC Washington Center while interning in Washington, D.C. Similarly, the UC Sacramento program includes rigorous coursework as well as intern and research experience in the state Capitol. At least 13 Merced students have participated in these internship programs so far.

Undergraduate Student Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate Student Profile</th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% First-Generation College¹</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% First Language Non-English</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Low Income (Pell Grant Recipient)</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Female</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-American</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% California Residents</td>
<td>98.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% San Joaquin Valley</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Live in Campus Housing</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Full-time</td>
<td>99.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With 100 campus clubs and organizations, students find rewarding activities and opportunities for leadership experience as well as for expanding friendships. Merced seniors who responded to the UCUES survey in Spring 2008 were just as satisfied, or more so, with their campus as UC seniors systemwide. UC Merced seniors clearly had more direct interaction with faculty members than their counterparts at other UC campuses. They were more likely to have talked with an instructor outside of class about course material (85 percent vs. 63 percent) and to have worked with a faculty member on a campus activity other than coursework (49 percent vs. 29 percent). Merced seniors, compared to seniors systemwide, enrolled at much higher rates in at least one independent research course (62 percent vs. 49 percent), and were more likely to have assisted faculty with research or a creative activity (68 percent vs. 53 percent).

### Undergraduate Student Experience: Seniors Spring 2008 UCUES¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>UC Merced</th>
<th>UC System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Would choose to attend this institution again</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were satisfied with their overall academic experience</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were satisfied with the value of their education for the price they paid</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported that their campus had a strong commitment to undergraduate education</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were satisfied with advising by faculty on academic matters</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talked with an instructor outside of class about course material</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with a faculty member on a campus activity other than coursework</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled in at least one independent research course</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted faculty with research or a creative activity</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey

### In their own words

Responding to being asked how their experience at UC Merced prepared them for their future endeavors, seniors graduating in Spring 2009 reinforced the common themes related to working closely with faculty and being able to work on meaningful research projects as an undergraduate:³

- “I have had the opportunity to work on a few projects that would not have been possible at a larger university…. I don’t think I would have had the opportunity to be writing a book during my undergraduate career anywhere else” (referring to “The Fairy Shrimp Chronicles”).
- “I learned the value of hard work and being a leader,” another senior said.

³ [http://commencement.ucmerced.edu/2.asp?uc=1&lvl2=133&contentid=152 ]
• Another expressed appreciation for “the importance of working within an interdisciplinary group, the value of efficient teamwork and the ability to develop my interest in biomedical research.”
• “UC Merced allows its students more access to research positions and internships than its larger counterparts.”
• Still another mentioned that he “helped found the local chapter of the National Society of Black Engineers,” “participated in a rewarding service-learning program,” and “more importantly, I made connections here by doing research, mentoring lower classmen and learning from great teachers and advisors.”

Graduate student profile

Graduate applications to UC Merced have increased almost five-fold, from 72 in Fall 2005 to 339 in Fall 2008. The median GRE score for enrolled graduate students is 1230. Over three-quarters of the graduate students are in STEM fields. Almost 85 percent are pursuing doctoral degrees. They represent diverse backgrounds with over 35 percent coming from other countries. Like the undergraduates, there is no ethnic majority: 1.1 percent African American, 8.7 percent Asian American, 12 percent Hispanic, 28.8 percent White; 35.3 percent internationals, and 14.1 percent other/unknown. From FY 2005-06 through Summer 2008 the campus awarded seven master’s degrees and, in Summer 2008, Merced’s first doctoral degree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graduate Student Characteristics</th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median GRE (Verbal &amp; Quantitative)</td>
<td>1230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Master's students</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Doctoral Students</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Female</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-American</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty

Total full-time instructional faculty at UC Merced has nearly tripled since the campus opened in Fall 2005. Part-time instructional faculty also increased, but at a slower rate than full-time faculty in recent years. Eighty percent of full-time faculty (including lecturers) have Ph.D.s or equivalent degrees. Females comprised almost 40 percent of full-time faculty in Fall 2008; minorities (Asian American, Hispanic and Native American) comprised 28 percent. For the size of its faculty, it is remarkable and impressive that already two PECASE awards were granted to UC Merced faculty (one each in the last two years). By comparison, in 2006, 11 were awarded to faculty in the entire UC system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UC Merced Faculty and Instruction</th>
<th>Fall 2005</th>
<th>Fall 2006</th>
<th>Fall 2007</th>
<th>Fall 2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Full-Time Instructional Faculty</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Male</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Female</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-American</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Part-Time Instructional Faculty</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Male</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Female</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-American</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Faculty Ratio¹</td>
<td>12 to 1</td>
<td>14 to 1</td>
<td>14 to 1</td>
<td>15 to 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹FTE students to FTE faculty, using the CDS definition (FT plus 1/3 PT)

Note: Faculty includes ladder rank & lecturers
Research

UC Merced’s 162 full-time faculty members have a wide range of interdisciplinary research interests, beginning with the campus’ signature research centers:

- the Sierra Nevada Research Institute,
- the Merced Energy Research Institute, and
- the Biomedical Sciences Research Institute.

Faculty expertise includes hydrology, solar power technologies, stem-cell biology, infectious disease, biodiversity and global climate change, air and water quality, and population health. Partnerships with other UC campuses and with entities such as Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Sequoia & Kings Canyon National Parks and Yosemite National Park enhance education and research at UC Merced.

Total Research and Development (R&D) expenditures increased almost four-fold from fiscal year 2005 through 2008 (from $4.5 million to almost $17 million). R&D per ladder rank faculty increased from almost $100,000 to over $150,000 in this short period of time.

Resources and Philanthropy

Total revenues for UC Merced in 2007-08 were over $100 million, up by 53 percent over the first year (2005-06) and 40 percent over 2006-07. Almost $26 million was spent in 2007-08 on instructional and academic support ($13,567 per FTE student), representing over 27 percent of overall expenditures. Expenditures specifically devoted to Student Services and Financial Aid represented 16 percent of the total. This is nearly twice those totaled for 2005-06. Research expenditures totaled over $10 million, or 11 percent of total expenditures, compared to 9 percent for 2005-06.

UC Merced has 18 endowed chairs and professorships, eight of which already are fully funded. At the close of fiscal year 2007-08, Merced’s endowment was valued at over $24.6 million. Almost two-thirds (65.4 percent) of the endowment is targeted to departmental support, about a fifth (20.2 percent) to student support and instruction, and the remaining (14.4 percent) to campus improvement and other purposes.
Vision for the Future

From the beginning, the UC Regents and campus founders envisioned UC Merced to be a campus that would blend world-class graduate and undergraduate education with basic and applied research, the process of discovery, and an entrepreneurial spirit. Building on that concept, the first Strategic Academic Vision describes a campus that expands its interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary programs in natural sciences, engineering, social sciences, humanities, and arts with strong professional programs, creatively interweaving teaching and research interests that will benefit students in so many ways and positively impact the social welfare of the state and beyond.
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About UC Riverside

Mission

The University of California, Riverside serves the needs and enhances the quality of life of the diverse people of California, the nation and the world through knowledge – its communication, discovery, translation, application, and preservation. The undergraduate, graduate and professional degree programs; research programs; and outreach activities develop leaders who inspire, create, and enrich California’s economic, social, cultural, and environmental future.

With its roots as a Citrus Experiment Station, UC Riverside is guided by its land grant tradition of giving back by addressing some of the most vexing problems facing society. Whether it is assuring a safe, nutritious, and affordable food supply; stimulating the human mind and soul through the humanities and arts; or finding solutions to the profound challenges in education, engineering, business, healthcare, and the environment, UC Riverside is living the promise.

“\n
“The notion of promise is important to me. The importance of living the promise is even more so, as this requires action and expects high levels of achievement.”

Chancellor Timothy P. White
Inaugural Address, March 17, 2009

UC Riverside’s achievements include:

✓ Serving as an economic engine for the state and region. In 2008, UCR contributed $1.2 billion into the economy, a 5:1 return on state investment.
✓ Maintaining social relevance, for which Washington Monthly (2007) ranked UCR 15th in the nation. Factors considered included the degree to which UCR is an engine for social mobility, promotes service to the country, and fosters scientific and humanistic research.
✓ Providing a model as a public research university that combines diversity and excellence. The 2009 U.S. News and World Report rankings placed UCR fifth in the nation for the diversity of its undergraduate population.
✓ Combining affordability and access. The Princeton Review named UCR as one of America’s Best Value Colleges, lauding the campus for its small class sizes, helpful and friendly professors, and strong pre-medical education.
✓ Achieving scholarly productivity. According to the Faculty Scholarly Productivity Index (2007), UCR ranked third in the nation in environmental sciences, fourth in both soil science and entomology, fifth in natural resources and conservation, and 10th in both plant pathology and botany and plant biology.
✓ Being a growth campus of choice and access. Fully 94 percent of incoming students made UCR their campus of choice; the remaining six percent come from the referral pool, as provided for in California’s Master Plan for Higher Education.
✓ Serving the underserved. In 2008, UCR became the first in the UC system to receive the federal education designation of Hispanic-Serving Institution. Subsequently, the campus won a $3.3 million federal grant to bring more Hispanic and low-income transfer students into the STEM fields.
Goals

The following goals were identified as part of UCR’s five-year plan:

- Achieving the Profile of an AAU Member Institution – UCR is widely recognized as a campus on the move. Our intent is to move from prominence to preeminence. The indicators used to assess our progress are the quantitative measures used by AAU in evaluating institutions for membership.

- Expanding Community Engagement – UCR has long enjoyed a strong relationship with its community and region. An important long-range goal is to capitalize on this relationship by partnering with our community to effectively utilize and apply the university’s knowledge, resources, and expertise to mutually address the needs and problems facing our society. In so doing, we will bring value not only to our community, but to faculty and students as well.

- Managing Growth with Excellence and Diversity – With its highly diverse undergraduate population, UCR plays a unique role within the UC system. Through a variety of programs aimed at student success, UCR will increase retention and six-year graduation rates, grow the number of underrepresented minority students in STEM fields, and become even more of a residential campus of choice.

- Developing Additional Revenue Sources – UCR currently receives approximately 44 percent of its funding from state general funds. Given the current economic situation, this dependency on state funding makes the campus increasingly vulnerable to budget cuts. We aspire to reduce this dependency, by both developing new revenue streams and by expanding existing non-state sources of revenue.

- Launching New Professional Schools – UCR aspires to launch a UC-quality, research-based School of Medicine by Fall 2012. The school will help to address a dire shortage of physicians in Inland Southern California by training a diverse physician workforce. In addition, UCR will launch a new School of Public Policy, focusing on the environment, immigration and population dynamics, higher education and health, with a special emphasis on diversity.

UCR at a glance

In Fall 2008, UC Riverside reached its largest enrollment ever at 18,079 students, a 4.5 percent increase from Fall 2003 and a more than 70 percent increase in the last decade. Graduate enrollment grew from 11.4 percent of the overall student population in 2003 to 12.8 percent, or 2,317 students, in Fall 2008.

UCR currently has three colleges, two schools, and a division of biomedical sciences. Together they offer 80 bachelor degree programs, 46 masters degree programs, 38 Ph.D. programs, and 17 California teaching and administrative credential programs. Between 2003 and 2008, the total number of degrees conferred increased 41 percent; during this period, the number of Ph.D.s granted increased by 85 percent. In 2008, the UC Board of Regents approved the formation of two new schools, a School of Medicine and a School of Public Policy.
Undergraduate Access and Preparation

UC Riverside maintains an unfailing commitment of service to the people of California, both by ensuring that it remains accessible and by making a positive contribution to California youth through academic preparation programs. Again, this commitment is rooted in UCR’s land grant mission as the “people’s University,” and is particularly important given that UCR’s service area has one of the lowest college-going rates in the state.

Diversity

With 98 percent of its undergraduate students California residents, UCR reflects the diverse face of the state – ethnically, economically, educationally, and geographically. The table below provides the breakdown for undergraduate students as of Fall 2008.

Last year close to half (46.8 percent) of California’s public high school graduates were African American, Chicano/Latino or American Indian, groups defined as “underrepresented” based upon their traditionally low UC eligibility rates. In 2008, 40.2 percent of UCR freshmen from California public high schools were underrepresented minorities, compared to 24.0 percent in UC overall. In the last decade UCR has made steady progress in increasing the proportion of underrepresented minority freshmen; the gap at UCR relative to California public high school graduates was cut in half since 1999 even as the proportion of underrepresented minorities among California’s public high school graduates grew over the same period. The graphic below parallels Indicator 3.1 of the Accountability Report, but includes data for UCR.

Thus, in both the classroom and informal settings, UCR students are likely to encounter the kind of “critical mass” of students from different backgrounds that enhances learning and will serve them well in tomorrow’s work force. UCR also contributes to social mobility in California, with more than half (56 percent) of UCR students the first in their families to attend college, compared to 46 percent for the UC system (Accountability Indicator 4.9).
Academic preparedness

UC Riverside’s growing reputation for academic excellence, access, and diversity is evident in that freshmen applications from California residents increased from 9,341 in 1995 to 29,097 in 2008, a remarkable three-fold increase that outpaced application growth at all other UC campuses. Increasingly UCR is a campus of first choice. For Fall 2009, undergraduate applications are up 7.6 percent, compared to a 4 percent increase systemwide.

UCR students are academically talented. In 2008 the mean high school GPA for the entering class was 3.42 and the average SAT was 1051 (Math + Critical Reading), which is similar to preparation levels for the entering class in recent years. Nevertheless, slightly more than half of entering first-year students take preparatory work in writing, mathematics, or both to bring them to the level of performance necessary to succeed at UC (Undergraduate Education Placement Results, Fall 2008).

Through educational partnership programs such as the ALPHA Center, UCR works with local school districts and schools with the goal of improving performance in the fields of mathematics and science. Likewise, the MESA office at UCR’s Bourns College of Engineering – part of the statewide Mathematics Engineering Science Achievement program – brings hundreds of disadvantaged middle and high school students to a competition on campus and supports these youth in their aspirations to become budding scientists and engineers.

Community college transfers

Another critical pathway under the Master Plan is transfer from California Community Colleges. Nine of 10 UCR transfer students come from the California Community Colleges, and about half of UCR’s transfer students come from Riverside and San Bernardino counties (counties that have low rates of sending students to college as freshmen). Transfer students enter UCR with an average GPA of 3.0. The proportion of underrepresented minority students in the transfer class is comparable to UCR’s freshmen class, and most of UCR’s transfers are also first-generation college students.

The vast majority of UC undergraduates who served in the military or are on active duty enter through the transfer route. Relative to the size of its entering transfer class, UCR does better than the system as a whole in enrolling transfer students who are veterans.

Affordability and access

UCR is a national leader among research institutions with respect to access for low-income students (see chart to the right, similar to Indicator 2.4). In 2007-08, 44 percent of UCR undergraduates received Pell Grants, compared to 33 percent for the UC system (Indicator 8.7). The proportion of Pell Grant recipients at UCR is also double to triple levels found at UC’s Comparison 8 institutions.

In all, about three-quarters of UCR’s undergraduate students receive some form of financial aid from the university. Moreover, 56.4 percent are employed on and/or off campus, and employed UCR students
average 16.3 hours per week (above the systemwide average of 14.2 hours) to help support themselves and, in some cases, their families (UCUES, 2008).

**Undergraduate Student Experience**

Many UCR students arrive on campus from backgrounds of low socioeconomic status and limited opportunity for academic achievement. In light of this, UCR clearly brings value added to the students’ educational experience. The first to second year retention rate is slightly more than 84 percent, much higher than the nationwide average of 73 percent for public research/doctoral level institutions, albeit lower than other UC campuses (ACT, 2008; Indicator 7.5, UC Accountability Report 2008). Six-year graduation rates hover around the national average of 65 percent (or 68 percent, including students transferring to another UC).

A point of pride for UCR is the relative parity of retention and degree completion among racial and ethnic groups for the 2002 freshman class (see above). Likewise, for the 1998 to 2001 freshman classes (not shown), the gap in graduation rates between White students and African Americans was only 3.4 points (UC system = 11.9 point gap), and there was no gap between Chicano/Latinos and Whites (UC system = 7.9 point gap). UCR transfer students generally perform at least as well academically as do continuing UCR students, in terms of retention, grades in the same courses and graduation rates.

While UCR undergraduates may differ somewhat from their counterparts at other UC campuses in terms of background characteristics, once students arrive at Riverside, their overall student experiences on campus closely resemble the experiences of undergraduates across the UC system (UCUES 2008):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>UC</th>
<th>UCR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My campus has a strong commitment to undergraduate education</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel valued as an individual on this campus</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that I belong at this campus</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Likewise, UCR undergraduates report making appreciable gains in the acquisition of academic skills during their years of study on the campus (UCUES 2008). The percent of UCR students who report levels of “very good” or “excellent” in the following areas was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>As Freshmen*</th>
<th>As Seniors*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analytical and critical thinking skills</td>
<td>24% (27%)</td>
<td>65% (65%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of specific field of study</td>
<td>11% (10%)</td>
<td>62% (63%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*UC systemwide averages in parentheses

How does UC Riverside accomplish these outcomes, given the economic and educational profile of our student population? The campus understands that successful transition from high
school to university academics is crucial, and prioritizes undergraduate student success. To increase first to second year retention and decrease time to degree, academic engagement programs are tailored to the needs and concerns of entering first year students and new transfers, including first year learning communities, supplemental instruction, early alert programs, and success series workshops. Changes to the academic advising system have created a reasonable student-advisor ratio and incorporate student development theory into advising practice. To balance their studies and grow personally, students are encouraged to become involved in co-curricular, professional, cultural and social activities.

**Graduate Studies**

At UC Riverside the number of graduate and professional students enrolled has increased by 23 percent since 2003 and 76 percent since 1998. The campus has experienced a significant increase in the number of women enrolled in several discipline areas between 2003 and 2008. Biomedical sciences has increased its number of women from 50 percent to approximately 77 percent of its total enrollment in the past five years; in engineering the number of women has increased from approximately 23 percent to nearly 28 percent. The percentages of women enrolled in the humanities, arts, and social sciences (54 percent); management (51 percent) and the natural and agricultural sciences (40 percent) have remained relatively stable during this time.

UCR has seen a 26 percent increase in the total number of African-American, Asian, Native American, and Latino students in UCR’s graduate and professional programs since 2003. The percent of the total graduate population that identifies as members of those ethnic groups is 30.8 percent of our total domestic graduate enrollment. In STEM fields, underrepresented minorities (African Americans, Native Americans, Chicano/Latinos) have increased 108 percent since 2003, and now comprise more than 14 percent of the total domestic student enrollment, which is up from 10 percent in 2003. Campus-wide URM numbers have increased 37 percent and now make up 15 percent of total domestic enrollment. In comparison, underrepresented minority graduate enrollment for the UC system is slightly less than 12 percent (2007 figures).

As shown to the right, degrees awarded at both the master’s and doctoral level increased from the 2002-03 academic year by 19.6 percent and 85.1 percent, respectively.

UCR continues to increase the number of master’s and doctoral degrees it awards in STEM fields. The proportion of master’s degrees conferred in these fields is 27 percent, which is significantly higher than the national average of 16 percent. The percentage of doctoral degrees in these fields is 66.1 percent at UCR; the national average is 44 percent.

### University of California, Riverside

**Graduate Degrees Conferred 2002-03 and 2007-08**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Type</th>
<th>2002-03</th>
<th>2007-08</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Time to degree**

During the past three years, master’s students at UCR have required between 1.9 and 2.1 years, on average, to complete their degrees. Doctoral students have required 5.2 years. Both of these are consistent with the normative times to degree expected by UCR graduate programs and at peer institution averages.

**Graduate placement in academe**

Over the past three years, placements for students from the College of Humanities, Arts, and Social Sciences into positions in academe have averaged 54 percent of those reporting. Similar
placements for reporting students from the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences have averaged 40 percent. Both of these percentages have been generally trending upward during the past 10 years. In Bourns College of Engineering, placements in academia are somewhat lower (16 percent of those reporting). However, many graduate students in engineering seek professional or technical positions outside of academe. Placement in such areas has averaged 33 percent of those reporting and also has been trending upwards over the past five years. Overall employment figures for our graduate students have also been trending upward. On average since 2003, 77 percent of all those reporting in the College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences are employed, 75 percent in the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences, and 69 percent in Bourns College of Engineering.

Expanding available programs

UCR currently accepts students into 46 graduate programs, most of which offer both master’s and doctoral degrees. Since the start of the 2005-06 academic year, new programs have been launched in Bioengineering, Ethnic Studies, Religious Studies, and Southeast Asian Studies. The Music program added a Ph.D. degree, and the UCR Palm Desert Graduate Center initiated programs in both Management and Creative Writing. Creative Writing also established a concentrated residency program.

Two highly anticipated expansions to graduate education at UCR are the recently approved schools of Medicine and Public Policy. The School of Medicine will improve health care in this medically underserved part of the state, as well as increase the diversity of the physician workforce. At maturity, this school will have 400 M.D. students and 160 Ph.D. students. The School of Public Policy will address regional, state, and national needs, including immigration, land use and the environment, higher education, and health policy. This school will offer both master’s and Ph.D. degrees and, when mature, is expected to enroll 170 graduate students.

Faculty and Instruction

Student-faculty ratios are a key measure of academic quality, and this is an area where UCR has made recent progress. A contributing factor to this progress is that between 1998 and 2008—a period of significant student enrollment growth—UCR increased its headcount of ladder-rank faculty members by nearly two-thirds. The trend in UCR’s actual (and budgeted) student faculty ratio is shown in Accountability Indicator 7.6.

One challenge for Riverside is that our actual student-faculty ratio is approximately 15 percent higher than the ratio at the non-growth UC campuses. This is attributable to the previously used (and richer) funding allocation rules that were advantageous for campuses with large numbers of graduate students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicano/Latino</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown/Undeclared</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Ladder Rank Faculty</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty diversity

UCR reaffirms the UC Statement on Diversity adopted by the Assembly of the Academic Senate in 2006 and endorsed by the Regents in 2007, which includes recognition of 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.” UCR’s faculty diversity has improved modestly in recent years (Accountability Framework Indicators 7.2 and 7.4). Currently 31 percent of Riverside’s ladder rank faculty members are women, up from 25 percent in 2003. Combined, African Americans, Latinos, Asian, and American Indians comprise 28 percent of UCR faculty members. UCR is committed to enhancing the faculty diversity pipeline through programs such as the Chancellor’s Postdoctoral Fellowships for Cultivating Diversity in the STEM fields.

Faculty awards and honors

The UC Riverside faculty makes an immense contribution to society through the advancement of knowledge. UCR faculty members have won numerous national awards and been named to the most prestigious academic societies in the nation. For example, the 2008 class of fellows for the American Association for the Advancement of Science included thirteen UCR faculty members. The table below (similar to Accountability Indicator 7.11) displays several awards and honorary memberships.

UCR recognizes individual faculty members and its institutional commitment to teaching and faculty excellence through its award programs. These include teaching, research and service awards determined by Academic Senate committees, awards based upon nominations by deans (e.g., UCR Academy of Distinguished Teachers) and awards chosen by the Chancellor or Executive Vice Chancellor based on advisory committees (e.g., Eminent Scholar and University Scholar programs). The quality of instruction at UCR is also corroborated by students’ self-reported gains in academic skills described earlier in the section on the undergraduate experience.

| University of California, Riverside Faculty Recipients of Honorary Memberships or Awards |
|--------------------------------------------|-----|
| Memberships in:                           | Number |
| American Association for the Advancement of Science | 120 |
| American Chemical Society                 | 9 |
| American Council of Learned Societies     | 16 |
| Entomological Society of America          | 23 |
| Ford Foundation Fellowships               | 13 |
| Fulbright Scholarships                     | 38 |
| Guggenheim Fellowships                     | 20 |
| National Academy of Sciences               | 4 |
| National Endowment for the Humanities     | 30 |
| NSF Early Career Development Program      | 16 |
| Sloan Fellows                              | 13 |

Note: Excludes emeriti, retired, former, or deceased faculty.

Research and Technology Transfer

For fiscal year 2008, sponsored funding for contracts and grants awarded to UCR faculty, staff and students totaled $104.7 million. This represents a 7 percent increase over sponsored
funding for FY 2007, and nearly 32 percent growth since FY 2004. Funding received from federal agencies increased by 3 percent over the previous year, for a total of $66.7 million. The National Science Foundation continues to be the major federal funding agency, providing UCR with $20.6 million in FY 2008, a 14 percent increase over the previous fiscal year.

State sponsors also contributed significantly to this year’s overall increase by providing $11.2 million, an increase of 37 percent over the previous year. Similarly, funding from non-profits and other governmental sponsors substantially contributed to this year’s increase with a combined total of almost $15.6 million, representing a 12 percent increase over the previous year. As the only Hispanic-Serving Institution in the UC System, UC Riverside ranks 3rd nationally in terms of research expenditures at Hispanic-Serving Institutions.

UCR has more than 30 research units, including the College of Engineering-Center for Environmental Research and Technology, the Edward J. Blakeley Center for Sustainable Suburban Development, the Center for Conservation Biology, the Institute for Integrative Genome Biology, the Stem Cell Center, the Center for California Native Nations, and the Center for Ideas & Society. The campus is also headquarters to several systemwide programs, including the Water Resources Center, Natural Reserve System, UC Institute for Mexico and the United States (UC MEXUS), and the Agricultural Experiment Station.

**Technology transfer:** Between FY 2003 and FY 2008, UCR’s performance improved on all technology transfer measures. This may be due in part to the transfer of intellectual property management to the campus in 2008. The number of new invention disclosures increased 80 percent to 63, the number of active options and licenses grew 100 percent to 204, and gross revenue from intellectual property grew to $1.5 million, an increase of almost 80 percent.

**Resources, Efficiency and Productivity**

**Funding trends and efficiencies**

More than the UC system as a whole, the Riverside campus relies heavily on state general funds; this funding stream accounted for 44 percent of the campus’s total expenditures in fiscal year 2007-08. As shown on the chart to the right, UCR’s reliance on state general funds has been reduced by only two percentage points during the past five years, while over this same time period increased expenditures have been seen in
tuition and fees (2 percent) and other sources (3 percent).

When comparing UCR to similar UC campuses without medical schools, UCR is more reliant on state general funds than UCSC (40 percent) and UCSB (37 percent), while being very comparable in the government and tuition and fees funding expenditures categories. The other sources expenditure category (which contains private gifts, sales and service, reserves, and auxiliary enterprises expenditures) represents a much larger percentage of the total at UCSC (23 percent) and UCSB (25 percent) as compared to UCR (19 percent).

State support per student FTE declined between FY 2002-03 and FY 2007-08. Over that time period, state support per student FTE (MCOI, or marginal cost of instruction) dropped from $10,934 (when adjusted for inflation) to $10,586, representing an effective 3.18 percent decrease. In part because of the decrease in state support, tuition increased from $4,339/year (adjusted for inflation) to $6,636/year for an undergraduate resident student. This increase represents a 52.93 percent increase over a five-year period.

**Space productivity**

UC Riverside increased productivity of space between FY 2003 and FY 2007. The Education and General (E&G) assignable square feet per full-time equivalent student increased slightly, from 129 in FY 2003 to 136 in FY 2007. During this period, the average weekly hours of classroom and class lab utilization was consistently high. Between 2003 and 2007, classroom utilization averaged 98 percent, based on guidelines established by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC). In the same timeframe, class labs were utilized an average of 104 percent, based on CPEC guidelines.

UC Riverside has steadily increased the average number of research dollars per square foot of E&G research space. In FY 2007, UC Riverside generated $154.17 in research expenditures per square foot of research space compared with $148.08 in FY 2003.

**Capital investments**

UC Riverside’s capital program between 2003 and 2007 emphasized strategic investment of state and non-state resources to support UCR’s teaching, research, and public service mission. Investment in academic, research, support facilities, and infrastructure totaled almost $300 million during this period. Funding included $223 million in state funds and approximately $77 million in non-state funds. These investments yielded 369,078 ASF of new space and 158,708 ASF of renovated space, as well as replacement of obsolete campus utility systems with more efficient infrastructure. Within the same timeframe, UCR realized investments totaling more than $168 million of fee funded facilities to enhance student life and campus community life. These investments included 455,821 ASF of new student housing (1,200 beds), and dining and hospitality facilities for students, faculty, and staff.
Philanthropy

Building long-term relationships with alumni, donors, prospective donors, and friends is essential to UCR’s institutional mission. Ultimately, success on this front contributes to the future of the campus – UCR’s ability to attract and retain the finest faculty from around the world, to attract and support diverse and outstanding undergraduate and graduate students, and to serve the region of Southern California as an economic engine of new ideas and resources.

UCR has been late in making Advancement and its operational elements an integral part of the campus. Increased investment at UCR in the last 10 years, however, has begun to pay off. Through gifts and prudent investing, in less than a decade the UC Riverside Foundation Endowment and Endowment held by the Regents on behalf of the campus have grown from $50 million to more than $122 million. In little more than two decades, UCR went from having one endowed chair to nearly 40 today.

The number, loyalty and generosity of UCR’s donors continue to grow as a result of the continued investment in the advancement mission. As the campus accounts for cumulative gifts to our institution over time, these results stand out:

- Six donors have given cumulative gifts of $10 million; four have given $8 million or more.
- Seventy donors have given between $1 million and $10 million; and 5 more have given $800,000 or more.
- From 1994-95 to 2000-01, average campus outright gifts and pledges stood at $15 million per year. Between 2001-02 and 2007-08 average campus outright gifts and pledges stood at nearly $24 million per year, which begin to reflect recent investments made in Advancement (see chart below.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University of California, Riverside</th>
<th>Outright Gifts and Pledge Payments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corporate</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Related Organizations</td>
<td>17,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporations</td>
<td>7,839,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundations</td>
<td>3,490,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Organizations</td>
<td>5,263,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Totals</td>
<td>16,611,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni</td>
<td>521,9987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2,348,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Totals</td>
<td>2,870,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Giving Source Totals</strong></td>
<td>19,482,748</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: CAE Reporting Standards.

UCR’s economic impact on California

UC Riverside has a significant impact on California’s economic activity, extending far beyond campus. For 2007-08, UCR’s economic impact on the state of California was more than $1.2 billion, with portions continuing for multiple years. With 7,350 employees (including part-time and students), UCR is the second largest employer in the city of Riverside and tenth largest in...
the region. With nearly 70 percent of its impact in Inland Southern California, UCR is a major economic engine for the region. It is estimated that the spending by UCR, and its students, faculty and staff, visitors and retirees generates more than 14,000 full time jobs in California.

More information about UCR's economic impact may be found at http://impact.ucr.edu/.

Community Engagement

The growth of the Inland Southern California region has created opportunities for UCR to help shape the future. UCR is an active partner in economic development with our communities, fostering a new and strengthened economic job base. The campus has given priority to three areas of university engagement: economic development, education, and the arts.

In addition to providing a highly skilled workforce, UCR has collaborated with the City of Riverside and Riverside County to build a biotech incubator with wet lab near the UCR campus. In the Coachella Valley UCR is nurturing entrepreneurs in partnership with the Coachella Valley Angel Network, which is facilitating a collaboration to establish a green venture fund to grow the clean tech industry. Also in the Coachella Valley, the UCR Desert Lyceum, composed of community leaders, is the driving force for a regional economic development strategy.

UCR and the Community Foundation have formed the Educational Leadership Federation of Riverside and San Bernardino counties, comprised of college presidents, school superintendents, business CEOs, civic organization leaders, and faith-based organization leaders. The mission is to improve student learning and increase college-going rates, targeting students from low-income and traditionally non college-going families. This action is intended to improve the college-going eligibility rates of our region.

UCR recently created a downtown ARTSblock, a collaborative endeavor with the city that is composed of the UCR/California Museum of Photography, the Sweeney Art Gallery, and the future (2009) Culver Center for the Arts, a media lab and presentation facility. Built on dialog and interaction, the ARTSblock will help the continued revitalization of Riverside and bring ambitious art exhibits and events to the community.

Performance Metrics

In maintaining accountability, it is important to establish goals and measure progress. This will also help the campus to identify and focus on areas that need particular attention. A specific goal is to develop the profile of an AAU university, with the ultimate goal of achieving membership. The following chart provides a comparison of UC Riverside with its AAU comparison universities against a variety of metrics. Specific goals are still under development, but they have been developed based on metrics at comparable institutions.
### UC Riverside vs. AAU Comparison Universities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UC Riverside</th>
<th>AAU Comparison Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Enrollment(^1)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17,187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Proportion Graduate</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Graduate Students per Faculty</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Faculty(^2)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Academies Members(^9)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articles per Non-Medical Faculty(^6)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Research Expenditures per Faculty(^8)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$88,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Awards(^10) (Sum-2002 to 2006)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAT Total Score(^3)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 25th Percentile</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six-year Graduation Rate(^4)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Student Diversity(^5)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes: See Next Page</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Notes:

1. Fall Quarter/semester enrollment. Graduate percent excludes first professional (e.g., medical students). Source IPEDS Peer Analysis System <http://nces.ed.gov/IPEDSPAS>.


5. Diversity index is a probability index created by Meyer and McIntosh (1992) it is used by the U.S. News and World Report to rank the campus ethnic diversity.
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UC San Diego: Local Impact, National Influence, Global Reach

UC San Diego is dedicated to the advancement of knowledge through excellence in education and research at the undergraduate, graduate and postdoctoral levels. The campus is committed to community engagement, public service and industry partnerships in order to advance the well-being of our region, state, nation and the world. Our academic community of world-renowned faculty, bright students and dedicated staff is characterized by a culture of interdisciplinary collaboration. To foster the best possible working and learning environment, our university strives to maintain a climate of fairness, cooperation and professionalism, which is embodied in our campus Principles of Community. UC San Diego embraces diversity, equity and inclusion as essential ingredients of academic excellence in higher education.

UC San Diego’s Trajectory to Excellence

At just under 50 years old, UC San Diego has emerged as one of the nation’s premier research universities, widely recognized for its local impact, national influence and global reach. UC San Diego was established in 1960, building upon the foundation of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography (SIO), the nation’s first multidisciplinary oceanographic institution, founded in 1903. The San Diego campus is renowned for its collaborative, diverse and cross-disciplinary ethos that transcends traditional boundaries in the sciences, engineering, medicine, and the arts and humanities. UC San Diego’s rich academic portfolio includes six undergraduate colleges, five academic divisions and five graduate and professional schools. The university’s award-winning scholars are experts at the forefront of their fields with an impressive track record for achieving scientific, medical and technological breakthroughs.

In the most recent rankings from the National Research Council (NRC), UC San Diego is listed 10th in the nation in the quality of faculty and graduate programs. Nearly half of the 29 UC San Diego programs rated by the NRC rank in the top 10 based on faculty quality. The Center for Measuring University Performance, which relies exclusively on objective measures, ranks UC San Diego in the top 25 for five measures. In U.S. News and World Report’s Graduate Program
Rankings, UC San Diego has consistently climbed the ranks in engineering and medicine. The UC San Diego School of Medicine, which was ranked 22nd in 2000, is now ranked 14th among research medical schools and 5th among the nation’s public schools of medicine. The Jacobs School of Engineering, ranked 20th in 2000, is now 11th among the nation’s 191 engineering schools, and 5th among the nation’s public engineering schools. A number of UC San Diego’s graduate specializations have ranked in the top three in the nation over the last 10 years, including bioengineering, theatre and dance, econometrics, comparative politics, behavioral neuroscience and cognitive psychology. In the last decade, UC San Diego has also consistently ranked in the top 10 among public universities in U.S. News and World Report’s America’s Best Colleges ranking, and in the top 40 among all universities in the nation.

UC San Diego contributes more than $7.2 billion in direct and indirect spending and personal income each year to the California economy and generates 39,000 jobs. The university’s faculty and alumni have created nearly 200 start-up companies, including many local biotech companies. The active companies in California employ more than 17,000 people and generate more than $10 billion in annual sales. The university is the third largest employer in San Diego County (behind the federal and state government), with nearly 26,000 employees.

The campus founders laid the ground work for UC San Diego’s extraordinary trajectory with a commitment to excellence in education, research and service and the conviction that these principles go hand in hand. Shared governance and transparency are integral to the institution and have helped to foster interdisciplinary collaboration and understanding. These traditions have continued throughout the campus’s young history, and will carry us forward as we celebrate UC San Diego’s 50th Anniversary in 2010 and beyond.

Undergraduate Education

UC San Diego strives to prepare students to be global citizens equipped with the tools of analysis, expression and cultural understanding required for leadership in today’s world. The campus is committed to providing a quality academic environment that fosters passionate, enthusiastic and ongoing expansion of knowledge and approaches to scholarship.

UC San Diego’s distinctive undergraduate college system provides students with the feel of a small liberal arts college with all of the advantages of a large research university. Each of the six colleges has a unique programmatic theme, curricular requirements, residential neighborhood and extracurricular activities. Each college strives to foster the intellectual, personal and social development of its students by providing an educational environment in which they can explore and expand their leadership potential and build community through participation in a wide variety of college organizations and special events. The colleges each maintain a unique set of General Education requirements, while sharing departmental majors.

The campus boasts a wide array of academic offerings, which include excellent degree programs and a myriad of interdisciplinary programs with majors and minors that cross traditional boundaries, providing UC San Diego undergraduates access to scholarly opportunities reflective of the dynamic research collaborations across the campus.

Undergraduate success

Over the last 12 years, UC San Diego has continued to improve student retention and graduation rates. The overall freshmen retention and six-year graduation rates of 94 percent and 84 percent, respectively, place UC San Diego in the top one-third of the UC system with respect to student performance on these two important indicators. Transfer students are also
retained and graduate at high rates. The first-year retention rate of UC San Diego community college transfer students is 93 percent and the four-year graduation rate of community college transfers is over 80 percent. In 2007-08, more than 5,300 undergraduate degrees were conferred, which represent a 66 percent overall increase over the past 10 years. These degrees constitute 75 percent of the total degrees awarded.

### TABLE 1: UNDERGRADUATE DEGREES BY MAJOR FIELD OF STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate Degrees by Major Field of Study</th>
<th>Fall Quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'07/'08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Field of Study</td>
<td>'02/'03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>'03/'04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'04/'05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'05/'06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'06/'07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total UG Degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 Year Δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Arts</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Humanities</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Engineering</td>
<td>402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Science/Math</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Biology</td>
<td>868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social Science</td>
<td>1,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Double/Special</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total UG Degrees</td>
<td>3,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Undergraduate access

UC San Diego continues to recruit and admit students with strong academic preparation as evidenced by the high school grades and standardized examination scores of entering freshmen. The 2008 entering class of UC San Diego freshmen had an incoming average GPA of 3.94, and composite SAT I Math and Verbal scores of 1252. These indicators of strong student preparation, campus selectivity and student outcomes as indicated by our high retention and graduation rates have contributed to the rapid rise of UC San Diego in national rankings. The campus application/admit rate has increased by 45 percent over the past 10 years, and the registered/admit rate has increased by 27 percent. In 2007-08, the number of students receiving undergraduate degrees who were the first generation to attend college was 1,429, a 133% overall increase over the past 10 years. During the 2007-08 academic year, 64 percent of UC San Diego undergraduates received financial aid, including student and parent loans. In Fall 2007, 49 percent of undergraduates received need-based scholarships or grant aid and 35 percent received Pell Grants.

### TABLE 2: UNDERGRADUATE DEGREES BY 1ST GENERATION COLLEGE STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Undergraduate Degrees by 1st Generation College Status</th>
<th>Fall Quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'07/'08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'02/'03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'03/'04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'04/'05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'05/'06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'06/'07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total UG Degrees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 Year Δ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• First Generation</td>
<td>613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+133%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not First Generation</td>
<td>2,608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total UG Degrees</td>
<td>3,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In an effort to increase the number of local underserved, low-income youths who are eligible for admittance to UC-caliber universities, UC San Diego has provided essential outreach to the local community through the Center for Research on Educational Equity, Assessment and Teaching Excellence (CREATE), which has established partnerships with middle and high schools that serve traditionally underserved populations. In addition, the successful Preuss Charter School at UC San Diego provides a rigorous college preparatory education for motivated low-income students, who will become the first in their families to graduate from college. This school serves as a model to study and develop best practices in the preparation of low-income, urban students for college admission. Preuss was recently ranked the 6th best high school in the nation by Newsweek and the 8th best high school by U.S. News & World Report.

**Undergraduate student profile**

UC San Diego's current undergraduate enrollment is 22,500. Female students represent 52 percent, an increase of 28 percent over the past 10 years. The number of new students in Fall 2008 was 6,168, which represents an overall increase of 45 percent over the past 10 years. Of these new students, 70 percent were freshmen and 30 percent were transfer students. Our student population has changed in response to the shifting demographics in California, increased selectivity, high school preparation levels and other demographic and economic factors. Approximately 64 percent of undergraduates are students of color, including African American, Asian, Mexican American, Filipino, Latino, and Native American, which represents a 27 percent increase in the past decade; 44 percent are Asian; 30 percent are of the first generation in their family to attend college; and 36 percent do not speak English as their first language at home.

**Undergraduate student experience**

Based on data from the most recent UC systemwide University of California Undergraduate Experiences Survey (UCUES), UC San Diego rates similarly to the UC system as a whole on major selection and planned educational and career goals. Overall, UC San Diego students are comparable to the UC system on several measures of academic engagement and overall involvement in campus activities. They report learning and skill development gains across a wide variety of learning domains from their freshman to their senior year. Students report significant improvements in analytical and critical thinking skills, writing ability, research skills and understanding of a specific field of study.

**Graduate and Professional Education**

UC San Diego continues to develop an environment that is attractive to and supportive of graduate students as they prepare for academic and professional careers. UC San Diego’s current graduate enrollment is 4,000 (including health sciences academic programs). The graduate student population at UC San Diego has remained relatively even from Fall 2006 to Fall 2008, however, there has been a 22 percent increase in underrepresented graduate student enrollment between 2004 and 2008, with a 10 percent increase in 2008 over 2007. The campus has set a goal for the graduate student population to represent 20 percent of the total general campus student FTE by 2020. Graduate students currently represent 13 percent. Recent approvals for new degree programs are expected to assist with increasing enrollment numbers. The scope of self-supporting graduate programs is also expanding and, in addition, UC San Diego is working to enhance cooperative agreements for graduate student exchange with international universities. The recently approved agreement between the Chilean
government and UC to fund the education of 150 doctoral and 150 master’s students at four UC campuses, including UC San Diego, is but one example of our efforts to increase UC San Diego’s visibility as an attractive venue for graduate and professional students.

The Office of Graduate Studies (OGS) is committed to the recruitment, admission and retention of a highly qualified, diverse graduate student body. To this end, OGS supports the Summer Training Academy for Research in the Sciences through which qualified undergraduate students from across the country gain valuable research experience and prepare for graduate school. UC San Diego also participates in the Alliance for Graduate Education in the Professoriate (AGEP), which provides funding for the recruitment and retention of underrepresented students. In 2006-07, *Diverse Issues in Higher Education* ranked UC San Diego 20th in the top 100 institutions awarding doctoral degrees to Hispanics.

UC San Diego awarded 1,330 graduate and professional degrees in 2006-07. In 2007-08, 1,349 degrees were awarded at the master’s and doctoral levels, an increase of 2 percent and 9 percent, respectively.

### TABLE 3: 2007-2008 GRADUATE DEGREES AWARDED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Supported Department/Program</th>
<th>PhD, EdD, DMA, AuD</th>
<th>MFA</th>
<th>MBA, MPIA</th>
<th>MA, MS, MEng, MEd</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Sciences</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Relations &amp; Pacific Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobs School of Engineering</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Sciences</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rady School of Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scripps Institution of Oceanography</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB TOTAL (State Supported)</strong></td>
<td><strong>458</strong></td>
<td><strong>38</strong></td>
<td><strong>145</strong></td>
<td><strong>615</strong></td>
<td><strong>1256</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non State Supported Department/Program</th>
<th>Flex MBA</th>
<th>MAS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rady School of Management</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters of Advanced Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUB TOTAL (Non State Supported)</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>43</strong></td>
<td><strong>93</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL GRADUATE DEGREES</strong></td>
<td><strong>508</strong></td>
<td><strong>81</strong></td>
<td><strong>615</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average stipend level for pre-doctoral candidates decreased slightly from $22,000 in 2006-07 to $21,100 in 2007-08. The number of total campus diversity awards increased 24 percent due in part to matching fellowships provided by the Office of Graduate Studies for faculty research grant proposals. Non-UC visiting graduate students have more than doubled since 2006-07 to 343 students in 2008-09. The majority of these students are international.

### University Extension/Lifelong Learning

As the professional education and public service division of UC San Diego, Extension is focused on being a major catalyst for the continued economic, intellectual, and cultural growth of the San Diego and Baja California region. Core offerings include professional education and training, cultural enrichment, and regional economic solutions. This integrated approach assists in the
development of a globally competitive talent pool, accelerates economic vitality, and fosters community-building. Extension offers more than 130 distinct academic programs ranging from the life sciences and engineering to arts and business leadership. Approximately 50,000 enrollees, representing 22,600 students in over 4,200 courses, were served by Extension in 2007-08. In addition, Extension’s public outreach programs are designed to improve the region’s economy through entrepreneurial development, research, public forums and civic conversations.

Opportunities for continued learning are also offered through extension programs in the Health Sciences, Jacobs School of Engineering, Rady School of Management, the Graduate School of International Relations and Pacific Studies, and the Education Studies Program.

Faculty

An outstanding faculty is the hallmark of any great institution. UC San Diego is home to numerous world-renowned scholars in a variety of disciplines. The UC San Diego faculty counts among its members 7 Nobel Laureates, one Fields Medalist, 6 MacArthur Foundation Fellows, a Pulitzer Prize winner, 124 members of the National Academies and 4 recipients of the National Medal of Sciences. They also hold more than 110 Endowed Chairs.

The recruitment and retention of excellent faculty is a top priority for the UC San Diego campus. In the past five years, the ladder-rank and LSOE faculty has grown by 13 percent to 1,205 members. Of the 372 new recruits, 150 were tenured (40 percent of the new hires) and 222 (60 percent) were non-tenured. 148 of the total new recruits were net new faculty hires. Of this group, 68 were tenured and 80 non-tenured. Non-tenured faculty grew at a rate of 36 percent compared to over 7 percent growth in tenured faculty appointed in the same period. UC San Diego also experienced significant growth in non-ladder-rank faculty during this time frame.

Competitive salaries are critical to UC San Diego’s success in recruiting and retaining high-caliber faculty. As University salary scales have fallen behind market realities and those of our comparison institutions, a great number of faculty have been granted off-scale salaries. UC San Diego has attempted to address local salary compression and market issues with promotion bonuses, equity increases and pre-emptive retention incentives.

In 2007, the UC Regents implemented a salary program in an effort to make UC salaries more competitive with the academic marketplace and to restore the integrity of the rank-and-step system for faculty advancements. In academic year 2008-09, 58 percent of UC San Diego ladder-rank faculty members have off-scale salaries. Excluding Health Sciences faculty, UC San Diego’s average ladder-rank professorial salaries are $78,259 at the Assistant rank, $86,393 at the Associate rank and $136,899 at the rank of full Professor.

Faculty equity and diversity

UC San Diego values diversity, equity, and inclusion as essential ingredients of academic excellence in higher education. In 1999, UC San Diego established best-practice recruitment strategies as a means to enhance the diversity of applicant pools for open ladder-rank faculty positions. As a result of implementing these strategies, the diversity of applicant pools has increased. The representation of women for the years 1999-00 to 2006-07, on average, was 26 percent, an increase of 6 percent from the years prior to 1999. Similarly, the representation of minorities for these same eight years averaged 27 percent, an increase of 10 percent from the years prior to 1999. A comparison of the 2007 and 2000 workforces shows that women increased from 18 percent to 21 percent and minorities increased from 17 percent to 22 percent.
An important part of our effort to recruit a diverse faculty has been to broaden the curriculum with content related to diversity, and to allocate faculty FTE specifically for interdisciplinary recruitments in these areas: African-American Studies Minor; African Studies Program; California Cultures in Comparative Perspective; Chicano/a and Latino/a Arts & Humanities; Diaspora and Indigenous Studies; and the International Migration Studies Minor are examples of such initiatives.

Further efforts to diversify the UC San Diego faculty include the appointment of an Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Equity (AVC-FE) in July 2008, whose overall goal is to change practices and culture that are barriers to faculty equity, with a specific focus on recruiting. The AVC-FE works with the campus Chief Diversity Officer and newly appointed divisional Faculty Equity Officers to develop opportunities for faculty advancement and enhanced campus climate.

Faculty Equity Officers also provide advice and information about practices that advance faculty diversity and excellence.

Staff

UC San Diego’s cadre of talented, diverse and dedicated staff is an institutional asset and cornerstone of the campus. UC San Diego currently employs 12,536 career staff employees and another 1,166 limited appointment employees. The campus’ staff workforce has increased its minority representation by 14 percent over the past twenty years. Female staff representation is currently at 65 percent, a slight decrease over the same time span. The Management and Senior Professional (MSP) program employees have increased by 9 percent and 15 percent in minority and female representation respectively.

UC San Diego has a highly visible presence in the San Diego area community through a variety of outreach and recruitment activities. With an online career development portal (My Career at UCSD), an internal recruitment program, and a succession planning blueprint emphasizing workforce diversity, efforts are continuing to build upon the progress that has been achieved in the areas of staff diversity at UC San Diego. Reports that track activity in the areas of recruiting, hiring, reclassification, transfer and promotion, and separations are produced regularly and are used as the basis for assessing diversity strategies.

Research

UC San Diego is well known for its strong tradition of recognizing emerging interdisciplinary fields of research and investing in them. Climate change, neuroscience, and digital arts are examples of research areas that draw upon multiple classical fields to create new paradigms of scholarship. The campus has a robust, dynamic group of Organized Research Units (ORUs), including the San Diego Supercomputer Center (SDSC), the California Institute for Telecommunications and Information Technology (Calit2), and the Moores Cancer Center, that administratively support interdisciplinary endeavors. These activities have led to initiatives in such cutting-edge areas as stem cell research, engineering in medicine, aerosol science, smart grids, digital humanities, anthropogeny, and algae-based biotechnology. Another important aspect of research at UC San Diego includes Scripps Institution of Oceanography’s (SIO) fleet of four state-of-the-art research vessels and a floating instrument platform that support the oceanographic research programs conducted by Scripps researchers and colleagues from institutions worldwide.
According to data from the National Science Foundation, UC San Diego expended nearly $800 million for research and development during the 2007 fiscal year, placing the campus sixth nationally among all universities and colleges in federal research and development funding. SIO saw an increase of $7.4 million in awards over the prior year, for a total of $125.7 million in contract and grant awards, the second highest amount received in the 106-year history of the SIO campus.

**TABLE 4: 2007 R&D EXPENDITURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>All R&amp;D expenditures (Dollars in thousands)</th>
<th>Federal government</th>
<th>State and local government</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Institution funds</th>
<th>All other sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Johns Hopkins U., The</td>
<td>1,554,103</td>
<td>1,362,836</td>
<td>4,870</td>
<td>27,453</td>
<td>76,474</td>
<td>82,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>U. CA, San Francisco</td>
<td>842,840</td>
<td>467,402</td>
<td>24,578</td>
<td>45,659</td>
<td>145,705</td>
<td>159,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>U. WI Madison</td>
<td>840,672</td>
<td>469,076</td>
<td>32,780</td>
<td>25,090</td>
<td>238,934</td>
<td>74,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>U. CA, Los Angeles</td>
<td>823,083</td>
<td>488,846</td>
<td>12,981</td>
<td>39,731</td>
<td>161,738</td>
<td>119,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>U. MI all campuses</td>
<td>808,731</td>
<td>577,201</td>
<td>6,850</td>
<td>36,282</td>
<td>145,970</td>
<td>42,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>U. CA, San Diego</td>
<td>798,896</td>
<td>475,708</td>
<td>26,072</td>
<td>44,786</td>
<td>132,658</td>
<td>119,690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Duke U.</td>
<td>781,843</td>
<td>459,122</td>
<td>17,895</td>
<td>161,072</td>
<td>78,872</td>
<td>43,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>U. WA</td>
<td>756,787</td>
<td>620,375</td>
<td>10,692</td>
<td>63,560</td>
<td>41,650</td>
<td>20,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>OH State U. all campuses</td>
<td>720,206</td>
<td>313,242</td>
<td>112,272</td>
<td>142,177</td>
<td>102,158</td>
<td>50,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Stanford U.</td>
<td>687,511</td>
<td>534,787</td>
<td>6,002</td>
<td>54,181</td>
<td>46,522</td>
<td>46,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>PA State U. all campuses</td>
<td>652,144</td>
<td>370,789</td>
<td>69,662</td>
<td>93,535</td>
<td>116,041</td>
<td>2,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>U. PA</td>
<td>648,247</td>
<td>449,887</td>
<td>7,542</td>
<td>42,427</td>
<td>63,310</td>
<td>85,261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Cornell U. all campuses</td>
<td>641,936</td>
<td>367,094</td>
<td>71,223</td>
<td>23,398</td>
<td>116,868</td>
<td>63,353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>U. MN all campuses</td>
<td>624,149</td>
<td>337,968</td>
<td>56,877</td>
<td>29,432</td>
<td>105,379</td>
<td>94,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>MA Institute of Technology</td>
<td>614,352</td>
<td>476,318</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>81,570</td>
<td>10,213</td>
<td>45,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>U. CA, Davis</td>
<td>600,508</td>
<td>256,994</td>
<td>49,921</td>
<td>26,159</td>
<td>201,084</td>
<td>66,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>U. FL</td>
<td>592,835</td>
<td>240,819</td>
<td>100,792</td>
<td>34,124</td>
<td>184,855</td>
<td>32,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Washington U. St Louis</td>
<td>572,775</td>
<td>424,451</td>
<td>14,669</td>
<td>13,725</td>
<td>80,700</td>
<td>39,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>U. Pittsburgh all campuses</td>
<td>558,566</td>
<td>441,357</td>
<td>10,561</td>
<td>10,153</td>
<td>69,836</td>
<td>26,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>U. CA, Berkeley</td>
<td>552,365</td>
<td>251,043</td>
<td>41,298</td>
<td>25,361</td>
<td>151,941</td>
<td>82,722</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The campus recognizes its critical role in creating the next generation of scholars. A key element of our development of new fields of research at the faculty level has been the commitment to reflect these new areas in our undergraduate and graduate programs. At least 40 percent of undergraduates participate in a research project during their time at UC San Diego, and many also carry out research with local companies. The campus will be expanding this opportunity to all undergraduates through new models, recognizing that creating knowledge has become a core competency in today’s globalized environment.

**Technology transfer**

The research enterprise at UC San Diego is the source of great innovation. Nearly 200 companies have been created from campus inventions and have helped to transform greater San Diego into one of the leading biotechnology and telecommunications regions in the world. The campus is now helping to seed a “clean technology” corridor in the San Diego region. UC San Diego’s Technology Transfer Office receives an idea for an invention every day of the year, on average, from its researchers. This intellectual property (IP) is a critical element in moving
campus discoveries into the marketplace where they can benefit society. The von Liebig Center at UCSD has received national recognition for nurturing early stage inventions to the point where they can be licensed or become the basis for startup companies.

Libraries and Academic Information Resources

The UC San Diego Libraries, the youngest library system admitted to the Association of Research Libraries, are ranked amongst the top 25 public research libraries in North America, providing access to more than 7 million digital and print volumes, journals, and multimedia materials to meet the knowledge demands of faculty, students and members of the public. Each day, more than 7,300 patrons visit one of the nine UCSD libraries and the Libraries' vast resources and services are accessed more than 87,500 times daily via the Libraries' Web site. The Libraries also lead the San Diego Circuit, an immensely successful partnership among major San Diego County libraries that allows San Diego library card holders to borrow books from any of the member libraries.

The Libraries initiated the Pacific Rim Digital Library Alliance (PRDLA), a consortium of 31 prestigious academic libraries from various countries around the Pacific. PRDLA's mission is to facilitate user access to scholarly research materials by using digital technologies to share and deliver information, collection and personnel resources in a timely and effective manner. Last year the UC San Diego Libraries became the first library in Southern California to partner with Google in its Book Search Project, a significant effort to digitize and provide access to the collections of the world's top public and academic libraries. The UC San Diego Libraries also collaborate with other campus partners, including Academic Computing Services and the Media Center, to make a broad array of information technology resources available to the University’s more than 52,000 faculty, staff and students.

Budget, Finance and Private Support

Budget and finance

UC San Diego remains in a growth mode for instruction, research and health care as the campus approaches its 50th anniversary. These program requirements drive the growth of revenues in support of core activities. Over the past eight years, these revenues have risen from $1.6 billion to over $2.5 billion. The Medical Center accounts for almost 30 percent of the fiscal year 2008 revenues. Federal grants and contracts provide the second largest source of UC San Diego revenues at $564 million, or 22 percent of the total. This is followed by state educational appropriations of $301 million. Expenditures of the UC San Diego Medical Center enterprise and campus research programs closely follow their revenue streams; however, UC San Diego expended $477 million on instruction in 2008, which surpassed the state investment, due to student tuition and fees and private support.

Revenue diversification continues to be an important strategy, in order to maintain our standards of excellence and accessibility in both lean and prosperous times. In response to the global economic slowdown, UC San Diego is implementing a series of strategic cost-cutting measures for fiscal year 2009 and beyond. At the same time, the campus is ensuring that critical programs continue to prosper, maintaining the entrepreneurial nature of the institution and the core of the campus’s academic mission.
Private support

UC San Diego concluded a successful seven-year capital fundraising campaign in 2007, during which time gifts from over 100,000 donors propelled the campus beyond the goal of $1 billion. The campaign helped build UC San Diego’s base of private support substantially, representing an increase from approximately $80 million annually prior to the campaign to approximately $120 million today. UC San Diego is working toward a goal of sustained annual private support in the range of $130 to $150 million.

In 2007-2008, 97.5 percent of the private support UC San Diego received was restricted. This was similar to the systemwide results during the same period. San Diego’s results differ somewhat from the system in terms of donor restrictions, with a greater proportion of funds earmarked for research. In 2007-08, 48.4 percent of private support was restricted for research, whereas 21.9 percent was earmarked for department support, 11.5 percent for student support, 8.3 percent for instruction, 7.4 percent for campus improvement, and 2.5 percent of the funds were unrestricted. Funds designated for other purposes comprised less than 1 percent.

Systemwide, the Regents and the campus foundations hold approximately $9.6 billion in endowment assets. UC San Diego’s endowment and endowment per student have been on the rise over the last decade, primarily due to the success of the capital campaign. Endowment funding per student was essentially flat for the years 2006-07 and 2007-08 at approximately $19,000.

While endowment funding has been on the rise, the growth in endowment funding per student is tempered by growth in enrollment. UC San Diego, as compared to other campus endowment funding per student, ranks approximately fifth in the UC system.

Capital Resources and Sustainability

Capital investment

The capital investment in UC San Diego is significant and growing. About $200 million is invested each year through construction of new facilities, renewal and renovation of older buildings and infrastructure, and seismic upgrades. With a point-in-time view of projects spanning the initial planning phase through the construction phase, the campus is currently planning, designing and constructing $2 billion in capital projects. The majority of these projects are new construction of housing and dining facilities for undergraduate and graduate students (over $400 million) and Health Sciences projects (over $800 million). In addition, almost $100 million is being expended on Health Sciences seismic and infrastructure improvements.

Although the current financial downturn has a direct impact on the timing of state-funded projects, the campus has two major instructional facilities ready to begin construction. Recently completed is the $55 million Conrad Prebys Music Center.

In terms of incoming revenues for capital projects, SIO was recently awarded $12 million by the U.S. Department of Commerce/National Institute of Standards and Technology to construct a new laboratory building on its campus for research on marine ecosystem forecasting.

Sustainability

UC San Diego is one of the nation’s greenest college campuses, and has embarked on a sustainable energy program that is among the largest in the nation undertaken by a university. The campus’s far-reaching program, which includes solar, biogas fuel cells and wind energy,
has resulted in buildings and parking garages on campus with solar photovoltaic panels. UC San Diego’s green energy capacity will eventually produce 29 million kilowatt hours a year, and remove an equivalent of 10,500 tons of carbon dioxide from the atmosphere each year. The university will soon generate 7.4 megawatts of green energy, providing 10 to 15 percent of its annual electrical output, and the campus will also produce another 2.8 megawatts from a fuel cell powered by renewable methane. In addition, UC San Diego plans to begin a unique program to swap fossil fuel-generated energy for wind power. This will generate up to 3 megawatts of green energy.

The UC San Diego campus is a living laboratory where Project GreenLight, a research effort supported by the National Science Foundation, will inform energy usage associated with computer hardware and software, thereby helping to define green cyber-infrastructure practices; student-collected data from micro-weather stations are being used to more efficiently heat and cool buildings and irrigate the campus; biofuels are being researched to power the campus transportation fleet; and a multi-megawatt fuel cell will provide a platform for advanced energy storage experiments. UC San Diego was recently recognized by the Clinton Global Initiative for the campus’ superior efforts and leadership in sustainability and environmental stewardship. The work to bring discovery, solutions, and practical application to the climate change challenges affecting our world are being confronted by the best and brightest at UC San Diego.

**Health Sciences and Services**

UC San Diego Health Sciences encompasses the School of Medicine, Skaggs School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences, and UC San Diego Medical Center, the principal clinical teaching site for the professional schools.

The community benefit provided by UC San Diego Health Sciences in 2008 was an estimated $544.27 million. In addition to almost $456.2 million in research funding awarded to Health Sciences faculty, and $33.6 million invested in the education and training of physicians, pharmacists and other health professionals, UC San Diego Medical Center is a major provider of “safety net” care to the San Diego region. Although the Medical Center cares for only about 8 percent of the total inpatient market in San Diego, the hospitals provide care for 38 percent of the county’s under- and uninsured patients. This amounted to nearly $31 million in unreimbursed care in 2008 including shortfalls in payment from government-sponsored programs such as Medicaid, and another $23.5 million in charity services.

The School of Medicine, which opened in 1968, currently has an entering class of 134 students, including 8-10 M.D./Ph.D. students. With only 5 percent of over 5,500 applicants accepted, the UC San Diego medical students’ average undergraduate GPA is higher than the national mean, and their MCAT (Medical College Admission Test) scores are in the top 10-15 percentile. The Skaggs School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences, the only public pharmacy school in Southern California, opened in 2002. The Charter Class received top scores in the 2006 national and state pharmacy licensure exams, with 75 percent of the graduating classes remaining in San Diego for post-graduate training or employment opportunities.

The UC San Diego Medical Center consists of two hospitals operated under one license, a Medical Group practice of over 340 faculty physicians providing primary and specialty care at a number of outpatient sites, the Shiley Eye Center, and the Moores UCSD Cancer Center, the only National Cancer Institute-designated Comprehensive Cancer Center in the region. Annual inpatient admissions exceed 23,000. In 2008, emergency room visits topped 60,000 and outpatient visits numbered over 470,000.
The UC San Diego Medical Center is the only San Diego hospital consistently ranked among the top 50 in the nation in multiple specialties by U.S. News and World Report, with eight programs named among the nation’s best in 2008, including oncology, respiratory disease, gynecology, kidney disease, urology, psychiatry, rheumatology, and ear, nose and throat.

The Medical Center has successfully maintained a positive operating margin. The net income in 2008 was over $61.3 million for reinvestment in programs and facilities, compared with a margin of nearly $55 million in 2005. The 2008 numbers reflect an increase in operating revenue of nearly 11.4 percent from 2007, with an almost 14 percent increase in operating expenses.

Together, UC San Diego’s hospitals and ambulatory care practices provide the full spectrum of services and attract the volume and diversity of patients necessary to advance the educational, research, and public service missions of UC San Diego Health Sciences.

**UC San Diego on the Horizon**

The global recession has heavily impacted publicly funded universities such as UC San Diego, and declining revenues from the state, endowments, and external sources will present a challenge to the campus over the next several years. Amidst current budgetary constraints, the campus has expanded efforts toward securing non-traditional support and enhancing administrative efficiencies, and will continue its long-standing development of a strategic academic plan that will contribute to UC San Diego’s financial security.

Looking toward the next 50 years and beyond, UC San Diego will endeavor to sustain its extraordinary trajectory as a world-class research university, upholding the core principles of excellence in education, research, and service. Maintaining its commitment to the regional, national, and global community, the campus is working to develop a comprehensive research cyber-infrastructure and a strategic plan for research facilities that will enable its scholarly community to continue to define the leading edge of scholarship, including its leadership in sustainability and climate change research.

As an expansion of its Central Utility Plant, UC San Diego is set to begin construction on its third cogeneration gas-fired turbine ($26 million) that takes one source of energy (gas) and produces two sources (electricity and steam). This third turbine will allow the main campus to produce virtually all of its electrical needs. By the end of 2009, the campus will have completed the first phase of an “Alternative Fueling Station” that when finally completed, will provide CNG, hydrogen-CNG Blend, and hydrogen fueling capabilities in addition to electric fast-charging stations.

Concurrently, scientists at SIO are branching out in two relatively new research directions in ocean acidification and algal biofuels. Scripps will capitalize on its strong foundation in this area to explore the ripple effect produced from increased ocean acidification, including the effects on marine food webs, commercial fish stocks, coral reef habitats, and the ocean’s ability to absorb, and therefore mitigate, anthropogenic CO2 emissions. Algal biofuels represent another important new field of discovery and are being studied by researchers in the divisions of Biological and Physical Sciences and the Jacobs School of Engineering.

Innovative new curricular offerings will continue to enhance the educational experience of UC San Diego’s next generation of scholars. Degree proposals for an interdisciplinary doctoral program in Anthropogeny, a Ph.D. in Nanoengineering, and Joint Doctoral programs with the CSU system in various Engineering Sciences and Geophysics are advancing in the review process and will enhance UC San Diego’s graduate offerings. Undergraduate proposals on the
horizon include an Accounting Minor program, Marine Biology B.S., and Electrical Engineering and Society B.A. A comprehensive graduate fellowship campaign will soon be launched in an effort to increase UC San Diego’s competitiveness in recruiting and retaining the best and brightest graduate students. The campaign will include an emphasis on gifts that create endowed multiple-year graduate fellowships.

Whether it’s the latest information on climate change and sustainability, the newest processes in telemedicine and nanotechnology, the most recent advances in theories of social networking, or innovative curricular offerings that transcend traditional disciplinary boundaries, UC San Diego is committed to pursuing excellence in discovery and innovation through its dedicated faculty, staff and students.
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University of California, San Francisco

Founded in 1873, the University of California, San Francisco (UCSF) is the only UC campus in the 10-campus UC system dedicated exclusively to health sciences. Today, UCSF is a leading university dedicated to promoting health worldwide through advanced biomedical research, graduate-level education in the life sciences and health professions, and excellence in patient care. UCSF boasts high-ranking schools of dentistry, medicine, nursing, and pharmacy and a Graduate Division, as well as one of the nation’s top medical centers.

All four professional schools, UCSF Medical Center, UCSF Children’s Hospital and virtually all UCSF graduate programs ranked among the best in the country in 2008 surveys by *U.S. News and World Report* and other agencies. According to National Science Foundation data for 2007, UCSF was second among all universities in the United States in total expenditures on research and development. In 2008, UCSF ranked second nationally – and first in California – in total funding from the National Institutes of Health. A 2007 report in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* ranked the “scholarly productivity” of UCSF faculty as third among all universities and research institutes worldwide.

UCSF is a multisite campus with a total land area of 185 acres. The University is affiliated with San Francisco General Hospital, San Francisco Veterans Affairs Medical Center, the J. David Gladstone Institutes, a private biomedical research entity adjacent to the Mission Bay campus, and the Ernest Gallo Clinic and Research Center. The 57.5-acre Mission Bay campus was opened in 2003, providing research space and facilities that will double UCSF’s research enterprise and speed the pace of biomedical discovery and innovation. Recently, the UC Board of Regents approved the construction of a new medical center complex at Mission Bay, including hospitals for children, women and cancer patients.

UCSF is the second-largest employer in San Francisco, with a workforce of approximately 22,000 employees and more than 4,000 students. The annual operating budget approximates $3 billion, with $933 million in research awards. In fiscal year 2007-2008, the campus raised $366 million in private support, ranking UCSF fourth among public universities and 14th among all universities in the United States.

Commitment to promoting diversity among its faculty, staff, students and trainees is one of the top priorities at UCSF. The goal is to make the campus a truly inclusive community, representing the extraordinary diversity among the citizens of San Francisco and California. Similarly, meaningful civic engagement is a core UCSF value. Consistent with its mission as a public university, UCSF has been an integral part of the community, forging successful partnerships in San Francisco and around the world to advance education and promote health and well-being.

In 2007, the UCSF Strategic Plan (strategy.ucsf.edu) was unveiled, articulating the collective vision of UCSF’s many constituencies to guide the University’s direction over the next decade.
Mission and Goals

UCSF’s mission is advancing health worldwide™.

In advancing health worldwide, UCSF’s goals are to:

- Develop the world’s future leaders in health care delivery, research and education. UCSF is currently at the forefront of health sciences education and is well positioned to meet the growing demand for health professionals and scientists. The development of the next generation of leaders in health care delivery, research and education is vitally important to the economic and social well-being of California and the rest of the world.

- Be a world leader in scientific discovery and its translation into exemplary health. The pace of major scientific and technological discovery is remarkably rapid. But meaningful translation of these developments into treatments and disease prevention is lagging. UCSF is uniquely poised to alter this trend by creating new research models that accelerate translation. UCSF boasts an exceptional cadre of distinguished investigators, a diverse portfolio of leading-edge research programs spread across four preeminent health professional schools, a pioneering health care enterprise, and an unparalleled spirit of cooperation.

- Provide high-quality, patient-centered care leading to optimal outcomes and patient satisfaction. This goal commits the Clinical Enterprise to the core principle that care at UCSF is patient-centered. It also recognizes that our students receive their best training in an institution that has systems and staffing that are designed to optimize outcomes and eradicate medical errors. This commitment was reiterated in the UCSF Clinical Enterprise Strategic Plan adopted in the fall of 2008.

- Educate, train and employ a diverse faculty, staff and student body. Offering a wide range of educational and career opportunities for students, faculty and staff, UCSF seeks candidates whose life experience, work experience or community service has prepared them to contribute to our commitment to diversity and excellence. Diversity is a defining feature of California’s past, present and future and refers to the variety of personal experiences, values and worldviews that arise from differences in culture and circumstance. For UCSF, such differences include race, ethnicity, gender, age, religion, language, abilities/disabilities, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status and geographic region, among others.

- Provide a supportive and effective work environment to attract and retain the best people and position UCSF for the future. Recruiting and retaining excellent faculty and ensuring that they have an environment which supports their academic and personal needs is essential to maintaining the international stature and reputation, and thus the future, of UCSF. To achieve all of UCSF’s long-term goals, which are ambitious and far-reaching, leadership and participation by faculty of the highest caliber is critical. Likewise, recruiting and retaining excellent staff is equally essential to supporting the academic community to continue the outstanding research, teaching, community service and health care.

- Serve our local, regional and global communities and eliminate health disparities. Community and public service is integral to the UCSF vision of advancing health worldwide™. Whether focusing on breakthroughs in basic science research, innovations in patient care, or training the next generation of leaders in health sciences and health
care, UCSF faculty, staff and students share a common purpose of wanting to make a
difference to improve the health of people in our local, regional and global communities.
As a public university, UCSF has a particular responsibility to ensure that it contributes
to the public good and is an exemplar of civic responsibility. Striving to eliminate health
disparities is one important part of this social responsibility. Inequities in health mar the
landscape of our communities, from neighborhoods in San Francisco to distant nations
across the globe. UCSF’s vision of **advancing health worldwide™** means a commitment
to advancing health for all, and not just for a privileged few.

**Professional Education**

**Dentistry**

The UCSF School of Dentistry admits 88 students annually to the four-year Doctor of
Dental Surgery (DDS) program. The admissions process is very competitive, with
more than 1,700 applications received every year.

The school also provides a two-year international program with 24 enrollees per
year who are dentist-graduates trained in other countries and desiring to earn
American DDS degrees. The school offers postgraduate programs in eight of the nine
American Dental Association recognized dental specialty areas – dental public health,
endodontics, oral and maxillofacial surgery, oral and maxillofacial pathology, oral
medicine, orthodontics, pediatric dentistry, periodontics, and prosthodontics— together
with a general practice residency program. These programs total more than 50
students. The School of Dentistry also offers a DDS/PhD program, one of very few in the United
States.

The School of Dentistry is committed to educating future leaders in the dental profession,
including the next generation of dental scholars and faculty members. The school’s faculty are
world leaders in dental education and research. The school teaches and practices a philosophy
of minimally invasive dentistry that embraces prevention before surgical intervention. Five years
ago, faculty completely revised the curriculum to emphasize education that is integrated among
the disciplines and fundamentally prepares graduates to evaluate and apply scientific
knowledge to make informed, evidence-based decisions in practice as they move forward. The
school recognizes that all graduates will not become scientists, but firmly believes that all
graduates must become men and women of science.
Medicine

The UCSF School of Medicine educates physicians and physician-scientists to advance the field of medicine by incorporating inquiry, innovation and discovery throughout their careers, whether in private practice, industry or government, academic medicine, or other pursuits.

Admission to the MD program is highly competitive, with 152 students admitted from approximately 6,000 applicants. The curriculum consists of two phases: two years of integrated coursework organized around organ systems and clinical themes, followed by two years of clerkships offered in ambulatory and hospital settings in the greater San Francisco Bay Area and Fresno. Among the medical school’s strengths are the wide range of clinical settings that students experience during their training and the many electives and special programs available to them. In 2008, the medical school’s enrollment included 1,218 residents and clinical fellows and 1,100 postdoctoral scholars. More than 15,000 learners participated in UCSF School of Medicine Continuing Medical Education programs.

Joint Medical Program:
An additional 16 medical students enter the Joint Medical Program at UC Berkeley, where they complete a preclerkship curriculum and, in a third year, a master’s degree in health sciences, before transferring to UCSF for their clinical years of training.

Program in Medical Education for the Urban Underserved (PRIME-US):
Eleven students within the entering class at UCSF and four students within the Joint Medical Program at UC Berkeley are selected for PRIME-US. The didactic and clinical curriculum plus intensive mentoring prepare students to work with urban underserved populations.

Pathways to Discovery Program:
This elective program fosters the pursuit of discovery, inquiry and innovation, and provides learners with opportunities to pursue indepth study and experience in one of several pathways: clinical and translational research, global health, health and society, health professions education, and molecular medicine.

Medical Scientist Training Program:
A combined MD/PhD program, the Medical Scientist Training Program prepares 12 new students each year for careers as physician-scientists.

Graduate Medical Education:
The school educates an additional 785 residents and 433 clinical fellows at UCSF Medical Center (Parnassus, UCSF Children’s and Mount Zion hospitals), San Francisco General Hospital, San Francisco Veterans Affairs Medical Center and Langley Porter Psychiatric Institute. Additional residents are trained in the UCSF Fresno Medical Education Program.
Nursing
The UCSF School of Nursing prepares advanced practice nurses and scientists for leadership roles in health care. Taking advantage of its long history as a part of the UCSF health sciences campus, the school works cooperatively with other health professional schools on campus and collaborates with other health disciplines nationally and internationally in its search for excellence in teaching, research, practice and public service. Faculty provide education and research training in the social, behavioral and biological sciences focused on health, illness and health care. They are internationally recognized for their contributions to science and clinical care, and the school has been ranked number one in funding from the National Institutes of Health since 2003. The School of Nursing has recently begun an innovative, interprofessional shadowing program with the School of Medicine, and is hoping to extend this program to other schools.

Master’s Programs in Nursing: The school sponsors an accelerated RN program for 85 students each year, drawing from a highly competitive, nationwide pool of more than 600 applicants. Students continue into the master’s program. In addition, the school offers 17 specialties in its master’s program for approximately 440 students who are preparing for advanced practice nursing roles such as nurse practitioner, clinical nurse specialist and nurse-midwife. Each specialty area defines a course of study leading to the master of science degree, and many specialty areas prepare the student for state or national certification, as appropriate. Some specialty areas include subspecialty, optional or focus choices to meet individual student needs.

Doctoral Program in Nursing: Each year, 25 to 30 students are admitted from a highly competitive pool into the doctoral program in nursing. The curriculum is designed to prepare graduates to assume leadership roles in nursing clinical practice, administration, teaching and research.

Doctoral Program in Sociology: Six students are admitted yearly to focus on the social, political and policy levels of nursing. The substantive focus of the program lies in the sociology of health and illness and biomedicine, with options for specialization in an area relevant to health. Qualitative research and analysis and quantitative methods are emphasized.

Pharmacy
The UCSF School of Pharmacy offers the top-ranked Doctor of Pharmacy (PharmD) program in the United States. The program is highly competitive. Out of a pool of more than 1,500 applicants, the school admits 122 students each year.

The school’s faculty members, who are known worldwide as leaders in pharmacy professional education and research, teach PharmD students, who in turn become leaders and innovators in pharmacy practice, policy and science. And they teach the students to be lifelong experts in the safe and effective use of medicines and to be effective and vocal members of health care teams alongside physicians, nurses and other health care providers. As one case in point, the school’s faculty members have created the interdisciplinary climate and have given students the tools they needed to teach more than a thousand health professional students and resident physicians to date about the health policy and access issues surrounding the Medicare Part D prescription drug benefit.

Because of the severe pharmacist shortage and the quality of the school’s program, the expertise of UCSF School of Pharmacy graduates is highly prized.
The school’s PharmD curriculum consists of four years of full-time study for select applicants who have completed appropriate prerequisites and earned a bachelor of science degree. All students take a required core curriculum and select an emphasis in one of three pathways.

**Pharmaceutical Care (PC):** The PC pathway prepares students to use their clinical knowledge and skills to manage drug therapy for patients with acute and chronic diseases, to work with health care teams to provide cost-effective care, and to provide medication consultation to families and caregivers.

**Pharmaceutical Health Policy and Management (PHPM):** The PHPM pathway is designed to prepare students to conduct health services research and to be decisionmakers on health policies and processes for drug use in the private and public sectors.

**Pharmaceutical Sciences (PS):** The PS pathway offers a unique and innovative curriculum designed for students interested in pharmaceutical research within academia, industry or governmental agencies. Mentoring, grant opportunities and programs such as Preparing Future Faculty encourage students in all pathways to consider academic careers.

All students are eligible for licensure as a registered pharmacist upon graduation, and more than 99 percent pass the licensure examinations. The highly personal and individual attention the school offers students has resulted in exceptional retention and graduation rates. About 60 percent to 70 percent of pharmacy students pursue, and are highly competitive for, postgraduate training or education in the form of residencies, fellowships or advanced degrees.

The school also makes possible expanded degree options.

**PharmD/MPH:** The UCSF School of Pharmacy works with the UC Berkeley School of Public Health to establish a program through which PharmD students can earn a master of public health (MPH) degree at Berkeley.

**PharmD/MSCR:** The UCSF Training in Clinical Research program offers UCSF PharmD students the opportunity to earn a master of science degree in clinical research (MSCR).

**PharmD/PhD:** Application to the UCSF joint PharmD/PhD degree program is open to qualifying first-, second- and third-year UCSF PharmD students.

### Graduate Education

The Graduate Division currently has oversight of more than 1,500 graduate students in 22 programs awarding certificates, the master’s degree, doctoral degree in physical therapy and PhD degree. Another 1,100 postdoctoral scholars are engaged in research. Overall, the graduate student body is 68 percent female, 5.3 percent international and 14 percent underrepresented minorities; 61 percent of UCSF graduate students are in PhD programs. UCSF’s graduate programs are highly competitive, with fewer than 10 percent of applicants matriculating into its PhD programs each year. The average time to earn the PhD degree is 6.1 years, and UCSF’s completion rates are approximately 95 percent.

The UCSF philosophy of graduate education is highly interdisciplinary; that is, nearly all of the graduate programs are not based in departments, but are crossdiscipline, cross-department and even cross-school.
Most faculty research is interdisciplinary, and it is not unusual for a faculty member to have appointments in multiple graduate programs. This emphasis on interdisciplinary research, a major strength of UCSF, has led to outstanding research accomplishments and a high national ranking for its graduate programs. For example, the Program in Biological Sciences organizes educational activities, courses and seminars for the degree programs in biochemistry, cell biology, developmental biology, genetics, neuroscience, biophysics and chemistry.

Another successful umbrella, the Program in Quantitative Biology, links UCSF’s quantitative degree programs in bioengineering, biophysics, bioinformatics and chemistry with new efforts in systems biology.

This interdisciplinary approach to graduate training is one of UCSF’s strengths, but also allows the Graduate Division to centralize graduate diversity efforts for UCSF. Thus, the Graduate Division oversees the only UCSF undergraduate Summer Research Training Program, a National Institute of General Medical Sciences (NIGMS)-funded program supporting underrepresented minority (URM) graduate students, a National Science Foundation-funded Alliances for Graduate Education and the Professoriate program, and a program specific to UC, called UC-LEADS, as well as a new program for URM postdoctoral scholars funded by the NIGMS.

As evidence that the UCSF interdisciplinary approach is successful, *U.S. News and World Report* ranks UCSF seventh overall in the field of biomedical science in its 2009 issue of “America’s Best Graduate Schools.” Other ranking entities routinely place most UCSF graduate programs in the top 10. Thus, UCSF educates the best and brightest students, who go on to leadership positions in science and industry.

**Faculty**

UCSF’s 2,200 faculty are very distinguished by all measures and include wide representation in all five faculty series.

UCSF faculty are internationally acclaimed for their excellence, achievements and leadership in health sciences. Honors garnered by UCSF faculty include Nobel Prizes (four), Lasker Awards (11), Gardner Awards (seven), National Academy of Sciences memberships (34), Institute of Medicine memberships (79), American Academy of Arts and Sciences Fellowships (49), and MacArthur Fellowships (three).

Over the last six years (from 2001 to 2007), the total number of faculty rose 20.4 percent, from 1,840 to 2,200. Although the data in this report are for only ladder rank faculty, all five series are critical to UCSF. Ladder rank faculty make up 17.5 percent of the total, while 20.8 percent are in residence, 11.9 percent clinical X, 16.6 percent adjunct and 33.1 percent HS clinical. More than
half of UCSF faculty are in senate series. The number of ladder rank faculty has not changed significantly, but the percentage of ladder rank faculty has decreased because of growth in each of the other series. This increase in faculty in the non-ladder rank series represents growth in both research and clinical programs. Thus, UCSF has seen a continuing increase in the number of faculty, and the growth has occurred in all series except ladder rank.

During this same period, the percentage of women rose from approximately 37 to 42, and the percentage of minority faculty rose from about 19 to 26. The percentage of women and underrepresented minorities rose in each of the series, with the largest percentage increases for women in the in residence, clinical X and adjunct series and for minorities in the in residence and adjunct series.

A faculty climate survey in 2001-2002 suggested the need for more opportunities in a number of areas, and these findings are being addressed by the Chancellor’s Council on Faculty Life. A faculty mentoring program for all assistant professors and new faculty has been established. The approximately 800 faculty in the program have career mentors assigned by a mentoring facilitator in each department or large unit. Ninety-seven faculty have completed the leadership program, which was developed with the Coro Center for Civic Leadership and involves approximately 70 hours of leadership training. Evaluations have been very positive, and many of the graduates have assumed greater leadership roles and have shown increased leadership skills. A new Faculty Information and Welcoming Week allows new and continuing faculty to learn about various topics, from compensation and running a research program to raising children in the Bay Area. Two lecture series, Faculty Development and Faculty Wellness, round out the programs to enhance faculty life at UCSF. In 2008, the Scientist ranked UCSF 12th in its assessment of the best places to work in academia.
UCSF is a premier employer in San Francisco, second in size only to the city and county of San Francisco, with employees working in a wide range of roles at campus locations dispersed across the city and beyond. As the campus has grown in stature and scope as an academic and clinical enterprise, so have the scope and range of employment.

A decade ago, UCSF provided 12,000 jobs, and today that number is approximately 22,000. This dramatic growth in employment has attracted and retained bright, energetic and hardworking men and women from a diverse set of backgrounds and careers.

While UCSF’s international standing and success are primarily dependent upon academic employees, most of its employment growth has been in nonacademic staff, which has more than doubled in size over the past decade from about 8,000 to 22,000 employees.

These employees work in a variety of roles, from hospital bedside to administrative support, and provide vital contributions in sustaining UCSF’s excellence and fulfilling its mission. UCSF’s largest single category of staff employees work in clinical care positions (more than 6,000), followed by professionals in fiscal and administrative services (more than 3,100), clerical support employees (about 2,800), and laboratory science professionals (more than 1,200). Over this same period of time, UCSF’s nonacademic employee mix, like the population of California, has moved from being a white majority to one in which employees of color comprise more than 55 percent of the total. Two-thirds of UCSF staff members are women.

While UCSF’s turnover rate is about 13 percent per year, on average, only 3 percent of employees leave UCSF to seek employment outside of the University. The remaining 10 percent resign to attend school, move away from the San Francisco Bay Area or retire from the University. The factors that positively influence UCSF’s
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**UCSF STAFF ETHNICITY**
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- Native American: 80
- Asian: 4979
- Black: 1027
- Hispanic: 1628
- White: 6142
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Connie Barbante smiles upon her graduation from the Turnaround Program, a yearlong mentorship program for staff, while Karen Newhouse, her mentor, looks at her certificate.
position in the marketplace include good pay and very strong benefits, challenging work, and the excellent reputation of UCSF within the state, nation and the world. UCSF regularly surveys its staff to gauge employee satisfaction, and by wide margins, employees report favorably on the excellence of services provided by their units, the quality of care provided by UCSF and satisfaction with employee benefits provided. In response to specific concerns from these surveys about the need for more training and development and cross-departmental communications, UCSF has launched staff leadership development programs, which are showing early signs of appreciation and success and will help develop and nurture future leaders for UCSF in the decade ahead.

Research

UCSF has created powerful, internationally recognized research programs in biological, clinical, social, behavioral and population sciences. Preeminent faculty, who are conducting scientific investigations at the molecular and cellular levels, are unmasking the fundamental mechanisms of biology. And acclaimed faculty conducting investigations involving humans are discovering new solutions for preventing and treating a wide array of diseases, including cardiovascular disease, neurological disorders, cancer, diabetes, genetic disorders, immunological and infectious disease, and reproductive and developmental disorders.

These research efforts draw on the remarkable talent and achievements of UCSF’s cadre of exceptional investigators and trainees and its dedicated staff. They also benefit tremendously from UCSF’s widely recognized spirit of collaboration and entrepreneurship.

Increasingly, UCSF’s research endeavors are multidisciplinary and aimed at translating basic discoveries into innovations that improve health. Two examples of major institutes recently created to bring together large teams of experts from a variety of disciplines to tackle major scientific and health issues are the UCSF Clinical and Translational Science Institute (CTSI) and the California Institute for Quantitative Biosciences (QB3), a cooperative effort with UC Berkeley, UC Santa Cruz and private industry. The CTSI is a cross-campus UCSF institute established to facilitate translational clinical research and bring better health to more people more quickly. QB3 was established to link the quantitative sciences – mathematics, physics, chemistry and engineering – with the biosciences to attack complex scientific problems and spawn potent new technologies.

UCSF’s prowess as a leader in biomedical research is evidenced by its success in garnering research support. In 2008, UCSF faculty received $933 million in research awards. Overall, UCSF ranks second in receipt of National Institutes of Health funding, with the schools of dentistry, nursing and pharmacy all ranking first, and the School of Medicine ranking second.

Importantly, results from this research are having an impact worldwide.
According to a global survey by the Milken Institute, UCSF ranks second in the world for the number of biotechnology patents. And a report in the Chronicle of Higher Education ranked the faculty scholarly productivity of UCSF as third among all universities and research institutes in the world, while Newsweek International ranked UCSF ninth among all the research universities in the world for its scholarly excellence and global impact.

Libraries and Academic Information

The UCSF Library and Center for Knowledge Management is recognized worldwide for its comprehensive health sciences paper, electronic and archival collections, for a building with remarkable spaces for study and research, and for digital technologies and services that link students and faculty to the scientific knowledge base supporting the generation of new knowledge. The library is engaged in a period of transformation as new forms of scholarly communication emerge and information technologies offer great potential to create, discover, share, reuse and preserve knowledge.

The initiatives in the UCSF Strategic Plan serve as the foundation for the library’s mission: to advance science, foster excellence in teaching and learning, and promote health through the collection, development, organization and dissemination of the world’s health sciences knowledge base. The library is committed to the application of technologies and services that bridge the geography of separate campus sites and to transforming physical and virtual spaces that promote innovative approaches to teaching and learning.

The library manages facilities at the Parnassus Heights and Mission Bay campuses, with more than 500,000 visits annually. Affiliate libraries are located at the four major clinical sites. More than 20,000 full-text electronic journals, 11,000 directly related to the health sciences, support UCSF’s research, education and service mission. A major project is underway to transform the second floor of the Parnassus library to support interprofessional and interdisciplinary education. Approximately 2,000 students attend library classes, in part as a result of integrated curricular instruction. Centralized technology support for education is provided through student computing labs and classrooms and an innovative Collaborative Learning Environment for online instruction. The library maintains one of the largest digital archives of internal tobacco industry documents, with more than 3,600,000 views from 52 million pages.

Health Sciences and Services (Clinical Enterprise)

The UCSF clinical enterprise is defined as all clinical programs at UCSF, including the inpatient and outpatient medical center and clinical practices.

UCSF Medical Center is a 722-licensed bed, tertiary care referral center with two major clinical sites at Parnassus Heights and Mount Zion, approximately 750,000 outpatient visits per year, and annual revenue of $1.4 billion. With a history of strong operating performance and clinical innovation, the medical center consistently ranks as one of the nation’s top 10 hospitals by U.S. News & World Report.

In partnership with the UCSF clinical faculty, UCSF Medical Center has earned respect for its nationally preeminent programs, including:

- UCSF Children’s Hospital, with more than 150 specialists in 40 areas of medicine and dentistry;
Nancy Ascher, MD, PhD, right, chair of the UCSF Department of Surgery, has devoted her career to organ transplants and transplant research. The Liver Transplant Program at UCSF Medical Center, designated as a Center of Excellence by the US Department of Health and Human Services, is recognized as one of the nation’s leading centers for pediatric and adult liver transplants.

The medical center has experienced patient volume increases of approximately 4 percent per year for the past nine years, and now has significant constraints on its capacity, which will require interim steps in advance of the construction of the new, 289-bed children’s, women’s and cancer hospital complex at Mission Bay in 2014. The new complex will be the first hospital built from the ground up in San Francisco in 30 years, and will serve as the third major site for UCSF patient care, supporting UCSF’s ongoing commitment to advancing health sciences education in collaboration with research and patient care. UCSF Medical Center is a leader in quality and safety initiatives nationally, and will complete the implementation of a comprehensive electronic medical records system in fiscal year 2009-2010.

Clinical services also are provided by UCSF faculty in the schools of dentistry, medicine, nursing and pharmacy in outpatient or ambulatory care settings.

The School of Dentistry clinical enterprise, which includes 14 clinics at three sites across San Francisco, provides more than 121,000 patient visits per year. The School of Dentistry operates its own teaching clinics, each of the clinical specialties runs its own clinic and there are several sites for faculty practice. In addition to the on-campus clinics, the school has 21 active community clinic sites that permit students to experience practicing in nontraditional and underserved areas. This expansion of dental care beyond the on-campus clinics has contributed greatly to meeting the needs of underserved Californians. During the past five-year period, 62,780 patient visits occurred, and the equivalent of $6.5 million in care was provided by dental students in these community safety net clinics.

The School of Medicine’s patient care and clinical training programs occur at UCSF Medical Center, San Francisco General Hospital Medical Center, San Francisco Veterans Affairs Medical Center, and the San Francisco VA Medical Center.

- Integrated neuroscience services, including the largest brain tumor treatment program in the nation;
- An organ transplantation program that has performed more kidney transplants than any other institution in the world;
- Northern California’s only National Institutes of Health designated Center of Excellence in Women’s Health; and
- The National Cancer Institute-designated Helen Diller Family Comprehensive Cancer Center, the first in Northern California.
Medical Center, and many other sites in the San Francisco Bay Area, Northern California and the Central Valley. The school includes the UCSF Medical Group and its nearly 1,000 physician faculty members. In fiscal year 2008, the group had 730,353 outpatient visits and earned $315 million in revenue, a 34 percent increase over the previous three years.

The School of Nursing provides patient care and clinical training programs in a variety of venues across San Francisco. It is responsible for all health services at Glide Church and Progress Foundation, and provides clinical care at Valencia Health Services for residents from birth to 21 years who live in the San Francisco Mission District.

The School of Pharmacy’s student-pharmacists and faculty actively collaborate on patient care initiatives and core measures at UCSF Medical Center and other sites throughout the state of California. The pharmacy residency program includes both general practice and specialty residents who provide inpatient and outpatient care to UCSF Medical Center and San Francisco General Hospital.

**Community**

Since the early days of treating neighbors in need after the great 1906 earthquake, UCSF has long been an integral part of the community, forging partnerships in the San Francisco Bay Area and beyond to advance education and promote health and well-being.

Through its patient care provided at local hospitals and neighborhood clinics, research conducted in cooperation with partners around the globe, academic outreach programs and campus activities – including lectures and programs for the general public – UCSF’s reach and impact stretch far into the community.

UCSF enjoys a strong and growing partnership with the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD). Since 1987, the Science & Health Education Partnership (SEP) – a nationally recognized program – has brought UCSF and SFUSD scientists and educators together to support quality science education for K-12 students. Each year, more than 400 SFUSD K-12 teachers and their students, representing 80 percent to 90 percent of SFUSD’s schools, participate in SEP programs. UCSF and SFUSD recently expanded their partnership with plans to work more intensively in five local schools as part of the establishment of a robust educational program.

UCSF welcomes input from the community and provides opportunities for ongoing dialogue in two ways. The UCSF Community Advisory Group (CAG), originally formed in 1992, has representatives from a wide range of San Francisco’s neighborhood, civic, ethnic, labor and business groups, who provide UCSF with their views on how the campus can better coexist with its city neighbors. The CAG primarily focuses on land use, campus planning and related issues. The University Community Partnerships Program, established in 2006 and comprising representatives from UCSF and the community, coordinates the many existing academic, clinical and research partnerships between UCSF-affiliated individuals or groups and community organizations, and also facilitates new University-community collaborations.

**Budget and Finance**

UCSF’s financial management model is defined by both the diversity of its funding sources and the decentralized manner in which its financial activities are conducted. Income from the federal government, private gifts, grants and contracts, and medical center patient revenue comprise
almost 80 percent of its income base. State of California general fund appropriations are less than 8 percent of the total. Income from local government contracts, auxiliary enterprises (campus housing, parking, recreation facilities, food service, etc.), tuition and fees, and other miscellaneous sources make up the balance of the more than $3 billion of income UCSF brought in during fiscal year (FY) 2008. In terms of revenue, UCSF is the second-largest campus in the UC system, surpassed only by UCLA.
In a time when federal funding of research was relatively flat or declining, UCSF had a compound annual growth rate of 7 percent between FY 2001 and FY 2008. UCSF Medical Center’s compound annual revenue growth rate was more than 9 percent, and UCSF’s income from local government, private gifts, and grants and contracts was 6 percent. This contrasts with the state appropriations, which grew at less than 2 percent over the same period. The addition of significant student housing units and parking garages allowed the auxiliary enterprises to grow at almost 12 percent per year in the same period. Beyond UCSF’s strong revenue base
and its management structure, it has built, over time, a very strong financial balance sheet and, for a public institution, a reasonably strong endowment. At the end of FY 2008, UCSF’s cash and equity in short-term investment were almost $1.5 billion. During FY 2008, UCSF was able to earn more than $63 million in non-operating income to enhance and support its mission-based operations. In addition, the market value of its endowment and gift funds (both in its foundation and those held by the UC Regents) was more than $1.4 billion at the end of FY 2008.

Despite the feeling of relative comfort these facts might convey, UCSF also has had to endure reductions to its state general fund appropriations for 14 of the last 18 years, and is about to enter into the 15th year of more budget cuts. The state’s financial situation has meant inadequate funding for the cost of electricity and gas utility purchases, as well as for basic operating and maintenance of most of the new, state-eligible facilities at the Mission Bay campus. The cumulative effect of this continuous budget cutting has meant that UCSF has had to shift basic instruction, academic and institutional support functions off state funds and onto funds traditionally used for the strategic advancement of UCSF. In essence, UCSF has had to use its strategic, discretionary resources just to keep the lights on.

Given the economic uncertainties that are now facing all publicly funded research universities as a result of depressed national and state economies, the basic cost of remaining competitive with UCSF’s peer institutions continues to rise – especially for the recruitment and retention of top faculty, students and staff. Regional cost-of-living factors (salaries, child care, housing, schooling, etc.) all come into play.

Consequently, strong funding support will be a primary Achilles’ heel, given the demonstrated unreliability of state support for UCSF’s most basic missions. UCSF must seek ways to increase administrative and program support efficiencies, as well as leverage and strengthen links to new financial partnerships in nontraditional arenas. UCSF must make strategic and judicious decisions in managing its financial resources to remain competitive as it strives to maintain and strengthen its place as one of the top academic health centers in the world.

Development

The UCSF Office of University Development and Alumni Relations and the UCSF Foundation are responsible for promoting awareness of the missions of UCSF to the community and beyond, and for garnering private support for the University’s four professional schools, the Graduate Division, UCSF Medical Center, and the numerous departments, centers and institutes that make up UCSF.

As UCSF receives less than 8 percent of its operating budget from state appropriations, the University must rely increasingly on development support to help continue its work locally, nationally and internationally.

Fiscal year 2008 was extremely successful, with $366 million contributed to UCSF, topping the FY 2007 total of $252 million by more than $100 million and setting an all-time fundraising record. Nearly 35,000 gifts were received, with 82 percent coming from foundations and individuals, and 18 percent from alumni, corporations and other nonprofit organizations.

Philanthropic support has been critical for numerous UCSF projects now underway: the new Eli and Edythe Broad Center of Regeneration Medicine and Stem Cell Research building on the Parnassus campus; the Helen Diller Family Cancer Research Building at Mission Bay, due to open in June 2009; the new Cardiovascular Research Building under construction at Mission
Bay; the Institute for Neurodegenerative Diseases facility, which is in the planning stages; and one of the most ambitious projects ever undertaken by UCSF, the new medical center to be built at Mission Bay.

Established in 1982, the UCSF Foundation accomplishes its mission through the leadership, guidance and generosity of its board of directors and chancellor’s associates. The board of directors oversees the foundation's operations and advises University administration with the help of several committees. The directors bring unique and diverse skills, expertise and financial acumen to the board and are deeply dedicated to supporting UCSF.

**Capital Resources**

UCSF is a multisite campus with facilities containing approximately 9 million gross square feet, including teaching, research, clinical and support space. In accordance with its Long Range Development Plan, the San Francisco campus has embarked on an $800 million, multitrack, major capital improvement program (excluding medical center projects) to solve a number of longstanding capital needs.

**Mission Bay Site:** To address the critical space deficit, UCSF has constructed four biomedical research buildings, with a fifth building under construction and due for completion in 2011, and a sixth that will be constructed by a third-party developer and completed in 2012. The Mission Bay campus site also has a new campus community center with fitness facilities, housing complex, child care center, parking structures, a quadrangle of open space and landscaped walkways.

**Parnassus Heights Site:** A new stem cell research building is under construction and due for completion in 2010, and a new child care center is due for completion in 2009. Completion of a housing complex at 145 Irving Street and conversion of seven houses along 3rd and 5th avenues and Kirkham Street from administrative and academic offices to residential use have increased the number of housing units. In addition, UCSF is making significant progress in upgrading infrastructure and laboratories in the Medical Sciences Building, Health Sciences East building and Health Sciences West building.

**Mount Zion Site:** Since 1992, UCSF has constructed a research building and a cancer center clinics building, acquired two medical office buildings, and is constructing a new medical office building to house the Osher Center for Integrative Medicine and a number of medical center offices and clinics.

**Sustainability**

UCSF has embarked on a comprehensive sustainability strategy embracing both new building construction and renovation of existing facilities, in compliance with UC Regents policies, and campus and medical center operations. New buildings are submitted to the US Green Building Council for certification, with a target level of silver established at the outset of design. Similar performance levels are targeted for renovation projects. The Chancellor’s Committee on Sustainability coordinates sustainability efforts across all UCSF constituencies, including all aspects of ongoing campus and medical center operations. In addition, UCSF is an active participant in the UC Strategic Energy Conservation Program, and carries an active catalogue of energy-efficiency projects.
Conclusion

Despite the economic challenges facing UCSF, the University remains a strong institution, nationally renowned for its formidable biomedical research, high-quality health care and top-ranked teaching programs, and driven by the talent and tenacity of its distinguished faculty and their entrepreneurial spirit and culture of collaboration.

In fact, UCSF stands to benefit from new scientific research funding opportunities created by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, which authorizes $10.4 billion in funds to the National Institutes of Health. UCSF also will benefit from a new federal policy on embryonic stem cell research, which opens the door for scientific discoveries in this promising field. UCSF’s program in regeneration medicine is at the threshold of developing cell-based approaches and therapies for various debilitating diseases that result from tissue injury or degeneration.

UCSF is on the verge of transforming health care through its clinical enterprise, which looks to build a new, $1.68 billion medical center at Mission Bay for children, women and cancer patients in 2014. Energized by a matching challenge grant of $125 million by The Atlantic Philanthropies, the new medical center at Mission Bay is critical to the future of UCSF as a world-class health sciences institution, as well as to the patients it serves. An expanded medical center is also vital to the health care professionals and scientists who work to deliver on the promise of uniting advanced biomedical research with clinical care, so that research findings can be rapidly translated into medical advances.

Finally, UCSF is well positioned to achieve its mission of *advancing health worldwide™* through the cooperation of its many constituencies – faculty, staff, students, trainees, donors, alumni, business partners, volunteers and members of the community – all of whom have contributed to its 145-year history as a place for discovery, learning and healing.
University of California, Santa Barbara
Accountability Profile

This report on key UC Santa Barbara success indicators consists of an introductory background section noting campus highlights and distinctions followed by an annotated compilation of a range of statistical measures, assessments, and survey results that focus extensively on graduate and undergraduate education. Together this information provides a contemporary snapshot of the campus, its development, and achievements.

Part I

A Campus of Distinction

Short history, long shadow
In just six decades as a campus of the University of California, UC Santa Barbara has become internationally recognized as a leading center for teaching and research, distinguished by its interdisciplinary programs and a commitment to innovation.

Once a small, independent teachers college, UC Santa Barbara today is an integral part of the 10-campus UC system. A center of cutting-edge intellectual activity that spans the academic spectrum, this campus is also one of only 62 research-intensive institutions elected to membership in the prestigious Association of American Universities, placing it in the top 2 percent of all colleges and universities in North America.
Prize-winning faculty

UC Santa Barbara’s 1,000-member faculty includes five Nobel Prize winners (all awarded since 1998), the 2006 Millennium Technology Prize winner, a Fields Medalist, a National Humanities Medalist, dozens of winners of Guggenheim and Fulbright Fellowships, and scores of elected members or fellows of the National Academy of Sciences, the National Academy of Engineering, the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Doubling of applications

Teaching and research go hand in hand at UC Santa Barbara, and students are full participants in an educational journey of discovery that stimulates independent thought, critical reasoning, and creativity. The campus has been enrolling approximately 20,000 students per year since 1990, under the terms of the 1990 Long Range Development Plan. The student population includes approximately 3,000 graduate students. Applications for admission have doubled in this decade, from 26,000 to 54,000, while total enrollment has remained constant. Every year, UCSB welcomes a more academically outstanding and diverse freshman class.

200 majors and degrees

UC Santa Barbara offers more than 200 majors, degrees, and credentials through three colleges (Creative Studies, Engineering, and Letters and Science) and two professional schools (the Bren School of Environmental Science and Management and the Gevirtz Graduate School of Education). UCSB has a tradition of emphasizing both undergraduate and graduate programs in a friendly and collegial environment in which students, staff, and faculty members from diverse backgrounds and perspectives explore and learn together. The campus provides significant support for undergraduate research.

Prominent rankings

The quality and stature of undergraduate programs have been on the rise and are now highly ranked. U.S. News & World Report includes UC Santa Barbara among the top 50 universities in the country and ranks it number 12 among all public institutions. Twice in this decade, UCSB was named one of the “hottest colleges” in the country by the popular Newsweek guide to colleges, a distinction that recognized the exceptional intellectual vitality of the campus as well as its extraordinary setting. “If there’s a more beautiful campus than this one at the edge of the Pacific, we haven’t seen it,” said Newsweek. For its quality and accessibility, The Wall Street Journal recognized UCSB in 2006 as one of eight higher education “best bargains” nationally.
Graduate programs on the campus are equally renowned. In 1995, the National Research Council ranked 10 of UCSB’s doctoral programs within the top 20 in the nation. A new survey is to be published by NRC in the near future. In 2008, the “Academic Ranking of World Universities” conducted by Shanghai Jiao Tong University ranked UC Santa Barbara #36 in the world overall, #18 in the area of natural sciences and mathematics, #13 in engineering/technology and computer sciences.

**Developments and discoveries**

UC Santa Barbara has focused on developing strengths in research clusters that are unique, highly interdisciplinary, collaborative, and that aim to be the best in the world.

The campus is home to 11 national centers and institutes, eight of which are sponsored by the National Science Foundation. These centers offer specialized research opportunities and a multidisciplinary environment for study at the undergraduate, graduate, and postdoctoral levels.

- Center for Nanotechnology for Treatment, Understanding and Monitoring of Cancer
- Center for Nanotechnology in Society
- Institute for Collaborative Biotechnologies
- International Center for Materials Research
- Kavli Institute for Theoretical Physics
- Materials Research Laboratory
- Nanotech, a part of the National Nanotechnology Infrastructure Network
- National Center for Ecological Analysis & Synthesis
- Pacific-Southwest Regional Center for Excellence (RCE) for Biodefense and Emerging Infectious Disease Research
- Southern California Earthquake Center
- UC Center for Environmental Implications of Nanotechnology

Examples abound of other areas of research excellence, spanning all the disciplines. The following is just a small sampling:

- Carsey-Wolf Center for Film, Television, and New Media
- Bren School of Environmental Science and Management
- Marine Science Institute
- Solid State Lighting and Energy Center
- California NanoSystems Institute
- Institute for Collaborative Biotechnologies
- American Presidency Project
- Koegel Autism Center
- Center for Stem Cell Biology and Engineering
- SAGE Center for the Study of the Mind, home to the Law and Neuroscience Project (funded with a $10-million grant from the MacArthur Foundation)
Increased federal funding

External research support, which is considered the lifeblood of a premier research university, reached a record $194 million in fiscal year 2008, an increase of $18 million over the previous year and twice the level of a decade ago.

UC Santa Barbara enjoys a high level of funding from federal agencies, especially for a campus that does not feature a medical school.

- In FY 2008, UCSB received funding from the National Science Foundation totaling $52.2 million, ranking 17th in the country. UCSB also ranked among the top 20 in five of the six research directorates at NSF:
  - 8th in Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences
  - 10th in Mathematical and Physical Sciences
  - 13th in Biological Sciences
  - 16th in Computer Science and Engineering
  - 20th in Geosciences

- The Department of Defense is the second largest provider of funds for basic research at UCSB. In FY 2006, UCSB had DOD-funded research expenditures of $33.7 million, an amount which ranked it 13th among the nation’s universities.

A fund-raising milestone

Since 2000, the campus has been conducting its first comprehensive campaign to ensure UC Santa Barbara’s excellence for future generations. More than $500 million in private support has been raised. UC Santa Barbara reached that milestone in June 2008.

During the campaign the campus has raised support for five donor-funded buildings. The campus has also constructed a new donor-funded East Entrance, including the landmark Henley Gate. The number of endowed chairs has grown from 24 to 78 during the campaign. A total of $30.9 million has been raised for student support, including $21.2 million for the establishment of 134 new graduate fellowships and $9.7 million for undergraduate scholarships and prizes. During the campaign, alumni participation in giving has grown from 10 percent to 19 percent.
Capital improvements
Located on the coast approximately 100 miles northwest of Los Angeles, the 1,055-acre campus is bordered by the Pacific Ocean and the Santa Ynez Mountains. An ongoing, billion-dollar capital improvement program has seen the completion of 14 new structures and major additions in just the past five years, including new buildings for engineering, humanities, social sciences, sciences, student resources, athletics, and recreation.

The university houses more than 7,500 students in residence halls and apartments located on the Main and Storke campuses and in university-owned facilities in the adjacent bustling student community of Isla Vista. A majority of other students reside in privately owned housing in Isla Vista.

Vision for the future
A proposed new Long Range Development Plan and a Strategic Academic Plan have been crafted, and public meetings were held in 2008. Building on the success of the previous decade, these plans look toward the nature of the campus in the year 2025.

The plans underscore how UC Santa Barbara is committed to providing the facilities needed for a world-class teaching and research university to flourish, while at the same time preserving and enhancing the campus’s unique environment, architecture, and open space. This comprehensive plan gradually grows the overall student body from 20,000 to 25,000 while increasing the percentage of graduate students from 14 percent to 17 percent. By building on campus strengths of interdisciplinarity and collaboration, it also provides guidance for new academic initiatives, growth and replenishment of faculty and staff, and housing and infrastructure sufficient to meet the needs of that growth.

Faculty hiring
In addition to recruiting extraordinary scholars to the faculty, UC Santa Barbara has been committed to hiring an increasingly diverse faculty. In the last decade, about one-fifth of appointments have been minority faculty, and the percentage of female appointments to ladder faculty positions has increased from 32 percent to 53 percent.

In 2002, the campus created a new position of Associate Vice Chancellor for Diversity, Equity, and Academic Policy, with primary responsibility for policies related to issues of equity and fairness for minorities and women. Professor María Herrera-Sobek, who holds the Luis Leal Endowed Chair in Chicano Studies, is currently serving in this role (initially a half-time position, increased to full-time in 2007).
Housing

Making affordable housing available is a key to attracting and retaining a diverse and excellent faculty. Providing such housing is therefore an integral part of both the short-term and long-term campus development plans. Currently the campus is undertaking two housing projects that will make available 161 for-sale units to current and future faculty, as well as 151 units of rental housing for faculty, staff, and student families.

Providing affordable housing is also key to recruiting top graduate students. The campus’ San Clemente Graduate Student Housing project, with 976 beds, opened to its first graduate residents this year.

The campus Long Range Development Plan calls for several different types of housing developments on campus property, sufficient to house anticipated growth of UCSB faculty, students, and staff over the next 15 years.

Committed to a mission

UC Santa Barbara’s achievements have been realized in the context of its mission of teaching, research, and public service. The campus’s mission statement in full reads:

“The University of California, Santa Barbara is a leading research institution that also provides a comprehensive liberal arts learning experience. Because teaching and research go hand in hand at UC Santa Barbara, our students are full participants in an educational journey of discovery that stimulates independent thought, critical reasoning, and creativity. Our academic community of faculty, students, and staff is characterized by a culture of interdisciplinary collaboration that is responsive to the needs of our multicultural and global society. Our commitment to public service is manifested through the creation and distribution of knowledge that advances the well-being of our state, nation, and world. All of this takes place within a living and learning environment like no other, as we draw inspiration, opportunity, and advantage from the beauty and resources of UC Santa Barbara’s extraordinary location at the edge of the Pacific Ocean.”
Part II

Focus on Students

Undergraduate education
The increasing success of undergraduate education at UC Santa Barbara is closely tied to the strength, excellence, and prominence of its faculty and academic programs. Statistical information about undergraduates based on an assortment of measures — including applicant qualifications, time to graduation analysis, and customer satisfaction survey results — can be found later in this section. But complementing that data is this information about the rich and textured fabric of undergraduate education at UCSB.

Among the highlights of undergraduate education at UCSB are the following:

- The UCSB undergraduate student-faculty ratio is 17 to 1. Lower-division classes average 47 students. Almost half of all UCSB courses enroll 21 or fewer students.
- More than a quarter of all undergraduates are now involved in original research with graduate students and faculty members. Students compete for hundreds of thousands of dollars in grants for undergraduate research each year.
- Over the past decade, enrollment of underrepresented minorities as a percentage of the total undergraduate student population has grown steadily, from 17 percent to 24 percent.
- Last year, more than 900 UCSB undergraduates participated in the UC Education Abroad Program, choosing from over 130 colleges and universities in 35 countries throughout the world.
- Through the UCSB Washington Center Program, students pursue internships, research, or creative activities in the nation’s capital. A similar program is offered in the state capital, Sacramento.
- More than 6,000 UCSB students serve as community volunteers through the campus’s Community Affairs Board, a large student volunteer organization.
- The campus ranks #18 among all large colleges and universities for the number of its graduates who elect to serve in the Peace Corps.
- UCSB’s Intercollegiate Athletics program includes 20 teams that compete at the NCAA Division I level.
- Two-thirds of students going into the workforce have enjoyed one or more internships while at UCSB.
- After earning their degree, approximately one-third of all UCSB students go on to pursue advanced study in a graduate or professional school.
Special programs for undergraduates

UC Santa Barbara supplements the educational experience with a number of programs that benefit students. Examples of current programs that are highly rated by students include the following:

- The Freshman Seminar program provides opportunities for freshmen to take small classes with distinguished faculty to learn first hand about their expertise and interests. More than 90 such seminars were held in 2008-09.

- First-year programs have provided more than 500 first-year (including transfer) students with a special course introducing them to a research university and the role of lifelong learning.

- CLAS, a counseling service, provides opportunities for instructional groups, drop-in services, one-on-one consultations or tutorials, and academic skills services.

- The Educational Opportunity Program serves first-generation, low-income, and underrepresented students. They currently have 40 percent of the UCSB undergraduate population in their service group.

Transfer student success

All California community college students who meet eligibility criteria for transfer are admitted to UCSB. Other transfer students from four-year institutions and community colleges outside the state of California are reviewed for competitive eligibility and given admission as space permits.

The majority of transfer students come from community colleges (91 percent); more than a quarter of transfer students come from Santa Barbara City College alone (27 percent). Other transfer students come from other University of California campuses (4 percent), the California State University system (2 percent), and other four-year colleges (3 percent).

Graduate education

UC Santa Barbara strives to ensure its intellectual vitality by attracting a talented and diverse community of scholars to its graduate programs, and by providing its continuing graduate students with a strong support system for achieving their personal, academic, and professional goals.

UCSB’s graduate student body has grown significantly in both number and proportion since the early 1990s, and makes up nearly 14 percent of total campus enrollment today. Charts and tables illustrating some of the information that follows can be found at the end of this section.
Growing graduate enrollment

Today almost 3,000 UCSB graduate students pursue master’s, Ph.D. and credential programs in more than 100 degree programs in 45 departments. Since 2005, seven interdisciplinary master’s and/or Ph.D. programs have been initiated, adding to the rich array of interdisciplinary options for research and scholarship.

The campus Long Range Development Plan and Academic Plan call for growth in the relative proportion of graduate students, from today’s level of 14 percent of the student body to at least 17 percent by the year 2025.

UCSB persistence rates are comparable with other UC campuses and better than national rates. After two years, 89 percent of entering graduate students remain at UCSB, compared to a UC-wide average of 89 percent and a national average of 86.2 percent. There has been a steady increase in doctoral degrees conferred.

Characteristics of graduate students

UC Santa Barbara continues to attract high-quality graduate students, as evidenced by their undergraduate GPA and high scores on Graduate Record Exams (GREs). The campus also has strived to fulfill its commitment to recruiting a diverse graduate population. The campus attracts international graduate students at a rate above the national average. UCSB continues to explore ways to increase diversity among its graduate student population, particularly by increasing the percentage of women (currently 50 percent) and underrepresented minorities (currently 10 percent).

Support for graduate students

Graduate support comes in the form of fellowships (both centrally and departmentally administered — $22,371,170 in 2007-08), graduate student research assistantships ($23,047,676), and teaching assistantships ($24,911,156). Most graduate students receive some form of such financial support throughout their stay at UCSB.

UC Santa Barbara continues to work to increase the amount of funds available for graduate student support. Since 2004-05, the total amount of financial support available to graduate students has increased by more than 17 percent. This has been a priority of the Campaign for UC Santa Barbara, and since the fund-raising campaign’s inception in 2000, 134 new graduate fellowships have been established.
Student Profile and Performance Indicators

This section provides information about UC Santa Barbara on a range of topics in a format similar to that used by many colleges and universities, which should facilitate comparisons with other institutions on important indicators and characteristics of our educational program. UC Santa Barbara is committed to regularly collecting and analyzing this data, to making it available to the public, and to updating it annually.

(An enhanced version of this section can be found on our Web site in the UCSB Portrait. It includes additional information as well as Web links for more statistics, comments on methodology, and appropriate campus offices. The UCSB Portrait is particularly useful for prospective students and parents.)

Student Characteristics (Fall 2007)

TOTAL NUMBER OF STUDENTS* 21,410

Student Level and Enrollment Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Enrollment Status</th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17,966</td>
<td>2,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>455</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figures include all off-campus and study abroad enrollments

UNDERGRADUATE PROFILE

Total 18,415

Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>10,165</th>
<th>54%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>8,250</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Race/Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American / Black</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian / Alaskan Native</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian / Pacific Islander</td>
<td>3,018</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>3,565</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>9,692</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity Unknown</td>
<td>1,295</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Geographic Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geographic Distribution</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>17,494</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other US</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Countries</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Age</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Undergraduates Age 25 or Older</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Undergraduate Success & Progress Rate

A 92% four-year success and progress rate means that 92% of students starting in Fall 2001 either graduated or are still enrolled at a higher education institution four years later.

Counts for the entering classes shown in the graph above.

- 3644 Freshmen entering in Fall 2001
- 1372 Transfer Students entering in Fall 2003

Average Time to Degree for 2006-07 Graduates

Entering as Freshmen:

- 12 enrolled quarters (4.0 elapsed years)

Entering as Transfers:

- 6.3 enrolled quarters (2.2 elapsed years)

One-year retention of Fall 2006 Freshmen

Returned for Fall 2007 91%
Costs of Attendance and Financial Aid

Typical Undergraduate Cost per Year without Financial Aid (Full-Time, In-State Students)

2008-09 Total: $26,453

*Required fees include waivable Student Health insurance

Financial Aid Awarded to Undergraduates
(all figures below exclude parent loans)

Overall Financial Aid
• During the 2007-08 academic year, 54% of Fall 2007 UCSB undergraduates received financial aid (including loans); the average award was $15,944.

Family Income-Based Grants and Scholarships
• 36% of Fall 2007 UCSB undergraduates received family income-based scholarships or grant aid; the average award was $11,992. 26% of UCSB undergraduates received Pell Grants.

Loans (2006-07 Graduating Class)
• Among students who graduated from UCSB in 2006-07 and started as freshmen, 48% borrowed while enrolled at UCSB. Average cumulative debt at graduation for these borrowers was $15,201. All figures exclude parent loans.
• Stafford student loan default rate for UCSB: 1.1% for 2006.

Percent of Fall 2006 Freshmen Receiving Each Type of Financial Aid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Aid Type</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Grants</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Grants</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Loans</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Aid/ Scholarships</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any Type of Financial Aid</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Students may receive aid from more than one source.

Undergraduate Admissions

Fall 2007 Applicants, Admits and Enrollees

Test(s) Required for Admission:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAT or ACT</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>540-660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Reading</td>
<td>530-650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>530-650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Middle 50% of SAT Score Range
50% of enrolled students have test scores in the following ranges. 25% have scores above and 25% have scores below.

Entering New Freshmen SAT Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>540-660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Reading</td>
<td>530-650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>530-650</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Middle 50% of GPA Range

Entering New Student GPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPA Range</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen High School GPA (weighted 4-point scale)</td>
<td>3.57 - 3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer Student GPA (weighted 4-point scale)</td>
<td>2.93 - 3.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Areas of Study and Degrees

Degrees Awarded at UCSB in 2006-07

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Type</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's</td>
<td>5,442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional (Teaching Credentials)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Master's certificates</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,453</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Areas of Study at UCSB with Largest Number of Undergraduate Degrees Awarded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree Area</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Social Science disciplines</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Managerial Economics</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological/life sciences</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary studies</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other degree areas</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
University of California, Santa Barbara
Student Profile and Performance Indicators

The UCSB Community

UC Santa Barbara’s mission statement describes the campus as a leading research institution that also provides a comprehensive liberal arts learning experience. Because teaching and research go hand in hand at UCSB, our students are full participants in an educational journey of discovery that stimulates independent thought, critical reasoning, and creativity. Our academic community of faculty, students, and staff is characterized by a culture of interdisciplinary collaboration that is responsive to the needs of our multicultural and global society.

In addition, our Division of Student Affairs promotes community on campus with its program of “Scholarship, Leadership, and Citizenship.” The major tenets of this program are:

- Respect and consideration in interactions with others
- Integrity in academic pursuits
- Free, open, and respectful exchange of ideas

Other community-building initiatives sponsored by the Division of Student Affairs include intensified safety programming and a greater campus presence in Isla Vista, renewed efforts in leadership training, promotion of civic responsibility, and a formal ceremonial induction of new students into our community of scholars.

Study at UCSB

Classroom Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students per Faculty</th>
<th>17 to 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate classes with fewer than 30 students</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate classes with fewer than 50 students</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructional Faculty

| Total Full-time Instructional Faculty | 1,101 |
| % Women Faculty | 34% |
| % Faculty from Minority Groups | 16% |
| % Faculty with PhD or Equivalent | 100% |

Future Plans of 2006

Bachelor’s Degree Recipients

- Study or Work Abroad: 8%
- Work Full-Time: 39%
- Graduate or Professional school: 40%
- Something Else: 13%

Based on 2006 UCUES respondents who were seniors

Student Housing

94% of new freshmen live on campus
69% of all undergraduates live within walking distance to campus

Campus Safety

UCSB has a full-service Police Department. Services and programs include:

- 24-hour uniformed patrol coverage
- Rescue unit staffed with state-certified paramedics
- Proactive crime prevention programs
- Electronic alerting system used to send important alerts and updates to students, faculty and staff who have registered their mobile device and/or email account
- Personal safety escorts on campus and in Isla Vista

The Alcohol & Drug Program operated by Student Health Services includes classes, counseling services, early intervention and referral programs, and other efforts aimed at ensuring the health and safety of students.
Student Experiences and Perceptions

Students who are actively involved in their own learning and development are more likely to be successful in college. Like most research universities, UCSB offers students a wide variety of opportunities both inside and outside the classroom to become engaged with new ideas, people, and experiences. Institutions measure the effectiveness of these opportunities in a variety of ways to better understand what types of activities and programs students find the most helpful.

Following are selected results from the 2006 University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES). The questions have been grouped together in categories that are known to contribute to student learning and development. The results reported below are based on the responses of UCSB seniors who participated in the survey.

Below, "percent satisfied" combines responses of "very satisfied," "satisfied," and "somewhat satisfied."

Of seniors who took the UC Undergraduate Experience Survey in 2006:

Group Learning Experiences
- 81% worked outside of class on class projects or studied with classmates
- 19% spent at least 6 hours per week participating in student organizations or clubs
- 24% reported serving as an officer or leader in a campus organization or club
- 87% helped a classmate better understand course material

Active Learning Experiences
- 82% reported making class presentations
- 80% spent at least 6 hours per week studying and other academic activities outside of class
- 45% enrolled in at least one independent research course
- 24% participated in a study abroad program
- 40% participated in an internship
- 43% assisted faculty with research or a creative activity
- 46% participated in community service in 2005-06

Institutional Commitment for Student Learning and Success
- 89% were satisfied with advising by faculty on academic matters
- 80% were satisfied with advising by college staff on academic matters
- 77% were satisfied with the availability of courses needed for graduation
- 85% reported raising their standards for acceptable effort due to the high standards of a faculty member

Student Satisfaction
- 78% were satisfied with the value of their education for the price they paid
- 91% were satisfied with their overall academic experience
- 86% would choose to attend this institution again
- 89% reported that their campus had a strong commitment to undergraduate education

Experiences with Diverse Groups of People and Ideas
- 96% rated their ability to appreciate, tolerate, or understand racial and ethnic diversity as good, very good, or excellent
- 93% rated their ability to appreciate cultural and global diversity as good, very good, or excellent
- 54% gained a deeper understanding of other perspectives through conversations with students of a different nationality
- 54% gained a deeper understanding of other perspectives through conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity

Student Interaction with Campus Faculty and Staff
- 76% sought academic help from an instructor or tutor
- 75% talked with an instructor outside of class about course material
- 31% worked with a faculty member on a campus activity other than coursework
Alumni Feedback (Source: 2007 survey of recent baccalaureate degree recipients)

Of respondents currently employed full-time:
- my current job is highly related to my undergraduate major 36%
- my current job is moderately related to my undergraduate major 24%
- my current job is slightly related to my undergraduate major 19%
- my current job is not related to my undergraduate major 21%
- UCSB prepared me very well or more than adequately for my present occupation 61%
- UCSB prepared me adequately for my present occupation 34%
- UCSB prepared me less than adequately or poorly for my present occupation 5%

Of respondents who went on to graduate or professional school:
- UCSB prepared me very well or more than adequately for graduate/professional school 80%
- UCSB prepared me adequately for graduate/professional school 16%
- UCSB prepared me less than adequately or poorly for graduate/professional school 4%

Of respondents who were currently enrolled in a graduate or professional program:
- Masters 48%
- Doctorate 34%
- Credential/Certificate/Other 31%

(Total exceeds 100% because some graduate programs lead to more than one degree)

Alumni Satisfaction:
- Percent of alumni who were satisfied with the overall UCSB experience 95%
- Percent of alumni who were satisfied with the UCSB academic experience 94%
- Percent of alumni who were satisfied with the UCSB social experience 90%
- Percent of alumni who would recommend UCSB 93%

Learning Outcomes

The University of California, Santa Barbara holds to the fundamental principle that student learning outcomes and their assessment should be locally defined, discipline specific and faculty driven. Through periodic and systematic academic program reviews of undergraduate and graduate education, evidence of student learning, retention and completion is presented; and analyses by program faculty, faculty administrators and peer reviewers are undertaken with the goal of continuous program improvement, and the improvement of curricula and pedagogy.

### SELF-REPORTED GAINS IN ACADEMIC AND LIFE SKILLS FOR SENIORS WHO ENTERED UCSB AS FRESHMEN (UCUES 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>As Freshmen</th>
<th>As Seniors</th>
<th>Gain While at UCSB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of a Specific Field of Study</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>79 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical/Critical Thinking Skills</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>60 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Awareness and Understanding</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>57 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to Read and Comprehend Academic Material</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>56 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of International Perspectives</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>52 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to be Clear and Effective when Writing</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>50 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to Prepare and Make a Presentation</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>49 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of the Importance of Personal Social Responsibility</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>43 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Skills</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>42 pts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Skills</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>34 pts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alumni Feedback (Source: 2005 survey of recent graduate level degree recipients, and most recent Doctoral Exit Survey)

- 92% of graduates from UCSB graduate programs were satisfied or very satisfied with their UCSB experiences overall. Among Ph.D. recipients, 95% were satisfied or very satisfied.
- 87% of the students were satisfied or very satisfied with the graduate academic experience.
- 84% of the students were satisfied or very satisfied with the climate for graduate study.
- 90% of graduates were satisfied or very satisfied with the level of intellectual stimulation in their graduate program.
- 80% of the students were satisfied or very satisfied with the climate for graduate study.
- 80% of the students would choose to attend UCSB again for graduate study.
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University of California, Santa Cruz
Accountability Profile

UC Santa Cruz serves the people of California as a world-class research university and a leading institution for the education of students, fostering a culture of excellence, inquiry, creativity, diversity and public service in developing solutions to the world’s most critical challenges.

The mission of UC Santa Cruz is to provide a comprehensive education for undergraduate and graduate students in focused, high-quality programs. The combination of research and teaching links faculty and students in a partnership dedicated to independent critical thinking, active understanding, creativity and social responsibility.

Legacy of Innovation

Founded in 1965 as an innovative residential college-based university, UC Santa Cruz combines the advantages and human-scale community of a series of small colleges with the depth and rigor of a major research university. As a premier public research institution with a record for excellence in undergraduate education, UCSC has an important legacy as a leader in American higher education and holds a special place within the University of California.

UC Santa Cruz has a rich history of innovative, cutting-edge and interdisciplinary scholarship, from the internationally prominent History of Consciousness program—the first interdisciplinary graduate program in the country—to the Center for Biomolecular Science and Engineering, which supports the Genome Browser, a crucial resource for the international scientific community exploring biological and medical issues resulting from genome sequencing.

Its location on the shores of the Monterey Bay National Marine Sanctuary and within close proximity to Silicon Valley gives UC Santa Cruz unparalleled access to resources that provide a dynamic laboratory for exploration, collaboration, and research.

As one reviews the University of California accountability metrics, as well as additional indicators—both over time and adjusted for size—it is clear that UC Santa Cruz is a campus on the rise. It is an uncommon research and teaching institution with regional, national and global impact, whose students, faculty, staff and alumni are “people making a world of difference.”

UC Santa Cruz’s distinctions include

- recognition as the nation’s top-ranked university for the quality of its research in astronomy and astrophysics, according to the analysis “The Science Impact of Astronomy Ph.D. Granting Departments in the United States;"
- top-10 nationally ranked programs in linguistics, international economics, physics and environmental studies;
- establishment of the University Affiliated Research Center in Silicon Valley, winner of the largest NASA contract awarded to any university ($330 million over 10 years);
- $19.4 million in stem cell research grants from the California Institute for Regenerative Medicine;
- an all-time high for research grants and contracts reached in 2008—an increase of 44 percent over five years; and
as Santa Cruz County’s largest employer, contributing over $1 billion in annual economic impact to its host community.

**Distinctive Undergraduate Experience**

UCSC provides undergraduates with exceptional opportunities to engage with faculty in original research. In a 2008 survey (UCUES), 55 percent of students reported that they had assisted faculty with research or a creative activity. Additionally, 73 percent (compared to a 63 percent average for UC as a whole) spoke with an instructor outside of class about course material.

Its unique residential colleges, organized around broad academic themes, create opportunities for faculty and undergraduates to work together. These personalized, living-learning communities reinforce innovative interdisciplinary study and provide peer support for undergraduates as they encounter the challenges of university life.

**Increasingly diverse and selective**

UCSC enrolls more than 15,000 undergraduates, compared with fewer than 10,000 a decade ago. Among incoming students in 2008-09, 21 percent were transfers and 79 percent were first-time freshmen. UCSC has become increasingly popular and selective: Over the last two years freshman applications have risen by 11.3 percent and transfer applications by 19.4 percent.

The student population has also grown more diverse. In Fall 2008 42 percent of undergraduates were students of color (a 7 percent increase over five years); 25 percent were from underrepresented ethnic groups (a 3 percent rise over the same period). UCSC undergraduates were 3 percent African American, 1 percent Native American, 17 percent Chicano/Latino, 22 percent Asian, 50 percent White/Caucasian, and less than 1 percent international. Seven percent declined to state their ethnicity.

UCSC attracts students from diverse socioeconomic backgrounds. As reported in the 2008 UCUES survey, 9 percent described their backgrounds as low-income or poor, 23 percent as working class, 39 percent as middle-class, 27 percent as professional or upper middle-class, and 2 percent as wealthy. In 2008-09, 36 percent of new freshmen and 39 percent of new transfers were first generation college students. In 2007-08, 27 percent of students received Pell Grants, 43 percent received need-based scholarships or grants, and 58 percent received some form of financial aid including student or parent loans.

Most (97 percent) UCSC undergraduates are from California; 3 percent are from out of state and less than 1 percent are international. Estimates suggest that 12 percent are foreign born and another 29 percent have at least one foreign-born parent; 8 percent reported learning a language other than English as their first language, and an additional 24 percent learned both another language and English as their first languages.

Last year, the campus’s Educational Partnership Center (EPC) worked with more than 41,000 students in 16 high schools, 17 middle schools, 13 regional community colleges, and nine school districts to increase college-going rates among underrepresented minorities and families where neither parent has attended college. Complementing those outreach efforts, UC Santa Cruz provides an array of services to support success once students are enrolled. These include services for transfer and re-entry students (STARS); an academic excellence (ACE) program that supports underrepresented and first generation students in lower-division science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) fields; ACCESS, an academic bridge program for community college students interested in pursuing a science career; and
Educational Opportunity Programs (EOP) that help identify, retain and graduate a diverse student body.

21st century curriculum

UCSC’s general education requirements have been honed and updated to reflect the breadth and depth of coursework needed by graduates in the 21st century. Required interdisciplinary course “clusters” are designed to help students consider and analyze complex issues from multiple perspectives, including ethics, finance, science and politics. In addition to a historical emphasis on effective communications, the new curriculum adds additional coursework in communications within all academic disciplines. All UCSC undergraduates also must meet a capstone requirement, many in the form of a final project or thesis.

These new requirements enhance the educational experience and expectation that UCSC undergraduates are rigorously prepared in their major and broadly educated in qualitative areas that give them an appreciation for diversity of thought and perspective, a sense of social justice and the ability to critically analyze and make insightful and direct presentations of their knowledge.

Data suggests that this uncommon undergraduate focus is reflected in student outcomes. According to the Spring 2008 survey (UCUES):

- 76 percent of UCSC students reported making class presentations (the UC average is 69 percent);
- 61 percent of UCSC students enrolled in at least one independent research course, more than any other UC (49 percent systemwide average); and
- More UCSC students (29 percent) study abroad than their UC peers (25 percent).

Student engagement

UCSC students and graduates are highly engaged in community and public service. In 2007-08, 35 percent of undergraduates completed internships and 44 percent performed community service. During the 2006-07 academic year, students in the social sciences alone contributed more than 220,000 hours of community work.

Recognized for its commitment to academic engagement and a quality undergraduate education, UC Santa Cruz also instills in its students an uncommon commitment to scholarship and social justice. In 2008, UCSC was ranked second nationally among peer institutions for the number of alumni serving in the Peace Corps. Among all universities, UCSC ranked 18th, up from 22nd in 2007 and 35th in 2006.
Undergraduate success and outcomes

UC Santa Cruz students are challenged by rigorous academics and dynamic co-curricular opportunities, while supported by college-based advising and academic support programs. As a result, most students are successful in their undergraduate careers at UCSC. The campus’s six-year graduation rates have risen steadily. Its most recent six-year graduation rate (71 percent) is an all-time high and places UCSC well within the range of current Association of American Universities (AAU) institution rates (56 percent to 93 percent). The average time-to-degree for students who enter as freshmen is 12.1 enrolled quarters (just over four years), and 6.4 quarters for those entering as transfers.

Many of UCSC’s alumni go on to advanced study. As reported in the Spring 2008 UCUES survey, 39 percent of seniors plan to attend graduate school upon graduation.

According to the most recent Survey of Earned Doctorates, UCSC ranked 44th in the world among colleges and universities whose undergraduate alumni went on to earn a U.S. research doctorate (10-year period ending in 2005-06).

When normalized for size, Santa Cruz was second only to Berkeley in the UC system for the percentage of alumni earning doctorates between 2002 and 2006 (based on baccalaureate degrees awarded between 1994 and 1998).

### Top 10 Undergraduate Degrees 2007-08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Degrees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biology/Health Sciences</td>
<td>558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Management/Economics</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Science</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film and Digital Media</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Degrees</td>
<td>3,535</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Baccalaureate Origins of U.S. Research Doctoral Recipients 2001-02 through 2005-06

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>27,841</td>
<td>2,107</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>11,769</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>16,607</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>28,210</td>
<td>1,239</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>20,561</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>8,152</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>15,479</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>20,474</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: [www.norc.org/projects/survey+of+earned+doctorates.htm](http://www.norc.org/projects/survey+of+earned+doctorates.htm)
Graduate Programs

UCSC is rapidly expanding graduate offerings and enrollments, focusing on issues and challenges most relevant in the 21st century. Over the past 15 years, the campus has more than doubled the number of Ph.D. programs and doubled the number of doctoral degrees awarded.

New programs approved in the past seven years include electrical engineering (M.S./Ph.D.), education (Ph.D. and Ed.D.), digital arts and new media (M.F.A.), film and digital media (Ph.D.), visual studies (Ph.D.), bioinformatics (M.S./Ph.D.), music composition (D.M.A.) and music (Ph.D.), MCD biology (Ph.D.), EE biology (Ph.D.) and social documentation (M.A.).

Emerging disciplines to meet societal challenges

UCSC’s newest graduate programs reflect its legacy for innovation and the importance of cross-disciplinary and interdisciplinary work to effectively address emerging global challenges. They explore new biological and biomedical questions arising from genome sequencing and advances in biomolecular science. Their cutting-edge, computational approach with new research in biology, chemistry and engineering promotes discovery and invention in the post-genomic age.
The graduate program in biomedical sciences and engineering illuminates how UC Santa Cruz is committed to leveraging the interdisciplinary and collaborative nature of research in these fields, providing graduate students with the opportunity to be part of diverse teams of faculty, postdoctoral scholars, and researchers working in cutting-edge research facilities.

**Stellar and Highly Diverse Faculty**

UC Santa Cruz boasts an outstanding faculty as evidenced by research impact, awards, diversity and commitment to teaching.

With fewer than 600 tenure-track faculty, an impressive number have been formally recognized by their peers. UC Santa Cruz’s world-class faculty and emeriti include:

- 29 fellows of AAAS (American Association for the Advancement of Science)
- 16 fellows of ACLS (American Council of Learned Societies)
- 12 fellows of the National Academy of Sciences
- 19 fellows of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences

And, during their careers, UC Santa Cruz faculty and emeriti have garnered prestigious awards, including:

- 33 Sloan fellowships
- 80 Fulbright scholarship (includes individual winners of multiple awards)
- 39 Guggenheim fellowships

UCSC has the highest percentage of women faculty among all UCs (36 percent), and is among the most ethnically diverse. Three percent of UCSC’s tenure-track faculty are African American, 1 percent American Indian, 12 percent Asian/Pacific Islander, 7 percent Hispanic/Latino, and 70 percent White/Caucasian (6 percent declined to state ethnicity). This reflects the campus’s strong commitment to diversity and recognizes its importance toward achieving its academic goals.

**Faculty success attracting research funding**

UCSC faculty compete effectively in winning research funding. UC Santa Cruz consistently scores ahead of its peers in year-to-year growth and on a per-faculty basis.

UCSC’s growth in federal research and development expenditures has outpaced other UCs, as well as public and private AAU institutions. Private research awards are up more than 400 percent since 1996-97. Federal government research awards to UC Santa Cruz increased 44 percent in the past five years, during a period of generally flat federal research funding.
UCSC faculty rank 9th among AAU institutions without medical schools in terms of federal research dollars per faculty member:

### Federal R&D Expenditures ($000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Federal R&amp;D per faculty</th>
<th>Total Fed R&amp;D (NSF/CMUP)</th>
<th>Total faculty (IPEDS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California Institute of Technology</td>
<td>$767</td>
<td>$246,591</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts Institute of Technology</td>
<td>$396</td>
<td>$476,362</td>
<td>1,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carnegie Mellon University</td>
<td>$224</td>
<td>$185,389</td>
<td>826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado at Boulder</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$233,316</td>
<td>1,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California-Berkeley</td>
<td>$178</td>
<td>$261,718</td>
<td>1,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton University</td>
<td>$143</td>
<td>$117,845</td>
<td>826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania State University*</td>
<td>$141</td>
<td>$322,712</td>
<td>2,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland-College Park</td>
<td>$133</td>
<td>$209,764</td>
<td>1,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>University of California-Santa Cruz</strong></td>
<td><strong>$121</strong></td>
<td><strong>$66,390</strong></td>
<td><strong>549</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California-Santa Barbara</td>
<td>$117</td>
<td>$106,169</td>
<td>904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandeis University</td>
<td>$117</td>
<td>$41,184</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td>$108</td>
<td>$273,147</td>
<td>2,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice University</td>
<td>$95</td>
<td>$53,880</td>
<td>567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers University-New Brunswick*</td>
<td>$78</td>
<td>$122,472</td>
<td>1,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nebraska-Lincoln*</td>
<td>$66</td>
<td>$74,660</td>
<td>1,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>$65</td>
<td>$46,583</td>
<td>713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kansas*</td>
<td>$60</td>
<td>$66,689</td>
<td>1,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University-Bloomington*</td>
<td>$42</td>
<td>$68,611</td>
<td>1,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td>$28</td>
<td>$25,299</td>
<td>906</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Shown are FY2006 expenditures/faculty except for institutions marked with an asterisk; in these cases the most recent information available was FY2005.

Source: NSF/SRS Survey of R&D Expenditures at Universities & Colleges and the Center for Measuring University Performance, Fiscal year 2006
Research impact

One measure of research impact is the sheer quantity of publication in top peer-reviewed journals. A key indicator of research quality and importance is citation impact, the average number of times research papers are cited by other researchers.

The impressive intellectual contribution of UC Santa Cruz faculty is evidenced by an analysis of publications and citations impact (using data compiled by Thomson-Reuters in University Science Indicators).

Over the most recent five-year period, UCSC’s citation impact is greater than all but three AAU institutions; UC Santa Cruz’s research impact exceeds that of all public AAU members.

UCSC has several especially noteworthy areas of research excellence. For example, UCSC’s citation impact is first or second among AAU institutions in the fields of biochemistry and molecular biology; biotechnology and applied microbiology; environmental studies; and literature (see table on next page).

In other citation impact analyses, UC Santa Cruz fares even better. Astronomy and astrophysics research across all departments at UCSC was ranked first in the nation for its impact, according to an analysis extending back 10 years ("The Science Impact of Astronomy Ph.D. Granting Departments in the United States"). When the analysis focused exclusively on research by faculty in Astronomy and Astrophysics departments, UCSC was second only to Caltech.

### Citation Impact (2003-2007) of AAU Institutions

(Sorted by Impact)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Citations</th>
<th>Papers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HARVARD UNIV</td>
<td>12.48</td>
<td>600,974</td>
<td>52,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALTECH</td>
<td>11.28</td>
<td>149,018</td>
<td>13,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>11.02</td>
<td>209,999</td>
<td>19,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIV CALIF SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>10.78</td>
<td>48,594</td>
<td>4,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOHNS HOPKINS UNIV</td>
<td>10.87</td>
<td>208,803</td>
<td>28,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANFORD UNIV</td>
<td>10.41</td>
<td>266,061</td>
<td>25,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YALE UNIV</td>
<td>10.24</td>
<td>198,778</td>
<td>19,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASHINGTON UNIV</td>
<td>10.18</td>
<td>154,724</td>
<td>15,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIV CHICAGO</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>135,199</td>
<td>13,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIV WASHINGTON</td>
<td>9.87</td>
<td>274,442</td>
<td>27,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINCETON UNIV</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>108,849</td>
<td>11,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUKE UNIV</td>
<td>9.45</td>
<td>180,585</td>
<td>19,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIV CALIF LOS ANGELES</td>
<td>9.44</td>
<td>267,277</td>
<td>28,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIV PENN</td>
<td>9.39</td>
<td>227,035</td>
<td>24,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIV CALIF BERKELEY</td>
<td>9.36</td>
<td>230,524</td>
<td>24,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRANDIES UNIV</td>
<td>9.35</td>
<td>17,021</td>
<td>1,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VANDERBILT UNIV</td>
<td>9.30</td>
<td>117,054</td>
<td>12,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMBRY UNIV</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>110,108</td>
<td>11,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMBIA UNIV</td>
<td>9.22</td>
<td>215,849</td>
<td>23,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIV CALIF SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>9.18</td>
<td>221,911</td>
<td>24,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIV N CAROLINA CHAPEL HILL</td>
<td>8.77</td>
<td>149,054</td>
<td>16,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHWESTERN UNIV</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>140,289</td>
<td>16,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIV</td>
<td>8.70</td>
<td>83,965</td>
<td>9,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIV PITTSBURGH</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>169,611</td>
<td>19,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY STONY BROOK</td>
<td>8.59</td>
<td>65,615</td>
<td>7,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICE UNIV</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td>37,111</td>
<td>4,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIV ROCHESTER</td>
<td>8.51</td>
<td>79,130</td>
<td>9,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW YORK UNIV</td>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>113,514</td>
<td>13,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIV COLORADO SYSTEM</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>157,180</td>
<td>18,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIV CALIF SANTA BARBARA</td>
<td>8.32</td>
<td>78,759</td>
<td>9,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORNELL UNIV</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>157,863</td>
<td>21,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIV CALIF IRVINE</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>95,839</td>
<td>11,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWN UNIV</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>61,127</td>
<td>7,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIV MICHIGAN</td>
<td>8.09</td>
<td>232,856</td>
<td>28,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIV VIRGINIA</td>
<td>8.08</td>
<td>68,429</td>
<td>11,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIV ARIZONA</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>115,652</td>
<td>14,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIV WISCONSIN MADISON</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>172,223</td>
<td>22,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TULANE UNIV</td>
<td>7.58</td>
<td>33,641</td>
<td>4,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIV SC CALIF</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td>100,317</td>
<td>13,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIV IOWA</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>87,443</td>
<td>11,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIV MINNESOTA</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>167,672</td>
<td>23,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIV OREGON</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>23,621</td>
<td>3,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARNegie MELLON UNIV</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>45,506</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutgers State UNIV</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>119,263</td>
<td>17,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDIANA UNIV</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>99,363</td>
<td>14,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENN STATE UNIV</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>132,908</td>
<td>19,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHIO STATE UNIV</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>126,426</td>
<td>18,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIV CALIF DAVIS</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>133,807</td>
<td>20,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIV TEXAS AUSTIN</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>85,678</td>
<td>13,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY BUFFALO</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>43,650</td>
<td>7,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIV MARYLAND COLLEGE PARK</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>69,264</td>
<td>13,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIV ILLINOIS URBANA</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>103,003</td>
<td>17,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICHIGAN STATE UNIV</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>71,605</td>
<td>12,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOWA STATE UNIV</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>55,404</td>
<td>9,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYRACUSE UNIV</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>16,937</td>
<td>2,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIV KANSAS</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>39,210</td>
<td>6,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIV FLORIDA</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>114,363</td>
<td>20,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIV MISSOURI COLUMBIA</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>39,068</td>
<td>7,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas A&amp;M UNIV SYSTEM</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>84,065</td>
<td>17,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PURDUE UNIV</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>66,503</td>
<td>13,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIV NEBRASKA LINCOLN</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>24,368</td>
<td>5,816</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yellow highlighted are institutions without medical or veterinary schools.
While citation impact analyses may not be perfect (nor the only indicators of research quality), it is worth noting that UCSC ranks very highly in many such studies. For example:

- 1st in the nation for research impact in physics (Thomson Scientific in *Science Watch*, 2007)
- 1st among leading institutions for citations per high-impact paper in molecular biology and genetics (Thomson Scientific in *Science Watch*, 2008)
- 2nd most influential research institution in the world in physical sciences (Institute for Scientific Information, 2001)
- 3rd nationally on the faculty scholarly productivity index among doctoral programs in music and environmental health engineering (*Chronicle of Higher Education*, 2007)

### Economic and Cultural Impact

UC Santa Cruz is a multi-site campus. In addition to its main 2,030-acre campus established in 1965, it includes a Marine Science Campus, also in Santa Cruz; Lick Observatory atop Mt. Hamilton in San Jose; the Monterey Bay Education, Science and Technology Center; and its newly evolving campus at the Silicon Valley Center. In all, the campus comprises 5,796 acres utilized for instruction and research and another 4,939 acres managed by the campus on behalf of the UC Natural Reserve System. UCSC also leases nearly 300,000 square feet of ancillary space for additional instruction, research, student housing and academic support programs.

Throughout its core three-county (Santa Cruz, Santa Clara and Monterey) area, UC Santa Cruz contributes meaningfully to the region’s economic vitality.

As the largest employer in Santa Cruz County, UCSC contributes more than $1 billion in annual economic impact within Santa Cruz County. An economic impact analysis also concluded that UCSC's presence helped create over 9,500 additional jobs for local residents. Additionally:

- While the campus draws nearly all its funding from outside the local area, it spends seven out of every 10 dollars it receives in the local economy; and
- Every dollar invested by the state of California in UC Santa Cruz, when combined with student fees and other University resources, generates $6.50 in local economic activity.

The presence of a world-class teaching and research university draws talented, engaged individuals who contribute intellectual, educational, research, cultural and service contributions to the local region. UCSC researchers and the knowledge and practical, innovative solutions they generate, contribute to the creation of new economic opportunities and jobs. And, UC
Santa Cruz sponsors or attracts world-renowned speakers, programs and events, enriching the region’s intellectual, cultural, and artistic depth.

The UC for Silicon Valley

As a campus known for its innovative and entrepreneurial approaches to teaching and research, UC Santa Cruz is ideally suited to serve the most innovative region on earth, Silicon Valley. UCSC oversees an ambitious, cutting-edge research enterprise, the University Affiliated Research Center (UARC), at the NASA Ames Research Park in Mountain View. Led by UC Santa Cruz since 2003, when NASA awarded a 10-year, $330 million dollar contract to UC, the UARC conducts research in information technology, biotechnology, nanotechnology, computer science, aerospace operations, astrobiology and fundamental biology. The UARC research supports NASA’s growing multidisciplinary research mission needs.

While operated by UCSC, the UARC serves campuses throughout the UC system. For the five-year period beginning September 2007, the UARC is expected to award up to $40 million per year to faculty and researchers throughout UC. In addition, a 3 percent assessment on these awards has funded:

- a new, small spacecraft science mission program while training graduate and undergraduate students;
- 41 awards to 29 UC faculty (through 2006) totaling $1.3 million and supporting more than 50 graduate students; and
- 16 new awards totaling $600,000 in 2007.

UC Santa Cruz is also the lead educational partner in a new venture involving NASA and other regional colleges and universities. In the wake of a newly formed entity called University Associates, LLC, UCSC is leading a consortium of public and private colleges and universities and other partners in developing an environmentally sustainable, 75-acre teaching, research and residential community at the NASA Ames Research Park.

Leader in Sustainable Practices

UCSC lives sustainably. The EPA ranked UCSC sixth among all U.S. colleges and universities for use of “green” energy sources. UCSC’s Dining Services have been rated the nation’s “greenest;” the campus purchases locally grown organic produce and has reduced monthly water consumption by over 30,000 gallons and food waste by 25 to 35 percent by eliminating the use of food trays. Nine campus dining facilities are certified as “green businesses” as part of the Monterey Bay Green Business partnership.

In September 2007, UCSC joined the city and county of Santa Cruz in signing a Climate Action Compact that committed all parties to specific targeted reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. In February 2008, Chancellor George Blumenthal convened a campus Council on Climate Change. The group is developing a set of recommendations on how to further reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Last year UCSC launched the nation’s most successful university-based car-sharing program through a multi-year relationship with Zipcar. Over 630 participants, including nearly 600 UCSC students, faculty and staff, share a fleet of clean vehicles for trips to, from, and around campus.
Excellence and Impact Across Disciplines

UC Santa Cruz strategically focuses its programs, leverages collaborative/regional assets, and aligns resources with academic priorities to create a maximum impact. For example:

- UC Santa Cruz operates the UC Lick Observatory and, in partnership with the California Institute of Technology, manages the largest telescopes in the world at the W.M. Keck Observatories on the summit of Mauna Kea in Hawaii.

- Astronomy and Astrophysics and Earth Sciences, both ranked in the first quartile of programs nationally.

- Ocean Sciences is world renowned for its research into global climate change. The program, in collaboration with the marine sciences consortium around the Monterey Bay, represents the largest concentration of marine research in the country.

- UCSC’s bioinformatics/biomedical science/bioengineering faculty was the first to map the human genome and make it publicly available. In fact, researchers around the world visit the UCSC Web site daily to use the human genome browser. It attracts, on average, 4,000 daily visitors.

- Stem cell grants from the California Institute for Regenerative Medicine match those of our larger peers.

- The cutting-edge research of physics/SCIPP faculty is an active player in the field of particle accelerators around the world, including the Large Hadron Collider in Switzerland.

- The disciplinary and interdisciplinary impact of UCSC’s music/film and digital media departments is significant. A recent external review credited the film and digital media faculty with redefining the field.

- International economics, environmental science, literature, linguistics, history of consciousness, astronomy/astrophysics and adaptive optics are consistently ranked in the top 10 nationally.

Distinctive and Distinguished

UC Santa Cruz is a distinguished research university committed to delivering high-quality undergraduate and graduate education. The impact and quality of its research and educational programs are competitive with older, better-known national peers—including AAU institutions within UC and nationwide.

An increasingly selective and diverse campus, UC Santa Cruz is a magnet for top faculty eager to participate in innovative teaching and research across multiple disciplines—and for curious, engaged students eager to study and participate in research with them.

UC Santa Cruz is an extraordinary place.