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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.**
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PART I. Introduction

A. The Framework
The framework measures campus and Universitywide performance in meeting key research, teaching, public service and other goals. It includes an annual report that takes a broad look at access and affordability, student success, research impact and funding, faculty diversity and quality, and other issues. In addition, the framework will include periodic sub-reports that bring specific areas more sharply into focus. Together these reports — all of them made public via the World Wide Web and distributed in printed form to the Board of Regents, the California Legislature and state officials — will provide a clear look at the University that will be used to support:

- transparency and public accountability;
- strategic planning and decision making;
- budgeting, including budget trade-off decisions; and
- management performance evaluation.

In these regards and for these reasons, it is one of the highest priorities of University President Mark Yudof and the University of California Board of Regents.

This first report is presented in draft to the Board in September 2008. After a period of public review and comment it will be revised and presented again in its first published form in May 2009. Subsequent editions will be published annually thereafter.

The current draft comprises two parts.

Part 1. Introduction — offers an overview of the framework and its purpose and will evolve to highlight areas of strategic interest.

Part 2. Universitywide indicators — documents campus as well as Universitywide progress using longitudinal data that track trends over time and make comparisons between campuses and in many cases with the eight research universities (four private and four public) that UC has historically tracked for purposes of benchmarking faculty salary and other budget data. This part of the report is organized into sub-sections. Each focuses on specific goals, having to do, for example, with research or undergraduate student success. And each is oriented with explanatory text that identifies the goals being addressed and the data that are used. Interpretive annotations are used sparingly and reflect the Universitywide picture. Specific differences among the ten UC campuses are not discussed though clearly will be part of ensuing deliberations.

Future editions of this report may also include profiles of each of the ten campuses. These would include for each campus a brief statement of its strategic goals as well as data that demonstrate progress in meeting them. Here campuses may choose what measures to use and be responsible for any explanatory or interpretive text.
B. Scope
The framework focuses on goals that are indisputably at the heart of UC’s mission as California’s public research university. It opens out immediately onto student access and affordability and onto the nature and quality of the student experience. It also gives pride of place to the quality and success of UC faculty, the scope and impacts of their research, and the significance of graduate and professional education. Cross-cutting themes such as diversity recur throughout the work so they may be developed and evaluated in the context of other key information about the University’s students and its faculty.

Future editions will extend the scope of the report so that it may illuminate progress toward meeting goals in other areas: for example, patient care, compliance and risk management, UC contributions to agriculture and environmental sustainability. And they will grapple ultimately with issues such as learning outcomes that are impractical to include at present because measures are either unavailable or perceived as inadequate.

The work of the Regents’ Committee on Long Range Planning continues to be influential in the framework’s development. The dual emphasis in Part 2 on university and campus indicators, and the aspiration toward a third section devoted wholly to campus profiles, reflects the vision for the University that the Committee has embraced — of ten distinctive campuses, each with its own academic strengths, capable of acting together in service to the state.

The Committee’s work has also provided a touchstone in discussion on what goals to focus attention on in this early draft. Particularly formative is the Committee’s work distilling in one place and from several sources — the California Master Plan, the Board of Regents’ policies and budget priorities, the Academic Senate, and the campuses’ strategic and academic plans — a clear statement of the University’s goals and the strategies that may be pursued in order to achieve them.

C. Methodology
The report adheres throughout to a number of standards that have been developed to ensure accessibility, integrity and consistency.

- Data are preferred where they are routinely produced and publicly available. This will continue even where newly adopted measures require the compilation of new data.
- Data are presented graphically rather than in tabular form so they may be accessible visually to the widest possible audience. For consistency, repeated use is made of twelve standard graph and chart types. In order to stimulate the widest possible discussion and analysis, annual publications of the accountability framework will, beginning in May 2009, make available via the Web, all data underlying the published graphs and charts.
- Each measure is presented first as trend data for the system as a whole and next as trend data for each of the ten campuses.
- With some measures, campus-level data for a single (most recent) year is shown next to comparable data from eight leading research universities we have chosen to compare ourselves to. Typically, the comparison institutions include four public universities (Illinois, Michigan, SUNY Buffalo and Virginia) and four private ones (Harvard, MIT, Stanford and Yale). In a few cases comparisons are made to averages for all four private and all four
When comparisons are made, the data for the UC campuses and the comparison institutions come entirely from publicly accessible national data sources, such as the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) or the National Postsecondary Student Aid Survey (NPSAS).

Where comparative data are made available, they are presented graphically with each UC campus, followed by the four public comparison institutions in alphabetical order followed by the four private comparison institutions again in alphabetical order. Consistent use of this arrangement ensures that a degree of neutrality is maintained in presenting comparison data.

Graphs and charts are introduced with brief descriptive titles. In some cases, additional information is supplied, typically in bulleted form, but only where the information provides new or essential context.

Despite these attempts at standardization, assessing institutional performance remains an inexact science. Few measures are entirely beyond dispute. Oftentimes this reflects legitimate differences of opinion about exactly what should be measured, and how to measure it. Should enrollment numbers be based only on fall term or a year average? Should faculty counts be based only on full-time regular-rank (that is, tenured or tenure-track faculty), all instructional faculty or all faculty except those in the health sciences, who are funded on a different basis? How should time to degree be measured — cumulatively from the time a student enters an institution, or by the number of terms they start or the number of terms they actually complete?

Even where measures seem to be precise (applicants’ SAT scores, graduating seniors’ grade point averages), interpreting them can be more art than science and require a great deal more context than any single measure can supply. When compared to Harvard, Stanford, MIT and Yale, UC students on average take longer to complete their undergraduate degrees, and there is a higher rate of attrition among them. But how are these data to be interpreted? Is it important to know that undergraduates at the four private institutions are better prepared for university, at least as is evident in the higher average SAT scores of their incoming freshman? Are UC undergraduates more likely to leave and complete their degrees at another institution? Is there something about the relative socioeconomic and demographic breadth of UC’s intake — a high percentage of low-income or first-generation students — that contributes in explaining the trend?

The point here is not to explain UC graduation rates but to draw attention to two challenges — reading too much into any single measure or interpreting data without adequate context — and an opportunity — fostering discussion that informs university decision making as well as good public policy.

In addition, accountability is hampered in many places by data that are relatively poor owing to the complexities inherent in defining and collecting them. Particular weakness is evident in this draft report in sections on faculty and graduate students. It reflects the variability among institutions in determining, for example, who is a faculty member or who is a graduate student (as opposed to a student studying for a professional degree). These difficulties impact on the research section, too, where typical success measures (number of research dollars generated,
number of patents produced) need to be normalized for an institution’s programmatic scope (universities with medical schools receive more research funding from the National Institutes for Health) and for faculty size, neither of which is entirely practical.

Nowhere are the methodological challenges greater than they are with comparing institutional performance. The use of comparative data to assess institutional performance is necessarily constrained by what data is publicly available. For many measures — student-faculty ratios, for example — there are no national standards. Even when comparative data are available, they can be problematic in ways that reflect very real institutional differences. As already indicated, what counts as a tenured faculty member at one university, for example, may not even be in a category eligible for tenure at another. To overcome these difficulties, universities maintain data in their own internal databases that do not always perfectly match what they report to national databases. This practice introduces its own problems. The University of California, for example, defines “professional” students differently than the National Center for Education Statistics, which maintains IPEDS. Accordingly, when UC or any of its ten campuses report the number of professional students for purely local purposes, they may produce numbers that are slightly different from those that are available in the IPEDS databases.

Selecting comparison institutions is also complicated. Is it better to use the same comparison group for every measure or to constitute different comparison groups depending on what is being assessed? And is it appropriate to compare each of the ten UC campuses against the same group despite the campuses’ celebrated distinctiveness? To take a polar example, should Merced, which opened in 2005 with approximately 1,000 students, be benchmarked against the same institutions as Berkeley or UCLA, UC’s two flagship campuses, which each enroll approximately 35,000 students and are widely recognized as two of the leading public research universities in the country?

Despite these difficulties, great pains have been taken to compare UC performance on as many measures as possible, focusing in particular in this first edition of the report on those measures that document student access, affordability and success. Where comparisons are made, they are made against the group of eight institutions that UC has historically used to compare faculty salaries and other key budget information. The reason is simple. Comparison provides the only means of locating the experience of this University and its ten campuses in a national higher education context. It is important to point out that comparison data do not identify successes or failures. To do that we need to assess our performance against clearly articulated campus and systemwide goals. They are, nonetheless, vital to our developing a broader understanding of this institution, its promises and its challenges.

Next steps

The framework results from the confluence of several creative streams:

- It is a natural outgrowth of the Universitywide academic and Regents’ long-range-planning processes that have evolved in coordination as a means of determining Universitywide strategic and budgetary priorities.
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- It draws extensively on performance data that are routinely prepared by the campuses and at a system level in support of a variety of objectives.

- It promotes and in turn reflects the University’s 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 it responds to state and national pressures for greater accountability in higher education as articulated by the California Postsecondary Education Accountability Act (SB325, Scott, pending), Secretary of Education Spellings’ Commission on the Future of Higher Education, the 2008 Higher Education Reauthorization Act and the Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA) adopted in November 2007 by the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC) and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU).

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

- UC annually reports to the legislature on a variety of measures that respond to interest in its expenditure of public funds.

- Each campus is currently preparing its own accountability template modeled closely upon the Voluntary System of Accountability.

- The University supports the development of a statewide accountability bill and will be responsive to SB325 (Scott), if and when it passes.

Furthermore, it is intended to evolve with the University’s understanding of its own goals and with increasing sophistication nationally of accountability measures.

On this last point we acknowledge the debate that continues to surround many accountability measures. In particular, the comparison of campuses with different histories, resources, strengths and weaknesses can mislead as easily as it informs. The current selection — intended to be indicative of key trends — will be subject to ongoing revision and refinement through consultation with the campuses, the Academic Senate and the Board of Regents.
PART II. Universitywide Indicators with Campus Comparisons

Section 1. Undergraduate Student Success

Goals
The University of California aims to graduate the students it enrolls and to provide them with a high-quality education that raises their aspirations, engages their intellectual curiosity and instills in them a life-long love of learning, a commitment to civic engagement and a sense of excellence.

Measures
The data that follow provide a series of measurements that illustrate UC undergraduates’ progress in earning their degrees compared to students at other institutions. They tell how many students who enter UC complete their degrees and the areas of study in which their degrees are earned. In addition, two tables display students’ post-graduation plans and aspirations. The high level of success for UC undergraduates is evident across campuses, across disciplines, and across freshman and transfer entrants, who succeed as well as entering freshmen.
Indicators 1.1: Graduation Rates — Entering Freshmen, Fall 1999 Cohort

UC and Comparison Institutions

- Berkeley: 89%
- Davis: 81%
- Irvine: 79%
- Los Angeles: 89%
- Riverside: 64%
- San Diego: 86%
- Santa Barbara: 78%
- Santa Cruz: 70%
- U of Illinois: 82%
- U of Michigan: 87%
- SUNY at Buffalo: 61%
- U of Virginia: 92%
- Harvard: 98%
- MIT: 93%
- Stanford: 95%
- Yale: 96%

Merced opened in fall 2005. San Francisco has no undergraduates.

- Six years is the national standard used by the U.S. Department of Education for measuring college graduation rates. The fall 1999 cohort is the latest for which the six-year graduation rate is available in the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) Graduation Rate Survey.

- Six-year graduation rates for entering freshmen at the University of California are robust. Systemwide, 81 percent of freshmen who entered UC in 1999-00 graduated in six years.

Source: 2006 IPEDS Graduation Rate Survey
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 57 percent for 2003. Likewise, six-year graduation rates have risen from 76 percent in 1992 to 81 percent in 2001.

Note: Campus graduation rates do not entirely match IPEDS’ graduation rates because UCOP’s methodology for computing campus graduation rates includes inter-campus transfers, which IPEDS graduation rates do not. Data on graduation rates of students who transferred from a UC campus to a non-UC campus are not available at this point in time.

Source: UCOP StatFinder files (statfinder.ucop.edu)
1.2 (continued) Graduation Rates — Entering Freshmen, Fall 1998 to Fall 2003

Berkeley

Davis

Irvine

Los Angeles

Riverside

San Diego

Santa Barbara

Santa Cruz

(Merced opened in 2005.)

(San Francisco has no undergraduates.)
Graduation rates for California Community College (CCC) transfer students at the University of California parallel those for entering freshmen – 51 percent of CCC transfers graduate in two years, 81 percent in three years and 86 percent in four years.

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

Source: UCOP StatFinder files (statfinder.ucop.edu)
1.3 (continued) Graduation Rates — Entering California Community College Transfer Students, Fall 2000 to Fall 2005

Berkeley

Davis

Irvine

Los Angeles

Riverside

San Diego

Santa Barbara

Santa Cruz

Graduate in 2 Years
Graduate in 3 Years
Graduate in 4 Years

(Merced opened in 2005.)

(San Francisco has no undergraduates.)
San Francisco has no undergraduates.

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

Source: *U.S. News and World Report’s America’s Best Colleges*, August 27, 2007. Merced is not included in the *U.S. News* rankings; retention data are from UC StatFinder.
Indicator 1.5
Retention of New UC Students (Freshmen and CCC Transfers), Fall 2000 to Fall 2006

• Retention of new freshmen and California community college transfer students ranges from 91–92 percent.

Source: UCOP StatFinder files (statfinder.ucop.edu)
1.5 (continued) Retention of New UC Students (Freshmen and CCC Transfers), Fall 2000 to Fall 2006

Berkeley

Davis

Irvine

Los Angeles

Merced

Riverside

San Diego

(San Francisco has no undergraduates.)

Santa Barbara

Santa Cruz
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Merced opened in fall 2005 and awarded fewer than five degrees in 2005–06. San Francisco has no undergraduates.

Source: IPEDS Completions Survey, 2005-06
Indicator 1.7
UC Undergraduate Degrees Awarded, 2000-01 to 2006-07

- Undergraduate degree production at UC has grown 3.9 percent per year on average since 2000-01.

Source: UCOP Corporate Student System
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1.7 (continued) UC Undergraduate Degrees Awarded, 2000-01 to 2006-07

Berkeley

Davis

Irvine

Los Angeles

Merced

Riverside

San Diego

(San Francisco has no undergraduates.)

Santa Barbara

Santa Cruz
Indicator 1.8
Highest Degree Aspirations of Graduating Seniors, Spring 2006

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

Source: Spring 2006 University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES)
1.8 (continued) Highest Degree Aspirations of Graduating Seniors, Spring 2006

(Berkeley)

- Bachelors: 18%
- Masters: 22%
- Business: 12%
- Law: 10%
- Medical: 11%
- Doctorate: 23%
- Mult doc.: 4%

(Davis)

- Bachelors: 22%
- Masters: 27%
- Business: 9%
- Law: 7%
- Medical: 14%
- Doctorate: 18%
- Mult doc.: 3%

(Irvine)

- Bachelors: 20%
- Masters: 26%
- Business: 11%
- Law: 7%
- Medical: 15%
- Doctorate: 18%
- Mult doc.: 3%

(Los Angeles)

- Bachelors: 19%
- Masters: 20%
- Business: 11%
- Law: 11%
- Medical: 15%
- Doctorate: 18%
- Mult doc.: 3%

(Riverside)

- Bachelors: 22%
- Masters: 24%
- Business: 12%
- Law: 7%
- Medical: 11%
- Doctorate: 18%
- Mult doc.: 3%

(San Diego)

- Bachelors: 20%
- Masters: 25%
- Business: 12%
- Law: 7%
- Medical: 13%
- Doctorate: 19%
- Mult doc.: 4%

(San Francisco has no undergraduates.)

(Santa Barbara)

- Bachelors: 24%
- Masters: 29%
- Business: 12%
- Law: 8%
- Medical: 7%
- Doctorate: 18%
- Mult doc.: 2%

(Santa Cruz)

- Bachelors: 28%
- Masters: 30%
- Business: 5%
- Law: 8%
- Medical: 6%
- Doctorate: 22%
- Mult doc.: 3%

(Merced had too few respondents for reliable estimates.)
Draft for Discussion

Indicator 1.9
Post-Graduation Plans of Graduating Seniors, Spring 2006

Universitywide

- Work full-time: 36%
- Grad/Prof school: 45%
- Study/ work abroad: 6%
- Something else: 4%
- Don't know: 9%

Source: Spring 2006 University of California Undergraduate Experience Survey (UCUES)
Indicator 1.9 (continued) Post-Graduation Plans of Graduating Seniors, Spring 2006

**Berkeley**
- Don't know: 10%
- Study/work abroad: 7%
- Work full-time: 38%
- Grad/Prof school: 40%

**Davis**
- Don't know: 9%
- Study/work abroad: 5%
- Work full-time: 37%
- Grad/Prof school: 46%

**Irvine**
- Don't know: 7%
- Study/work abroad: 5%
- Work full-time: 35%
- Grad/Prof school: 50%

**Los Angeles**
- Don't know: 9%
- Study/work abroad: 5%
- Work full-time: 31%
- Grad/Prof school: 51%

**Riverside**
- Don't know: 6%
- Study/work abroad: 3%
- Work full-time: 39%
- Grad/Prof school: 49%

**San Diego**
- Don't know: 9%
- Study/work abroad: 2%
- Work full-time: 34%
- Grad/Prof school: 49%

**Santa Barbara**
- Don't know: 10%
- Study/work abroad: 8%
- Work full-time: 39%
- Grad/Prof school: 39%

**Santa Cruz**
- Don't know: 12%
- Study/work abroad: 10%
- Work full-time: 34%
- Grad/Prof school: 38%

(Merced had too few respondents for reliable estimates.)

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

Section 2. Undergraduate Affordability

Goals
In accordance with UC’s responsibility under the Master Plan for educating the top California high school graduates and as articulated by the financial aid policy adopted by the UC Board of Regents in 1994, 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 financial aid program. Operating on a systemwide basis, the program establishes expectations for how families can finance a UC education, assesses the needed level of program, 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- and middle-income students and students’ work and borrowing levels.

In addition to these measures, this section also provides information on the affordability of a UC undergraduate education compared to UC’s peer institutions. In most instances, the University’s standard 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), comparison was 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 later this year.
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 expenses, which partly reflect the high cost of living in the communities in which UC campuses are located.

Note: Figures reflect a weighted average cost of attendance across all budget types (on-campus, off-campus, and commuters). 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.

Source: UC figures are the annual student budgets published by the Office of the President. Budgets from comparison schools are self-reported on their websites.
Indicator 2.2
UC Cost of Attendance, 2000-01 to 2007-08

These figures represent the average total cost of attendance, or student budget, 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.

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).

Source: Annual student budgets published by the Office of the President
### 2.2 (continued) UC Cost of Attendance, 2000-01 to 2007-08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Berkeley</strong></td>
<td>$4,861</td>
<td>$4,307</td>
<td>$4,422</td>
<td>$5,918</td>
<td>$6,511</td>
<td>$6,888</td>
<td>$6,840</td>
<td>$7,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Davis</strong></td>
<td>$13,108</td>
<td>$13,909</td>
<td>$13,956</td>
<td>$14,546</td>
<td>$15,182</td>
<td>$15,316</td>
<td>$15,457</td>
<td>$14,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Irvine</strong></td>
<td>$4,874</td>
<td>$4,772</td>
<td>$4,841</td>
<td>$6,328</td>
<td>$6,901</td>
<td>$7,161</td>
<td>$6,984</td>
<td>$7,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Los Angeles</strong></td>
<td>$10,975</td>
<td>$12,042</td>
<td>$12,843</td>
<td>$12,921</td>
<td>$13,640</td>
<td>$13,637</td>
<td>$13,847</td>
<td>$14,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Merced</strong></td>
<td>$7,035</td>
<td>$6,839</td>
<td>$7,148</td>
<td>$15,069</td>
<td>$14,308</td>
<td>$13,538</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Riverside</strong></td>
<td>$4,632</td>
<td>$4,560</td>
<td>$4,633</td>
<td>$6,125</td>
<td>$6,704</td>
<td>$6,971</td>
<td>$6,775</td>
<td>$7,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>San Diego</strong></td>
<td>$4,622</td>
<td>$4,546</td>
<td>$4,716</td>
<td>$6,209</td>
<td>$6,804</td>
<td>$7,071</td>
<td>$6,875</td>
<td>$7,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Santa Barbara</strong></td>
<td>$4,605</td>
<td>$4,518</td>
<td>$4,604</td>
<td>$6,357</td>
<td>$7,100</td>
<td>$7,401</td>
<td>$7,206</td>
<td>$7,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Santa Cruz</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(San Francisco has no undergraduates.)

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>UC Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>$4,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>$4,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>$4,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>$5,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>$6,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>$6,888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>$6,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>$7,165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Fee Costs vs. Non-Fee Costs

- **Non-Fee Costs**
- **Fee Costs**

---
In 2007-08, half of all UC undergraduates received need-based financial aid, which includes need-based gift aid (grants and need-based scholarships) and other need-based awards (e.g., subsidized Stafford loans or work-study). Nearly all (94 percent) of UC’s need-based aid recipients received some form of gift aid.

UC’s relatively high population of low-income students (see Indicators 2.5 and 2.8) and its strong institutional and state aid programs contribute to the relatively high percentage of students receiving need-based aid compared to UC’s public comparison institutions.

The percentage of UC students receiving need-based aid is similar to that at UC’s four private comparison institutions. While these institutions enroll a much smaller percentage of low-income students, more middle- and upper-income students qualify for need-based aid at these institutions due to their higher cost.

Draft for Discussion

Indicator 2.4
Estimated Per Capita Gift Aid and Net Cost of Attendance for Need-based Aid Recipients, 2007-08

- Need-based gift aid (grants and need-based scholarships) dramatically reduces the cost of attending UC for needy students.

- Among need-based aid recipients, UC's net cost was lower than all but one of the University’s comparison institutions, the University of Virginia.

- 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.

Pell Grants are awarded by the federal government to low-income students, generally those whose parent incomes are below $45,000 or who are independent. The percentage of undergraduate students with Pell Grants provides a useful means to compare different institutions in terms of their financial accessibility for 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 2006-07 (32 percent) than any comparably selective institution, public or private.
Indicator 2.6
Gift Aid Receipt Among UC Undergraduates, 1999-00 to 2006-07

More than half of all UC undergraduates received some form of gift aid (grants or scholarships) in 2006-07. These awards were worth, on average, $9,759.

Systemwide, the percentage of UC students receiving gift aid has changed little in recent years. The modest decline since 2003-04 reflects the phase-out of the Governor’s Scholarship Programs, 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, hence, 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.

Source: UCOP Corporate Student System
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2.6 (continued) Gift Aid Receipt Among UC Undergraduates, Universitywide and by Campus, 1999-00 to 2006-07
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Indicator 2.7
Net Cost of UC Attendance by Family Income, 2000-01 to 2006-07

---

**Universitywide**

- 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, 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 and independent students).

- Between 2000-01 and 2006-07 (the latest year for which final data are available), augmentations to grant aid kept the average increase in net cost for low-income students to about $2,000, compared to $4,200 for higher-income students.

- Additional grant aid did not fully cover cost increases for low-income students in part because non-fee costs have increased without augmentations in grants to offset them.

---

Source: UCOP Corporate Student System
2.7 (continued) Net Cost of UC Attendance by Family Income, Universitywide and by Campus, 2000-01 to 2006-07

Inflation-adjusted dollars

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

It is not clear what accounts for the larger enrollment of high-income students at UC than at comparable public institutions. It may reflect differences in the income distribution of academically eligible students within each state.

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

Source: UC figures are from the Corporate Student System. Other figures are from the 2004 NCES National Postsecondary Student Aid Survey (NPSAS). The NPSAS survey is conducted every four years; 2008 NPSAS results will be available in December 2008.
Indicator 2.9
UC Undergraduate Income Distribution, 1999-00 to 2006-07

This indicator tracks how well the University’s financial aid programs have enabled UC to remain financially accessible to students at every income level.

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

More than one-quarter of undergraduates have parents with annual income below $45,000.

Note: Campus figures for UC San Diego overstate the number of students in the $89K–$134K bracket and understate the number of students in the Above $134K+ bracket due to limitations in the data provided to the Corporate Student System. These limitations have been fixed for 2007–08 and subsequent years.

Source: UCOP Corporate Student System
2.9 (continued) UC Undergraduate Income Distribution, 1999-00 to 2006-07

Berkeley

Davis

Irvine

Los Angeles

Merced

Riverside

San Diego

Santa Barbara

Santa Cruz

(San Francisco has no undergraduates.)

Income
Unknown

Above
$134K

$89-$134K

$45-$89K

$0-$45K

Independent
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-extensive institutions, both public and private.

Overall, 44 percent of UC students reported that they did not work for pay during the 2005-06 academic year.
In 2005-06, 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 student expenses so their students will not have to work.

Some students at every income level report 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.

Excessive work is often associated with higher than average reported student expenditures, especially in discretionary areas.

Source: Data come from the spring 2006 administration of UCUES.
Indicator 2.11 (continued) UC Undergraduate Hours Worked Per Week by Family Income, 2005-06

(Merced had too few respondents for reliable estimates.)

(San Francisco has no undergraduates.)
Just over half (52 percent) of all UC undergraduates who graduated in 2006-07 had borrowed at least one student loan while enrolled at UC.

Consistent with more borrowing among lower income students and UC’s enrollment of a high percentage of low-income students (see Indicators 2.5 and 2.8), UC undergraduates were more likely to graduate with student debt than students at seven of the eight UC comparison institutions (all but SUNY-Buffalo), which enroll a much smaller percentage of low-income students.

Source: UCOP Corporate Student System and 2007-08 Common Data Set (2006-07 Common Data Set for Harvard and SUNY at Buffalo)
Indicator 2.13
Cumulative Indebtedness of Graduating Seniors, 2006-07

UC and Comparison Institutions

- 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.

Source: UCOP Corporate Student System and 2007-08 Common Data Set (2006-07 Common Data Set for Harvard and SUNY at Buffalo)
Despite national reports of increasing student debt burden, the percentage of UC undergraduates who graduate with student loan debt has been declining slightly since 1999 despite no real change in the income distribution of UC undergraduates (see Indicator 2.9).

Average cumulative debt among graduating seniors has declined in constant dollars since 1999. With stagnant annual borrowing limits for federal student loan programs, parents may have increasingly turned to home equity loans to capitalize on the rapid growth in California property values during this period along with increased use of federal parent education loans.

Source: UCOP Corporate Student System
2.14 (continued) Average Cumulative Indebtedness of Graduating UC Seniors, 1999-00 to 2006-07

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>$15,531</td>
<td>$15,442</td>
<td>$15,295</td>
<td>$14,699</td>
<td>$14,663</td>
<td>$14,475</td>
<td>$15,117</td>
<td>$14,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>$17,507</td>
<td>$17,400</td>
<td>$17,342</td>
<td>$19,687</td>
<td>$19,507</td>
<td>$19,076</td>
<td>$18,960</td>
<td>$18,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>$16,635</td>
<td>$15,991</td>
<td>$15,464</td>
<td>$15,067</td>
<td>$14,526</td>
<td>$14,589</td>
<td>$14,520</td>
<td>$13,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>$15,347</td>
<td>$14,485</td>
<td>$14,466</td>
<td>$14,679</td>
<td>$15,273</td>
<td>$15,976</td>
<td>$15,616</td>
<td>$15,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>$17,733</td>
<td>$16,898</td>
<td>$15,546</td>
<td>$15,181</td>
<td>$15,139</td>
<td>$15,451</td>
<td>$15,078</td>
<td>$14,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>$15,936</td>
<td>$15,267</td>
<td>$15,960</td>
<td>$15,667</td>
<td>$15,951</td>
<td>$15,920</td>
<td>$15,884</td>
<td>$15,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>$16,106</td>
<td>$16,047</td>
<td>$16,273</td>
<td>$16,838</td>
<td>$16,797</td>
<td>$16,678</td>
<td>$15,874</td>
<td>$15,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>$15,522</td>
<td>$15,660</td>
<td>$15,078</td>
<td>$14,495</td>
<td>$14,725</td>
<td>$14,577</td>
<td>$14,429</td>
<td>$14,234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Merced had no graduates during the period covered.)
(San Francisco has no undergraduates.)

(San Francisco has no undergraduates.)
PART II. 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 leaves it to UC to define that pool. UC has historically done this by establishing academic criteria by which students can become “eligible.” UC then guarantees admission to the students who have satisfied the eligibility requirements.

The Master Plan also provides a “second chance” for students that are not in the top 12.5 percent of public high school graduates to earn a UC undergraduate degree. It dictates that UC create a well-defined route for students that attend a California Community College to transfer to UC. UC provides this well-defined route by establishing academic criteria by which students can become “eligible” to transfer and be guaranteed admissions to all transfer students who have satisfied the eligibility requirements. In addition, all UC campuses give junior level California community college students priority over other transfer applicants and seven campuses offer individual admission guarantee agreements. More than 90 percent of UC’s transfer students come from the California community colleges.

Measures
This section provides measures of access, including applications, admissions and enrollments for both freshman and transfer students. It also includes information on academic quality indicators for new students, such as their 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.
UC has classified as “underrepresented” students 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 Americans, American Indians and Chicano-Latinos.

In 1996 the voters of California passed Proposition 209, which prohibits public institutions from considering race and ethnicity, among other characteristics, 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 absolute numbers as well as proportion of these 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. In 2006 and 2007, the gap between the proportion of underrepresented students among high school graduates and among UC freshmen narrowed slightly.

Source: UCOP Student Affairs Office
• UC freshman enrollment has increased rapidly in the past ten years, both because the number of high school graduates has increased rapidly, more of these students are meeting UC’s eligibility requirements and a greater proportion are applying to the University.

• Freshman enrollment dropped in 2004 when funding for enrollment growth was excluded from the 2004-05 state budget. Although these funds were later restored, UC denied an unusually large number of students for fall 2004.

Note: Universitywide data are unduplicated counts. Students typically apply to more than one UC campus so the sum of campus details will exceed the Universitywide totals.

Source: UCOP StatFinder files (statfinder.ucop.edu)
3.2 (continued) UC Freshman Applicants, Admits and Enrollees, Fall 1995 to Fall 2007

(San Francisco has no undergraduates.)
Annually, transfer students make up approximately 30 percent of incoming students. The tables shown here display the fall admissions cycle only, however 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.

Source: UCOP StatFinder files (statfinder.ucop.edu)
Draft for Discussion

3.3 (continued) UC Transfer Applicants, Admits and Enrollees, Fall 1994 to Fall 2007

(San Francisco has no undergraduates.)
Draft for Discussion

Indicator 3.4
Middle 50% of SAT Math and Critical Reading Score Range — Entering Freshmen, Fall 2006

UC and Comparison Institutions

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

Data for the SAT Writing Test are not available for comparison institutions. San Francisco does not enroll freshmen.

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.

- The scores reported here represent admitted students' highest total SAT scores (or converted ACT 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 continued in 2006 and has been reported by the College Board and other institutions around the country.

Source: UCOP StatFinder files (statfinder.ucop.edu)
3.5 (continued) Average SAT Scores — Entering UC Freshmen, Fall 2000 to Fall 2007

(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.

Source: UCOP Statfinder files.
3.6 (continued) Middle 50% of SAT Score Range — Entering UC Freshmen, Fall 2007
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(San Francisco has no undergraduates.)
In determining students' eligibility for UC, UC considers only grades earned in college preparatory ("a-g") coursework completed in 10th and 11th grade.

The "weighted" GPA used to determine eligibility recognizes the degree of difficulty in a student's curriculum by assigning an additional grade point for successfully completing difficult courses, such as those in the College Board's Advanced Placement program. An A in an honors course receives 5 points, a B receives 4 points, etc. The number of honors courses included in the weighted GPA used to determine eligibility is capped at 8 semesters.

In making admissions decisions, some campuses also consider the unweighted GPA. This 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.

Source: UCOP StatFinder files (statfinder.ucop.edu)
3.7 (continued) Average High School GPA of Entering UC Freshmen, Fall 2000 to Fall 2007

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

(San Francisco has no undergraduates.)
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.
3.8 (continued) Average College GPA — Entering UC Transfer Students, Fall 2000 to Fall 2007
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(San Francisco has no undergraduates.)
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PART II. Universitywide Indicators with Campus Comparisons

Section 4. Undergraduate Student Profile

Goals
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.” The diversity of UC’s undergraduate student body is measured by many dimensions.

Measures
This section depicts the makeup of the University of California undergraduate population. 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.

California is a diverse state in its ethnic, social and economic makeup — and so is the UC undergraduate student body. The second part of this section demonstrates UC undergraduates’ economic diversity, showing, for example, that more than a quarter come from families earning less than $45,000 annually and nearly a third qualify for the U.S. federal government’s Pell Grants for students from low-income families. In addition, ethnic diversity has steadily increased among UC students, and large proportions of UC students speak a second language and will be the first in their families to earn baccalaureate degrees.

In their scope, breadth and diversity, UC campuses are strong engines of social mobility for families throughout California.
Indicator 4.1
Entering UC Freshman and Transfer Students, 2000-01 to 2006-07

- National comparative data on the number of transfer students are not available.

Source: UCOP Corporate Student System
4.1 (continued) Entering UC Freshman and Transfer Students, 2000-01 to 2006-07
Draft for Discussion

Indicator 4.2
Full-Time and Part-Time UC Undergraduate Enrollment, Fall 2000 to Fall 2007

- Undergraduate enrollment fell slightly in 2004 due to limits in enrollment and steep fee increases brought about by a state budget crisis. They then rose steadily through 2007.

- Full-time enrollment enables students to progress more rapidly toward degree completion.

Note: Part-time enrollment figures prior to fall 2007 at Davis are inflated because some course units were not counted in the full-time/part-time calculations. More specifically, units earned in the basic writing course needed to fulfill the Entry Level Writing Requirement for some students were not included in a student’s total number of units attempted per term. Consequently, the course loads of many of these 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 their course load equaled or exceeded the minimum needed. This oversight has been fixed as of fall 2007.

Source: UCOP Corporate Student System
4.2 (continued) Full-Time and Part-Time UC Undergraduate Enrollment, Fall 2000 to Fall 2007

Berkeley

Davis

Irvine

Los Angeles

Merced

Riverside

San Diego

Santa Barbara

Santa Cruz

(San Francisco has no undergraduates.)
Indicator 4.3
Undergraduate Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity, Fall 2006

Universitywide data exclude San Francisco, which has virtually no undergraduates.

Source: IPEDS Enrollment Survey Fall 2006
Draft for Discussion

4.3 (continued) Undergraduate Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity, Fall 2006

[Charts showing enrollment data by race/ethnicity for various institutions including Berkeley, Davis, Irvine, Los Angeles, Merced, Riverside, San Diego, Santa Barbara, Santa Cruz, U of Illinois, U of Michigan, SUNY at Buffalo, U of Virginia, Harvard, MIT, Stanford, and Yale. The charts include bar graphs and percentage charts for different racial and ethnic categories such as Other & Unknown, White, Asian American, Chicano/Latino, African American, American, and Indian.]
Draft for Discussion

Indicator 4.4
UC Undergraduate Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity, Fall 2000 to Fall 2007

Universitywide

"Other" includes international students and students who declined to state their race/ethnicity.

Source: UCOP Corporate Student System
4.4 (continued) UC Undergraduate Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity, Fall 2000 to Fall 2007

- Universitywide - African American
- Universitywide - Asian American
- Universitywide - Chicano/Latino
- Universitywide - White
- Universitywide - International
- Universitywide - Other & Unknown
Draft for Discussion

Indicator 4.5
Female Undergraduate Enrollment, Fall 2006

Source: IPEDS Enrollment Survey, 2006-07
4.5 (continued) Female Undergraduate Enrollment, Fall 2006

UC and Comparison Institutions

UC and Comparison Institutions
The percentage of female undergraduates at UC is consistent with the nationwide trend of higher undergraduate enrollment 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) UC Female Undergraduate Enrollment, Fall 2000 to Fall 2007

(San Francisco has no undergraduates.)
Indicator 4.7
Geographic Distribution of UC Undergraduate Students, Fall 2007

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

Source: UCOP Corporate Student System
4.7 (continued) Geographic Distribution of UC Undergraduate Students, Fall 2007

Berkeley: 90% CA Resident, 7% Other US, 3% International

Davis: 96% CA Resident, 2% Other US, 2% International

Irvine: 95% CA Resident, 2% Other US, 3% International

Los Angeles: 91% CA Resident, 5% Other US, 4% International

Merced: 98% CA Resident, 1% Other US, 1% International

Riverside: 97% CA Resident, 1% Other US, 2% International

San Diego: 94% CA Resident, 3% Other US, 3% International

(San Francisco has no undergraduates.)

Santa Barbara: 95% CA Resident, 4% Other US, 1% International

Santa Cruz: 96% CA Resident, 3% Other US, 1% International
Indications 4.8
Age of UC Undergraduate Students, Fall 2007

Universitywide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average age:</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent over 25:</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- College students are sometimes classified as “traditional” (up to age 25) and “nontraditional” (age 25 and older). Nontraditional students are often working full time and/or raising families.

- Ninety-six percent of all undergraduates at UC are under 25, compared to about 60 percent nationally.

Source: UCOP Corporate Student System
### 4.8 (continued) Age of UC Undergraduate Students, Fall 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Average age</th>
<th>Percent over 25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A first-generation undergraduate is one for whom neither parent holds a four-year degree.
4.9 (continued) First-Generation Undergraduate Students at UC, Fall 2007

- Berkeley: 47% at least one parent is college graduate, 53% neither parent is college graduate
- Davis: 48% at least one parent is college graduate, 52% neither parent is college graduate
- Irvine: 42% at least one parent is college graduate, 58% neither parent is college graduate
- Los Angeles: 44% at least one parent is college graduate, 56% neither parent is college graduate
- Merced: 43% at least one parent is college graduate, 57% neither parent is college graduate
- Riverside: 44% at least one parent is college graduate, 56% neither parent is college graduate
- San Diego: 48% at least one parent is college graduate, 52% neither parent is college graduate
- Santa Barbara: 43% at least one parent is college graduate, 57% neither parent is college graduate

(San Francisco has no undergraduates.)
Indicator 4.10
First Language Spoken at Home — UC Undergraduate Students, Fall 2007

Source: UCOP Corporate Student System
4.10 (continued) First Language Spoken at Home — UC Undergraduate Students, Fall 2007

Berkeley
- English Only: 65%
- English and Other Language: 16%
- Other Language Only: 19%

Davis
- English Only: 64%
- English and Other Language: 15%
- Other Language Only: 21%

Irvine
- English Only: 61%
- English and Other Language: 26%
- Other Language Only: 13%

Los Angeles
- English Only: 60%
- English and Other Language: 18%
- Other Language Only: 22%

Merced
- English Only: 64%
- English and Other Language: 23%
- Other Language Only: 13%

Riverside
- English Only: 59%
- English and Other Language: 14%
- Other Language Only: 27%

San Diego
- English Only: 61%
- English and Other Language: 22%
- Other Language Only: 17%

(San Francisco has no undergraduates.)

Santa Barbara
- English Only: 75%
- English and Other Language: 10%
- Other Language Only: 15%

Santa Cruz
- English Only: 76%
- English and Other Language: 9%
- Other Language Only: 15%
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACCOUNTABILITY FRAMEWORK

PART II. 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.

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 rate their ability to appreciate, tolerate or understand racial and ethnic diversity as good or better. In terms of learning, they report their analytical and critical thinking skills, their ability to write clearly and effectively, and especially their understanding of a specific field of study has increased significantly. But there are gaps. Slightly less than half, for example, reported making class presentations, taking an independent research or internship course, or assisting faculty with research.

The UCUES survey uses a number of questions comparable to those found in the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). None of UC’s four private comparison institutions participate in NSSE, and only one of UC’s four public comparison institutions participated in the NSSE survey in 2006. Comparative data on undergraduate student experiences may become more available in the future as institutions increasingly participate in, and publicly release data from, their student experience surveys.

In addition to the UCUES survey, the University is working on additional measures of student outcomes. The Undergraduate Education Planning Group, established in 2007 by the administration and the Academic Senate, has charged its Undergraduate Effectiveness Task Force with providing guidance to campuses, particularly academic departments, on ways of developing and communicating learning objectives and student achievement of those learning objectives.
### Indicator 5.1
#### Group Learning Experiences, Spring 2006

<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>79%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spent at least 6 hours per week participating in student organizations or clubs</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported serving as an officer or leader in a campus organization or club</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helped a classmate better understand course material</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Indicators in this section are based on the most recent UCUES administration in spring 2006. San Francisco is omitted because the campus has no undergraduates. Additional technical notes appear at the end of this section.
## Draft for Discussion

### Indicator 5.2

**Active Learning Experiences, Spring 2006**

<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>Reported making class presentations</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spent at least 6 hours per week studying and on other academic activities outside of class</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled in at least one independent research course</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in a study-abroad program</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in an internship</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assisted faculty with research or a creative activity</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in community service in 2005-06</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Draft for Discussion

### Indicator 5.3

**Institutional Commitment to Student Learning and Success, Spring 2006**

<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</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty on academic matters</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 advising by</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>college staff on academic matters</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 the</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>availability of courses needed for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>graduation</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 raising their standards</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for acceptable effort due to the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high standards of a faculty member</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 5.4
Student Satisfaction, Spring 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>were satisfied with the value of their education for the price they paid</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 their overall academic experience</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would choose to attend this institution again</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reported that their campus had a strong commitment to undergraduate education</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Indicator 5.5
### Experiences with Diverse Groups of People and Ideas, Spring 2006

<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>Rated their ability to appreciate, tolerate or understand racial and ethnic diversity as good or better</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rated their ability to appreciate cultural and global diversity as good or better</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gained a deeper understanding of other perspectives through conversations with students of a different nationality</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gained a deeper understanding of other perspectives through conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Draft for Discussion

**Indicator 5.6**  
Student Interaction with Campus Faculty and Staff, Spring 2006

<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>74%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talked with an instructor outside of class about course material</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked with a faculty member on a campus activity other than coursework</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 5.7
Self-Reported Gains in Analytic and Critical Thinking Skills, Ability to Write Clearly and Effectively, Understanding a Specific Field of Study, Spring 2006

Universitywide

A. Analytical and critical thinking
   - Started UC as a Freshman: 23%
   - Senior Year: 72%

B. Ability to write clearly and effectively
   - Started UC as a Freshman: 22%
   - Senior Year: 59%

C. Understanding of a specific field of study
   - Started UC as a Freshman: 6%
   - Senior Year: 75%

Legend:
- Blue: Percent Rating Skills as "Very Good" or "Excellent" When Started UC as a Freshman
- Purple: Percent Rating Skills as "Very Good" or "Excellent" in Senior Year
5.7 (continued) Self-Reported Gains in Analytic and Critical Thinking Skills, Ability to Write Clearly and Effectively, Understanding a Specific Field of Study, Spring 2006

(Tables and graphs showing percentage of students reporting gains in various skills at different UC campuses)

* Percent Rating Skills as “Very Good” or “Excellent” in Junior Year for Merced.
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 2006 administration of UCUES, which is the most recent survey available at UC’s systemwide office. Since Merced had too few respondents for reliable estimates in 2006, its data come primarily from seniors who responded to the spring 2008 UCUES survey (and from juniors who responded to the three learning outcomes measures); results were computed by the campus. Responses to seven behavioral questions (worked outside of class on class projects or studied with classmates; helped a classmate better understand course material; reported making class presentations; reported raising 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 6-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 2006 administration of UCUES was 38 percent overall, and 37 percent for the spring 2008 survey at Merced. This compares favorably to NSSE’s 33 percent response rate. Male, minority and low-GPA students respond at lower rates to UCUES.
Goals
Graduate students are essential to UC’s research enterprise and as such contribute directly to California’s well-being and its global competitiveness. The Master Plan for Higher Education assigns UC an exclusive role providing public academic and professional doctoral education and in this unique regard, helping to meet the state’s workforce needs. As those workforce needs evolve and grow, UC remains committed to increasing the number of its high-quality and diverse graduate and professional student bodies. To this end, UC recently developed long-range enrollment projections to 2020 which include a 47 percent increase in graduate enrollment with special emphasis on meeting the state’s workforce needs in the health sciences.

Measures
The indicators available thus far show trends in the size and diversity of graduate and professional school enrollment, trends in the types of degrees awarded and trends in the value of the financial support received by academic doctoral students. However, graduate student measures and definitions vary across institutions and fields of study considerably more than those for undergraduates. For example, the criteria used to categorize students as graduate or professional degree students are often unique to each institution depending on the nature of the programs offered. Moreover, measures of graduate student characteristics and outcomes typically vary considerably by broad discipline, with aggregations often masking that variation. Most of the indicators are disaggregated into graduate academic and professional degree programs based on the common distinction used by IPEDS. However, on every indicator there is much heterogeneity across broad fields of study and individual programs within them. Future editions of this report will deploy additional indicators about graduate student quality, access, affordability and success.
In fall 2006, the ten UC campuses enrolled about 46,000 students across their graduate and professional programs compared to 84,000 graduate students enrolled across the eight comparison institutions.

Graduate and professional enrollment at UC represented 22 percent of total enrollment in 2005-06 compared to 33 percent at comparison public institutions and 60 percent at comparison private institutions.

Source: 2006-07 IPEDS Enrollment Survey
6.1 (continued) Graduate and Professional Enrollment, Fall 2006
Indicator 6.2
UC Graduate and Professional and Undergraduate Enrollment, Fall 2000 to Fall 2007

- Undergraduate enrollment has represented the bulk of UC enrollment (77-79 percent) since 2000.

Source: UCOP Corporate Student Systems
6.2 (continued) UC Graduate and Professional and Undergraduate Enrollment, Fall 2000 to Fall 2007
White students made up the largest share (43 percent) of UC’s graduate and professional enrollment in fall 2006 as they did at the comparison public institutions (54 percent) and comparison private institutions (41 percent).

UC enrolled a larger share (7 percent) of Latino and Chicano students in its graduate and professional programs in fall 2006 than either the public (3 percent) or private (4 percent) comparison institutions.

In fall 2006, UC enrolled a smaller share (16 percent) of international students in its graduate and professional programs than did the comparison public institutions (23 percent) and comparison private institutions (27 percent).

Source: 2006-07 IPEDS Enrollment Survey
6.3 (continued) Graduate and Professional Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity, Fall 2006

UC and Comparison Institutions

- Other/Unknown
- International
- White
- Asian American
- Latino/Chicano
- African American
- American Indian

Institutions:
- UC 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
- Yale
The proportion of graduate and professional students by race/ethnicity varies across academic disciplines.

Source: UCOP Corporate Student Systems
Draft for Discussion

6.4 (continued) UC Graduate Academic Enrollment by Race/Ethnicity, Fall 2000 to Fall 2007

[Charts showing enrollment trends for different race/ethnicity categories: Universitywide-African American, Universitywide-Asian American, Universitywide-Chicano/Latino, Universitywide-White, Universitywide-International, Universitywide-Other/Unknown]
In fall 2006, women made up 48 percent of UC’s graduate and professional enrollment compared to 49 percent at the four public comparison institutions and 43 percent at the four private comparison institutions.

Source: 2006-07 IPEDS Enrollment Survey
6.5 (continued) Graduate and Professional Enrollment by Gender, Fall 2006

UC and Comparision Institutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</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>UC Irvine University of Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Berkeley University of Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY at Buffalo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale University</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Indicator 6.6
UC Graduate and Professional Enrollment by Gender, Fall 2000 to Fall 2007

- The proportion of graduate and professional students by gender varies across academic disciplines.

Source: UCOP Corporate Student System
6.6 (continued) UC Graduate and Professional Enrollment by Gender, Fall 2000 to Fall 2007

[Bar charts showing enrollment by gender for Berkeley, Davis, Irvine, Los Angeles, Merced, Riverside, San Diego, San Francisco, Santa Barbara, and Santa Cruz from 2000 to 2007.]
UC awarded more than 54,000 degrees in 2005-06, about 24 percent of which were at the graduate and professional level. In contrast, about 41 percent of degrees at the four public comparison institutions and 64 percent at the four private comparison institutions were at the graduate and professional level.

Note: Graduate students include students in both masters and doctoral programs. Professional degree students are in programs leading to a professional degree in law, health sciences, business, divinity and related fields.

Source: IPEDS 2006 Completions Survey
6.7 (continued) Graduate, Professional and Undergraduate Degrees Awarded, 2005-06

UC and Comparison Institutions

- Undergraduate
- Professional
- Graduate
The ten UC campuses produced about 7,000 graduate degrees in 2005-06 compared to 10,000 graduate degrees produced by the eight comparison institutions.

The largest share of UC’s graduate degrees were in science, technology, engineering and mathematics (49 percent). These STEM degrees represented more than 55 percent of graduate degrees at both the public and private comparison institutions.

Source: 2006-07 IPEDS Completions Survey
Draft for Discussion

6.8 (continued) Graduate Degrees Awarded by Discipline, 2005-06

UC and Comparison Institutions

- UC Accountability Framework Discussion Draft 129
- September 21, 2008
The ten UC campuses produced about 6,000 professional degrees in 2005-06 compared to 13,000 professional degrees produced by the comparison eight institutions.

The largest share of UC’s graduate professional degrees were in business (30 percent) and other professional fields (36 percent), followed by law (14 percent) and medicine (11 percent). These proportions were relatively similar across both the public and private comparison institutions.

Source: 2006-07 IPEDS Completions Survey
6.9 (continued) Professional Degrees Awarded by Discipline, 2005-06
Unlike undergraduates, domestic graduate students can meet California residency requirements after their first year of study in the state. Since most first-year domestic non-resident students become in-state residents in their second year, focusing on newly enrolled graduate students allows for a more accurate representation of their geographic origin.

New graduate academic students are much more geographically diverse than undergraduate students. This reflects the University’s goal of drawing top academic talent from across the nation and around the world.

New international student enrollment has fluctuated over the past few years in response to the climate for international student recruitment and the ability of departments to fund the higher costs associated with international students, who, unlike domestic graduate students, continue to pay nonresident tuition after their first year.
6.10 (continued) Geographic Distribution of New UC Graduate and Professional Students, Fall 2007

Berkeley
- CA Resident: 22%
- Other US: 38%
- International: 40%

Davis
- CA Resident: 18%
- Other US: 20%
- International: 62%

Irvine
- CA Resident: 24%
- Other US: 67%
- International: 19%

Los Angeles
- CA Resident: 16%
- Other US: 30%
- International: 54%

Merced
- CA Resident: 38%
- Other US: 15%
- International: 47%

Riverside
- CA Resident: 31%
- Other US: 13%
- International: 56%

San Diego
- CA Resident: 19%
- Other US: 25%
- International: 56%

San Francisco
- CA Resident: 4%
- Other US: 24%
- International: 72%

Santa Barbara
- CA Resident: 20%
- Other US: 28%
- International: 52%

Santa Cruz
- CA Resident: 20%
- Other US: 26%
- International: 54%
Post-doctoral training has become an integral part of the training of Ph.D. students in the sciences.

Students who earn University of California doctoral degrees are accepted readily into the job market. Almost three-quarters (71 percent) had already accepted an employment offer or were entering post-doctoral training at the time they completed their Ph.D.'s.

Source: National Science Foundation Survey of Earned Doctorates
6.11 (continued) Plans at Time of Ph.D. Completion, Spring 2006

(Merced opened in 2005 and had awarded very few graduate degrees as of spring 2006.)
Indicator 6.12
Average Net Stipend Offered to Academic Doctoral Students Admitted to UC Compared to Their First-Choice Non-UC Schools, 2004 and 2007

Figures are in constant 2007 dollars, adjusted for inflation.

- Surveys in both 2004 and 2007 indicated that UC’s per capita net stipend offers to graduate students are not fully competitive with those from students’ top-choice non-UC institutions. Net stipend is the amount remaining for students after accounting for tuition/fees.

- In 2007, the UC per capita net stipend offer was $1,000 lower than that of competing institutions ($17,356 vs. $18,356). This represented an improvement over the $1,500 competitiveness gap that existed between UC and competing institutions in 2004 ($16,203 vs. $17,728).

- The degree of UC’s per capita graduate net stipend competitiveness varies by campus.

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

Source: University of California Graduate Student Support Survey, Spring 2004 and Spring 2007
6.12 (continued) Average Net Stipend Offered to Academic Doctoral Students Admitted to UC Compared to their First-Choice Non-UC Schools, 2004 and 2007

Figures are in constant 2007 dollars, adjusted for inflation.
Per Capita Average Net Stipend of UC Academic Doctoral Students, 1998-99 to 2006-07

- Net stipend is the amount of competitive aid students have to live on after covering total tuition and fees charged. It is calculated by subtracting total fees and tuition charged from a student's total gift and assistantship support.

- Per capita net stipend has increased by 18 percent in real terms since 1998-99.

Figures are in constant 2006 dollars, adjusted for inflation.

Source: UCOP Student Financial Aid Office
Indicator 6.13 (continued) Per Capita Average Net Stipend of UC Academic Doctoral Students, 1998-99 to 2006-07

- Berkeley
- Davis
- Irvine
- Los Angeles
- Merced
- Riverside
- San Diego
- San Francisco
- Santa Barbara
- Santa Cruz
Trends in the percent of professional degree students who graduate with debt vary by discipline, but generally changed little in recent years.

The recent increase in borrowing among students in the “Other Non-Health” category 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 graduates reflect a combination of several 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 will be presented to the Regents as they review multiyear fee plans submitted by the University’s professional degree programs.

Source: UCOP Corporate Student System
Section 7. Faculty

**Goals**
UC’s faculty are crucial to its success as a leading research university and to the nature of the educational experience it provides. Accordingly, the recruitment and retention of a world-class faculty are the University’s most important overarching goals. In addition, the faculty’s gender, ethnic and racial composition is indicative of the University’s progress in achieving the Regents’ diversity goals.

**Measures**
As with graduate students, data on faculty are disparate and complicated to aggregate. Accordingly, this section too is expected to absorb a great deal of attention as the framework is developed in the years to come.

The data presented at this stage 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 are able to 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.
In 1993 and 1994, the University lost many faculty in response to a Voluntary Early Retirement Incentive Program that was instituted in response to state budget shortfalls. This is responsible for the drop in faculty members during that period.

Source: UCOP Academic Advancement Office
7.1 (continued) Full-Time Ladder-Rank Faculty, Fall 1989 to Fall 2007
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Los Angeles
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Riverside

San Diego

San Francisco

Santa Barbara

Santa Cruz
• Proportionately speaking, the UC campuses have more minority faculty – Asian-American, Latino/Chicano, African American and American Indian – than our public or private comparison institutions. This reflects UC’s commitment to increasing faculty diversity.

Source: IPEDS Fall Staff Survey, 2005-06; data are the most recent available.
7.2 (continued) Full-Time Ladder-Rank Faculty by Race/Ethnicity, UC and Comparison Institutions, Fall 2005

UC and Comparison Institutions

UC Accountability Framework Discussion Draft
September 21, 2008
The percentage of African American, American Indian and Latino/Chicano faculty varies by discipline.

Source: UCOP Academic Advancement Office
7.3 (continued) UC Trend in Full-Time Ladder-Rank African American, Latino/Chicano and American Indian Faculty, Fall 1993 to Fall 2007
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Indicator 7.4
Full-Time Female Ladder-Rank Faculty, Fall 2005

Source: IPEDS Fall Staff Survey, 2005-06; data are the most recent available.
7.4 (continued) Full-Time Female Ladder-Rank Faculty, Fall 2005

UC and Comparison Institutions

UC and Comparison Institutions

UC Accountability Framework Discussion Draft
September 21, 2008
Women make up 29 percent of the total faculty.

The percentage of women faculty varies by discipline. For example, in 2006-07, 50 percent of full-time ladder-rank faculty in education were women, while 41 percent in arts and humanities and 12 percent in engineering were women.

Source: UCOP Academic Advancement Office
Draft for Discussion

Indicator 7.6
UC Student-Faculty Ratios, 2002-03 to 2006-07

- Student-faculty ratios (SFRs) are computed in different ways, depending upon their purpose. There is no nationally agreed-upon standard for computing SFRs and thus no comparable data that UC can use to benchmark its student-faculty ratios against those of other institutions.

- UC computes two different general campus student-faculty ratios which it reports to the state – actual SFRs and budgeted SFRs. The general campus computations reported here exclude health science faculty and enrollments.

- Actual SFRs refer to full-year actual general campus FTE student enrollment divided by estimated actual general campus FTE faculty employed. This is perhaps the best measure of the faculty available on any campus for each full-time student. Budgeted SFRs are a measure of the funding available to campuses for hiring faculty.

- Since 2000-01, the University's budgeted SFR has been 18.6 to 1. The University's goal is to achieve a long-term budgeted SFR of 17.6 to 1 in order to increase the funding available to support faculty hires.

Source: UCOP Budget Office; technical details available upon request.
7.6 (continued) UC Student-Faculty Ratios, 2002-03 to 2006-07

(San Francisco is a health sciences campus; these statistics are for general campus enrollment.)
Student credit hours (SCH) is one measure used to assess faculty teaching activities. SCH is defined as the number of enrollments in a class times the number of units. A four-unit class of 50 students would generate 200 SCH. SCH is a measure of the intensity of teaching since it takes into consideration both the size of a class and the number of units for which it is offered.
Draft for Discussion

7.7 (continued) Student Credit Hours by Course Level and Faculty Appointment, 2005-06
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Indicator 7.8
Average Faculty Salaries, 2007-08

- 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).

Source: American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Faculty Compensation Survey, 2007-08
Draft for Discussion

7.8 (continued) Average Faculty Salaries, 2007-08

[Bar charts showing average faculty salaries for Full Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor across various institutions.]
Indicator 7.9
Average Faculty Salaries, 1997-98 to 2007-08

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

In 2007-08, to better reflect the market the University implemented changes to the faculty salary scales which slightly closed the gap between average faculty salaries at UC and its comparison institutions.

The data presented here were extracted from annual reports published by the American Association of University Professors. The AAUP defines its population to include all full-time instructional faculty except those who receive clinical compensation. The average weighted faculty salaries reported here may not completely match average faculty salaries reported elsewhere due to differences in population definitions. However, the general trends reported are comparable.

Source: American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Faculty Compensation Survey, 2007-08
7.9 (continued) Average Faculty Salaries, 1997-98 to 2007-08

UC and Comparison Institutions - Professor

- UC: 131,322
- Pub: 112,777
- Priv: 142,854

UC and Comparison Institutions - Associate Professor

- UC: 75,622
- Pub: 78,863
- Priv: 107,317

UC and Comparison Institutions - Assistant Professor

- UC: 64,517
- Pub: 74,915
- Priv: 74,915

97-98 98-99 99-00 00-01 01-02 02-03 03-04 04-05 05-06 06-07 07-08
Indicators of Community Engagement (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>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulitzer Prize</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The quality of the faculty is recognized through national and international lifetime achievement awards, honorary memberships in the nation’s most distinguished academic societies and many other annual awards.

- Of the 53 Nobel Prizes received by UC faculty, 20 have been awarded since 1995.

Note: Awards effective as of October 2007. Includes current, emeriti, retired, former and deceased faculty at UC campuses, the Office of the President and National Laboratories managed by UC.

Source: University of California Higher Education Compact Performance Measures, 2007-08
### Indicator 7.11
**Faculty Recipients of Honorary Memberships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>Recipients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Academy of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Association for the Advancement of Science</td>
<td>543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Chemical Society</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Council of Learned Societies</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Geophysical Union</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Philosophical Society</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Physical Society</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute of Medicine</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Academy of Education</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Academy of Engineering</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Academy of Sciences</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Awards effective as of October 2007. Includes current faculty at UC campuses, the Office of the President and National Laboratories managed by UC. List does not include emeriti, retired, former or deceased faculty.

Source: University of California Higher Education Compact Performance Measures, 2007-08
Draft for Discussion

Indicator 7.12
Faculty Recipients of Annual Awards and Honors, 2003-04 Through 2006-07

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

- UC’s newest 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 2007. Includes current faculty at UC campuses, the Office of the President and National Laboratories managed by UC. List does not include emeriti, retired, former or deceased faculty.

Source: Campus reports and University of California Higher Education Compact Performance Measures
PART II. Universitywide Indicators with Campus Comparisons

Section 8. 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. And the first of three goals considered by the committee in 2007 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 research costs associated with research carried out by UC campuses (without regard to the amount of indirect costs that were actually recovered). These data were used because they conform to the definitions used in the National Science Foundation Research and Development (R&D) 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.

*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 8.1
Total Research and Development Expenditures, Annual Growth, 1996-97 to 2005-06

Figures are in constant 2005-06 dollars, adjusted for inflation.

- These charts show real inflation-adjusted growth (or decline if the percentage is negative) of total research and development (R&D) expenditures from year to year.

Source: National Science Foundation Research and Development (R&D) Expenditures Survey. NSF R&D expenditure data include both direct and indirect costs.
8.1 (continued) Total Research and Development Expenditures, Annual Growth, 1996-97 to 2005-06

* 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.

** The single data point for Merced represents the one-year change from 2004-05 to 2005-06.
## Indicator 8.2
Total Research and Development Expenditures, 1996-97 to 2005-06

<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>$2,547,584</td>
<td>$29,574,088</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>$2,776,054</td>
<td>$30,963,927</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>$2,946,015</td>
<td>$32,564,129</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>$3,243,809</td>
<td>$34,938,419</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>$3,530,510</td>
<td>$37,260,601</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>$3,807,530</td>
<td>$40,456,793</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>$4,072,577</td>
<td>$43,752,970</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>$4,210,168</td>
<td>$46,085,429</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>$4,272,176</td>
<td>$47,280,035</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>$4,331,346</td>
<td>$47,760,402</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures are in constant 2005-06 dollars, adjusted for inflation.
## Draft for Discussion

### Indicator 8.3
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>-</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>270</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
Indicator 8.4

Figures are in constant 2005-06 dollars, adjusted for inflation.

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

Source: National Science Foundation Research and Development Expenditures Survey; NSF R&D expenditure data includes both direct and indirect costs.
8.4 (continued) Federal Research and Development Expenditures, Annual Growth, Universitywide and by Campus, 1996-97 to 2005-06

[Graphs showing annual growth of federal research and development expenditures from 1996-97 to 2005-06 for Berkeley, Davis, Irvine, Los Angeles, Merced, Riverside, San Diego, San Francisco, Santa Barbara, and Santa Cruz.]
Federal funds account for the majority of R&D expenditures, providing about 60 percent of actual reimbursed costs of research and about 52 percent of all R&D expenditures.

The majority of federal funds come from Health and Human Services and represent National Institutes of Health funding given to medical schools. Campuses with medical schools (Davis, Irvine, Los Angeles, San Diego and San Francisco) garner a large amount of federal funding from NIH (see Indicator 8.6).

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.

The “all other sources” category includes awards from nonprofit foundations and voluntary health agencies and gifts from individuals that are restricted by the donor to research.

Note: In order to gauge the relative size of contributions to the University’s research expenditures from various external sponsors, it is useful to look only at direct R&D expenditures plus associated indirect costs funded by an external sponsor (money actually paid by the source to the University). By way of comparison, while the University’s total FY 2007 R&D expenditures as reported on the NSF survey (which includes both direct and indirect costs) were over $4.5 billion, the direct cost of research was about $3.3 billion and UC’s actual revenue received for research totaled approximately $3.9 billion.

Source: National Science Foundation Research and Development Expenditures Survey; data include both direct and indirect costs.
8.5 (continued) Research and Development Expenditures by Source, 1997-98 to 2006-07
Indicator 8.6

Figures are in constant 2006-07 dollars, adjusted for inflation.

Source: National Science Foundation Research and Development Expenditures Survey; NSF began collecting information by federal agency in FY 2003-04.
8.6 (continued) Inflation-Adjusted Federally Funded Research and Development Expenditures by Agency, 2003-04 to 2006-07

Berkeley (thousands)

Davis (thousands)

Irvine (thousands)

Los Angeles (thousands)

Merced (thousands)

Riverside (thousands)

San Diego (thousands)

San Francisco (thousands)

Santa Barbara (thousands)

Santa Cruz (thousands)
For the past 12 years, the UC system has led the nation in the number of U.S. patents awarded to a university system.

In recent years, UC has spawned more than 30 companies in the clean/green technology sector, evidencing the system’s leadership in the renewable energy and sustainable development sector of California’s economy.

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

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 relationships. As alternate metrics are developed, they will be included in future accountability reports.

Source: UCOP Office of Technology Transfer Annual Reports.
8.7 (continued) Number of Patents and Inventions, 1997-98 to 2006-07
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 inventions are hepatitis-B vaccine, a treatment for intracranial aneurysms, nicotine patch, atomic microscope, and the camarosa, ventana and albion strawberry varieties, which were released from the UC Davis Strawberry Variety Program.

UC Riverside's contribution to UC’s plant licensing activities can be traced back to its founding in 1906 as the California Citrus Research Station. UCR is still a major contributor to the California citrus industry, especially with the recent release of five seedless mandarin cultivars.
8.8 (continued) Trend in Number of Active Licenses
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Indicator 8.9
Licensing Income, 1997-98 to 2006-07

Figures are in constant 2006-07 dollars, adjusted for inflation.

- The 2006 Milken Institute report “Mind to Market: A Global Analysis of University Biotechnology Transfer and Commercialization” ranked the UC system second (after MIT) in its technology transfer and commercialization index.

- In biotechnology, UC has created through licensing more than 200 biomedical and biotechnology-related start-ups in the past 20 years, over 85 percent of which are still in business today. Also, one in six public biotechnology companies nationally — and one in three in California — were founded by a UC scientist.

Note: In 1999-2000, the University received a $200 million payment as settlement for a long-standing infringement suit involving the University’s human growth hormone patent. In 2005-06, the University received a $100 million payment as a partial settlement of a patent infringement suit involving bovine growth hormone patents. 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.

Source: UCOP’s Office of Technology Transfer Annual Reports
8.9 (continued) Licensing Income, 1997-98 to 2006-07

### Berkeley (thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>4,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>5,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>7,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>8,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>8,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>11,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>9,484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>7,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>7,388</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Davis (thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>8,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>9,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>8,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>11,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>18,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>10,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>10,729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>11,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>9,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>9,217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Irvine (thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>1,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>1,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>3,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>5,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>6,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>12,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>10,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>6,716</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Los Angeles (thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>6,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>6,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>10,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>11,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>11,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>14,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>23,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>22,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>25,294</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Merced (thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Riverside (thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>1,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>1,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>1,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>1,784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>1,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>1,408</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### San Diego (thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>10,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>7,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>9,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>9,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>14,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>11,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>16,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>22,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>27,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>25,696</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### San Francisco (thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>70,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>50,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>44,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>39,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>35,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>33,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>30,351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>27,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>33,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>75,197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Santa Barbara (thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>1,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>1,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>1,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>1,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>2,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>3,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>4,590</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Santa Cruz (thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997-98</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART II. Universitywide Indicators with Campus Comparisons

Section 9. 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. Although rising in a particular ranking scheme is clearly not one of UC’s strategic goals, 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 Washington Monthly. 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 9.1
### National Research Council’s Ratings of UC Doctoral Programs, 1995

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UC CAMPUS</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 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 rankings are the most recent. The NRC plans to release an updated set of rankings in fall 2008.
Indicator 9.2
The Center for Measuring University Performance: Top American Research Universities, 2005 to 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UC Campus</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, federal 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 one of two clusters 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 its 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 federal research expenditures are heavily influenced by NIH funding. The data also are not normalized by faculty size, resulting in lower rankings for smaller institutions.
Draft for Discussion

Indicator 9.3
*U.S. News and World Report’s Graduate Program Rankings, 2000 to 2009*

### Business

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</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>
9.3 (continued) *U.S. News and World Report’s* Graduate Program Rankings, 2000 to 2009

### Law

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</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>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</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>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></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>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</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>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Medicine - Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</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>Program</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>
9.3 (continued) *U.S. News and World Report*s Graduate Program Rankings, 2000 to 2009

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

- An institution may not be reported in the list above for one of two reasons: 1) its program fell below 20 in *USNWR*’s graduate program rankings in 2009, or 2) an institution does not have a program in the designated area.

- *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. UC Merced is not ranked because it does not have graduate professional programs in business, education, law or medicine; it does offer graduate study in engineering areas, but the programs are too new to have awarded degrees or to be reviewed by *U.S. News*. 
Draft for Discussion

Indicator 9.4
*U.S. News and World Report’s America’s Best National Universities, 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>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</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>45</td>
<td>47</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>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tier</td>
<td>tier</td>
<td>tier</td>
<td>tier</td>
<td>tier</td>
<td>tier</td>
<td>tier</td>
<td>tier</td>
<td>tier</td>
<td>tier</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>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</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>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</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>4</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. Privates tend to score higher than public universities on four indicators: graduation rates, faculty resources, financial resources and alumni giving rates, which together count for 55 percent of a school’s total score.

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

- San Francisco is not ranked because it is a graduate health sciences campus, and Merced, which opened in 2005, is not ranked because it has interim accreditation.

Note: *USNWR* labels its rankings for the prospective year; the 2009 rankings were published August 22, 2008.
### Indicator 9.5

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UC CAMPUS</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>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>10</td>
<td>8</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>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</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>

- *U.S. News and World Report’s Top 50 Public National Universities’ ranking follows its list of Best National Universities, with the private universities excluded.*
## Draft for Discussion

### Indicator 9.6

*Washington Monthly* Rankings, 2005 to 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UC CAMPUS</th>
<th>Ranking Among National Universities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Illinois</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Michigan</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY at Buffalo</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Virginia</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


- Unlike *USNWR*, which tends to rank colleges and universities on their wealth, the *Washington Monthly* ranks colleges and universities on their contribution to society. Its measures include: 1) being an engine of social mobility, 2) fostering scientific and humanistic research, and 3) fostering an ethic of service to the country.

- The *Washington Monthly* published a list of its top 30 national universities in 2005 and expanded the list to include all national universities in subsequent years.
The University of California 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.

Two major factors determine the capital needs for the University of California: 1) meeting enrollment demand, consistent with the University’s commitment to student access under the Master Plan for Higher Education; and 2) maintaining the effectiveness of existing capital assets of the University through investment in systematic modernization and renewal of facilities. Adequate facilities are a critical factor in the University’s ability to accommodate the rapid growth of students and maintain the quality of the academic program. However, the University also has significant capital needs related to seismic and life-safety requirements, modernization of out-of-date facilities that no longer adequately serve the academic programs they house, new infrastructure for growing campuses, and renewal of infrastructure and other facilities systems that are worn out and cannot accommodate even present demand.

Private support, finally, 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 per-student average educational expenditures.

The capital data presented here cover the magnitude of the University’s capital facilities, the University’s efficiency in the use of facilities and progress on addressing seismic safety needs.

The development data cover trends in private support at UC and its comparison institutions, donor restrictions on support and endowment per student.
Indicator 10.1
Revenue by Source, 2003-04 to 2006-07

- University revenue consists of funds from a variety of sources. State support, which helps leverage other dollars, remains most crucial.

- In 2006-07, 33 percent of University revenue was generated from contracts and grants, including the DOE laboratories. Another 28 percent was generated from medical center operations and auxiliary enterprises, while state appropriations and student fees generated 23 percent of total revenue.

Source: UCOP Budget Office
Expenditures for instruction, including faculty salaries, libraries, other academic support and student services were 27 percent of the total during 2006-07. Research and public service were 17 percent and 2.2 percent, respectively.
Indicator 10.3
Per-Student Average Expenditures For Education, 1998-99 to 2007-08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Universitywide</th>
<th>Fees</th>
<th>UC General Funds</th>
<th>State General Funds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998-99</td>
<td>$13,910</td>
<td>$1,840</td>
<td>$5,540</td>
<td>$7,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999-00</td>
<td>$13,780</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>$5,480</td>
<td>$7,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-01</td>
<td>$14,250</td>
<td>$1,820</td>
<td>$5,660</td>
<td>$7,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-02</td>
<td>$13,540</td>
<td>$1,860</td>
<td>$5,600</td>
<td>$7,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-03</td>
<td>$11,830</td>
<td>$1,950</td>
<td>$5,950</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>$10,480</td>
<td>$2,140</td>
<td>$5,170</td>
<td>$7,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>$9,550</td>
<td>$2,060</td>
<td>$4,960</td>
<td>$7,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>$9,580</td>
<td>$2,030</td>
<td>$4,960</td>
<td>$7,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>$9,650</td>
<td>$1,920</td>
<td>$4,960</td>
<td>$7,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>$10,160</td>
<td>$1,940</td>
<td>$5,090</td>
<td>$7,120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures are in inflation-adjusted constant 2007-08 dollars.

- Since 1998, average inflation-adjusted expenditures for educating UC students declined 20 percent.
- The state's share of expenditures has plunged 27 percent.
- Over this period, the student share of total educational expenditures, net of financial aid, rose from 26 to 29 percent. Since 1990, the student share, net of financial aid, has more than doubled, from 13 to 29 percent.

Source: UCOP Budget Office
The amount of space that can be used for programs or functions or assigned to occupants is known as the assignable area. The assignable area of a room is the area within the interior walls of the room. Assignable area is measured in terms of assignable square feet (ASF) as of the fall term.

The ten major room use categories for assignable space are: classrooms, laboratories, office facilities, study facilities, special use facilities, general use facilities, support facilities, health care facilities, residential facilities and unclassified areas.

Public areas that support the functioning of the building irrespective of program (e.g., custodial space, corridors and elevators, phone closets, restrooms) are excluded.

Total assignable area equals the sum of the ten room use categories of assignable space.
The legislatively approved standard for classroom utilization is 35 weekly student contact hours.

This standard applies to all general campus classrooms and seminar rooms. Excluded are the health sciences, University Extension and other non-standard classrooms (e.g., for physical education or military science).

Weekly student contact hours are based on the number of hours a classroom is scheduled and the number of seats occupied. For example, 40 students times 3 lecture hours per week generates 120 student contact hours.

When last reviewed, the legislative standard of 35 weekly student contact hours was among the most stringent in the country. The University’s average classroom utilization of 28.9 hours is relatively close to the CPEC recommendation of 30 weekly student contact hours.

Utilization is measured on fall data only.

Source: UCOP Budget Office
Note: Historical data are not available for the Merced campus, which opened in fall 2005. Classroom utilization standards are not applicable to the San Francisco campus, a health sciences only campus.
The legislatively approved standard for teaching laboratory utilization is 20 weekly student contact hours.

This standard applies to departmentally controlled class laboratories and any campus general assignment laboratories. Excluded are laboratories in the health sciences, University Extension and other non-standard rooms (e.g., for physical education or military science). Also excluded are special class laboratories in which unscheduled but required instruction takes place (e.g., language labs, music studios, self-instructional computer/media labs, drop-in labs, etc.).

Utilization is measured on fall term data only.

Source: UCOP Budget Office.
10.6 (continued) Average Hours per Laboratory Use, Fall 1991 to Fall 2006

Berkeley

Davis

Irvine

Los Angeles

Riverside

San Diego

Santa Barbara

Santa Cruz

Note: Historical data are not available for the Merced campus, which opened in fall 2005. Laboratory utilization standards are not applicable to the San Francisco campus, a health sciences only campus.
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).

This accounts for two-thirds of all space requiring seismic correction, including 64 percent of all educational and other state-supportable space and 77 percent of all auxiliary and other non-state space. The cost of this work, in nominal dollars, was about $1 billion, excluding FEMA funding.

Seismic correction for another 15 percent of space (3.8 million GSF) is in progress or has been vacated, accounting for nearly 17 percent of educational and other state supportable space and 7 percent of all auxiliary and other non-state supportable space. The cost of this work is more than $1.6 billion.

Remediation for the remaining 4.5 million gross square feet (18 percent) of all seismically rated poor or very poor space is needed.
10.7 (continued) Seismic Retrofitting Progress as of June 2008

- **Berkeley**: Completed 62%, In Progress 5%, Remaining Educational 24%, Remaining Auxiliaries & Other 9%
- **Davis**: Remaining Educational 2%, In Progress 43%, Completed 51%
- **Irvine**: Completed 51%, In Progress 43%, Remaining Educational 0%, Remaining Auxiliaries & Other 3%
- **Los Angeles**: Completed 67%, Remaining Educational 26%, In Progress 5%
- **Riverside**: Completed 92%, Remaining Educational 0%, In Progress 5%
- **San Diego**: Completed 92%, Remaining Educational 0%, In Progress 7%
- **San Francisco**: Completed 16%, Remaining Educational 9%, In Progress 70%
- **Santa Barbara**: Completed 66%, Remaining Educational 5%, In Progress 27%
- **Santa Cruz**: Completed 68%, Remaining Educational 0%, In Progress 32%

Merced opened in 2005-06 and has no retrofitting needs.
**Draft for Discussion**

**Indicator 10.8**
**Total Five Year Giving, 2002-03 through 2006-07**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>02-03</th>
<th>03-04</th>
<th>04-05</th>
<th>05-06</th>
<th>06-07</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UC of California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$1,6B</td>
<td>$1,9B</td>
<td>$1,5B</td>
<td>$2,3B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC of Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(System)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Michigan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY at Buffalo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,2B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,3B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

University of Illinois does not report separately for its campuses.

- These data clearly demonstrate the value of fundraising campaigns. In 2000-01, the Berkeley campus wrapped up a $1.3 billion campaign. In 2004-05, UCLA completed a $3 billion campaign and UCSF a $1.6 billion campaign.

- Gift volume at UC is influenced by the age of the campus, size of its community (many of which grew with campus development) and number of health science programs (which attract almost half of all private support).

- Campus development programs are at different states of maturity.

Source: Council on Aid to Education Data Miner
Fundraising at UC began in earnest in the 1960s at Berkeley and UCLA.

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

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.
In 2007, approximately 98 percent of gifts UC received had donor restrictions; only about 2 percent was given to UC without donor-imposed restrictions. In contrast, Harvard and Stanford received 9.9 and 6.7 percent respectively in unrestricted gifts, according to the 2007 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 devoted to the different areas—research, capital improvements, etc.—varies from year to year, however the percentages reflected in the chart above are typical.
• The Regents and the campus foundations together hold approximately $10 billion in endowment funds for the University of California.

• Although the total endowment is sizable, UC educates approximately 200,000 students per year, resulting in an endowment per student of approximately $50,000 on a systemwide basis.

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

• On the other hand, public schools such as UC have relied on state support in the same way that private schools have relied on endowments.

• In the past 20 years, the endowments at UC’s private comparison institutions have grown substantially while state support has failed to keep pace.

Source: Council on Aid to Education Data Miner
Draft for Discussion

Indicator 10.12
UC Endowment and Endowment per Student, 1996-97 to 2006-07

- UC endowments have grown significantly over the past decade; this growth is attributable to strong investment returns (despite the challenges encountered in certain years) and new gifts for endowment.
- Approximately 25 percent of endowment payout is directed for research, approximately 20 percent for instruction (including endowed chairs and professorships) and 20 percent for student financial support.
- Chair endowments have grown significantly; 30 percent of UC’s endowed chairs have been established in the last four years.
- UC’s task is to increase endowments without reducing the amount of current use gifts.

Source: UCOP Institutional Advancement Office
Draft for Discussion

10.12 (continued) Endowment and Endowment per Student, 1996-97 to 2006-07