Executive Summary

The charge of the Strategic Planning Subcommittee on Resources, Budget, Planning and Infrastructure is presented in Section 1. Several guiding principles for Strategic Plan management and implementation are identified Section 2. The specific recommendations of the subcommittee are discussed in Sections 3, 4, and 5. The specific recommendations are:

1. All campus planning and resource allocation decisions should be based on the Strategic Plan. To facilitate the implementation of the Plan, each Organizational Unit (OU) will prepare goals, milestones, metrics, and benchmarks aligned with the Plan. A Strategic Planning Coordinating Committee should be formed to work with the EVC/P and unit heads to review the OU plans and to advise on the implementation of the strategic plan, the adequacy of infrastructure, and resource allocations. Specific considerations can be found in Section 3.

2. To enhance transparency of budgeting and decision processes, UCR should publish documents to clearly define: annual budget appropriations; the budgeting process; the budgeting terminology. Such documents and data should be openly available, and easily understandable. Specific considerations can be found in Sections 3 and 5.1.

3. One guiding principle of the strategic plan implementation should be the removal of barriers to innovation or risk taking. UCR should redefine the relationship between administrative/support units and academic units to maximize faculty time spent on the research and teaching missions, and minimize faculty time spent on bureaucratic, compliance, and other administrative functions. The major function of support units should be to relieve faculty of this burden. Specific considerations can be found in Sections 5.2 and 5.3.

4. UCR must diversify and expand funding from all revenue streams, especially Private Giving and Contracts and Grants. The tradeoffs are discussed in Section 4.3. A suitable goal and benchmark is to make UCR's proportions of support match our peer institutions. New stable revenue sources should be used to replace "unfilled faculty line" funding of lecturers, initial startup packages, etc. Specific considerations can be found in Sections 4.3, 5.3 and 5.6.

5. UCR needs to consider fully the cost structure of its undergraduate academic enterprise. UCR should do the following: (1) fully engage in enrollment management to realize a highly qualified, academically prepared, and diverse student body; (2) redesign its preparatory programs to be more cost effective; (3) reconsider various cost/quality tradeoffs relating to curricular requirements, faculty teaching loads, the types of courses offered, etc. Specific considerations can be found in Section 5.5.

6. Decisions related to capital planning, funding for deferred maintenance, and facilities upgrades should be transparent and integrated into UCR's Strategic Plan. Specific considerations can be found in Sections 3.0, 5.3, 5.4, 5.7, and 5.8.

1   Introduction

The Strategic Planning Subcommittee on Resources, Budget, Planning and Infrastructure (RBPI) was formed with the charge:

1   To evaluate and make recommendations on ways for the campus to become less dependent on state funding.
2   To evaluate and make recommendations on resource generation and cost structure, and achieving budgetary transparency.
3   To examine and make recommendations on ways to increase the effectiveness and efficiency of the campus infrastructure, including administrative structure, business affairs, facilities, and services in support of the teaching and research missions.

The charge did not include the role of making unit-specific recommendations for growth or cuts, nor did the committee feel such a role was appropriate, given the limited knowledge of committee members individually and the committee as a whole, of the detailed structure and operations of each campus unit. Rather, the subcommittee considered its charge to be to describe the process that would underlie the implementation and management of the strategic plan, to identify desirable changes UCR's revenues, and to identify specific desirable changes in UCR's infrastructure and business model.

Section 2 states a set of principles on which the Strategic Plan and its implementation and management should be based. The three steps of this process are depicted in Figure 1. In the first step, currently underway, the UCR campus community specifies strategic goals. The second step will involve organization and analysis of the feasibility of implementation of each part of the plan, and should conclude with recommendations for initial resource allocations. The third step will involve dynamic management of the strategic plan implementation through an ongoing process of:

o   defining goals for each organizational unit in relation to UCR's strategic goals;
o   determining unit-specific metrics, benchmarks, and milestones to assess performance and progress toward the strategic goals;
o   evaluation of those metrics on a defined, regular schedule; and
o   reallocation of resources based on the outcome of that evaluation.

In this third step, areas of ineffective resource allocation should be identified and improvements implemented. Section 3 makes specific recommendations with regard to the implementation of the ongoing Strategic Plan Management process necessary to implement Steps two and three outlined in Figure 1. Without these second and third steps, the first step of defining the Strategic Plan goals would have no useful effect.

Figure 1. Generation, implementation, and ongoing management of strategic plan.

Step 1	Step 2	Step 3

Strategic planning
• Specify goals
	Strategic plan Initialization
	• Identify steps to reach goals
	  - Assumptions
	  - Parameters
	  - Financial model
	
	→Initial resource allocation
		Strategic plan Ongoing management
		• Define per unit goals
		  - Measurables
		    - Metrics w/benchmarks
		    - Milestones
		  - Evaluation vs measurables
		→ Resource reallocation

Section 4 considers UCR's current revenue streams relative to a group of appropriate peer institutions. That analysis highlights certain already well-understood objectives for changes in the funding of UCR's academic enterprise. While developing a detailed strategy for enhancing revenue is beyond the scope of the committee, we were able to identify several areas where UCR lags behind peer institutions. In this context, it should be emphasized that revenue stream targets cannot be quantitatively defined until the Strategic Plan goals have been specified, because those goals determine the required financial resources.

Section 5 discusses a variety of specific areas desired for functionality improvement.

The committee membership is listed in Appendix A. The Organization Units (OU's) referred to in this report are summarized in Appendix B. Data related to UCR's expenditures and revenues are presented in Appendix C.

2 Principles of Strategic Plan Management

This section outlines four principles of strategic plan management that the RBPI subcommittee considers to be critical to UCR's financial and programmatic decisions. All of the principles are derived from the first and overarching principle that the academic mission of the campus and the infrastructure critical to this mission, including essential student and faculty services, should have first priority in all strategic planning and resource management decisions.

I. **Maintain, Protect, and Enhance the Three Pillars of the UCR Campus: Access, Excellence, and Diversity.** Since the campus was established in 1954 it has contributed to the realization of the Master Plan and the betterment of the state of California by providing access to the highest quality postsecondary education to students who represent the diversity of the state. The academic mission of the campus must be protected.

II. **Strategic Planning effort should create a culture-of-evidence to examine at regular intervals the contributions of each campus unit to the mission and goals of UCR**. This principle will create and sustain confidence campus-wide that the mission of the institution is in place and being implemented. Three sub-principles that support this principle are:

a. **Each campus unit, academic and administrative, must define, direct, and evaluate all of its activities in relation to the core academic mission of the campus.** UCR has six academic and 13 nonacademic units (See Appendix B) cooperating to achieve its academic mission. Enhancing the efficiency of these cooperative efforts is essential to maintaining and improving the quality of UCR in this difficult financial environment as well as meeting our shared goal to be an AAU recognized institution. To this end, the mission and goals of each unit on the campus need to be aligned with the Strategic Plan and academic mission. To affect this desired end, a culture-of-evidence in relation to the Strategic Plan must be established. Although academic units are, by definition, dedicated to the academic mission, their efforts in this regard need regular examination to ensure that they contribute to the Strategic Plan and enhance the academic mission in the most effective ways possible. The primary function of the nonacademic units should be to enable and facilitate the academic mission and Strategic Plan competently, efficiently, and

expediently. Administrative functions should be streamlined as much as possible and all efforts should be made to eliminate inefficiencies and redundancies in their functions.

b. **All available resources must be used as effectively as possible and be in clear and justifiable alignment with the academic mission of the campus.** In all economic situations, but especially when there are limited resources, it is vital that all the resources that are available to the campus be used as effectively as possible to support, maintain, and advance the academic mission. The proposed culture-of-evidence should drive resource allocation and re-allocation decisions.

c. **Semi-Annual Review of All Campus-level Units**. The Strategic Plan management approach suggested in Section 3 proposes semi-annual review of all nineteen campus-level organizational units. Regular periodic review is required at least at this rate to enable effective Strategic Plan management, informed decision making, progress monitoring, and resource reallocation. Development of similar processes within the campus-level organizational units, while not specifically proposed herein, is also important.

This principle is discussed in greater depth in Section 3.

III. **Shared governance is central to the establishment and viability of the Strategic Plan.** Shared governance is an honored tradition of the University of California, one that has helped the University attain and sustain its position as the premier public institution of higher learning in the world. Although this Plan begins in a time of shifting and shrinking resources, the institution would be shortsighted to overlook this valuable principle. Shared governance is greatly aided by clear and effective channels of communication. Toward this end, the campus should use open forums as well as its electronic infrastructure to enhance the development, communication, and implementation of the strategic plan.

IV. **Transparency in planning, decision-making, and resource allocation is essential.** Commitment to the strategic plan by the UCR community is essential to its successful implementation. Broad "buy-in" can only be achieved by transparency of the related decision and management processes. Transparency should be obtained through regular, clear, and thorough reporting of information pertinent to decisions, both within and across units and on the campus at large.

3 Strategic Plan Management

As UCR implements its Strategic Plan, it is essential that existing campus resources as well as new revenues be allocated in an agile fashion that optimally promotes the Plan's goals. To enable this flexible allocation of resources, it is equally essential that all campus units and departments create plans, vision documents, and straightforward metrics that describe and quantitatively measure how each organization is contributing to the successful implementation of the Strategic Plan. These unit and department specific plans and metrics must be evaluated regularly, both to ensure campus organizations are robustly contributing to UCR's vision and also to create a continuing inventory of campus resources for reallocation as UCR evolves

UCR's campus leadership has indicated that UCR's Strategic Plan will be a "living document" that is malleable and dynamic. Dynamic evolution of the plan will enable UCR to react to changing circumstances, new opportunities, and unforeseen challenges that present themselves to the university over time. In order to be effective, *unit and departmental efforts must be aligned with UCR's Strategic Plan, and a university body must monitor and manage the Strategic Plan's implementation on an ongoing basis*.

UCR's faculty and academic programs already are evaluated relative to program-specific metrics (i.e., merit files, program accreditation, and programs and department national rankings). We advocate extension of this process to all organizational units (OU's) on campus (see Appendix B). To be useful, the process must feature the following characteristics: the process must be transparent to the UCR community; the process must not be overly burdensome; and the milestones, metrics, and benchmarks must be defined to measure quantities that are important (and probably different) for each of the OU's. A three-step process, with justifications for each step, is outlined below.

1. Appointment of a Strategic Plan Coordination Committee (SPCC).
   - This SPCC should be chaired by the EVC/P.
   - This SPCC should be broadly representative of campus.
   - This SPCC must have memory from one academic year to the next; therefore, members should have staggered appointment starting dates and sufficiently long appointment terms. For example, a six person committee with three year terms and two new appointees per academic year.

Justification: The committee must be led by the EVC/P because its objective is to aid in the definition of goals, milestones, metrics and benchmarks for the campus OU's. Without the EVC/P's direct involvement and leadership, the process will be meaningless. The necessity of long term "committee memory" is integral to the definition of long term goal setting with the OU's. The committee memory is also necessary to allow effective committee operations when meetings with each OU occur only twice per year.

As a living document, the Strategic Plan will require adjustments over time. Therefore, it is critical that the SPCC be broadly representative of the campus community. Also, multiple perspectives are useful in the definition of goals, milestones, metrics, and benchmarks. Finally, such a committee would help to ensure a steady campus direction and commitment to the strategic plan in the case of a change in the EVC/P, which is expected to occur twice during the timeframe of the plan.

2. Initial Role of the Strategic Plan Coordination Committee
   - The SPCC will collaborate with each OU to define long term goals for that OU. This process clarifies and defines how each OU is improving itself in support of the UCR mission and strategic plan goals.
   - The SPCC will collaborate with each OU to define and monitor milestones for measuring progress towards each of the long-term goals of the OU.
   - The SPCC will collaborate with each OU to define and monitor metrics and peer-relative benchmarks for measuring the quality, efficiency, productivity, and diversity of revenue streams of the OU.

Justification: The SPCC's initial meetings and dialog (outlined above) with each OU are necessary to ensure efficient attainment of the UCR mission and its strategic plan. The definition of metrics, benchmarks, and milestones will allow analysis of the efficiency and quality of each OU's output and of progress towards stated goals. These definitions also allow transparent communication to the campus

community of the goals, quality, and efficiency of each OU's performance. Moreover, a byproduct of this process will be the creation and maintenance of an "inventory" of campus resources, skills, and assets that might be reallocated as required to meet evolving campus needs during the next decade.

The SPCC's initial meetings and dialog with each OU are also necessary because each OU's is sufficiently distinct that an outside committee cannot understand them all at a sufficient level of detail to *externally* set the goals, milestones, metrics and benchmarks. At the same time, *internal* definition of these items by the leaders of the OU's may allow divergence from the UCR mission and strategic plan. We would expect that the internal management team for each OU would initiate the discussions with proposed goals, milestones, metrics and benchmarks. It should be emphasized that this process must not result in a large administrative reporting burden being placed on the OU's. The number of metrics must be kept to a minimum. Each metric must provide key insights into the OU and its contribution to UCR's Strategic Plan. Ideally, the metrics would also be useful to each OU in their own self-evaluation and development.

3. Ongoing Role of the Strategic Plan Coordination Committee
   - The SPCC will meet with the leader of each OU at least twice per year.
   - The two SPCC meetings will be organized as follows: A "beginning of year" meeting will provide an opportunity for the OU and SPCC to discuss unit specific metrics as well as existing and new goals and objectives for the upcoming year. A "mid-year" meeting will provide an opportunity for the OU and SPCC to discuss progress relating to current year's goals and objectives and any challenges or opportunities that have affected current year's operations.
   - Each year, each OU's statement of goals, milestones, metrics, and benchmarks, along with the available metric data, will be made available to the campus community.

Justification: The SPCC will make every effort to lessen the administrative burden on campus OUs, especially during this time of budget constraints and challenges. However, the process recommended in this document will place *some new burdens* on campus organizational units. However, for UCR to ensure a meaningful implementation of its Strategic Plan, the campus *must implement* a formal set of processes that ensure campus OUs are contributing to the Plan's deployment in an effective and efficient fashion: *after all, "what is measured is what gets done"*.

Assuming that such a process occurs, with measurable outputs, transparent communication of the process results to the UCR community is critical. Public availability of the items mentioned, as well as executive summaries of the reports and analysis generated throughout the year, can be achieved via a clear and transparent web site.

Finally, and importantly, outputs of this process will be one element of the UCR resource allocation and reallocation process aimed at improving the campus research, teaching, administrative, and information infrastructures through strategic investments; in short, one major goal of the process is to reward efficiency, entrepreneurialism, and productivity.

4   Revenue Streams

One of the critical challenges for UCR as it plans its future is diversification and stabilization of its resource base. This section begins in Section 4.1 with a brief definition of the major revenue streams available to UCR, followed in Section 4.2 by a discussion of the status of each revenue stream in comparison to UCSD, UCI, and UCSB based on the data contained in Appendix C. In all comparisons that follow, it is important to note that UCSD and UCI have medical centers, whereas UCR and UCSB do not,

at least for the time period for which these data are valid. Finally, Section 4.3 states conclusions relative to each of the categories of revenues.

4.1 Revenue Stream Definitions

UCR's major revenue streams are:

State General Funds: Funding provided by the State as an appropriation in the State Budget Act for the general operation of the University (e.g., 19900 funds).

Contracts and Grants: These revenue sources derive from agreements involving performance of specific projects agreed upon by granting agencies (e.g., NSF, NIH, Ford Foundation, etc.) and researchers. Note that not all Contracts and Grants are awarded to support research. Some are awarded to support instructional (e.g., training grants) and public service (e.g, California Department of Education meals program) missions of the University.

1.   Contracts are procurement-type awards designed for support of work that directly benefits the contracting agency. The contract requirements are normally defined by the sponsor, i.e., content of work statement, schedule, format of periodic progress reports, terms and conditions, etc.

2.   Grants are direct assistance awards, usually based on a competitive process for support of research authorized by governmental statute or by-laws/policy of a corporation or private granting entity. The specifics/consideration of a project are usually defined by the applicant and approved by the grantor with a resultant award containing more flexible terms and conditions than would be characteristic of a contract agreement with respect to the expenditure of funds.

Note that C&G funds may be provided by Federal, State and Local Governments or Agencies and by private companies, foundations and individuals.

Tuition and Fees: Revenues collected from enrolled students, including traditional UC students and those taking courses through University Extension or Summer Sessions. This funding stream includes Systemwide mandatory fees such as Registration Fees, Educational Fees, and Special Fees for Law and Medical School Students; and Campus-Based fees such as University Extension Fees, Summer Session Tuition, Professional School Fees, Course Material Fees, and Student self-imposed Referendum Fees (e.g., Commons, Recreation Center, etc.).

Private Giving: An irrevocable, charitable contribution to the University, including the UCR Foundation, which is intended as a donation, bestowed voluntarily and without expectation of tangible compensation, and for which no contractual requirements are imposed. Private giving may take the form of a gift to an individual faculty member's research program, a gift to the institution (e.g., scholarship fund, Friends of the Library), or an endowment (e.g., Endowed Chair).

Auxiliary Enterprises: Auxiliary Enterprises are self-supporting University-sponsored business activities which provide non-instructional standardized services or goods on a not-for-profit basis to students, faculty, and staff based upon approved rates. Auxiliary Enterprises are operated primarily for the convenience of University students, faculty, and staff and may only incidentally serve the general public and campus departments. Auxiliary Enterprises at UCR include Student Housing, Food Services, the Child Development Center, the Bookstore, Commons Direction, and Parking Services.

Sales & Services: Sales and service activities are academic (e.g., Analytical Chemistry instrumentation Facility, Vivaria, etc.) and non-academic (Printing and Reprographics, Library Fines, etc.) business

activities that provide standardized services or goods on a not-for-profit basis to University and non-University customers based upon approved rates.

Other: Miscellaneous revenue streams not addressed in any other category and streams collected at UCOP and allocated to the campuses such as F&A allocations (both federal and private/local) and Short-Term Investment Pool (STIP) earnings.

Federal Appropriations: Funding provided by the Federal Government as an appropriation in the Budget Act to support the land grant mission of the University (e.g., Hatch Act Funds).

UC General Funds: Revenues collected by the University, which by agreement with the State, UC classifies as UC General Funds to be used for the general operation of the University. This funding steam functions somewhat as a match to the State General Fund Allocation, and is primarily derived from Federal cost recovery and Non-resident tuition.

The first seven categories are similar to those defined in "The Colors of Money" [1]. The Federal Appropriations category is not discussed in [1]. It was added to allow a complete presentation of the UC-CFS data, excluding medical center expenditures. Finally, the UC General Funds category is in [1], but not in the UC-CFS data. For the analysis of the data in the Appendices, the UC General Funds revenues are combined into the first eight categories as appropriate (i.e., NRT to Student Fees, Federal cost recovery to Contracts and Grants, etc.).

In considering UCR's alternative revenue streams it is critical to remember the different constraints placed on the different revenue streams. For example, State General funds can only be used for expenses related to the educational mission, not for support of faculty research. Alternatively, while a faculty's research grant can fund a graduate student's fees, tuition, and stipend when the student works on the grant; it cannot be used for general expenses related to the educational mission (e.g., lecturers, graders). Therefore, the dominant sources of revenues to support the educational mission currently are and are expected to continue to be State General Funds and Tuitions and Fees (including NRT), supplemented by Private Giving.

4.2 Comparative Status of Revenue Streams

The top half of Table 1 (all tables are in Appendix C) displays the amount of expenditures, in thousands of dollars, by four UC campuses from each of the revenue stream categories described in Section 4.1. The raw dollar amounts are not themselves directly comparable, because of the different sizes and missions of each of the campuses. Subsequent tables reconsider this raw data from a few different perspectives. Medical school expenditures have been removed from the data to the extent possible, but expenditures by medical schools, for example through Sales and Services, are difficult to remove.

The bottom half of Table 1 displays the percentage of expenditures that are derived from each revenue stream, along with the mean and median of the percentage expenditures. The most obvious point is that State appropriations account for a higher percentage of total expenditures at UCR compared to the three other UC campuses. Medical center sales and service expenditures and state funding for the Agricultural Experiment Station have different impacts on different campuses. Compared to UCSB, which is most similar to UCR in not having a medical center, the percentage of revenue from the other sources is very similar, with the exception of Private Giving, where UCR is comparatively low. Comparison of percentage revenues is more difficult for UCI and UCSD. These two campuses have medical centers. While direct medical center income has been removed from the data, ancillary sales

and service functions associated with medical center activities are difficult to distinguish from those generated by general campus activities.

Table 2 and Table 3 scale the expenditures per revenue category by the number of headcount students and faculty FTE, respectively. Data for all revenue streams are shown in each table, but some revenue streams, such as student fees, are more natural to scale by student headcount, while other revenue streams such as contracts and grants are more natural to scale by faculty FTE. Table 2 shows that, with the exception of the small category of Federal Appropriations, UCR has the lowest revenue per student in every category. Variations are attributable to the time period and state funding methodologies under which each campus grew, and due to the fund management employed by UCOP in making actual allocations to the campuses. In addition, some categories, such as student fees can be impacted by individual campus fee levels and the mix of professional students to the total student population. The most important column in Table 3 is the Contracts & Grants income per FTE Faculty, where UCR is the lowest by $7k per FTE academic staff. Due to the denominator being academic staff instead of FTE faculty, the $7k difference may be in part due to differences in the distribution of academic staff on the distinct campuses.

These data should be considered within the context of the nature of each campus. The student headcounts and FTE academic staff and staff are displayed in Table 4 per the IPEDS data definitions. Note that UCR has the highest percentage (88%) undergraduate population and the highest student-to-academic staff ratio (9.5).

4.3   Analysis of Revenue Stream Goals and Constraints

Revenue enhancements from all units on campus are essential to the vitality and longevity of the campus. This section considers each of UCR's major revenue streams with regard to whether we can and should try to affect each.   A main consideration is that access to, and quality of, UCR's academic enterprise must be maintained or enhanced.

State Funding. The history and various alternative projections for the future of state appropriations are discussed in detail in the Futures Report [2] and the Cuts Report [3].

Although UCR cannot directly alter this revenue stream, the UC campus community and its leadership must do a better job of communicating and demonstrating the contributions of UCR, UC, and of the Master Plan to the Regents, the Legislature, and the California citizenry. State support of the UC system and higher education in general has been on a steady decline for the past 20 years, despite the acknowledged fact that UC is an engine of economic growth for the State. In addition to requesting State resources, UC and UCR must do much more to articulate how our activities provide a return on the state's investment.

Acknowledging the current difficulties in the State Funding rates, UCR should try to increase State Funding. It is also imperative that UCR increase the amount and portion of funding from the other seven revenue stream categories.

Contracts and Grants. Contracts and Grants from Federal, State, and Local agencies is a revenue stream that can be directly increased by UCR faculty, staff, and administrators. Our recommendations fall into five categories.

1)   Foster avenues for growth of collaborative research efforts. Federal research agencies are currently promoting collaborative research efforts with such collaboration required by some requests for

proposals. Faculty and researchers are familiar with the methods and rewards related to single PI C&G. This recommendation is meant to augment those efforts by encouraging collaborative and cross-disciplinary projects.

- o An impediment to research collaboration is lack of knowledge about research expertise on campus other than in a faculty or research staff member's home department, especially as the expertise relates to currently open RFP's. Various solutions might be considered, including: a) encouraging staff in the Office of Research to focus on assisting faculty and research staff in making research connections related to RFP's, b) fostering a more active faculty social atmosphere through use of a Faculty or University Club, c) definition of new and reorganization of existing Centers to enhance research communications between departments.
- o Once researchers become aware of each other's related expertise, initial seed funding from UCR may help generate pilot projects aimed at producing initial results suitable for inclusion in research proposals. To some extent, such seed funding is already available through the Committee on Research annual grants. The two top levels of this funding state an expectation that results from the work funded by those grants will provide the background data needed to drive a grant proposal. The success of this program should be evaluated: How many seed funding grants have been issued and for what amounts? What percentage of those grants has resulted in a proposal to an external agency? What percentage of proposals has been funded? How many dollars have been invested through seed grants and how many dollars have been returned to campus via directly resulting external grants? Based on the answers, the program might be left as is, redesigned (possibly with some portion of funds focused on collaborative efforts), or even expanded.
- o An impediment to research collaboration, whether true or merely perceived, is that CAP evaluates collaborative research from a negative perspective. It is perceived that only the project PI and only the dominant senior author gets credit for the grant or article. This perception will have to be addressed to encourage more collaboration. To directly address this in clear language, we recommend that the Call be reworded both with respect to Contracts & Grants and collaborative efforts.

2) Establish Funding Norms. All research personnel, faculty and staff, must contribute to the research and graduate education missions of the campus. Therefore, research funding expectations, based on national standards per discipline, for researchers in each academic unit should be established. These expectations must be transparent and clear (based upon a metric culled from other U.C.'s or from AAU universities close to our profile). Similarly, Centers should be able to justify their existence and staff support by outside revenue streams, grant generation, and value-added for grants and equipment acquisition. Activities of centers should be evaluated annually on this basis.

3) Expand Research Support and Incentives.
- o Indirect Cost Recovery Return. A transparent and well understood ICR return policy, with some percentage returning to the researchers, could be a strong incentive. In fact, for the portion of the ICR return that is considered discretionary within UCR, faculty that have generated this revenue should have a voice in how it is reinvested.
- o Cost Matching. Faculty sometimes make requests for resources (e.g., seed, retention, startup, graduate support). Whenever possible, such funds should be allocated as matching funds rather than as handouts.
- o Direct incentives to faculty for successful grant writing. Alter the Call to include successful grant writing explicitly as a factor in the promotion and merit review processes, relevant to per unit national metrics.
- o High Quality and efficient support for faculty in their research and scholarly activities must be established and maintained (see Section 5.4).

4) Increase Industrial and Private Research Support. Researchers are less aware of the opportunities in these areas.
    o Methods by which the Development office (and officers) can make better connections between researchers and research supporters should be considered.
5) Increase Graduate student support. Given that a goal of UCR is to be less dependent on state funds, faculty members should apply for more grants which support graduate students they choose to accept into their labs. Faculty should also strongly encourage every graduate student to apply for outside grants to alleviate some of the cost to the departments in supporting all students.

Private and Foundation Giving. This is a revenue source that UCR can directly affect; however, the reality is that UCR has not done well in this area. With large and some would argue unrealistic projected donations being included in various project plans (e.g., buildings, Medical School), UCR needs to improve its revenue generation in this area. In addition to increasing revenues from Giving, UCR needs to include more reasonable projections in its budget plans and to track and report transparently on development revenue relative to the projections included in building and program proposals.

Currently, 6% of UCR's expenditures are funded through Development efforts. Conversations with VC-Advancement indicate that 10% is a reasonable long-term goal, which is slightly above the median and averages as indicated in Table 1. While the Development staff is expected to grow, the challenge for the VC-Advancement is to manage the growth so that UCR's cost to raise a dollar decreases. Currently, UCR spends approximately $0.25 per $1.00 of giving on the efforts to attract and manage the giving. Comparable numbers at other campuses are $0.15 at UCSB (typical) and $0.08 at UCLA (low). Developmental Benchmarking, the evaluation of fund-raising costs, provides the basis for objective goal setting, a chance to verify and review programs strengths and weaknesses, and the data needed to establish productivity and efficiency standards. However, such analysis requires more than simply knowing the cost to raise a dollar and return on investment. Benchmarks must also consider what we are providing, the cost to accomplish one activity compared to the cost to another, campaign goals, and long-term infrastructure priorities. Such benchmarking requires significant expertise in Development.

Metrics and benchmarks, as stated in the previous paragraphs, based on discussions with the VC-Development, are crucial. Similar expectations relative to national standards for each OU need to be established so that each OU is responsible, in this comparative national context, for contributing to the fiscal integrity of the campus. These expectations must be transparent and clear (based upon metrics culled from other U.C.'s or from AAU universities close to our profile). Such a metric relative management approach is discussed in Section 3.

The Development office should try to identify faculty who are interested and willing to aid in the development effort. While most may not be interested or have time available, some have stated an interest and willingness to participate.

Auxiliary Services. UCR sets the rates for these services to break even relative to the cost of running the service. Although UCR cannot intentionally plan to generate a surplus relative to the costs, it can ensure that the accounting structures of these services fully recognizes all costs, so that some costs are not being subsidized by other revenue streams. Furthermore, provided that equipment maintenance is included in the cost of running facilities, reserves to provide for such maintenance should be allowed to accumulate.

Sales and Services. Table 5 displays the Sales and Service expenditure data for the nine general campuses of the UC system. Both in total and on a per faculty basis, UCR has the second lowest revenue,

with the only lower campus being UC-Merced. The committee did not have time, nor the necessary source data, to fully investigate this issue; still, perhaps a more entrepreneurial, less risk adverse, approach to this activity at UCR would result in revenues that could aid in the development and support of the research and equipment infrastructure on campus.

One means to facilitate such change is by UCR appointing an expert for Sales and Services. This person must understand the related legal and accounting issues, and yet, be entrepreneurial in their implementation when working with researchers and Resource Planning and Budget. By having a single person answering all such questions, the answers would be consistent and aligned with the UCR strategic approach. Also, UCR would not need to attempt to train many persons (e.g., MSO's) on various Sales and Services issues.

Student Fees. Given that the quality of the academic enterprise must be maintained in the environment of decreasing state support, general student fees at the local or systemwide level will need to be increased. This option should only be considered after decreasing expenses wherever possible (as student fees in the current year have already been increased by over 40%). A few specific suggestions follow:

- Encourage the recruitment of nonresident undergraduates, after fully recruiting to fill the number of state-supported resident undergraduates. The international student programs running through UNEX appear to be useful as feeder programs for high quality students. Structural impediments to such transfers should be identified and the means for their removal enacted.
- Create self-supporting professional programs where there exists academic need and merit. Such programs may be offered through the existing Colleges, Schools, or UNEX. While such programs are priced to "at least break even," they can run a surplus with the surplus used to offset state funding or to enhance other aspects of the organizing entity.
- Preparatory programs at UCR currently cost $1.1M annually. This committee recommends that routes to decrease the cost to UCR of remedial programs be explored, with the caveat that access, diversity, and educational quality must not be decreased. One approach would be to offer remedial programs through UNEX, with the students in the programs paying the fees for the courses. The remedial courses could be taught by the same lecturers and TAs, but paid through UNEX Student Fees instead of State General Funds. The advantage to UCR is that the students in the remedial courses would be paying (at least a large percentage of) the cost of running the programs.

5   Desired Attributes and Functionality at UCR

While the previous sections have discussed the big picture issues relating to the RBPI charge, a variety of more specific issues came up in the course of the committee discussions. These issues identify possible specific directions in which UCR could improve its efficiency, effectiveness, transparency, or cost and administrative structures.

5.1   Transparency

It is essential that the campus promote a culture of transparency and openness. This issue has various aspects:

- Transparency does not simply require that "raw data" exist and be retrievable in some fashion by a particular campus constituency. Rather, transparency should mean that information is easily

accessible, by a non-expert accountant or statistician, in meaningful ways to answer critical questions pertaining to the deployment and/or evolution of the Strategic Plan and the concomitant allocation of resources. Additionally, this same information must be available to assess UCR's Organizational Unit's contributions to the plan's successful implementation.

- Transparency requires some minimal set of common knowledge by interested parties: what are the main revenue and expense categories, what is the history of each item per organizational unit, what is the campus budget allocation process, where can definitions and data be found?

Lack of openness and transparency lead to myths, misconceptions, and distrust. The following specific recommendations are made in support of the aforementioned vision for campus transparency:

a. *Clear presentation of Campus Data and Processes.* UCR should annually update and make publicly available documents (or websites) that achieve the following: (1) define the process of resource allocation that was used in the prior year and that will be used in the current year; (2) summarize the state of the campus; (3) define any acronyms, terminology, constraints on revenue streams, campus or state resource allocation formulae.

   Regarding (1) various administrators (academic and nonacademic) and faculty express lack of understanding of the resource allocation decisions and processes. Regarding (2), these documents need not be monumental writing efforts. The data is already available on campus. It need only be collated and presented in organized and (nearly) identical formats for the different units. Good examples of the desired documents are contained in references [5,6]. UCR's "Colors of Money" presentation is a good start at (3), but could be improved for better accessibility and is currently hidden away on the Academic Senate web site.

b. *Strategic Plan Implementation Progress Web Site.* Either in conjunction with Item a or separately, the progress toward fulfilling the Strategic Plan must be publicly and transparently available. For each OU, the goals, milestones, metrics, benchmarks, and evaluative data should be presented in concise form.

c. *Clear presentation of Capital and Major Project planning and performance tracking.* The procedures and decisions for Capitol or Major Project planning should be easy to determine. Progress of Capitol and Major Projects must be tracked longitudinally so that the cumulative impact of a decision and any/all subsequent actions may be reviewed in their totality over time.

   The above is done somewhere on campus, but the process, decisions, and data are not well understood or transparently available. Documents should be available so that the UCR community can understand the process and data that affected these strategic resource decisions. Existing and newly planned facilities should be evaluated to determine their adequacy to support instruction, faculty research, and the strategic mission of UCR. If this has already been done, the information should be made available.

d. *Enhanced Online Decision Support Systems.* UCR's present online decision support tools and interfaces are most convenient to faculty and staff with a strong and intimate understanding of the information contained within the various databases. To provide better transparency through broader access to campus data, UCR should consider creating a series of web based systems that present information in standard, pre-formatted templates that incorporate any/all relevant business logic (and include graphical interfaces like pie charts, bar charts, etc.). If pursued, this could yield a document such as reference [5] that is updated automatically.

UCR has in place an institutional research team that could support the annual accumulation and presentation of the above items.

5.2 Redefine the Relationship between academic and administrative units.

At UCR, the role of the administration appears to have evolved from one of *support and facilitation* of the academic mission to one of *control and compliance* with regulations. In the process, Faculty workloads have been affected by incrementally small, but cumulatively substantial, extra documentation and layers of oversight or reporting. Faculty have a limited quantity of time per day; therefore, the more faculty time absorbed by bureaucracy, the less time is available to carry out the fundamental teaching and research mission, including generating revenue by writing additional grants. This growing emphasis on control and compliance rather than support and facilitation has become entrenched in the campus fabric. Thus, this committee makes the following recommendations:

- Redefine the administrative model from zero-tolerance for risk (i.e. compliance to the n-th degree, no matter what the cost and how wasteful of both faculty and administrative time) to one of acceptance of a low but economically insignificant level of accidental noncompliance. In short, UCR should stop spending dollars to save pennies
- Change the administrative mindset from control to facilitation; that is, turn the current attitude of "you must provide me with this list of requirements in order for me to help you" to "how can I help you fulfill your list of requirements."
- Redefine the administrative management style from one of multiple layers of redundant oversight to one of empowerment and delegation of responsibility. The number of people or administrative layers that check and recheck the same items is excessive, and undermines personal authority and responsibility. It is pointless to give administrative officers responsibility in theory (with their salaries being based in part on the expectation of that responsibility), when in practice, their decisions are subject to detailed oversight and review, and can be overturned at other administrative levels.
- Streamline the administrative process to eliminate or "hide" forms or documentation that are largely repetitive, duplicative, or that do not change from one use to the next (e.g., faculty do not need to see or even know about boilerplate forms filed with grants, such as those that certify that UCR is a drugfree workplace).
- Reduce uncertainty, contradictory instructions, and wasted effort by assigning a single person as the source for information on a particular topic. For example, if asked a particular question about contracts or grants, different departmental financial officers and MSOs are likely to provide different answers. Thus, one person should be assigned the responsibility of being <u>the</u> resource person on that particular topic, so that faculty and staff receive consistent answers to questions, and so that procedures are consistent across all units.

5.3 Research and Scholarly Support

A goal of the strategic plan is likely to be to augment UCR's research productivity. In this case, the number of research proposals generated by the campus will have to increase. This will require that an adequate infrastructure be established to support the activity. Given the discontent with the current structure and the fact of limited resources, it seems reasonable to reconsider the proposal generation process at UCR in its totality: if UCR was unconstrained and could modify any/all of its related processes, how should the campus design a proposal production and approval process for 2020 to handle the expected increase in the number of proposals, while maximizing the efficiency of associated campus wide operations? UCR should appoint a Task Force to undertake a comprehensive and constructive review of "end-to-end" process enhancements involving PIs, departments, colleges, as well as various

campus support units. The review process should yield a set of recommendations by December 2010.

5.4   Information Infrastructure – Technologies & Information Services

Information technology and services are tightly integrated throughout all campus activities, from scholarly research, teaching, and learning initiatives to virtually all aspects of campus administrative and academic operations. For the purposes of this Strategic Planning Report, the Information Infrastructure recommendations are divided into two components:
- Information Technology Infrastructure which supports the general campus; and,
- Library Research Resources and Information Services Infrastructure that support instruction, research, and campus wide access to scholarly information.

Technology Information Infrastructure. Properly leveraged, information technology and services are transformative elements that can support campus *strategic* initiatives and can also enable and promote *effective* and *efficient* academic and administrative services and operations.

In recent months, a group of faculty and campus administrators have been investigating new ways in which technology might be best utilized to facilitate implementation of the campus strategic plan and to enhance overall campus academic and administration operations. The committee's report [7] contains both strategic and operational recommendations that directly relate to the charge of this subcommittee. Following is a brief overview of these recommendations:
- Governance and Organizational Structures.
  Information technology has and will continue to play an increasing role in innovative pedagogy to enhanced student success, improved collaboration and communications, leading edge research and knowledge creation, effective outreach and public service, and efficient administrative operations, and improved campus transparency. This necessitates (as never before) robust and reliable technology systems, support, and services. UCR should therefore thoughtfully create the governance, organizational structures, and processes to ensure the most effective and profound utilization and leveraging of information technology in the years ahead. It is therefore recommended that UCR act as follows:
    o *Form an Enterprise Information Technology Governance Group*. This group will ensure that all of the various campus information technology initiatives are aligned with the campus overall strategic vision and meet the most pressing, mission critical institutional objectives. It will also provide one clear source of direction from campus to the IT group.
    o *Form an Information Technology Interoperability/Integration Committee*. Given the pending increase of Cloud Computing Services and the associated requirements for interoperability, the Information Technology Interoperability / Integration Committee will review all information technology projects that exceed a certain budget threshold. The Committee will determine if the proposed technological approach is the most efficient and effective and will best match the campus' long term information technology architectural vision.
    o *Enhance Information Technology Communications and Transparency*. It is proposed that UCR create regular formal interactions with the Dean's Council, the Operations Council, and the Chancellor's Cabinet that will enable dialog and discussion on information technology and services, specific projects and priorities, and challenges and successes the campus is currently experiencing.
- Specific System, Process, and Operational Goals/Objectives
  As UCR considers acting on and deploying various academic and administrative systems in the

years ahead, it should do so with a clear objective of streamlining operations to allow campus resources to be reallocated to enhance campus research, teaching, and public service efforts. Although the information technology and services visioning document [7] contains too many specific recommendations to list here, the following few are illustrative of how UCR might more optimally develop and deploy technologies and systems in the years ahead:

- o *Smarter / More Intelligent Business Systems*.
- o *Faculty / Graduate Student / Staff Self Service Functionality*.
- o *Academic Business Systems – Increased Resources*.
- o *Availability of Online Training and Business Process Expertise*.

In summary, as UCR considers its future and creates a vision to guide its journey toward increased preeminence and enhanced service to the region, state, and nation, information technology and information services holds great promise as core resources enabling and facilitating achievement of campus aspirations and strategic goals. UCR should therefore thoughtfully create the governance, organizational structures, and processes to ensure the most effective and profound utilization and leveraging of information technology in the years ahead.

Research Resources and Library Information Services Infrastructure. The University's library and information services directly impact the strategic planning in four task force areas: Academic excellence, Excellence in graduate education, Excellence in undergraduate education, and Excellence in research and creative activities. As such, the information services infrastructure must be planned and supported to leverage the goals of the strategic planning process in achieving excellence and AAU status. Finding effective and innovative ways to resolve library funding base and research support issues are essential to advancing UCR's national reputation/ranking to a top 25 public research university and to achieving AAU status.

5.5 Educational Process

Various facets of the UCR educational process should be considered for improvement with the joint goals of maintaining access and diversity, increasing quality, and decreasing costs to UCR.

- Enrollment management. UCR is at a point where the university can take control of various issues that impact academic excellence and cost structures, including more selective admissions, increased retention, and decreased normative time to graduation.
  - o Improved retention. Increasing retention enhances the state's return on its invested resources. Retention has become a chronic problem which to date has resisted attempts at improvement.
  - o Decreasing the time to graduation. The objective would be to streamline course offerings to ensure that students can obtain the courses that they need, when they need them, and in the logical sequence, to increase the number of students finishing degrees in four years.
- Decreased costs of preparatory programs. Significant resources currently are expended on preparatory programs. This is a cost to the state that could be decreased by charging the cost of such programs to the students that they serve. Additionally, the need for such programs could be reduced by a more selective admissions policy, at the cost of a slower rate of enrollment growth.
- Academic advising. The professionalization of academic counseling and the resources this entails should be submitted to cost-benefit analysis. Given the information technology skills of today's undergraduates, most routine academic counseling needs can be met via the numerous campus websites. As with other units, metrics and benchmarks should be put in place for each

counseling unit, to ensure that each dollar invested in such resources results in significant payoffs in increased retention and/or decreased time to graduation.

- Quarters versus Semesters. The subcommittee was asked to investigate the cost tradeoffs inherent in converting from Quarters to Semesters. While the subcommittee considered the issue important, due to the late timing of the request, the subcommittee did not have time to perform a thorough study. We recommend that a task force be assigned to investigate the issue.

5.6 Faculty Line Accounting

Given the importance of faculty FTE to achieving the mission of the University, the objective of decreasing reliance on State General Funds, and the objective to improve transparency and accountability, the Committee felt it justified to make the topic of "unfilled faculty lines" a separate section in its report. This is a topic that is not well-understood and therefore often misconceived. Faculty lines are and accounting mechanism used within UC to allocate resources to the Colleges and Schools. Funds from such "faculty lines" can only be used in support of the educational mission of the university, but need not be allocated to hiring ladder rank faculty. UCR tracks all expenditures charged against "faculty lines" to ensure that such funds are not misspent.

The tradeoffs – between filling all allocated faculty lines or leaving some lines unfilled so that the associated resources can be used for educational expenses other than faculty salaries – are nuanced. For example, resources from unfilled faculty lines are sometimes used to hire lectures, who have higher teaching loads that ladder rank faculty. To fill this set of faculty lines would require laying off the lecturers. To maintain the same number or course offerings, the faculty in the affected programs might have to accept significantly higher teaching loads. Higher teaching loads would be expected to adversely affect research productivity. To fill the faculty lines, while retaining the lecturers, would require UCR to obtain new sources of funding from other non-state general fund revenue streams.

Therefore, it is imperative that the "faculty line" resources be used, whether "filled" or "unfilled," in ways that move UCR toward its strategic mission and goals. Towards this end, the number and distribution of unfilled faculty lines, both those held centrally and those held within the units, should be public information, preferably with benchmark comparisons to our sister campuses.

The "unfilled faculty line" account and resource allocation approach does have negative implications for either the reality or the perception of UCR's academic excellence

- This accounting method is not transparent. Few people on campus understand the accounting or the allocation methods. Also, few understand the tradeoffs between filled and unfilled uses of the resource.
- This accounting method contributes to negative public perception. Statements similar to "UCR achieved its budget cuts by returning unfilled faculty lines" are easily misunderstood by the general public to mean that the university has extra unused resources.

An alternative resource allocation method should be considered.

5.7 Deferred Maintenance Planning

Currently, UCR has no central mechanism to plan for and fund deferred maintenance. Yet, maintenance and renovation of facilities is necessary to keep up with progress in educational and research processes, and to remain compliant with federal and state regulations. It can also play a critical role in student and faculty recruiting, faculty and student retention, accreditation, research productivity, and the general

campus mood. Facilities maintenance remains a major challenge for the colleges and schools and academic support units at UCR.

- UCR should find a funding mechanism for deferred maintenance.
- UCR should institute planning approach to prioritize known deferred maintenance issues while maintaining a prudent fund balance for emergency situations.

5.8 Additional Issues

There are even more examples of costly practices and initiatives pertaining to resource use on the campus that merit close examination and reconsideration, including but not limited to: (a) Division I sports, (b) the Palm Desert Campus, (c) new and old centers and schools, especially those that absorb resources while producing little or no net revenue, (d) the inflation of administrative titles and the salary enhancements that accompany these new roles, (d) the decentralization of many administrative functions, and (e) the number and organization of the colleges. These issues were raised in discussions, but the subcommittee did not have time to formulate opinions or recommendations on these topics.

Bibliography

1. G. Bolar, "The Colors of Money," October 2, 2008.
2. C. Newfield, H. Bohn, C. Moore, "Current Budget Trends and the Future of the University of California," University of California Committee on Planning and Budget, May 2006.
3. C. Newfield, A. Dickson, A. Klein, B. Nachtergaele, "The Cuts Report," University of California Committee on Planning and Budget, March 2008.
4. "P&B Recommendations to the Chancellor on the Budget Crisis," UCR Academic Senate Committee on Planning and Budget, April 2009.
5. "The UC Santa Cruz Budget – A Bird's Eye View," UCSD Office of Planning and Budget, 2009-2010 edition, December 2009.
6. "The Berkeley Budget Primer," UC Berkeley, Budget and Resource Planning, December 2009.
7. "UCR Information Technology and Communications Services – A Vision for the Future: Optimizing Strategic Impact, Ensuring Effective Services, Building Robust Infrastructures," C. Rowley and IT Visioning Committee, January 2010

Appendix A

The subcommittee members are

Mike Adams	Entom. & Neuroscience	Academic Senate, Planning & Budget Rep.
Chris Bardeen	Chemistry	
Monica Carson	Biomedical Sciences	
Peter Chung	AGSM	Academic Senate, Planning & Budget Rep.
Jay Farrell	Electrical Engineering	Chair
Mary Gauvain	Psychology	Vice Chair
Matt Hull	Academic Budget & Planning	
Ruth Jackson	University Librarian	
Jocelyn Millar	Entomology	
Lisa Nguyen	Student Representative	
Swanne Gordon	Graduate Student Representative	
Holly Prebble	Development	
Charles Rowley	Assoc. VC C&C	
Jim Sandoval	VC Student Affairs	
Jonathan Turner	Sociology	
Michael Vanderwood	Grad. School of Education.	

Karim Zahedi from the Chancellor/EVC/Provost Office provides staff support.

Appendix B

For the purpose of this report, the administrative organizational units on campus are:

Academic Organizational Units	Nonacademic Organizational Units
Anderson School of Management	Academic Senate
Bourns College of Engineering	Athletics
College of Humanities Arts & Social Sciences	Chancellor and Executive VC & Provost
College of Natural & Agricultural Sciences	Computing & Communications
Division of Biomedical Sciences	Finance and Business Operations
Graduate School of Education	Graduate Division
	Library
	Palm Desert
	University Extension
	VC Research
	VC Student Affairs
	VC University Advancement
	VP Undergraduate Education

In the 08/09 academic year, UCR was organized into the 21 OU's including, the nineteen listed above, plus Administration and Administration-OMP. As of Summer 2009, Administration and Administration-OMP have been reorganized into the nineteen remaining OU's.

Appendix C

This appendix contains the data that is discussed in Section 4. The subcommittee first attempted to use Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) data from the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) for the set of peer institutions requested by the Strategic Planning Steering Committee; however, the IPED's summary data for UCR was not comparable with UCR's internal data given the step down allocations added into the IPED's data submission by UCOP. Therefore, the peer institutions in this section are selected UC campuses for which we have comparable data from the Campus Financial Schedules (UC-CFS) of the UC Annual Financial Reports (http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/finreports/index.php?file=/07-08/finschd.html and from the UC Statistical Summary of Students and Staff (**http://www.ucop.edu/ucophome/uwnews/stat/**). The data is published each Spring. The most recent data available is for the 2007/2008 academic year.

Table 1 – Top: Comparison of Expenditures for Eight Major Revenue Streams Across Four UC Campuses Expressed in 1000's of Dollars. Bottom: Comparison of Percentage of Total Expenditures from Each Revenue Stream.

Institution	State Appropriations	Federal Appropriations	Tuition & Fees (Net of Scholarship Allowance)	Contr. & Grants	Aux Enterprises	Sales & Services of Educational Activities	Private Giving	Other
UC-Davis	488,665	4,485	246,201	416,195	93,319	256,986	138,563	34,106
UC -Irvine	270,852	0	213,423	235,361	158,690	136,078	94,863	46,241
UC-Riverside	**169,487**	**1,135**	**124,254**	**93,465**	**52,679**	**3,250**	**29,706**	**14,997**
UC -SB	224,361	0	176,479	141,896	89,828	5,870	71,008	34,541

	State Appropriations	Federal Appropriations	Tuition & Fees	Contr. & Grants	Aux Enterprises	Sales & Services	Private Giving	Other
UC-Davis	29%	0%	15%	25%	6%	15%	8%	2%
UC -Irvine	23%	0%	18%	20%	14%	12%	8%	4%
UC-Riverside	**35%**	**0%**	**25%**	**19%**	**11%**	**1%**	**6%**	**3%**
UC -SB	30%	0%	24%	19%	12%	1%	10%	5%
average	29%	0%	21%	21%	11%	7%	8%	3%
median	30%	0%	21%	20%	11%	6%	8%	4%

Source: FY 2007-08 Campus Financial Schedule A – Current Fund Revenues.

Table 2 – Comparison of Expenditures per Headcount Student for each of the Eight Major Revenue Streams.

Institution	State Gen Funds	Federal Approp.	Tuition & Fees	Contr. & Grants	Aux	S&S	Private Giving	Other	Total
UC-Davis	$17,155	$157	$8,643	$14,611	$3,276	$9,022	$4,864	$1,197	$58,926
UC -Irvine	$10,514	$0	$8,285	$9,136	$6,160	$5,282	$3,682	$1,795	$44,855
UC-Riverside	**$9,890**	**$66**	**$7,250**	**$5,454**	**$3,074**	**$190**	**$1,733**	**$875**	**$28,532**
UC -SB	$10,479	$0	$8,243	$6,628	$4,196	$274	$3,317	$1,613	$34,749
average	$12,010	$56	$8,105	$8,957	$4,176	$3,692	$3,399	$1,370	$41,766
median	$10,497	$33	$8,264	$7,882	$3,736	$2,778	$3,500	$1,405	$39,802

Table 3 – Comparison of Expenditures per FTE Faculty for each of the Eight Major Revenue Streams.

Institution	State Gen Funds	Federal Approp.	Tuition & Fees	Contr. & Grants	Aux	S&S	Private Giving	Other	Total
UC-Davis	$84,970	$780	$42,810	$72,369	$16,227	$44,685	$24,094	$5,930	$291,866
UC -Irvine	$67,109	$0	$52,880	$58,315	$39,319	$33,716	$23,504	$11,457	$286,300
UC-Riverside	**$93,743**	**$628**	**$68,725**	**$51,695**	**$29,137**	**$1,798**	**$16,430**	**$8,295**	**$270,450**
UC -SB	$92,826	$0	$73,016	$58,707	$37,165	$2,429	$29,379	$14,291	$307,813
average	$84,662	$352	$59,358	$60,272	$30,462	$20,657	$23,352	$9,993	$289,107
median	$88,898	$314	$60,802	$58,511	$33,151	$18,072	$23,799	$9,876	$289,083

Table 4 – Top: Raw data for Student Headcount and FTE Faculty and Staff. Bottom: Ratios of Students per FTE Faculty and Staff.

Institution Name	Grand Total - ALL STUDENTS (Fall 2007)	Grand Total - Under-graduates (Fall 2007)	Grand Total - Graduate Students (Fall 2007)	Total FTE - All Staff - April 2008	Academic Staff - April 2008	Executive and Management Staff - April 2008	Professional and Support Staff - April 2008
	Headcount	Headcount	Headcount	**Total Staff**	Academic Staff*	Administrative	Staff (non-academic)
UC-Davis	**28,485**	23,499	4,986	**20,945**	5,751	867	14,327
UC -Irvine	**25,761**	21,733	4,028	**12,773**	4,036	724	8,013
UC-Riverside	**17,138**	15,041	2,097	**4,751**	**1,808**	**234**	**2,709**
UC -SB	**21,410**	18,429	2,981	**6,128**	2,417	330	3,381
	Ratios to total students			Student/(All Staff)	Student/(Acad. Staff)	Student/(Ex. Staff)	Student/(Prof. Staff)
UC -Davis	100%	82%	18%	1.4	5.0	32.9	2.0
UC -Irvine	100%	84%	16%	2.0	6.4	35.6	3.2
UC-Riverside	**100%**	**88%**	**12%**	**3.6**	**9.5**	**73.2**	**6.3**
UC -SB	100%	86%	14%	3.5	8.9	64.9	6.3

* Represents ladder faculty, Lecturers, Associates-In, Visiting Assistant Professors, Adjuncts, Librarians, Academic Administrators, Professional Researchers, Post-Docs, etc.

SOURCE OF DATA: IPEDS

Table 5 – Sales and Services Expenditure Data for the Nine General Campuses of the UC System.

Campus	Expenditures[1]	Faculty FTE[2]	Avg per Faculty
Davis	$258,519,000	1,456	$177,595
Irvine	$169,912,000	1,343	$126,474
Los Angeles	$562,623,000	1,868	$301,187
San Diego	$238,798,000	1,382	$172,798
Berkeley	$88,024,000	1,833	$48,032
Merced	$46,000	143	$321
Riverside	$3,219,000	937	$3,437
Santa Barbara	$4,311,000	1,150	$3,747
Santa Cruz	$7,224,000	838	$8,616
UC Median w/ Med	$248,658,500	1,419	$175,196
UC Median w/o Med	$4,311,000	937	$3,747
UC AVG w/ Med	*$307,463,000*	*1,512*	*$194,513*
UC AVG w/o Med	*$20,564,800*	*980*	*$12,831*

[1] FY07-08 Campus Financial Statements Schedule D - Sales and Services of Educational Acitivties

[2] UCOP-Budget Office General Campus Budgeted Faculty FTE. Represents campus's budgeted ladder-rank faculty FTE, both Filled and Unfilled.