

Committee on Library & Scholarly Communication (LASC)

Tuesday, December 1, 2020

9:00 am – 10:30 am

Zoom Information:<https://ucmerced.zoom.us/j/2092286312>

Meeting ID: 209 228 6312

Password: 817585

Documents found at UCM Box: [LASC AY-20-21](#)**I. Chair's Report – *Maria DePrano* (9:00 – 9:30)**

- A. UCOLASC meeting November 18
- B. Update on Elsevier negotiations
- C. Introduce UC Merced budget issues
- D. Brainstorm potential means to communicate about open access and transformative agreements with the university community

II. Campus Review Items – (9:30 – 9:50)**A. [Academic Planning Targets](#)**

These are proposed institutional-level targets for a select subset of the Measures developed by the Academic Planning Work Group.

As part of this review, to inform the development of the campus' strategic plan, the Senate is asked to advise on the following two items:

1. The proposed targets.
2. The institutional support and infrastructure that need to be developed for the campus to reach the three, five and 10-year targets outlined in the document.

Action: LASC members are to discuss. LASC's comments are due to the Senate Chair by Tuesday, January 12, 2021.

B. [MAPP 025 – Conflict of Commitment and Outside Professional Activities](#)

This section supersedes the current [MAPP 1003](#).

Per APM 025-14, all faculty holding appointments in the following title series are subject to this policy: (1) Professor, including Acting titles, (2) Professor in Residence, (3) Adjunct Professor, (4) Professor of Clinical (e.g., Medicine), (5) Health Sciences Clinical Professor, (6) Clinical Professor of Dentistry, (7) Lecturer with Security of Employment, including Acting titles. The title series currently used at UC Merced which are subject to this policy include: Professor, Adjunct Professor, and Lecturer with Security of Employment (also known as Teaching Professor).

Summarized below are the proposed key policy revisions:

- i. Renumbered the policy as MAPP 025 to align with the system-wide policy [APM 025](#)
- ii. Reformatted the content to align with the system-wide policy outline
- iii. Removed language that is redundant of system-wide policy
- iv. Outlined key responsibilities for Faculty, Department Chairs, Deans, the Associate Vice Provost for the Faculty, and the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel

In light of current Senate activities related to anti-Black racism, Senate Chair DeLugan invites committees to review this item with special attention to generating recommendations for ways to intentionally maximize and promote equity, diversity, and inclusion, reduce, and eventually eliminate anti-Black racism and other forms of structural racism and inequities.

Action: LASC members are to discuss. Comments are due to the Senate Chair by Tuesday, January 12, 2021.

III. Consent Calendar (9:50– 9:55)

- A. Today's agenda
- B. [Draft September 16 meeting minutes](#)

Action requested: approval of Consent Calendar

IV. Consultation with University Librarian – *Haipeng Li* (9:55 – 10:25)

- A. Access to library materials during COVID-19
- B. Update on building the Sierra Nevada/Central Valley Research Archive at UC Merced
- C. Campus and Library Strategic Planning
- D. Medical education impact on Library planning

V. Other Business (10:25 – 10:30)

Committee on Library & Scholarly Communication (LASC)

Wednesday, September 16, 2020

11:30 am – 1:00 pm

Documents found at UCM Box: [LASC AY 20-21](#)

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Library and Scholarly Communications met at 11:30 am on September 16, 2020 via Zoom, Chair Maria DePrano presiding.

Attendees: Chair Maria DePrano, University Librarian Haipeng Li, Vice Chair Virginia Adán-Lifante, David Strubbe, and Changqing Li.

I. Chair's Report – *Maria DePrano***A. Introduction of members**

Chair DePrano welcomed new and returning members.

B. [Guide to Senate Committee Membership](#)

Chair DePrano shared a PowerPoint, which was made available to members on the LASC Box site.

Chair DePrano reviewed the following topics:

- Committee Membership:
 - Some committees consist of only Senate faculty, while others include both Senate faculty and student members
 - Ex-officio members contribute their perspective to issues, thereby facilitating informed deliberation and decision-making. Librarian Li is the ex-officio member for LASC.
- Member Rights:
 - All committee members are granted permission to speak.
 - Senate members participate and vote.
 - Ex-Officio members and student members are allowed to speak but cannot vote.
- Consultants and Guests:
 - Consultants are usually campus staff or administrators that provide subject matter expertise to the committee.
 - Guests are usually university staff or administrators that are invited to join a committee for a specific purpose.
- Committee Meetings and Executive Sessions:
 - Committee meetings are intended to facilitate the business of the committee.

- Executive sessions are held at times when the committee must discuss and act upon sensitive or confidential information in closed session. These sessions are not recorded or included in the minutes. There are set principles to guide the practice of Executive sessions.

C. May 20 UCOLASC Meeting Update

The Chair of LASC at every UC campus serves on the systemwide version of LASC which is called the University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC). Meetings are usually held three times a year.

Chair DePrano summarized the main topics discussed at the AY 19-20 UCOLASC meetings:

- An emergency meeting was called on May 15, where members were introduced to a transformative agreement between the UC system and Springer Nature. UCOLASC endorsed this transformative agreement, and it has been signed and implemented.
- Another emergency meeting was called on July 15, where UCOLASC endorsed reopening negotiations with Elsevier.
- May 20 UCOLASC meeting:
 - California Digital Library (CDL) Update – The Executive Director of CDL provided an update on the UCOP budget. All acquisitions will be given to UC San Diego. UC San Diego will be completing the purchasing for CDL.
 - The White House OSTP (Office of Science and Technology Policy) Consultation – The CDL wrote a memo to the White House OSTP requesting input on what universities and publishers think about a zero embargo for federally funded data and research. UCOLASC wrote a memo supporting the zero embargo. UC Merced LASC and the Committee on Research (CoR) together distributed a memo supporting a zero embargo. The CDL Executive Director attended a meeting at the White House to discuss the potential zero embargo.
 - Licensing updates – Additional money was given to CDL to purchase e-books under JSTOR (Journal Storage) and Project Muse.
 - Systemwide Integrated Library System (SILS) Update – SILS issued a Request for Proposals (RFP), selected a vendor, and a project manager has been hired. SILS will unify all libraries together under one catalog system. It will have an 18-month implementation period and there are hopes for

completion by 2021; COVID has delayed the process.

- HathiTrust ETA (Emergency Temporary Access) – Although UC Merced has curbside service to acquire physical books during the pandemic, ETA provides access to digital books and books that have been digitally scanned that the UC system owns, without violating copyright issues.
- Project Transform Working Group – Springer Nature is the second largest publisher in North America. The UC pays most publishers to read their articles; however, their agreement with Springer Nature allows access to articles as well as publishing, using a multipayer model. This is a 3-year pilot project with no price increase. \$1000 of the cost is paid by the Library and the remainder of the cost can be paid three different ways:
 - 1) The author can pay the remaining amount using their research funding.
 - 2) If the author does not have the funding, the Library will pay the remaining amount.
 - 3) The author can request that the article not be published OA.

Chair DePrano shared a list of other publishers that the UC currently has a transformative agreement with:

- Traditional Publishers:
 - Association of Computer Machinery (ACM)
 - Cambridge University Press
- OA Journals:
 - Public Library of Science (PLOS)
 - Journal of Medical Internet and Research (JMIR)

LASC members asked for clarification on the following topics:

- UC Merced's access to books online:

Librarian Li explained that each campus has a different online catalog. UC Merced utilizes the SILS system. This not only helps to streamline workflow but also provides easier access for users.
- The transformative agreement with Springer Nature:

Chair DePrano and Librarian Li explained that the contract has been signed and CDL is negotiating logistics with Springer Nature on the UC's behalf. The UC had two goals: cost reduction and open access, accomplishing both with Springer Nature. Many publishers have been pushing back about reducing costs, but Springer Nature gave UC Merced a deal for the first couple of years at a reasonable cost. Springer Nature also surpassed expectations for the open access point. Nature journals are not a part of this agreement, but it is important to note that Springer

Nature made a commitment to include them in the future.

The next UCOLASC meeting will take place in November and Chair DePrano will share updates at the December 1st LASC Meeting.

D. Spring 2020 Elsevier poll results

The UC's Council of University Librarians (CoUL) launched a poll in early Spring to assess the impact of the loss of immediate access to Elsevier journals. The poll was open for five weeks and was completed by over 7,300 UC affiliates.

Chair DePrano shared the UC systemwide poll results:

- Impact on residents:
 - 33% reported significant impact
 - 44% reported some impact
 - 21% reported no impact
- Impact on scientists involved in health sciences:
 - 52% reported significant impact
 - 40% reported some impact
 - 6% reported no impact
- How respondents acquired the Elsevier articles when they were not available:
 - 37% - asking a colleague at another institution
 - 27% - finding them online
 - 14% - using interlibrary loan
 - 11% - asking the author
 - 27% - did not pursue any method to obtain the article
- In regard to support for the UC's position, 39% of general respondents supported UC's goals of cost containment and establishing open access to UC research (18% for health sciences respondents), 25% understand what the UC is trying to accomplish although it is causing an inconvenience (26% for health sciences respondents), and 14% indicated frustration with the process (24% for health sciences respondents).
- The impact of respondents' relationship with Elsevier:
 - 68% reported no impact
 - 15% reported that it affects their decision to publish in Elsevier journals
 - 13% reported it affects their reviewing of Elsevier articles.

Despite the inconvenience, there is still strong support for the UC's position in reengaging in negotiations with Elsevier.

E. Renewed Elsevier negotiations

Elsevier negotiations began again in July. UCOLASC and CoUL are in support of the reopening of negotiations, and are hoping Elsevier provides a deal by December 2020.

The main conflict with Elsevier is that they are a very expensive subscription. They are the largest scholarly publishing company in the world, owning most of the scientific journals. Their price increases every year, and they are reluctant to work with the UC on reducing their costs. They charge for both subscriptions and open access for publications (through APCs) and have been uninterested in open access, but have recently shown interest.

F. AY 20-21 LASC goals and priorities:

Chair DePrano shared the following list of goals and priorities for AY 20-21 with LASC members:

- Continue to work with UGC, GC, and CAPRA to ensure and/or encourage authors of proposals for new programs, schools, ORUs to consult with library leadership early in the process of writing their proposals.
- Monitor the recently reopened UC negotiations with Elsevier, give input via UCOLASC as needed, and update the UC Merced community as appropriate.
- Support the University Library through the program review process.
- Communicate about open access and transformative agreements with the university community. Chair DePrano would like LASC members to brainstorm how to effectively communicate this, especially with SNS and SoE faculty.
- Support the Library in establishing the Sierra Nevada / Central Valley Archival Hub as appropriate.
- Address Library support for research, teaching, and learning within the context of the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic.

Action: Members are to send additional goals/priorities they may have via email to Chair DePrano and copy LASC Analyst Melanie Snyder.

II. Consent Calendar

A. Today's agenda

Action: The Consent Calendar was approved as presented.

III. Consultation with University Librarian – *Haipeng Li*

Librarian Li further discussed the results from the Elsevier poll, comparing UC Merced's results with the overall UC results:

Several responses were received UC systemwide, with 216 responses from UC Merced. The responses were separated by the different schools in UC Merced, as well as by status (i.e. faculty, staff, students, postdocs, etc.). UC Merced's results were similar to the overall UC responses.

Librarian Li shared the overall UC poll results and compared them with the UC Merced poll results:

- 33% reported significant impact (36% for UC Merced)
- 44% reported some impact (46% for UC Merced)
- 21% reported no impact (18% for UC Merced)

Quantitative data was presented to us but was not widely shared because sensitive data was included. Librarian Li shared confidential information with the committee.

A member asked why undergraduate student participation was higher than graduate student participation.

- This could be because of the type of assignment, or also because several undergraduate students help faculty with their research.

A. Support for research, teaching and learning during COVID-19

The pandemic has been causing several issues for the campus, even though UC Merced does not have many reported COVID-19 cases. A month ago, Librarian Li attended a meeting with campus leadership to discuss the reopening of the library. During the meeting, members were informed they were not allowed to reopen due to the increased numbers of COVID-19 cases in Merced.

Shortly after, the government's new tier system was established, which must be considered before the reopening of the Library. Merced is still in the top tier, and it will take some time to come down to the lower tier. Until then, the Library will remain closed.

Many concerns arose and a meeting with Humanities faculty was held. Faculty came up with several ideas in addition to the HathiTrust Emergency Service:

- Added Jove video content to assist the Science and Engineering faculty
- Offered curbside pickup service
- Instituted a mail delivery service

Interlibrary Loan (ILL):

Unfortunately, ILL operations have not resumed because several campuses still do not allow access to physical buildings. Therefore, UC Merced has limited access to materials. Some campuses are relaxed, while others are very strict. For example, UC Davis currently allows a

study space for students. On the other hand, UC Merced is currently housing approximately 500 students, and the dorm rooms are occupied by one student per room to manage social distancing. In order to assist students with their studies, many online services are offered at UC Merced. Such services include Library Instruction, Data Curation help, Data Carpentry, workshops, etc. Digitization services are available to faculty as well who need assistance with scanning, digitizing, and uploading their materials to CatCourses.

B. Library Planning Updates

a. Strategic Planning:

- The process began last year and there were hopes for completion by Summer 2020. Unfortunately, the process has been delayed due to COVID-19 but are still hoping for completion by the end of this semester. Strategic Planning addresses the entire spectrum of Library operations.

b. Academic Planning:

- Focuses on the academic aspect of Library operations, and is currently being incorporated into Strategic Planning efforts.

c. Periodic Review:

- Delayed due to COVID-19.

d. Budget Planning - 5% Reduction:

- Three scenarios were given by campus directive:
 - Keep the budget as is with no increase and no reduction.
 - 5% reduction in budget.
 - No increase in budget but growth in faculty and students.

This caused many concerns. UC Merced was asked to cope with the 5% reduction. How can faculty plan with a 5% reduction of their entire budget?

Librarian Li shared a Workforce and Budget Planning document that was provided to the planning team. Approximately two years ago, an organizational efficiency and sustainability effort was implemented among campus leadership. The Library was granted ten positions, with four of them slated for hiring this year. The 5% reduction can be used for some of these positions even though not all are filled yet, or some of the positions that count toward the 5% reduction can be given up. There were plans to fill these positions in order to cope with campus growth; however, the campus is currently going through a hiring freeze.

The Library can use these positions to count toward the 5% reduction or they will have to find money to cut elsewhere in their budget. After discussions at the Library Executive Committee meetings, it was decided that it may be better to give up the four allocated positions. The salaries of the four positions would amount to the 5% reduction from their entire budget. A 5% reduction in the Library's budget equates close to \$300,000. The four positions at \$70,000 salary each equates to approximately \$300,000 and money elsewhere can be found to make up the difference. This is probably the least disruptive scenario in

terms of Library operations because the Library would not know where else to locate \$300,000. This plan has been submitted to the EVC/Provost's office, and once that office receives responses from all schools, further discussions regarding the plan will take place.

UC Merced's programs are continuing to grow. New faculty will be hired and new students will be recruited, and at the same time the campus must cut their budget. Every UC campus is experiencing the 5% reduction. Because UC Merced is small, the Library will experience a large impact from the 5% reduction.

It will be difficult for the Library to complete several significant projects over the next couple years. One such project is the archival hub project. The Library has support from the Chancellor, EVC/Provost, LASC, and many faculty members to move forward with this project. A donor is interested in donating his library to UC Merced, which includes materials associated with Yosemite National Park. Also, the Sequoia National Park has been ordered to evacuate, so all materials will be moved from that archive to UC Merced. Furthermore, the Sierra National Forest agreed to give the UC Merced Library their archives because they do not have the space to house them. Unfortunately, these projects are put on hold due to the current circumstances.

A LASC member asked why projects are being put on hold if emergency evacuations are taking place. Librarian Li explained that some projects are on hold in terms of planning. The Library does not have the funding to process archival materials or to permanently house them at this time. However, in response to the current emergencies, the Library must find temporary space until the archives can be permanently housed.

C. Support for New Programs

a. Gallo School - Masters of Data Science

- Director Paul Maglio met with Library administration regarding the Masters of Data Science program. The school will most likely not be established for another two years; however, the Masters of Data Science program is moving forward. This new program will need Library support in several ways:
 - GIS support with Spark operations
 - Data Carpentry workshops
 - Collections support
 - Data Literacy for instruction
- There are plans for a data bootcamp. The Library team will work with students at a week-long bootcamp once they are recruited to ensure they are provided with a sufficient level of information and education.

b. Medical Education -

- BRIDGES Charter Taskforce - UCSF, UCSF Fresno and UC Merced to develop UC Merced medical education pipeline program in the next 1-2 years
 - Medical Education Director Thelma Hurd is leading this effort. The Library is involved in providing support for this group.

- Masters of Public Health –
 - Library administration met with Professor Irene Yen, who is leading this effort. Discussions occurred regarding possibilities for the Library to provide support.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 1:33 pm.

Attest: Maria DePrano, LASC Chair

DRAFT



OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLOR AND PROVOST

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
MERCED 5200 N. LAKE ROAD
MERCED, CA 95343
(209) 228-4439

November 10, 2020

Dear Robin:

For Senate review, please find attached proposed institutional-level targets for a select subset of the Measures developed by the Academic Planning Work Group to define and track the campus's progress on the Indices of Success and associated Criteria. The enclosed documentation provides an overview of how the targets were developed and the context for their use. Also attached are the data that supported their development and the list of APWG Measures, with the subset of Measures for which institutional targets have been proposed, highlighted.

As part of this review, I ask that the Senate advise on the following two items:

- 1. The proposed targets.**
- 2. The institutional support and infrastructure that need to be developed for the campus to reach the three, five and 10-year targets outlined in the document.**

The second item is equally important as the first; the Senate's feedback on these needs will inform development of the campus' strategic plan, which is to be grounded in academic planning.

As possible, I would very much appreciate the Senate's feedback by January 22, 2020.

I recognize establishing institutional-level targets is a significant step in the academic planning process. Considering this, I encourage Senate committees, as they consider the targets, to consult with Associate EVC/Provost Kurt Schnier and Assistant EVC/Provost Laura Martin. Kurt and Laura will be reaching out to committees with the offer to meet, answer questions, and provide additional context for committee's consideration.

Thank you very much for facilitating the faculty's review of this important component of the academic planning process and for generating input critical to the development of the campus strategic plan.

Sincerely,

Gregg Camfield
Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, UC Merced

CC: Kurt Schnier, Associate Provost, Planning and Budget
Laura Martin, Assistant EVC/Provost, Academic Planning & Institutional Assessment
Rich Shintaku, XXX
Fatima Paul, Executive Director, Academic Senate
Senate Office

DRAFT

ACADEMIC PLANNING THREE, FIVE, AND 10-YEAR TARGETS

Overview

The academic planning process currently underway is intended to advance the campus toward the Indices of Success defined by the [Academic Planning Work Group](#) (APWG). Per the APWG, progress is to be assessed using the measures defined by the APWG. Provided below, for campus review, are draft campus-level targets for a key subset of the APWG measures. The proposed targets were developed for measures commonly referenced in academia when evaluating the quality of an institution, including for R1 status. They are also APWG measures for which comparative data are available on the Office of the President's website allowing us to benchmark our own progress against that of our sister campuses (<https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/infocenter>).

Methodology

To develop the campus-level targets provided below, using the system's data (provided as an attachment), we estimated the recent average value¹ for our nearest peers in the UC system (UCR, UCSC and UCSB) and adopted these averages as our 10-year target so that in 2030 we will be on equal footing with our peer UC group.² Intermediate three-year and five-year targets were determined by linearly interpolating the difference between our current campus measure and our targeted level in 2030. "Current values" represent the most recent one-year value available, generally from AY 2018-19. We have chosen to provide, as the current value, the most recent year's value, rather than rolling averages (except when called for by a measure, e.g. "Rolling 5-year average of doctoral degrees conferred"), because the campus will be examining its progress on these targets annually and it will be important to track annually both our progress and the inter-annual variation on our progress.

When enrollment numbers were required to calculate a target, we assumed the campus is targeting a student population of 15,000 students (undergraduate and graduate combined) in 10 years' time. There are a few exceptions to this methodology which are detailed below. More generally, more nuanced methods for determining three and five-year targets were considered, for instance, considering the distribution of faculty appointments in estimating contract and grant awards or otherwise examining drivers of some of these measures more specifically. However, given the current fiscal uncertainty around our planning context, and the possibility that sister campus averages may change over time, this more simple and consistent approach was adopted.

Connection with School Level Planning

At the completion of Phase III of the Academic Planning Process in Spring 2021, the campus will have "living" five-year planning documents for each of the schools, the proposed Gallo School, the Library, and the divisions of undergraduate and graduate education. Each year moving forward these plans will be updated annually to reflect what has been accomplished to date and to adjust school plans in support of school goals and achievement of the campus's goals (the Indices of Success). As part of this process, the

¹ Generally, a five-year average except where noted.

² It is possible, in fact likely, that values for our selected peer group (UCR, UCSC and UCSB) will increase over the next 10-years. Should we wish to adjust our targets in anticipation we would appreciate that feedback. This said, as the data indicate, our sister campuses' generally values have been stable over the past few years.

campus will be tracking the school's contributions to advancing the campus's progress on the APWG Measures. The final version of the campus-level targets proposed here will help the Committee on Academic Planning and Resource Allocation (CAPRA) and the EVC/Provost evaluate the campus's overall progress and contextualize the contributions of the schools both individually and collectively.

As of November 9, 2020, the targets are pending Senate and Chancellor review. As such, they are provisional and subject to revision. Please direct any questions about their status to Kurt Schnier (kschnier@ucmerced.edu) and Laura Martin (lmartin@ucmerced.edu).

UC QUALITY SCHOLARLY AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY

Research and Development Expenditures

Total research and development expenditures per Senate faculty member (R1).

The data available from the Office of President is for contracts and grants awarded to each campus. Therefore, we elected to report targets for contract and grant dollars per-faculty member versus the total research expenditures as contract and grants are the component of research expenditures that faculty have direct control over. The denominator for this measure is the total number of Senate faculty as this follows the methodology utilized by Carnegie. Schools may in turn have desired targets that differ from the institutional target, but the collective institutional measure will be monitored.

Our selected nearest peer UCs (UCR, UCSC and UCSB) are all R1 institutions and it is going to be difficult for our campus to reach R1 grant funding levels in the next 10 years. Therefore, we reduced our grant funding per-faculty member to be more in line with a longer time horizon to achieve R1 grant funding levels. The average grant funding per-a-faculty at UCR, UCSC and UCSB is currently \$227K. The proposed 3-, 5- and 10-year targets put us on the trajectory toward R1, albeit it on a longer time horizon. They are as follows:

Current Value (total)	3-year Target (total)	5-year Target (total)	10-year Target (total)
\$137K ³ (~\$40M)	\$145K (~\$50M)	\$150K (~\$57M)	\$180K (~\$86M)

Research Staff

Number of research/technical support staff with a doctorate per faculty member (R1)

The current value for our UC peers is 0.513. This value is correlated with the grant writing target set above. Therefore, we pro-rated the value based on our grant writing target relative to our peer UC campuses ($0.41 = 0.513 * (180/227)$).

Current Value	3-year Target	5-year Target	10-year Target
0.31	0.34	0.37	0.41

UC QUALITY ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

³ Due to the high inter-annual variation in grant funding, we used a five-year moving average.

UC Quality Education*Capacity to Provide UC Quality Education*

Student (declared majors)-to-Senate faculty ratios

Current Value	3-year Target	5-year Target	10-year Target
31:1	30:1	29:1	28:1

UC Quality Education

The percentage of graduating seniors who reported conducting research with a faculty member, outside of regular coursework, as an undergraduate at UC Merced.

Current Value	3-year Target	5-year Target	10-year Target
33%	35%	37%	40%

Doctoral Conferrals

Rolling 5-year average of doctoral degrees conferred (R1). The current average for our UC peers is 261.6 doctoral degrees conferred. The average peer ratio of the doctoral degrees conferred to Senate faculty is 0.36. If we reach 15,000 students in 2030 and assume 14,000 are undergraduates with a desired student-to-faculty ratio of 28:1, we would have 500 faculty.⁴ With a ratio of 0.36 this would imply 180 doctoral degrees conferred, which will be our 10-year target.

Current Value	3-year Target	5-year Target	10-year Target
45.2	90.1	120.1	180

Measure #3 under Doctoral Conferrals in the APWG documents is the number of graduate students (broken down by Masters and PhD students) enrolled per a faculty member. The institutional targets for these two are provided below.

Number of PhD students (students per Senate faculty member). The average for our UC peers is 2.63 PhD students per Senate faculty member. Given the analysis done for the doctoral degrees conferred if we had 500 faculty with 15,000 students this would imply that at 2.63 PhD students per a faculty member that we would have 1,315 PhD students.

Current Value	3-year Target	5-year Target	10-year Target
696 (~2.31)	902 (~2.42)	1,040 (~2.49)	1,315 (~2.63)

Number of Professional Degree/Masters students (students per Senate faculty member). The average number of Professional Degree/Masters students per Senate faculty member enrolled at our peer UC campuses is 1.04. Given the analysis done for the doctoral conferrals, when we reach 15,000 students, we would anticipate having 500 Senate faculty which would imply a target of 520 Professional Degree/Master students.

⁴ For the number of PhD students metric we assumed 1,315 PhD students which is not consistent with 1,000 for this measure. However, if we assumed a higher number of PhD students and applied the undergraduate student-to-faculty ratio of 28:1 we would have significantly lower number of Senate faculty. Therefore, a more conservative measure was selected for this metric and which is associated with higher faculty growth.

Current Value	3-year Target	5-year Target	10-year Target
56 (~0.36)	210 (~0.59)	314 (~0.74)	520 (~1.04)

Student Success*Undergraduate Students*

First-year retention rates

Target is set at the average retention rate at our peer UC campuses over the past five years.

Current Value	3-year Target	5-year Target	10-year Target
85%	86.7%	87.8%	90%

Second -year retention rates

Second year retention rates are not available on the OP website. Therefore, we set these on a parallel 5% growth with the first-year retention rates.

Current Value	3-year Target	5-year Target	10-year Target
73%	74.7%	75.8%	78%

Four-year graduation rates

Target is set at the five-year average four-year graduation rate for our peer UC campuses.

Current Value	3-year Target	5-year Target	10-year Target
48%	52.3%	55.2%	61%

Six-year graduation rates

Target set at the five-year average six-year graduation rate for our peer UC campuses.

Current Value	3-year Target	5-year Target	10-year Target
69%	72.7%	75.1%	80%

Graduate Students

Percentage of graduate students supported by GSRs and Fellowships (i.e. externally funded). Targets were obtained using the external funding levels observed in the graduate funding incentive model with a targeted increase of 10% over the next ten years.

Current Value	3-year Target	5-year Target	10-year Target
22.5%	25.8%	28.1%	32.5%

DIVERSITY

11.9.2020 **DRAFT**

Percentage of under-represented minorities and women faculty by rank relative to gender and racial diversity in respective fields

- Need consultation with Associate Chancellor Dania Matos

National targets by discipline/program/department aggregated at institutional level

- Need consultation with Associate Chancellor Dania Matos

Key:

APWG Indices are in all caps and highlighted blue

Criteria are bolded and underlined


Measures are labeled as such. Numbers taken from APWG Report.

(R1) is a Carnegie measure.

* indicates a measure requiring definition by the school.

Each measure will be evaluated as both the school's gross contribution (e.g., total research and deve

 Measure for institutional target development.

 Measure targets for institutional target development, but which needs to be developed.

UC QUALITY SCHOLARHIP

UC Quality Scholarly and Creative Activity

Measure #1: Scholarly and creative excellence, as defined by faculty, and in line with international st

Research and Development Expenditures

 Measure #1: Total research and development expenditures within the school (R1) (Target is based on

Measure #2: Three-year running average of the percentage of faculty with grant money from source

Measure #3: Ratio of grants submitted to pre-award staff (includes both school-based and Office of f

Measure #4: Ratio of grants received to post-award staff (includes both school-based and ORED staff

Measure #5: Ratio of five-year lagged summation of research and development expenditures within

Research Staff

 Measure #1: Number of research/technical support staff with a doctorate per faculty member (R1)

UC QUALITY ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

UC Quality Education

Capacity to Provide UC Quality Education


Measure #1: Sufficient access to courses

Undergraduate – percentage of courses with an active waiting list broken down by required and elect

Graduate – question 6 on existing graduate student survey that asks respondents to rate the “avail

Measure #2: Number of courses and credit hours taught by instructor type (i.e., ladder-rank, teachin

Measure #3: Ratio of declared undergraduate majors within the school to the number of professiona

 Measure #4: Student (declared majors)-to-Senate faculty ratio at the school level

Measure #5: School share of total student credit hours for campus

UC Quality Education (evaluated at both undergraduate and graduate levels)


Measure #1: School's aspirational goals for their programs, in the context of the institution's commit

Measure #2: Expenditures on Research Experiences for Undergraduates (REUs) and training grants (i

 Measure #3: Percentage of undergraduates within the school that participate in research

Measure #4: School's contribution to General Education and campus service courses measured as to

Doctoral Conferrals

 Measure #1: Rolling 5-year average of doctoral degrees conferred (R1)

Measure #2: School's average rolling 5-year number of doctoral degrees conferred per faculty relativ

 Measure #3: Number of graduate students (broken down by Masters and PhD students) enrolled per

Student Success

Undergraduates

Measure #1: 4-year and 6-year graduation rates*, calculated as an absolute measure and sum of squares

Measure #2: 1st and 2nd year retention rates*, calculated as an absolute measure and sum of squares

Measure #3: Three-year rolling average of the percentage of programs pleased with student learning

Graduate Students

Measure #1: Completion rate over a 7-year time interval (those who start and complete within that interval)

Measure #2: Timely degree completion based on program-specific targets**

Measure #3: Percentage of graduates employed one year after graduation (UCOP survey – this will include those who are employed in the field)

Measure #4: Percentage of graduate students supported by GSRs, TAs and Fellowships within the university

Measure #5: Three-year rolling average of the percentage of programs pleased with student learning

DIVERSITY

Diversity

Breadth in Research and Teaching Programs

Measure #1: Herfindahl Index of majors (sum of the squared proportions)

Diversity of Faculty and Students

Measure #1: Percentage of under-represented minorities and women faculty by rank relative to general population

Measure #2: Sum of squared deviations from a school's demographic/diversity faculty targets for under-represented minorities and women

development expenditures), and growth in the measure over time. Below, however, measures are only stated as the



the school to the sum of the increases in budget allocations provided to the school over the preceding five years:



g Professors, Unit 18 lecturers, graduate students) and class type (LECT, SEM, LAB, DISC, LAB/DISC) differentiated

3 outcomes (as captured by the institutional reporting process – see Faculty Perceptions of Student Learning - es



der-represented groups (i.e., national graduation rates that may serve as targets) (applied only when below targ



d by upper and lower division within each school*

established in response to a WSCUC expectation)*



Grant Funding \$Ms				
Campus	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
UCB	\$694.64	\$676.21	\$844.38	\$706.85
UCD	\$785.60	\$760.06	\$782.68	\$846.72
UCI	\$293.03	\$395.28	\$378.08	\$361.69
UCLA	\$1,033.18	\$1,051.04	\$1,060.02	\$915.26
UCM	\$25.58	\$23.60	\$34.19	\$24.88
UCR	\$123.81	\$138.09	\$144.49	\$157.81
UCSD	\$1,012.20	\$1,070.09	\$1,094.05	\$1,118.45
UCSF	\$1,236.35	\$1,405.25	\$1,406.46	\$1,452.28
UCSB	\$186.29	\$184.10	\$183.82	\$209.57
UCSC	\$134.50	\$123.66	\$103.69	\$151.41

Faculty FTE (Ladder Rank)				
Campus	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
UCB	1382.6	1365.9	1379.6	1362.1
UCD	1432.6	1468.1	1530.1	1558.7
UCI	1152	1185.5	1221.1	1247.7
UCLA	1726.7	1746.7	1799.8	1781.4
UCM	200.1	215.5	218.8	245.7
UCR	663.1	693.7	765.2	785
UCSD	1192.9	1227.2	1320.6	1380.6
UCSF	367.3	367.5	379.1	369.7
UCSB	787.7	806.6	837.4	854.9
UCSC	512.7	525.6	541.7	564.1

\$'s / Faculty				
Campus	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18
UCB	\$502,414	\$495,066	\$612,048	\$518,944
UCD	\$548,374	\$517,715	\$511,520	\$543,224
UCI	\$254,362	\$333,426	\$309,623	\$289,886
UCLA	\$598,358	\$601,728	\$588,965	\$513,785
UCM	\$127,836	\$109,517	\$156,271	\$101,266
UCR	\$186,711	\$199,059	\$188,826	\$201,036
UCSD	\$848,520	\$871,975	\$828,449	\$810,122
UCSF	\$3,366,036	\$3,823,820	\$3,709,987	\$3,928,272
UCSB	\$236,497	\$228,243	\$219,515	\$245,141
UCSC	\$262,341	\$235,278	\$191,418	\$268,415
	3-Year Average		\$131,208	\$122,351

Research Support Staff

Average

UCSB	0.66	0.51333333	
UCSC	0.42		
UCR	0.46		
Median	0.6		
High	0.92		
Low	0.33		
		5-year	10-year
UCM	0.22	0.24037511	0.28845014

Research Staff w Doctorate Per Faculty

University of California-Berkeley	0.91620112		
University of California-Davis	0.54374714		
University of California-Irvine	0.33227647		
University of California-Los Angeles	0.68846412		
University of California-Merced	0.22317597		
University of California-Riverside	0.46144721		
University of California-San Diego	0.64828545		5-year
University of California-Santa Barbara	0.66026411		0.24384522
University of California-Santa Cruz	0.42342342		10-year
			0.29261426
Average	0.54414278		
Median	0.54374714		
Peer-Average	0.51504491		

2018-19	Average
\$773.62	\$739.14
\$845.54	\$804.12
\$441.42	\$373.90
\$1,266.33	\$1,065.17
\$51.08	\$31.87
\$174.60	\$147.76
\$1,296.36	\$1,118.23
\$1,593.55	\$1,418.78
\$215.57	\$195.87
\$165.85	\$135.82

2018-19
1351.3
1563
1299.6
1785
266.7
823
1409.5
371
873.7
572.6

2018-19	Average	Average Peer
\$572,498	\$540,194	\$227,400
\$540,969	\$532,360	
\$339,655	\$305,390	% of Peer
\$709,429	\$602,453	60.37%
\$191,537	\$137,285	
\$212,154	\$197,557	
\$919,728	\$855,759	
\$4,295,275	\$3,824,678	
\$246,727	\$235,225	
\$289,645	\$249,419	
\$149,691		

5-year

0.09261416

10-year

0.31113699



5-year target
\$150K
10-year target
\$180K



Faculty-Ladder rank and Equivalent

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
UCB	1304.9	1292.9	1299.7	1314.1	1318.4	1291.2
UCD	1188.6	1181.4	1178.5	1185.1	1204.8	1183.4
UCI	831.9	852.1	895	932.5	929	904.7
UCLA	1239.9	1260.3	1277	1330.6	1332.8	1310.9
UCM	47	71.1	83	107	118.6	125.2
UCR	574.7	576.4	618.2	649.3	636.4	624.6
UCSD	822.6	834.4	860.7	881.6	885.2	888.1
UCSB	802.9	801.7	810.3	806.7	800	791.4
UCSC	483.1	495.5	491.8	509.5	512.1	497.9

Faculty-Clinical/In-Residence/Adjunct

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
UCB	77.7	79.6	92.1	88.6	75.4	71.7
UCD	33.7	32.7	34.9	34.2	27.5	24.6
UCI	40	38.1	45.7	40.3	41.7	43.8
UCLA	115	130.6	136.2	132.9	107.1	116.7
UCM	0	0	1.7	4.4	1.4	2.2
UCR	21.3	23.1	26.7	26.3	31.4	32.6
UCSD	28.2	27.7	30	32.9	29.8	28.1
UCSB	17.2	11.7	5.7	6.4	6.7	9.4
UCSC	16.8	15.3	16.6	18.4	13.2	15.5

Faculty - Lecturers

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
UCB	280.5	292.4	309.3	298.9	286.6	307.6
UCD	227.9	218.5	221.6	210.6	190.8	179.7
UCI	199.3	204.9	218.5	197	152.9	160.4
UCLA	252.1	274.4	282.7	277.7	228.8	242.1
UCM	17.7	34.2	51.7	75.2	80.4	96.5
UCR	140	144.8	154.6	165.9	145.7	144.4
UCSD	135.4	151	143.7	147	137.5	128.5
UCSB	155.8	161.2	167.3	171.4	158.3	157.7
UCSC	149.5	161	166.2	180	157	153.3

Other Academic Employees

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
UCB	892.5	889.6	911.5	967.9	1023.5	1062.8
UCD	537.5	597.5	577.2	622.2	636.1	748
UCI	280	317.7	347.5	366.7	390.1	398.2
UCLA	462.5	449.9	446	475.4	450.7	475.7
UCM	19.8	16	19.1	23.2	23.9	28.1

UCR	204.9	239.4	244.1	235.6	253.2	262.6
UCSD	463.1	479.5	474.2	486	497.2	501.2
UCSB	316.7	321.3	335.7	329	365.7	363.7
UCSC	226.9	258	293.5	294	264	283.5

Postdoctoral Scholars

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
UCB	485.1	558.1	647.7	679.3	710.9	753.6
UCD	572.8	492.7	485.8	495.3	552.8	534.5
UCI	201.7	204.2	219.9	191.2	212.9	236.5
UCLA	276	293.6	283.4	315.7	331.7	343
UCM	14.7	16	11.3	17.5	18	22.1
UCR	227.6	182.1	183	188.4	195.2	192.1
UCSD	373.5	339.2	381.1	415.6	490.8	504.8
UCSB	250.5	252	254.4	262.2	265.3	281.9
UCSC	122.8	125	116.4	106.7	103.8	111.1

Student Teaching/Research Assistants

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
UCB	1866.1	1870.3	1924.7	1890.5	1837.8	1829.6
UCD	1242.4	1237.5	1270.7	1300.4	1278.6	1293.5
UCI	870.6	902.1	903.6	928.5	912.2	934.1
UCLA	1212	1186	1252.5	1234.3	1219.6	1238.4
UCM	16.3	37.5	58.1	82.6	103.2	114.6
UCR	539.9	548.3	590	629.1	645.1	705.6
UCSD	1066.2	1061.7	1044.5	1068.6	1104.5	1127
UCSB	822.9	833.7	833.1	852.6	822.7	834.4
UCSC	476.1	482.6	467.1	493.8	480.8	481.1

Total Faculty - Ladder Rank (& Equivalent) & Lecturers

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
UCB	1585.4	1585.3	1609	1613	1605	1598.8
UCD	1416.5	1399.9	1400.1	1395.7	1395.6	1363.1
UCI	1031.2	1057	1113.5	1129.5	1081.9	1065.1
UCLA	1492	1534.7	1559.7	1608.3	1561.6	1553
UCM	64.7	105.3	134.7	182.2	199	221.7
UCR	714.7	721.2	772.8	815.2	782.1	769
UCSD	958	985.4	1004.4	1028.6	1022.7	1016.6
UCSB	958.7	962.9	977.6	978.1	958.3	949.1
UCSC	632.6	656.5	658	689.5	669.1	651.2

Total Undergraduate Students

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
--	------	------	------	------	------	------

UCB	23,482	23,863	24,636	25,151	25,530	25,540
UCD	22,714	23,417	23,478	24,188	24,626	24,670
UCI	19,930	20,179	21,696	22,122	22,226	21,976
UCLA	24,811	25,432	25,928	26,536	26,687	26,162
UCM	841	1,210	1,750	2,534	3,190	4,138
UCR	14,571	14,792	14,973	15,708	16,996	18,242
UCSD	20,679	21,369	22,048	22,518	23,143	23,663
UCSB	18,077	18,212	18,415	18,892	19,796	19,186
UCSC	13,625	13,961	14,403	15,125	15,259	15,668

Total Graduate Students

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
UCB	10,065	10,057	10,304	10,245	10,300	10,293
UCD	6,101	6,211	6,318	6,380	6,621	6,722
UCI	4,470	5,051	4,787	4,862	4,916	5,018
UCLA	10,814	11,179	11,548	11,684	11,863	11,995
UCM	37	76	121	184	224	243
UCR	2,051	2,083	2,214	2,371	2,443	2,504
UCSD	4,641	4,878	4,972	5,002	5,275	5,513
UCSB	2,939	2,870	2,995	2,976	3,054	3,032
UCSC	1,387	1,403	1,422	1,490	1,516	1,519

Total Graduate Professional Degrees

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
UCB	3,445	3,505	3,526	3,592	3,647	3,687
UCD	2,042	2,112	2,195	2,247	2,387	2,390
UCI	1,295	1,316	1,422	1,433	1,461	1,618
UCLA	5,274	5,563	5,856	6,030	6,183	6,181
UCM	0	0	0	0	0	0
UCR	207	240	230	298	323	301
UCSD	1,194	1,274	1,355	1,375	1,400	1,515
UCSB	135	139	142	121	127	128
UCSC	11	4	5	12	22	22

Total Masters Students

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
UCB	675	593	679	662	687	696
UCD	852	796	762	705	765	808
UCI	514	509	533	589	596	599
UCLA	895	931	985	961	970	1,050
UCM	37	17	18	28	30	43
UCR	264	248	242	264	239	257
UCSD	622	681	717	735	859	940

UCSB	416	390	420	453	485	496
UCSC	307	298	281	304	296	306

Percentage of Students Graduate

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
UCB	30.00%	29.65%	29.49%	28.94%	28.75%	28.72%
UCD	21.17%	20.96%	21.20%	20.87%	21.19%	21.41%
UCI	18.32%	20.02%	18.08%	18.02%	18.11%	18.59%
UCLA	30.36%	30.53%	30.81%	30.57%	30.77%	31.44%
UCM	4.21%	5.91%	6.47%	6.77%	6.56%	5.55%
UCR	12.34%	12.34%	12.88%	13.11%	12.57%	12.07%
UCSD	18.33%	18.58%	18.40%	18.18%	18.56%	18.90%
UCSB	13.98%	13.61%	13.99%	13.61%	13.37%	13.65%
UCSC	9.24%	9.13%	8.99%	8.97%	9.04%	8.84%

PhD Students/Senate Faculty

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
UCB	4.56	4.61	4.69	4.56	4.53	4.58
UCD	2.70	2.80	2.85	2.89	2.88	2.98
UCI	3.20	3.79	3.16	3.05	3.08	3.10
UCLA	3.75	3.72	3.69	3.53	3.53	3.63
UCM	0.00	0.83	1.24	1.46	1.64	1.60
UCR	2.75	2.77	2.82	2.79	2.96	3.12
UCSD	3.43	3.50	3.37	3.28	3.41	3.44
UCSB	2.97	2.92	3.00	2.98	3.05	3.04
UCSC	2.21	2.22	2.31	2.30	2.34	2.39

Professional Degrees&Masters/Senate Faculty

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
UCB	3.16	3.17	3.24	3.24	3.29	3.39
UCD	2.43	2.46	2.51	2.49	2.62	2.70
UCI	2.17	2.14	2.18	2.17	2.21	2.45
UCLA	4.98	5.15	5.36	5.25	5.37	5.52
UCM	0.79	0.24	0.22	0.26	0.25	0.34
UCR	0.82	0.85	0.76	0.87	0.88	0.89
UCSD	2.21	2.34	2.41	2.39	2.55	2.76
UCSB	0.69	0.66	0.69	0.71	0.77	0.79
UCSC	0.66	0.61	0.58	0.62	0.62	0.66

Total Undergraduate/Total Faculty

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
UCB	14.81	15.05	15.31	15.59	15.91	15.97
UCD	16.04	16.73	16.77	17.33	17.65	18.10

UCI	19.33	19.09	19.48	19.59	20.54	20.63
UCLA	16.63	16.57	16.62	16.50	17.09	16.85
UCM	13.00	11.49	12.99	13.91	16.03	18.66
UCR	20.39	20.51	19.38	19.27	21.73	23.72
UCSD	21.59	21.69	21.95	21.89	22.63	23.28
UCSB	18.86	18.91	18.84	19.31	20.66	20.21
UCSC	21.54	21.27	21.89	21.94	22.81	24.06

Total Students/Total Faculty

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
UCB	21.16	21.40	21.72	21.94	22.32	22.41
UCD	20.34	21.16	21.28	21.90	22.39	23.03
UCI	23.66	23.87	23.78	23.89	25.09	25.34
UCLA	23.88	23.86	24.03	23.76	24.69	24.57
UCM	13.57	12.21	13.89	14.92	17.16	19.76
UCR	23.26	23.40	22.24	22.18	24.85	26.98
UCSD	26.43	26.64	26.90	26.75	27.79	28.70
UCSB	21.92	21.89	21.90	22.36	23.84	23.41
UCSC	23.73	23.40	24.05	24.10	25.07	26.39

Undergraduate Students/Ladder Rank

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
UCB	18.00	18.46	18.96	19.14	19.36	19.78
UCD	19.11	19.82	19.92	20.41	20.44	20.85
UCI	23.96	23.68	24.24	23.72	23.92	24.29
UCLA	20.01	20.18	20.30	19.94	20.02	19.96
UCM	17.89	17.02	21.08	23.68	26.90	33.05
UCR	25.35	25.66	24.22	24.19	26.71	29.21
UCSD	25.14	25.61	25.62	25.54	26.14	26.64
UCSB	22.51	22.72	22.73	23.42	24.75	24.24
UCSC	28.20	28.18	29.29	29.69	29.80	31.47

Total Students/Ladder Rank

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
UCB	25.71	26.24	26.88	26.94	27.18	27.75
UCD	24.24	25.08	25.28	25.79	25.94	26.53
UCI	29.33	29.61	29.59	28.94	29.22	29.84
UCLA	28.73	29.05	29.35	28.72	28.92	29.11
UCM	18.68	18.09	22.54	25.40	28.79	34.99
UCR	28.92	29.28	27.80	27.84	30.55	33.21
UCSD	30.78	31.46	31.39	31.22	32.10	32.85
UCSB	26.18	26.30	26.42	27.11	28.56	28.07
UCSC	31.07	31.01	32.18	32.61	32.76	34.52

Graduate Students/Ladder Rank

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
UCB	7.71	7.78	7.93	7.80	7.81	7.97
UCD	5.13	5.26	5.36	5.38	5.50	5.68
UCI	5.37	5.93	5.35	5.21	5.29	5.55
UCLA	8.72	8.87	9.04	8.78	8.90	9.15
UCM	0.79	1.07	1.46	1.72	1.89	1.94
UCR	3.57	3.61	3.58	3.65	3.84	4.01
UCSD	5.64	5.85	5.78	5.67	5.96	6.21
UCSB	3.66	3.58	3.70	3.69	3.82	3.83
UCSC	2.87	2.83	2.89	2.92	2.96	3.05

Ratio of Lecturers/Ladder Rank Faculty

	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
UCB	0.21	0.23	0.24	0.23	0.22	0.24
UCD	0.19	0.18	0.19	0.18	0.16	0.15
UCI	0.24	0.24	0.24	0.21	0.16	0.18
UCLA	0.20	0.22	0.22	0.21	0.17	0.18
UCM	0.38	0.48	0.62	0.70	0.68	0.77
UCR	0.24	0.25	0.25	0.26	0.23	0.23
UCSD	0.16	0.18	0.17	0.17	0.16	0.14
UCSB	0.19	0.20	0.21	0.21	0.20	0.20
UCSC	0.31	0.32	0.34	0.35	0.31	0.31

2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
1267.8	1284.9	1301.9	1321.7	1311.7	1324.1	1308.5
1134.6	1133.8	1132	1151.5	1180.6	1236.5	1262.9
939.5	954.5	927.9	979.2	1030.5	1060.5	1088.2
1277.6	1262.3	1250	1266.7	1287.9	1331.3	1320.1
131.6	158.8	166.9	200.1	215.5	218.8	245.7
619.3	620.5	618.5	648.1	676.2	745.5	764.1
880.6	876.9	899.1	927.2	940.3	990.6	1045.4
782.6	767.5	780.9	787.7	806.6	837.4	854.9
498.5	490.7	493	512.7	525.6	541.7	564.1

2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
82.8	79.1	85	79.7	71.3	72.6	74.6
30	31.7	31.7	30.3	40.1	43.7	46.3
42.5	39.5	45.9	38	40.7	39.9	38
125.3	134.4	144.1	144.1	148.7	156.2	168.1
3.3	7.3	8.7	5.3	1.6	2.3	2
29.8	31.2	24.1	25.9	35.6	30.1	31.3
24.2	32.5	25.3	27.4	29.9	38.2	43.7
19.1	23	22.4	20.1	19	24.5	23.6
20.1	18.3	12.8	16.4	13.2	11.5	8.5

2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
340.3	354.8	373	408.4	393.3	405.4	419.8
180.8	206.5	224	243.1	252.2	261.1	281.3
162.2	151.7	181.8	204.5	223.2	230.7	244.4
279.8	279.5	314.5	342.8	372	402.2	411.1
110.2	122.5	128.8	124.7	130.3	132	123.8
118.1	124.2	126.6	135	148.7	165.5	169.9
137.9	150.1	155.9	159.5	169.3	194.4	206.7
158	172.2	174.8	186	183.5	187.6	198.3
152.8	168.2	158.2	173.5	171	193.4	178

2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
1071	1108	1045.8	960.7	907.5	881	835.4
746.5	716.9	741.3	740.6	742.2	704.2	650.7
406.5	421	432.5	433.5	476.1	468.9	453.6
512.6	518.5	518.1	525.1	524.5	533.8	550.3
30	30.9	33.7	36.1	45.5	46.1	54.3

264.9	248.5	244.1	232.4	241.9	257.8	264.2
501.6	506.4	491.5	490.3	493.5	485.1	493
379.6	371.9	356.5	355.8	335.2	333	330.3
265	232.5	236.9	230.7	223.2	209.6	215.3

2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
720.8	767.4	755.5	752.1	793.5	814.7	888.2
528.5	485.3	504.4	512.7	523.7	504	499.3
234.1	226.2	213.7	178.6	199.7	239.7	241.3
323.7	331.2	312.4	336.6	367.5	394	425.8
29.7	35.2	33	38.7	43.7	41.6	51
157.5	139.9	135.9	140.2	170.6	195.2	194.1
501.6	506.4	491.5	490.3	493.5	485.1	487
236.1	257.6	235.1	246.6	266.7	252.3	273
121.5	107.9	98.4	95.3	113.1	123.5	116

2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
1789	1800.9	1777.1	1802.5	1842.6	1809.7	1863.2
1283.1	1255.3	1281.6	1327.9	1337.5	1392.6	1413.1
899.8	889.4	888.6	925.2	960.8	976.3	1028
1268.2	1271.9	1328.1	1314.9	1345.1	1436.4	1441.4
117.9	143.6	160.4	175.8	202.5	229.7	260
622.1	605.3	620.3	672.8	694.9	735.8	763.2
1120.6	1130.1	1171.3	1138.9	1245	1326.6	1346
794.1	808.8	810.3	811.3	845	868.1	893.9
480.9	484.5	486.8	500.7	516.8	567.2	583.7

2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
1608.1	1639.7	1674.9	1730.1	1705	1729.5	1728.3
1315.4	1340.3	1356	1394.6	1432.8	1497.6	1544.2
1101.7	1106.2	1109.7	1183.7	1253.7	1291.2	1332.6
1557.4	1541.8	1564.5	1609.5	1659.9	1733.5	1731.2
241.8	281.3	295.7	324.8	345.8	350.8	369.5
737.4	744.7	745.1	783.1	824.9	911	934
1018.5	1027	1055	1086.7	1109.6	1185	1252.1
940.6	939.7	955.7	973.7	990.1	1025	1053.2
651.3	658.9	651.2	686.2	696.6	735.1	742.1

2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------	-------------

25,885	25,774	25,951	27,126	27,496	29,310	30,574
25,038	25,666	26,533	27,565	28,257	29,379	30,066
22,004	22,216	23,530	24,489	25,256	27,331	29,307
27,199	27,941	28,674	29,633	29,585	30,873	31,002
4,938	5,431	5,837	5,884	6,237	6,815	7,375
18,522	18,539	18,621	18,790	18,607	19,799	20,073
23,046	22,676	23,805	24,810	26,590	28,127	28,587
18,620	18,977	19,362	20,238	20,607	21,574	22,186
15,945	15,978	15,695	16,277	16,231	16,962	17,577

2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
10,252	10,119	10,247	10,439	10,693	10,844	11,317
6,694	6,688	6,774	6,943	6,929	7,081	7,314
5,185	5,263	5,365	5,562	5,580	5,423	5,935
12,072	12,004	12,121	12,212	12,323	12,675	13,025
260	329	358	384	448	521	592
2,433	2,466	2,664	2,808	2,925	3,122	3,206
5,547	5,618	5,712	5,899	6,316	6,852	7,185
3,065	2,950	2,863	2,813	2,890	2,772	2,871
1,509	1,426	1,508	1,589	1,637	1,821	1,880

2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
3,679	3,642	3,776	4,325	4,620	4,837	5,375
2,426	2,436	2,416	2,455	2,467	2,520	2,669
1,690	1,776	1,882	1,888	1,927	1,922	2,174
6,231	6,177	6,195	6,327	6,494	6,752	6,985
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
312	342	428	607	652	776	820
1,625	1,588	1,582	1,656	1,519	1,685	1,733
109	86	83	84	97	109	117
18	9	10	32	28	30	43

2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
722	673	726	515	570	642	607
797	752	868	917	890	872	950
711	780	841	979	933	855	975
1,109	1,054	1,113	1,151	1,243	1,286	1,376
29	41	43	36	42	49	53
244	235	280	297	342	350	345
883	970	956	1,042	1,625	1,950	2,183

547	504	467	483	490	402	440
269	234	253	304	366	459	484

2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
28.37%	28.19%	28.31%	27.79%	28.00%	27.01%	27.02%
21.10%	20.67%	20.34%	20.12%	19.69%	19.42%	19.57%
19.07%	19.15%	18.57%	18.51%	18.10%	16.56%	16.84%
30.74%	30.05%	29.71%	29.18%	29.40%	29.11%	29.58%
5.00%	5.71%	5.78%	6.13%	6.70%	7.10%	7.43%
11.61%	11.74%	12.52%	13.00%	13.58%	13.62%	13.77%
19.40%	19.86%	19.35%	19.21%	19.19%	19.59%	20.09%
14.13%	13.45%	12.88%	12.20%	12.30%	11.39%	11.46%
8.65%	8.19%	8.77%	8.89%	9.16%	9.69%	9.66%

2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
4.62	4.52	4.41	4.24	4.20	4.05	4.08
3.06	3.09	3.08	3.10	3.03	2.98	2.93
2.96	2.84	2.85	2.75	2.64	2.50	2.56
3.70	3.78	3.85	3.74	3.56	3.48	3.53
1.76	1.81	1.89	1.74	1.88	2.16	2.19
3.03	3.04	3.16	2.94	2.86	2.68	2.67
3.45	3.49	3.53	3.45	3.37	3.25	3.13
3.08	3.07	2.96	2.85	2.86	2.70	2.71
2.45	2.41	2.53	2.44	2.36	2.46	2.40

2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
3.47	3.36	3.46	3.66	3.96	4.14	4.57
2.84	2.81	2.90	2.93	2.84	2.74	2.87
2.56	2.68	2.93	2.93	2.78	2.62	2.89
5.75	5.73	5.85	5.90	6.01	6.04	6.33
0.22	0.26	0.26	0.18	0.19	0.22	0.22
0.90	0.93	1.14	1.39	1.47	1.51	1.52
2.85	2.92	2.82	2.91	3.34	3.67	3.75
0.84	0.77	0.70	0.72	0.73	0.61	0.65
0.58	0.50	0.53	0.66	0.75	0.90	0.93

2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
16.10	15.72	15.49	15.68	16.13	16.95	17.69
19.03	19.15	19.57	19.77	19.72	19.62	19.47

19.97	20.08	21.20	20.69	20.15	21.17	21.99
17.46	18.12	18.33	18.41	17.82	17.81	17.91
20.42	19.31	19.74	18.12	18.04	19.43	19.96
25.12	24.89	24.99	23.99	22.56	21.73	21.49
22.63	22.08	22.56	22.83	23.96	23.74	22.83
19.80	20.19	20.26	20.78	20.81	21.05	21.07
24.48	24.25	24.10	23.72	23.30	23.07	23.69


2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
22.47	21.89	21.61	21.71	22.40	23.22	24.24
24.12	24.14	24.56	24.74	24.56	24.35	24.21
24.68	24.84	26.04	25.39	24.60	25.37	26.45
25.22	25.91	26.08	26.00	25.25	25.12	25.43
21.50	20.48	20.95	19.30	19.33	20.91	21.56
28.42	28.21	28.57	27.58	26.10	25.16	24.92
28.07	27.55	27.98	28.26	29.66	29.52	28.57
23.05	23.33	23.26	23.67	23.73	23.75	23.79
26.80	26.41	26.42	26.04	25.65	25.55	26.22

2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
20.42	20.06	19.93	20.52	20.96	22.14	23.37
22.07	22.64	23.44	23.94	23.93	23.76	23.81
23.42	23.28	25.36	25.01	24.51	25.77	26.93
21.29	22.13	22.94	23.39	22.97	23.19	23.48
37.52	34.20	34.97	29.41	28.94	31.15	30.02
29.91	29.88	30.11	28.99	27.52	26.56	26.27
26.17	25.86	26.48	26.76	28.28	28.39	27.35
23.79	24.73	24.79	25.69	25.55	25.76	25.95
31.99	32.56	31.84	31.75	30.88	31.31	31.16


2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
28.50	27.93	27.80	28.42	29.11	30.33	32.01
27.97	28.54	29.42	29.97	29.80	29.49	29.60
28.94	28.79	31.14	30.69	29.92	30.89	32.39
30.74	31.64	32.64	33.03	32.54	32.71	33.35
39.50	36.27	37.12	31.32	31.02	33.53	32.43
33.84	33.85	34.41	33.33	31.84	30.75	30.47
32.47	32.27	32.83	33.12	35.00	35.31	34.22
27.71	28.57	28.46	29.26	29.13	29.07	29.31
35.01	35.47	34.89	34.85	34.00	34.67	34.49

2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
8.09	7.88	7.87	7.90	8.15	8.19	8.65
5.90	5.90	5.98	6.03	5.87	5.73	5.79
5.52	5.51	5.78	5.68	5.41	5.11	5.45
9.45	9.51	9.70	9.64	9.57	9.52	9.87
1.98	2.07	2.14	1.92	2.08	2.38	2.41
3.93	3.97	4.31	4.33	4.33	4.19	4.20
6.30	6.41	6.35	6.36	6.72	6.92	6.87
3.92	3.84	3.67	3.57	3.58	3.31	3.36
3.03	2.91	3.06	3.10	3.11	3.36	3.33


2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
0.27	0.28	0.29	0.31	0.30	0.31	0.32
0.16	0.18	0.20	0.21	0.21	0.21	0.22
0.17	0.16	0.20	0.21	0.22	0.22	0.22
0.22	0.22	0.25	0.27	0.29	0.30	0.31
0.84	0.77	0.77	0.62	0.60	0.60	0.50
0.19	0.20	0.20	0.21	0.22	0.22	0.22
0.16	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.18	0.20	0.20
0.20	0.22	0.22	0.24	0.23	0.22	0.23
0.31	0.34	0.32	0.34	0.33	0.36	0.32




2018	2019
1298.6	1329
1261.1	1293
1132.2	1177
1342.6	1359.2
266.7	276.9
803.3	807.9
1072	1129.2
873.7	902.7
572.6	581.5



2018	2019
67.5	89
49.2	43.3
41.3	50.9
179.9	196.2
1.5	0
31.8	30.8
47.6	49.3
22.4	21
4.9	10.1



2018	2019
449.4	468.7
277.5	275.5
251.9	242.6
432.3	444
125.1	137.3
162.3	166.6
230.7	224.1
200.6	213
167.8	175.6



2018	2019
775.9	773.7
620.3	590.7
427.6	467
553.3	584.3
67.2	85.3

237.7	266.4
516.6	502.1
305.8	325.1
235.8	260.8

2018	2019
881.7	896.6
509.2	507.5
229.9	262.8
400.7	390.6
61.2	61.3
193.7	202.6
549.2	551
299.8	283.9
114	104.3

2018	2019
1904.4	1962.6
1433.6	1471.8
1085.4	1158.5
1444.1	1535.6
294.2	317
811.4	853.2
1434.9	1536.5
938.9	990.5
603.7	635.3

2018	2019
1748	1797.7
1538.6	1568.5
1384.1	1419.6
1774.9	1803.2
391.8	414.2
965.6	974.5
1302.7	1353.3
1074.3	1115.7
740.4	757.1

2018	2019	10-yr growth
-------------	-------------	---------------------

30,853	31,352	22.76%
30,718	30,982	25.59%
29,736	30,382	38.25%
31,577	31,543	20.57%
7,881	8,151	96.98%
20,581	22,055	20.90%
30,285	30,794	30.14%
23,070	23,349	21.70%
17,792	17,517	11.80%

2018	2019
11,648	11,833
7,449	7,652
6,296	6,526
12,960	12,828
663	696
3,341	3,492
7,602	7,942
2,906	2,965
1,908	1,977

2018	2019
5,690	5,179
2,675	2,245
2,609	2,711
7,005	6,853
10	16
855	958
1,779	1,819
104	122
26	63

2018	2019
611	1,345
1,033	1,043
789	753
1,277	1,201
46	41
409	417
2,364	2,593

443	404
458	423

2018	2019	Average
27.41%	27.40%	27.37%
19.52%	19.81%	19.60%
17.47%	17.68%	17.33%
29.10%	28.91%	29.22%
7.76%	7.87%	7.37%
13.97%	13.67%	13.72%
20.06%	20.50%	19.89%
11.19%	11.27%	11.52%
9.69%	10.14%	9.67%

2018	2019	Average
4.12	3.99	3.06
2.97	3.38	Peer Ave.
2.56	2.60	2.63
3.48	3.51	
2.28	2.31	
2.59	2.62	
3.23	3.13	
2.70	2.70	
2.49	2.56	

2018	2019	Average
4.85	4.91	2.92
2.94	2.54	Peer Ave.
3.00	2.94	1.04
6.17	5.93	
0.21	0.21	
1.57	1.70	
3.86	3.91	
0.63	0.58	
0.85	0.84	

2018	2019	Peer Ave.
17.65	17.44	
19.96	19.75	22.23

21.48	21.40
17.79	17.49
20.11	19.68
21.31	22.63
23.25	22.75
21.47	20.93
24.03	23.14

2018	2019	Peer Ave.
24.31	24.02	
24.81	24.63	25.18
26.03	26.00	
25.09	24.61	
21.81	21.36	
24.77	26.22	
29.08	28.62	
24.18	23.59	
26.61	25.75	

2018	2019	Peer Ave.
23.76	23.59	
24.36	23.96	27.76
26.26	25.81	
23.52	23.21	
29.55	29.44	
25.62	27.30	
28.25	27.27	
26.40	25.87	
31.07	30.12	

2018	2019	Peer Ave.
32.73	32.49	
30.26	29.88	31.43
31.82	31.36	
33.17	32.64	
32.04	31.95	
29.78	31.62	
35.34	34.30	
29.73	29.15	
34.40	33.52	

2018 **2019**

8.97 8.90

Peer Ave.

5.91 5.92

3.67

5.56 5.54

9.65 9.44

2.49 **2.51**

4.16 4.32

7.09 7.03

3.33 3.28

3.33 3.40

2018 **2019**

0.35 0.35

Peer Ave.

0.22 0.21

0.25

0.22 0.21

0.32 0.33

0.47 0.50

0.20 0.21

0.22 0.20

0.23 0.24

0.29 0.30

1st Year Retention Rates

Campus	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
UCB	96.7%	96.3%	95.5%	96.1%	95.8%	96.4%
UCD	91.8%	92.5%	91.9%	92.8%	92.9%	92.2%
UCI	94.1%	93.4%	92.6%	91.7%	91.9%	92.8%
UCLA	96.8%	96.8%	96.4%	96.2%	96.7%	96.2%
UCM	87.1%	84.5%	82.8%	84.3%	82.6%	83.8%
UCR	87.1%	87.4%	88.2%	88.9%	89.5%	90.9%
UCSD	95.8%	95.7%	93.8%	94.2%	94.6%	94.6%
UCSB	91.1%	91.9%	91.2%	91.8%	92.1%	92.9%
UCSC	89.3%	90.5%	90.5%	88.7%	88.8%	87.3%

2nd Year Retention Rates

	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
UCM	75.40%	74%	72.80%	73.20%	75%	74%

2015	2016	2017	2018	Average
96.7%	97.2%	96.7%	96.8%	96.4%
92.7%	92.6%	91.8%	92.1%	92.3%
92.1%	93.9%	92.9%	93.9%	92.9%
96.8%	96.6%	97.0%	96.4%	96.6%
85.6%	80.3%	81.3%	84.5%	83.7%
91.1%	88.8%	89.0%	89.6%	89.1%
95.4%	94.2%	94.0%	93.4%	94.6%
92.4%	92.5%	92.4%	91.9%	92.0%
90.0%	90.1%	87.7%	88.4%	89.1%

2015	2016	2017	Average
77.70%	72.90%	73.20%	74.24%



Peer Average

90.1%

% of Peer

92.91%

Goal for Retention

5-year

90%

10-year

93%



Parallel Growth off of 1st Year

4-year Graduation Rates

Campus	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
UCB	71.0%	72.3%	71.7%	73.1%	76.0%	75.4%
UCD	52.5%	51.8%	54.1%	58.0%	55.0%	58.1%
UCI	66.5%	68.2%	68.8%	71.9%	71.6%	70.7%
UCLA	71.2%	69.2%	72.9%	73.8%	74.1%	74.7%
UCM	31.9%	30.8%	35.1%	38.8%	38.7%	34.5%
UCR	43.1%	42.7%	45.7%	48.7%	47.9%	54.6%
UCSD	57.5%	57.0%	57.4%	58.9%	59.2%	55.7%
UCSB	68.7%	69.4%	70.5%	68.6%	69.7%	69.0%
UCSC	52.8%	52.2%	56.6%	57.0%	53.0%	54.4%

2012	2013	2014	2015	5-Yr Average
74.2%	75.7%	75.8%	78.6%	75.9%
60.9%	63.1%	63.8%	61.2%	61.4%
67.8%	69.5%	68.9%	68.5%	69.1%
76.7%	79.5%	80.7%	81.6%	78.6%
39.6%	45.3%	45.7%	48.5%	42.7%
56.8%	57.0%	63.9%	63.1%	59.1%
61.8%	65.1%	67.5%	73.1%	64.6%
68.8%	68.6%	69.8%	69.8%	69.2%
50.5%	53.3%	55.9%	62.3%	55.3%

Peer Average
61.2%

% of Peer
69.82%

3-year 53%
5-year 58%
10-year 62%

6-year Graduation Rates

Campus	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
UCB	91.2%	90.8%	90.8%	91.3%	90.8%	91.4%
UCD	83.7%	83.0%	82.0%	82.2%	84.2%	86.1%
UCI	83.7%	86.3%	86.7%	86.9%	87.6%	88.4%
UCLA	90.4%	90.8%	92.2%	91.0%	91.6%	91.4%
UCM		64.7%	62.6%	64.1%	66.3%	70.0%
UCR	71.3%	68.9%	69.1%	69.4%	71.9%	75.5%
UCSD	87.3%	86.8%	88.0%	87.0%	87.0%	88.0%
UCSB	81.5%	82.1%	83.0%	83.3%	83.5%	82.8%
UCSC	77.0%	77.6%	77.3%	77.1%	80.8%	81.3%

2010	2011	2012	2013	5-Yr Average
91.6%	90.9%	91.1%	92.5%	91.5%
84.9%	85.8%	86.7%	87.0%	86.1%
87.8%	85.4%	83.8%	84.8%	86.0%
91.5%	91.0%	90.4%	91.5%	91.2%
69.4%	67.5%	69.0%	71.3%	69.4%
75.4%	77.3%	77.2%	77.8%	76.6%
87.9%	85.3%	86.6%	87.3%	87.0%
83.6%	82.8%	83.2%	84.9%	83.5%
80.3%	80.0%	76.7%	77.1%	79.1%

Peer Average
79.7%

% of Peer
87.10%

3-year 73%
5-year 75%
10-year 80%

Diversity

Location	% Men	% Women	% White D	% White I	As/NatH D	As.NatH I
UCB	61.70%	38.30%	52.90%	13.30%	9.50%	5.60%
UCD	58.60%	41.40%	58.00%	9.60%	12.00%	7.10%
UCI	59.10%	40.90%	53.10%	9.50%	16.10%	8.00%
UCLA	59.30%	40.70%	49.70%	9.90%	16.60%	6.70%
UCM	56.30%	43.70%	48.20%	7.10%	8.00%	9.20%
UCR	63.60%	36.30%	46.10%	9.60%	11.10%	11.10%
UCSD	61.10%	38.90%	57.50%	10.50%	13.60%	6.40%
UCSB	58.30%	41.50%	55.00%	13.80%	4.60%	6.60%
UCSC	56.60%	43.40%	57.40%	10.10%	7.70%	6.20%
Ave.	59.40%	40.57%	53.10%	10.38%	11.02%	7.43%
Peer Ave.	59.50%	40.40%	52.83%	11.17%	7.80%	7.97%
AAU Ave.	59.24%	40.73%	54.80%	10.96%	11.44%	6.66%

Hisp/Lat D	Hisp/Lat. I	Amer Ind D	Amer Ind I	Black/Af D	Black/Af I	Two+ D
4.70%	1.20%	0.10%	0.00%	3.10%	0.50%	1.00%
4.00%	2.10%	0.30%	0.00%	1.60%	0.50%	0.50%
4.80%	0.90%	0.20%	0.00%	2.50%	0.30%	0.70%
4.60%	1.60%	0.20%	0.00%	3.10%	0.40%	0.80%
9.90%	2.60%	0.20%	0.00%	1.20%	0.50%	2.60%
6.00%	1.70%	0.90%	0.10%	3.50%	0.60%	1.20%
5.00%	2.00%	0.30%	0.00%	1.60%	0.10%	0.20%
4.80%	1.70%	0.60%	0.20%	1.90%	0.20%	0.80%
6.90%	2.70%	1.10%	0.00%	2.70%	0.20%	0.80%
5.63%	1.83%	0.43%	0.03%	2.36%	0.37%	0.96%
5.90%	2.03%	0.87%	0.10%	2.70%	0.33%	0.93%
4.97%	1.74%	0.40%	0.03%	2.36%	0.31%	0.69%



Two+ I	Unknwn D	Unknwn I
0.10%	6.00%	2.10%
0.10%	3.10%	1.10%
0.00%	3.50%	0.20%
0.10%	4.30%	2.00%
0.00%	7.30%	3.10%
0.20%	6.10%	2.00%
0.00%	2.10%	0.60%
0.00%	6.70%	3.30%
0.10%	2.90%	1.10%
0.07%	4.67%	1.72%
0.10%	5.23%	2.13%
0.06%	4.09%	1.49%

DATE ISSUED: TBD

SUPERSEDES: MAPP 1003

SOURCE DOCUMENT: APM 025

CONFLICT OF COMMITMENT AND OUTSIDE PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

025-0 Policy

This local policy is to be used in addition to the policies provided in the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) and describes the implementation of **APM 025** on the UC Merced campus. This policy applies to all UC Merced faculty as defined in **APM 025-14 a**.

025-6 Responsibility

a. Faculty

Faculty are responsible for complying with **APM 025**. Responsibilities are outlined in **APM 025-6**. Additional responsibilities include:

- (1) Faculty members must request and receive prior approval whenever activities are likely to raise issues of conflict of commitment (Category I), or when the faculty member intends to involve UC Merced students in their outside professional activities.
- (2) Requests must be submitted to the Dean at least 30 days in advance of expected activity, and no activity may be undertaken without prior approval.

b. Department Chair

- (1) Remind faculty annually of requirement to request and receive prior approval for Category I activities and any other outside activities that may create a question of perceived or real conflict of commitment.
- (2) Discuss any conflict of commitment concerns with faculty member.
- (3) Collect and review Report of Category I or II Compensated Outside Professional Activities and Additional Teaching Activities from all faculty by November 1, ensuring that the activities did not conflict with policy, and forward to the dean for approval.
- (4) Review and recommend in writing, when appropriate, requests from faculty to engage in Category I activities that fall within the time limits and requirements defined in **APM 025**.

c. Dean

- (1) Collect and approve Report of Category I or II Compensated Outside Professional Activities and Additional Teaching Activities from all faculty by November 1, ensuring that the activities did not conflict with policy.
- (2) Review and recommend in writing, when appropriate, requests from faculty to engage in Category I activities that fall within the time limits and requirements defined in **APM 025**.
- (3) In the Dean's Recommendation Memo for any faculty member's academic personnel advancement action, the Dean must certify that the appointee has complied with all **APM 025** requirements during the review period. No advancement case will be considered unless there is

certification from the Dean that the required reports have been submitted in accordance with this policy.

d. Vice Provost for Academic Personnel or the Associate Vice Provost for the Faculty

- (1) Category I activities must be approved in advance by either the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel or the Associate Vice Provost for the Faculty.
- (2) Requests to exceed the time limits set in **APM 025** must be approved in advance by the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel.
- (3) The authority to approve these activities cannot be redelegated.