MEETING CALL
REGULAR MEETING OF THE REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY
OF THE DAVIS DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Thursday, June 8, 2023
2:10 – 4:00 p.m.
Student Community Center – Multipurpose Room

1. *Approval of the February 16, 2023 Meeting Summary
2. Announcements by the President – None
3. Announcements by the Vice Presidents – None
4. Announcements by the Chancellor – None
5. Announcements by the Deans, Directors or other Executive Officers – None
6. Special Orders
   a. Remarks by Davis Division Chair Ahmet Palazoglu
7. Reports of Special Committees
8. Reports of Standing Committees
   a. Committee on Elections, Rules, and Jurisdiction
      i. Proposed Revision to Davis Division Bylaw 52:
         Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity
      ii. Proposed Revision to Davis Division Regulation 520:
          Doctor of Philosophy
      iii. Proposed Revision of Davis Division Regulation A545:
           Passed or Not Passed Grading
             1. Responses to Request for Consultation: Passed/Not Passed
                Deadline Proposal from ASUCD
             2. Proposal to Establish Davis Division Regulation 519:
                Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP)
7. Petitions of Students
10. Unfinished Business
11. New Business
12. Informational Items
   a. *2023-2024 Academic Senate Standing Committee Appointments
   b. Revised Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR) Courses at UC Davis
   c. Senate Chair Palazoglu Letter to Chancellor May and Provost Croughan on
      2023-24 Budget Actions
   d. Provost Croughan Response to Senate Chair Palazoglu on 2023-24 Budget
      Actions
   e. Senate Chair Palazoglu Letter to Provost Croughan Sharing CPB Salary
      Adjustment Principles

Heather Rose, Secretary

*Consent Calendar. Items will be removed from the Consent Calendar on the request of any member of the Representative Assembly.

All voting members of the Academic Senate (and others on the ruling of the Chair) shall have the privilege of attendance and the privilege of the floor at meetings of the Representative Assembly, but only members of the Representative Assembly may make or second motions or vote.
Thursday, June 8, 2023
2:10 – 4:00 p.m.
Student Community Center – Multipurpose Room

Representative Assembly of the
Davis Division of the Academic Senate

*Consent Calendar. Items will be removed from the Consent Calendar on the request of any member of the Representative Assembly.

All voting members of the Academic Senate (and others on the ruling of the Chair) shall have the privilege of attendance and the privilege of the floor at meetings of the Representative Assembly, but only members of the Representative Assembly may make or second motions or vote.
MEETING SUMMARY
REGULAR MEETING OF THE REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY
OF THE DAVIS DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Thursday, February 16, 2023
2:10 – 3:30 p.m.
Student Community Center Multipurpose Room

1. *October 20, 2022 Meeting Summary
2. Announcements by the President – None
3. Announcements by the Vice Presidents – None
4. Announcements by the Chancellor
   a. State of the Campus Address – Chancellor Gary S. May
      - View Chancellor May’s remarks.
5. Announcements by the Deans, Directors or other Executive Officers – None
6. Special Orders
   a. Remarks by Davis Division Chair Ahmet Palazoglu (see note 6.a.1 below)
7. Reports of standing committees
   a. Public Service
      i. Confirmation of the 2022-2023 Distinguished Scholarly Public Service Award Recipients
      - Motion approved by acclamation.
   b. Distinguished Teaching Awards
      i. Confirmation of the 2022-2023 Distinguished Teaching Award Recipients
      - Motion approved by acclamation.
   c. Faculty Distinguished Research Award
      i. Confirmation of the 2022-2023 Faculty Distinguished Research Award Recipient
      - Motion approved by acclamation.
   d. Elections, Rules and Jurisdiction
      i. Proposed Revision Davis Division Regulation 538: Examinations
      - Vote: 56 in favor, 0 opposed. Motion approved.
8. Petitions of Students
9. Unfinished Business
10. University and Faculty Welfare
11. New Business
12. Informational Item
   a. Revision of the School of Medicine Faculty Bylaws and Regulations

- 6.a.1. Senate Chair Palazoglu and Chancellor May announced that, per Senate and administration agreement, the campus will engage a consultant to conduct a benchmarking exercise for units across campus. The goal of benchmarking is to ensure that units are staffed and funded appropriately. The Committee on Planning and Budget will provide a framework to guide the consultants’ scope of work.
PROPOSED REVISION OF DAVIS DIVISION BYLAW 52:
Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity

Submitted and endorsed by the Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity.

Endorsed by Executive Council.

Rationale: The revision to Davis Division Bylaw 52, Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity, is the change of the committee’s name to the Committee on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion as the current name of Affirmative Action and Diversity is outdated. The revision also includes the removal of ex-officio Associate Executive Vice Chancellor for Campus Community Relations in 52.A as this title no longer exists, and replaced it instead with the Vice Chancellor for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion. The term “affirmative action” has also been removed from 52.B.1, 52.B.2, and 52.B.3 in effort to remain consistent with the change in the committee’s name. There have also been additions of the terms “equity” and “inclusion” made in 52.B.1 as a result of the change in committee name and is referred to throughout the rest of the bylaw as “DEI” (52.B.2, 52.B.3, 52.B.4, and 52.B.5). 52.B.1 has an updated definition for diversity that falls in line with Regents Policy 4400. 52.B.2 has been adjusted to provide a clearer range of topics for reports that can be reviewed by the committee to promote DEI accountability throughout the campus. What was previously listed as 52.B.2. has been removed as affirmative action will no longer be in the charge of the committee and the committee has not monitored aspects of the Educational Opportunity Program (now called the Office of Educational Opportunity and Enrichment Services) in the last few years and feels it no longer applies to the work done by the committee. Additional sections have also been added to 52.B (52.B.4, 52.B.5, 52.B.6) based on research done on the charges of similar committees on other UC Senates and with the goal of providing a clearer framework for future committee members on the work that can be expected as a member of this committee. The addition of 52.B.7 is a result of a collaboration between the Academic Senate office and the Office of the Chancellor on a fellowship that was initiated in 2019-2020.

Proposed Revision: Davis Division Bylaw 52 shall be amended as follows. Deletions are indicated by strikeout; additions are in bold type.

52. **Affirmative Action and Diversity - Diversity, Equity and Inclusion** (Renum 5/24/2001)

A. This committee shall consist of seven members of the Academic Senate, the Associate Executive Vice Chancellor for Campus Community Relations **Vice Chancellor for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion** non-voting ex officio, one undergraduate student representative, one graduate student representative, and three representatives appointed by the Davis Academic Federation. (Am. 10/20/97) (Am. 9/1/2010)

B. The committee shall have the following duties, which may be overseen by a subcommittee of its members and others: (Am. 9/1/2010)
1. To advise the Chief Campus Officer and the Davis Division on general policies and practice bearing on affirmative action, and diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) for academic personnel and academic programs. As used here, "affirmative action" refers to policies and programs concerning African Americans, Chicanos/Latinos/Hispanics, Asian Americans/Pacific Islanders, American Indians/Alaskan Natives, women, persons with disabilities, special disabled veterans and Vietnam era veterans, while "diversity" refers to the variety of personal experiences, values, and worldviews that arise from differences of culture and circumstance. Such differences include race, ethnicity, gender, age, religion, language, abilities/disabilities, sexual orientation, gender identity, socioeconomic status, and geographic region, and more. inclusively to all distinctions based on race, ethnicity, gender, age, citizenship, disability, sexual orientation, religious or political beliefs, status within or outside the university, or other differences among people that may be subject to bias on the part of others.

2. To monitor all aspects of the Educational Opportunity Program and Student Affirmative Action, with special attention to the problems of admission and retention of culturally diverse and economically disadvantaged students.

3. To promote campus accountability by requesting and reviewing reports related to the Committee’s charge, including undertaking studies of affirmative action and diversity DEI policies and practices and to advise advising the Chief Campus Officer, the Davis Division and relevant campus units accordingly. These studies should include but not be limited to data and analyses provided by the campus administration on:

   a. the recruitment, admission, retention, mentorship, appointment, assignment to duties, salaries, advancement, and/or separation from employment of members of groups identified by the Committee as the subject of its concern;

   b. events having either a positive or negative impact on diversity DEI; and

   c. steps taken to create a supportive environment for all members of the campus community.

4. To advise the Divisional Committees on Academic Personnel and Admission and Enrollment regarding affirmative action and diversity DEI issues within the jurisdiction of those committees.

4. To engage with relevant administrative, academic units, and academic departments on issues related to DEI and campus climate (e.g., DEI Office, Provost’s Office, Center for Advancement of Multicultural Perspective on Social Sciences, Arts, and Humanities (CAMPSSAH), Center for Advancement of Multicultural Perspectives on Science (CAMPOS), Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Undergraduate Education, Graduate Studies, Center for Educational Effectiveness (CEE), Ombuds, Office of Educational Opportunity and Enrichment Services, etc.).
5. To engage with the DEI office and campus DEI committees regarding facilitating the disclosure of best practices for departments, colleges, schools, and other campus units.

6. To select nominees to receive the Chancellor’s Fellowship for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion based on guidelines established by the Office of the Chancellor and this committee. The names of the recipients shall be presented to the Office of the Chancellor for final approval.

57. To report annually to the Davis Division on policies and practices.
PROPOSED REVISION OF DAVIS DIVISION REGULATION 520:

Doctor of Philosophy

Submitted by UC Davis Graduate Studies.

Endorsed by Executive Council.

Rationale: Regulation 520 currently states that students must file their dissertation to Graduate Studies “three weeks before the end of the quarter,” (DDR 520.C.3.). This differs from the deadlines of other graduate degree objectives which allow students to file or complete their final requirement by the last day of instruction. This also poses a challenge for faculty advisors and coordinators, as well as the Graduate Studies Senior Academic Advising team who often need to communicate and clarify this deadline for students and faculty. For example, one implication of this requirement is that students who file after this cut-off but before the end of the quarter (i.e., weeks 9 and 10 of the quarter) are placed on the subsequent quarter’s degree list. This is confusing for students who are able to complete their final requirements and secure the necessary approvals before the end of the quarter. The confusion about the deadline also results in additional requests for deadline exceptions and/or retroactive or expedited degree processing, further adding to the workload of the graduate programs, the Office of the University Registrar (OUR), the Academic Senate, and the Graduate Studies advising team.

Thus, Graduate Studies is proposing removing the “three week” requirement as it causes significant confusion among students and faculty and no longer yields value for students, programs, or Graduate Studies. This “three week” stipulation may have been necessary during a time when the filing process required significant lead time to transmit and review paperwork, but current practices, tools, and staffing resources allow for this process to be completed in a shorter time frame. In addition, the requirement to submit the abstract to Graduate Studies is now obsolete since it can now be handled digitally as part of the ProQuest submission process. Thus, we recommend removing this requirement to align with current practices.

Removing the “three week” stipulation from DDR 520 would accomplish the following:

1. Simplify and streamline the deadlines for submission of final requirements by allowing Graduate Studies to implement the last day of instruction¹ as the single deadline across all graduate degree objectives (see Appendix A) and consistent across the UC.
2. Allow students to utilize the whole quarter (10 weeks) to complete their final requirement (including receiving necessary approvals for their committee) and be on the current quarter’s degree list.
3. Make DDR 520 more consistent with the regulations for other graduate degree objectives (DDR 500-518), none of which state a specific date or timeframe for submission of the final requirement.

We request that this revision, if approved, be implemented by Fall 2023.

¹Note: Moving the filing deadline to the last day of instruction will not impact any other campus policies nor will it change the processing timelines for OUR and the Academic Senate. Graduate Studies will adjust its administrative protocols to ensure that we can still transmit the resulting degree list to OUR and the Academic Senate under the current timeline.
Proposed Revision: Davis Division Regulation 520 shall be amended as follows. Deletions are indicated by strikeout; additions are in bold type.

520. Doctor of Philosophy

C. Dissertation

1. A dissertation on a subject chosen by the candidate, bearing on the principal subject of study and of such character as to show ability to prosecute independent investigation, must receive the approval of the special committee in charge of the dissertation and of the Graduate Council before the degree is recommended. Special emphasis will be placed upon this requirement, and the degree will in no case be given merely for the faithful completion of a course of study, however extensive.

2. The dissertation must be in a form acceptable to the Graduate Council.

3. Not later than three weeks before the end of the quarter in which the degree is to be conferred, the candidate shall file with the Dean of Graduate Studies one copy of the dissertation (the original if typewritten) approved by the committee in charge. An abstract of the dissertation must be filed by the same date. (Am. 02/25/05)
# Appendix A: Proposed New Filing Timeline & Deadlines

*Deadline communicated to students*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Filing Fee</th>
<th>Regular Filing (Thesis/Dissertation)</th>
<th>Regular Filing (Plan II &amp; MFA Report)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weeks 8-10</strong></td>
<td>Required to meet with SAA to review paperwork for filing and file.</td>
<td>Optional meeting with SAA to review filing paperwork.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last day of instruction</strong></td>
<td>Deadline to submit required filing paperwork to Graduate Studies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Last day of the quarter** | ● Graduate Studies internal deadline to complete review of all filing paperwork.  
● Students who have successfully completed all of the filing process will be on that quarter’s degree list. | | Last day to complete final requirement(s). |
| **What happens if a student does not have an approved final packet by the last day of instruction?** | Cancellation of filing fee status and late registration for current quarter. | N/A | N/A |
| **What are the options for completing the filing process? What degree list will they be on?** | Options:  
1. Student completes filing process in the “gap” period between the current quarter and next quarter.  
2. Student goes on Filing Fee for next quarter.  
3. Student enrolls in the next quarter.  
In all cases, the student will not be on the current quarter degree list and may be on the next quarter’s degree list. | | |
PROPOSED REVISION OF DAVIS DIVISION REGULATION A545:
Passed or Not Passed Grading

Submitted on behalf of Division Chair Ahmet Palazoglu.

Endorsed by Executive Council.

Rationale: The deadline to change a grading mode between letter grading and Passed/Not Passed (P/NP) grading has historically been set by informal agreement among the Davis Division of the Academic Senate, the deans and faculty executive committees of the undergraduate colleges, and the Office of the University Registrar. During the COVID-19 pandemic, the Davis Division assumed governing responsibility for this deadline, which is now proposed for formal inclusion in Davis Division Regulations. Simultaneously, upon review of a proposal from the Associated Students of the University of California, Davis (ASUCD), this deadline is proposed to move from the historical 25th day of instruction for quarters (15th day of instruction for summer sessions) to the 40th day of instruction for quarters (20th day of instruction for summer sessions). This two-week shift allows students greater flexibility in their grading modes and reduces the need for students to petition for late approval.

Proposed Revision: Davis Division Regulation A545 shall be amended as follows. Deletions are indicated by strikeout; additions are in bold type.

A545. Passed or Not Passed Grading

(A) A regular undergraduate student in good standing may opt to take specific courses on a Passed (P) or Not Passed (NP) basis up to the limits specified in Davis Division Regulation A545(B). (Am. by mail ballot 5/7/74)

1) For spring quarter 2020, summer session(s) 2020, fall quarter 2020, winter quarter 2021, spring quarter 2021, and summer session(s) 2021, an undergraduate student not in good standing may opt to take specific courses on a Passed (P) or Not Passed (NP) basis up to the limits specified in the Davis Division Regulation A545(B) via petition and approval by the dean’s office. (En. 9/1/2020, Am. 9/1/2021)

(B) Not more than one-third of the units taken in residence on the Davis campus and presented for graduation by an undergraduate student may be in courses taken on a Passed or Not Passed basis, including courses graded in accordance with Davis Division Regulations A545(C) and A545(D). The faculty of any college or school on the Davis campus may establish regulations that are more restrictive regarding use of the Passed or Not Passed option by its students.

1) Spring quarter 2020, summer session(s) 2020, fall quarter 2020, winter quarter 2021, spring quarter 2021, and summer session(s) 2021 units taken Passed/Not Passed are exempt from the one-third calculation in both the numerator (Passed/Not Passed units taken) and the denominator (total units taken). (En. 9/1/2020, Am. 9/1/2021)
(C) With approval of the appropriate department or division and of the appropriate committees on courses of instruction, the grades assigned by instructors in specific undergraduate courses may be, for undergraduate students, Passed or Not Passed only and, for graduate students, Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory only.

(D) Each special study, directed group study, or other variable-unit undergraduate course shall be graded for undergraduate students on a Passed or Not Passed only basis and for graduate students on a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory only basis unless specific approval for the use of a letter grade is given by the appropriate committees on courses of instruction.

(E) For courses being undertaken on a Passed or Not Passed basis, the grade of Passed shall be awarded only for work which otherwise would receive a grade of C- or better. Units thus earned shall be counted in satisfaction of degree requirements, but courses undertaken on a Passed or Not Passed basis shall be disregarded in determining a student’s grade point average.

(F) The deadline to elect Passed/Not Passed grading is the 40th day of instruction in a quarter and the 20th day of instruction in a six-week summer session.

(G) After the Passed/Not Passed deadline and before the close of business on the last day of instruction for the quarter, or, for summer sessions (excluding special session), before the close of business on the last day of instruction in the fifth week of the session, a grade change may be granted via petition and approval by a student’s dean’s office.

(H) To change the grading mode after close of business on the last day of instruction for the quarter, or, for summer sessions (excluding special session), after the close of business on the last day of instruction in the fifth week of the session, the student must submit a petition to the Davis Division Grade Changes Committee.
Ahmet Palazoglu
Chair, Davis Division of the Academic Senate

RE: Passed/Not Passed Deadline

The Committee on Courses of Instruction (COCI) welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Associated Students of UC Davis (ASUCD) proposal to adopt the last day of instruction as the permanent deadline for election of a Passed or Not Passed (P/NP) grading option.

COCI members are in consensus on extending the P/NP deadline permanently beyond the 25th day of instruction. Members noted that this proposal would not change the college-specific limitations on the number and kind of courses that students can take P/NP, so most members comfortable with shifting the deadline. While a majority of members support shifting the deadline to the last day of instruction, others preferred a compromise position (e.g., 40th day of instruction) because they are concerned about some of the ramifications of extending the deadline to the last day of instruction. Their concerns include:

- Students may make last-minute decisions in the last few days of instruction without advisor guidance. Unlike during the instructional period, after the last day of instruction advisors in the dean’s offices cannot authorize a reversion to letter grading for students. Reversion to letter grading after the last day of instruction must be approved by the Grade Change Committee, which has much higher bars for these retroactive changes.
- Students may put in less effort in the class if they know they can change the grading mode so late in the term.

COCI would have liked to have more data on the impacts of extending the P/NP deadline during the pandemic to make a thorough assessment of this proposal. Specifically, the committee would like to know what impacts the policy change had on students, advising, degree progress, and graduation.

Regardless of the results of the proposal, COCI encourages all involved to increase education around P/NP grading options. For example, exploring new ways to inform students that a P grade requires a C- or better (C in ELWR courses).

Sincerely,

Colleen Bronner
Chair, Committee on Course of Instruction

c: Edwin M. Arevalo, Executive Director, Davis Division of the Academic Senate
Ahmet Palazoglu  
Chair, Davis Division of the Academic Senate

RE: Request for Consultation: Passed/Not Passed Deadline Proposal from ASUCD

Dear Ahmet:

The Undergraduate Council (UGC) has reviewed and discussed the RFC to change the Passed/Not Passed Deadline as proposed by the Associated Students of UC Davis to move the deadline to the last day of instruction.

In its discussion of the matter, the committee was unable to arrive at any one consensus or conclusion; rather, committee members brought up a variety of issues for consideration, some in favor of the measure, others that militate against it. The key points that were raised may be distilled as follows:

- UGC members expressed concern that there appears to be no historical documentation that might explain why and how the current deadline came to be set at the 25th day of instruction. Without such information, the date chosen appears to be arbitrary and, in the view of some, poorly aligned with the accelerated schedule that is characteristic of the quarter system, in which many courses are already into midterm testing by week 3.

- Committee members noted that extending the deadline to a point later in the quarter has the potential to provide students with greater flexibility in the event of unexpected emergencies, flexibility that does not simply push the burden forward in time in the way that incompletes and late drops do. However, it was unclear to UGC what unintended consequences a changed deadline might carry, and what different consequences might be attached to a deadline pegged to the last day of instruction versus one pegged to some other target, for example, one in week 8 or week 9 of the quarter. For example, are there implications for financial aid? More generally, there was concern that students are making decisions about grading without fully understanding both their options and the long term and unintended consequences of their choices for things like major requirements or postgraduate education. Some UGC members, noting that in point of fact, students already have the ability to apply for P/NP grading (and late drops) beyond the 25th day of instruction through their dean’s office, suggested that perhaps what is needed is better communication to students about the full array of options available to them. Others suggested that perhaps a later deadline would allow students to make more fully informed decisions in that it afforded them more time to consult with an advisor.

- Some UGC members expressed concern that a later deadline will reinforce the perception that GPA is of paramount importance, will undermine students’ willingness to take classes outside of their comfort zone, and will put greater pressure on instructors to have all grades complete and entered before the last day of classes. Others noted that a later deadline could conceivably have a negative effect on seat availability in high demand and over-enrolled courses.
Thank you.

A. Katie Harris
Chair, Undergraduate Council
Passed/Not Passed Deadline Proposal from ASUCD

FEC: College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences Committee Response

April 7, 2023

The Faculty Executive Committee of the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences reviewed the Passed/Not Passed deadline extension proposal by ASUCD and appreciates this opportunity to comment.

The FEC members were in general agreement to extending the P/NP deadline in the quarter. The use of a later P/NP deadline for students during the COVID pandemic restrictions allowed for greater flexibility and did not appear to affect general student academic standing or to significantly increase instances of P/NP use compared to prior to the pandemic.

Members can agree to a later P/NP deadline except for the last day of instruction as proposed by ASUCD. The last week of instruction is already difficult for faculty with course deadlines, student inquiries and increased workload with preparation for finals. Propose, perhaps, a deadline moved to the end of the seventh week of instruction, such as noted for UC Santa Barbara, or to the end of the eighth week (as for UC Riverside). Advising for students considering P/NP should continue to be offered and stressed to help them navigate through requirements and restrictions that the P/NP choice may affect in progress towards the completion of their major,
April 11, 2023

Ahmet Palazoglu
Chair, Davis Division of the Academic Senate

RE: Incentivizing Completion of Trainings for Academic Appointees

Dear Ahmet:

The College of Biological Sciences Faculty Executive Committee has considered in depth the ASUCD proposal to change the deadline for P/NP grading option changes to the last day of class in each quarter. Our department representatives collected many opinions from individual faculty members, and we also requested and received the opinions of the CBS student advising center (BASC) headed by Dr. Ebony Blackwell.

There was a broad spread of faculty opinion, ranging from strongly opposed to supportive. Most opinions in favor of the changes appreciated the importance of giving students flexibility but also indicated reservations and questions about how well this would work. The main concerns with the change were:

1. The concern that placing the deadline on the last day of the quarter will create a concentrated and rushed workload on advisors on this day, and that students may not be able to get timely access to advising at this busy time. Many of the supportive opinions thought that extending the deadline later in the quarter (i.e. 8th or 9th week) but not to the very end would be a better choice

2. The concern that students often make the choice to switch to P/NP, especially in major courses, when it is detrimental to them. People involved with advising and the grade change committee have seen many situations in which a student’s choice to switch to P/NP became a problem later on. There are many petitions to change P/NP back to a letter grade retroactively, after the student realizes that it was a poor decision, and it is thought that this change will likely increase the number of these situations. The BASC advisors also raised the question of whether students will be able to select the grade change option themselves in OASIS as they were allowed to during the pandemic. It was noted that when given this ability, students often made this choice even when advised not to.

3. The concern that GPA has become too much of a focus for students. The use of the P/NP option as a strategy to protect GPA was viewed negatively. Several opinions noted that students often see taking the P/NP option as preferable to a decrease in GPA but do not realize the potential detrimental implications of P/NP for graduate school or employment applications. In general, a number of opinions saw various difficulties in a model where students wait to see their final grade before deciding to choose P/NP.

Overall, many faculty voiced support for providing flexibility for students, and a desire to implement policies that help them when difficult personal situations arise. However, there are strong reservations that this particular change will achieve this end without causing additional difficulties. The advisors raised some important questions that we feel should be addressed before this change moves forward:

1. Is there a specific cut off time on the last day of instruction when students would be unable to access the P/NP petition in OASIS? Every advisor’s schedule varies, and this may affect the time BASC would have to review petitions.

2. What impact, if any, would the new policy have on time to degree?
3. What impact, if any, would the new policy have financial aid recipients?
4. Would a more lenient deadline be viewed by graduate schools negatively? Would this affect student admissions to graduate schools?

We hope that these questions and the above concerns can be taken into account as this change is considered. The College of Biological Sciences faculty and advisors appreciate the opportunity to comment on this proposal.

John Albeck
Associate Professor
Department of Molecular and Cellular Biology
Chair, College of Biological Sciences Faculty Executive Committee
Davis, CA
Passed/Not Passed Deadline Proposal from ASUCD

FEC: College of Engineering Committee Response

April 7, 2023

The Faculty Executive Committee of the College of Engineering discussed the Passed/Not Passed Deadline Proposal from ASUCF at a supplemental meeting on March 21, 2023. The Committee is generally supportive of the proposal idea however not unanimously. It was noted that the College of Engineering has specific terms for P/NP in terms of units and GE/Non-engineering units and is unlikely to impact Engineering students in a significant way due to these existing parameters.

The College of Engineering faculty appreciates the opportunity to comment.
Hi Edwin

I have discussed this with Dean Dillard and our CA&ES Undergraduate Academic Programs Director Leslie Charlton who are both copied here. I am also copying our FEC chair Gang Sun so that he is aware of our response to you; I will have further discussions with Gang and the CA&ES FEC separately.

Our thoughts are that we don’t have a problem with extending the deadline to request P/NP beyond the current deadline, but feel that the last day of instruction each quarter is difficult for faculty, due to workload issues during the last week of the quarter and students requesting grade information at the end of the quarter when faculty have many pressing deadlines for courses, preparing for finals, etc. A deadline of Week 7-8 may be better, while still allowing students a longer period of time in the quarter to elect to take a course P/NP than is currently allowed.

We do have strong concerns about providing more flexibility for students in good standing to elect P/NP grading without changes to the regulations that restrict students in Academic Difficulty from electing to take classes P/NP (i.e., DDR 545 A). Students who are not in good standing are disproportionately first generation and under-represented, therefore policies that allow greater flexibility for P/NP for students in good standing could disproportionately impact students who are not in good standing. Students can have a GPA above 2.0 and have 1 quarter of difficulty that would then restrict them from taking classes P/NP, when often the flexibility to take a class P/NP may be enough to get them through the immediate challenges, focus on major required courses, and return to good standing. During the pandemic, the requirement that students must be in Good Standing to elect to take courses P/NP was waived, and a process was developed where students who were not in good standing petitioned their college to take a course P/NP and the college reviewed the request, discussed with the student, and approved or not. Overall, we believe this process worked well and advisors did an excellent job of advising students about the impacts of P/NP decisions and referring students to major advisors for information on major-required courses.

Budget and Institutional Analysis also previously did some analysis of academic impacts of P/NP flexibilities during the pandemic. I have previously provided this information below to the Senate during the pandemic when P/NP flexibilities were being considered—yellow highlights refer specifically to P/NP flexibility for students in academic difficulty:

- There is little evidence that students over-used the P/NP flexibilities when they were made available in previous Covid quarters. The % of students who took one or more classes P/NP was different among colleges, and across quarters, but campus-wide, on average about 3-10% more students took one or more classes P/NP when the flexibility was offered, compared to before the pandemic. This equates to ~0.5 to 1.0 more P/NP units per quarter, on average, campus-wide. Before the pandemic, students took 37-42% of all courses as P/NP (this does include classes that are only offered as P/NP). (data from Aggie Dash P/NP Grade Trends
dashboard). [Note that the pandemic flexibilities provided considerably more flexibility in taking classes P/NP than any of the changes being discussed here since currently, all students would still be bound by DDR 545.B and college-level restrictions on taking courses P/NP].

- From initial data provided by BIA, it also does not appear that taking classes P/NP impacted academic standing significantly. For a given quarter, about the same percentage of students ended up in academic difficulty whether they took 1 or more classes P/NP or not. This was true for students who started the quarter in good standing and for students who started the quarter in academic difficulty.

- Before the pandemic-related flexibilities, the colleges limited the number or did not allow major-required courses to be taken P/NP, so it’s possible that the increase in P/NP classes taken is largely in major-required classes. Our own very preliminary data in CA&ES don’t necessarily support that, although there are some differences by major also. This could be something to look at further.

- There are some demographic differences that it may be useful to delve into more deeply at some point. For example, underserved students were slightly less likely (1.3-3.8% less likely) to take one or more classes P/NP than non-underserved students, however underserved students are about 2 times more likely to be in academic difficulty (either academic probation or subject to dismissal). It’s unclear why this difference in P/NP taking behavior. (data from Aggie Dash P/NP Grade Trends and Academic Standing dashboards)

We thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal and hope that the Senate will consider the overall impacts on equitable outcomes for all of our students.

Take care.

sue

---

From: Edwin M Arevalo <emarevalo@ucdavis.edu>
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2023 at 11:04 AM
To: Susan Ebeler <seebeler@ucdavis.edu>, Michele Igo <mmigo@ucdavis.edu>, Ralph Curtis Aldredge <rcaldredge@ucdavis.edu>, Letters & Science Associate Dean For Academic Programs & Planning <ls-ad-academics@ucdavis.edu>
Cc: Academic Senate Chair <aschair@ucdavis.edu>, Kyle S Gayman <ksgayman@ucdavis.edu>, Theresa Costa <tacosta@ucdavis.edu>, Mary E Vasquez <mpvasquez@ucdavis.edu>
Subject: P/NP Deadline Proposal

Dear Undergraduate College Associate Deans,

The Senate is currently reviewing ASUCD’s proposal to change the deadline for students to elect P/NP grading from the 25th day of instruction to the last day of instruction. If the Senate accepted that proposal and changed the deadline, would you have implementation or programmatic concerns? If so, do you have an opinion about alternate deadlines, e.g. the last day of instruction would be highly burdensome, but the 45th day would be ok?
These changes would also involve making the P/NP deadline a permanent Senate regulation. Historically, there has been no Senate regulation about the P/NP deadline, as it has operated as in informal understanding among the colleges, the registrar, and the Senate.

We have also solicited feedback from Senate standing committees, your college Faculty Executive Committees, and the University Registrar.

Please let me know your thoughts.

Thank you!
Edwin

Edwin M. Arevalo
Executive Director
Academic Senate Office, Mrak Hall 402
University of California, Davis
(530) 754-7468
Thank you for your feedback, Ralph.

Take care,
Edwin

Edwin M. Arevalo
Executive Director
Academic Senate Office, Mrak Hall 402
University of California, Davis
(530) 754-7468

HI Edwin - I am not in favor of the proposed extension of the deadline for P/NP election to the last day of instruction. Prior to the deadline, students in COE are able to use Schedule Builder to opt for P/NP grading in any course without prior consultation or approval. After the deadline, this is not possible. As only limited options for P/NP grading are acceptable for engineering students per COE policy (e.g., only up to 16 units and only for GE and other courses not required for the major), intervention by OUR to restore letter grading for engineering students after the P/NP election deadline but prior to the end of the quarter becomes necessary (in lieu of a retroactive grade change, which would be otherwise necessary). This might become overly burdensome on OUR and impracticable if the deadline for P/NP election were extended to the last day of instruction. For this reason, I believe that a deadline well before the end of the quarter such as the 25th day of instruction (about halfway through the quarter) or not too long thereafter, is best.

Best regards,

Ralph Curtis Aldredge, PhD, PE
Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies
College of Engineering, University of California, Davis
Professor, Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering
Program Evaluator, Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology
(530) 752-5016 | rcaldredge@ucdavis.edu
On Mar 9, 2023, at 11:04 AM, Edwin M Arevalo <emarevalo@ucdavis.edu> wrote:

Dear Undergraduate College Associate Deans,

The Senate is currently reviewing [ASUCD’s proposal](mailto:ASUCD's proposal) to change the deadline for students to elect P/NP grading from the 25th day of instruction to the last day of instruction. If the Senate accepted that proposal and changed the deadline, would you have implementation or programmatic concerns? If so, do you have an opinion about alternate deadlines, e.g. the last day of instruction would be highly burdensome, but the 45th day would be ok?

These changes would also involve making the P/NP deadline a permanent Senate regulation. Historically, there has been no Senate regulation about the P/NP deadline, as it has operated as in informal understanding among the colleges, the registrar, and the Senate.

We have also solicited feedback from Senate standing committees, your college Faculty Executive Committees, and the University Registrar.

Please let me know your thoughts.

Thank you!
Edwin

Edwin M. Arevalo
Executive Director
Academic Senate Office, Mrak Hall 402
University of California, Davis
(530) 754-7468
FYI – OUR response. They don’t have any issues with the possibility of changing the P/NP election deadline.

--Theresa

Theresa Costa (she/her/hers)
Budget and Policy Supervisor
Academic Senate Office
tacosta@ucdavis.edu
530.752.3917

Hi Theresa,

David, Patti, and I met to discuss (mainly to inform me of how the system behaves). From a procedural standpoint, the OUR does not have a concern with the proposal. It is a matter of setting the appropriate last day to allow the grade change in the system.

Thank you for checking in with us.

Brian
Hi Brian and David,

As you may have seen, the Senate is currently reviewing ASUCD’s proposal to change the deadline for students to elect P/NP grading from the 25th day of instruction to the last day of instruction. If the Senate accepted that proposal and changed the deadline, would you have implementation concerns? If so, do you have an opinion about alternate deadlines, e.g. the last day of instruction would be highly burdensome, but the 45th day would be ok?

We will also be soliciting feedback from the Associate Deans, so we’ll get some college level feedback as well.

Happy for any of your thoughts.

Thanks!

Theresa

Theresa Costa (she/her/hers)
Budget and Policy Supervisor
Academic Senate Office
tacosta@ucdavis.edu
530.752.3917
Proposal to Establish a New Davis Division Regulation (DDR) for the Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP)

**Background:** The first and current Doctor of Nursing Practice-Family Nurse Practitioner (DNP-FNP) degree program at UC Davis was established in fall 2021 and enrolled its first cohort of students in summer 2022. The proposed Davis Division Regulation (DDR) below is based on the current DNP program’s degree requirements as well as the current requirements at the other UC Schools of Nursing summarized in the table below. This professional doctorate is an applied doctoral degree and a different scholarly endeavor than a PhD. Therefore, this new DDR for DNP programs will cover the DNP-FNP as well as future DNP offerings at the School of Nursing.

**Table 1. Comparison of DNP Program Requirements Across the UC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Length of Program</th>
<th>MS(N) required for admission?</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
<th>Clinical Units/Hours</th>
<th>QE Requirement</th>
<th>Advancement to Candidacy Requirement</th>
<th>Final Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UC Davis</td>
<td>12 quarters</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>115-124</td>
<td>1000 hours</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>(see Section C of proposed DDR 519)</td>
<td>(see Section D of proposed DDR 519)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UC Irvine</td>
<td>3 years (DNP-FNP)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>98 (DNP-FNP)</td>
<td>1020 hours (DNP-FNP)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Completion of the DNP Scholarly Project Proposal (see form)</td>
<td>Scholarly Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 quarters (Post-Master’s)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>53 (Post-Master’s)</td>
<td>540 hours (Post-Master’s)</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>7 quarters</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>500+ hours</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Completion of core coursework and the QE</td>
<td>Scholarly Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCSF</td>
<td>7 quarters</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>53-57</td>
<td>500+ hours</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Completion of core coursework, and a minimum of three DNP Residency and DNP Project series courses (see handbook)</td>
<td>Scholarly Project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF DAVIS DIVISION REGULATION 519: DOCTOR OF NURSING PRACTICE (DNP)

Submitted by UC Davis Graduate Studies.

Endorsed by Executive Council.

**Rationale:** The proposed new Davis Division Regulation 519: Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP) establishes the academic requirements for the DNP degree objective, analogous to the requirements for higher degrees established in regulations 500-520 within the existing UC Davis Academic Senate Davis Division Regulations. The first DNP program, the Doctor of Nursing Practice - Family Nurse Practitioner (DNP-FNP), was established at UC Davis in 2021 and enrolled its inaugural cohort in summer 2022. In fall 2022, Graduate Studies received the proposal for a new DNP program in Nurse Anesthesia. Thus, the establishment of the proposed DDR 519 will ensure a consistent standard is applied in the evaluation of new programs within the DNP degree objective as well as the revision of degree requirements for current and future DNP programs.

The proposed regulation was drafted in consultation with the UC Davis Betty Irene Moore School of Nursing and the Graduate Council at its March 17, 2023 meeting. The proposal is based on the requirements for the established DNP program that was approved by the Graduate Council and the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) in 2021. In addition, the requirements listed in the proposed regulation are consistent with the expectations of other DNP programs across the UC. All UC DNP programs require a scholarly project. UCLA requires a Qualifying Examination prior to advancing to candidacy.

**Proposed New DDR:**

519. Doctor of Nursing Practice

The degree of Doctor of Nursing Practice will be granted on the following conditions:

A. Candidates for admission to a DNP program must possess the following minimum criteria for admission, in addition to the requirements for admission to graduate standing at UC Davis:
   1. Current unencumbered registered nurse (RN) licensure to practice in California or a current unencumbered R.N. licensure in another state plus eligibility to receive California licensure by the end of year one in the program.
   2. A Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN) degree or a Bachelor’s Degree with RN licensure, with a minimum GPA of 3.0 overall and within the science prerequisite coursework as defined in the program degree requirements.

B. Students must complete a minimum of six quarters of academic residence (as defined by Graduate Council) at the University of California.

C. Students are eligible for advancement to candidacy upon successful completion of the following:
   1. Nine quarters (including summer) of required graduate courses with a minimum GPA of 3.0, including clinical practice hours as specified by the program degree requirements.
2. Formal evaluation by the Scholarly and Clinical Advancement Committee appointed by Graduate Studies to assess the following:
   i. Readiness to engage in scholarly work.
   ii. Clinical competence.

D. After advancement to candidacy, students must complete a DNP Scholarly Project and a comprehensive clinical examination as established by the Graduate Program Committee and completed under the direction of a Scholarly and Clinical Doctorate Committee appointed by Graduate Studies.

1. Successful completion of the Scholarly Project requirement as determined by the candidate’s Scholarly and Clinical Doctorate Committee. The Scholarly Project includes a written component and may include an oral presentation.

2. Successful completion of the comprehensive clinical examination as determined by the candidate’s Scholarly and Clinical Doctorate Committee. The comprehensive clinical examination includes a written and/or practical examination.

Satisfaction of these requirements must be verified for each student by the Scholarly and Clinical Doctorate Committee Chair.
The Committee on Committees would like to thank all faculty, past and present, who have served on Academic Senate committees. Appointments and reappointments to Senate committees are performed annually, and in so doing the Senate seeks to reflect, as noted in UC Davis’s Principles of Community, the “multitude of backgrounds and experiences” that foster the “inclusive and intellectually vibrant community” of UC Davis. If we were unable to place you in service this year, we encourage you to apply again during next year’s call for service. If you are wondering which committees might be a good fit for you, we encourage you to browse the Academic Senate’s committee webpage and speak to your colleagues who have served on committees.

**Committee Appointments**

**Academic Freedom & Responsibility**
Chair: Gregory Downs  
Members: Niels Gronbech-Jensen, Greta Hsu, Beatriz Martinez Lopez, Burkhard Schipper  
University Committee on Academic Freedom (UCAF): Gregory Downs

**Administrative Series Personnel Committee** (AS representative)  
Member: Narine Yegiyan

**Admissions & Enrollment**
Chair: John Stachowicz  
Members: Anthony Albano, Julia Chamberlain, Susan Gentry, Noah Guynn, Mark Halperin, Hooman Rashtian, Li Tian, Cecilia Tsu  
Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS): John Stachowicz

**Affirmative Action & Diversity**
Chair: Agustina Carando  
Members: Krishnakumar Balasubramanian, Titus Brown, Hsuan Hsu, Michelle Ko, Tracy Yarbrough, Ayako Yasuda  
University Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (UCAAD): Agustina Carando

**CAP Appellate Committee**
Chair: Scott Simon
Members: Christine Cocanour, Dean Tantillo, William Usrey, Charles Walker

**CAP Oversight Committee**
Chair: Edward Dickinson
Members: David Begun, Alan Bennett, Prabir Burman, Zhi Ding, Angela Gelli, Brian Morrissey, Julie Sze, Francisco Uzal
University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP): Edward Dickinson

**Courses of Instruction**
Chair: Colleen Bronner
Members: Hussain Al-Asaad, Shirley Chiang, Susan Handy, Joel Ledford, Steven Luck, Mona Monfared, Anhvu Pham, Bruce Rannala, Matthew Reimer, Stefan Uhlig, Jeffrey Williams

**Distinguished Teaching Awards**
Chair: Michael Saler
Members: Lucy Corin, Marc Facciotti, Cassandra Tucker, Lawrence Winn

**Elections, Rules & Jurisdiction**
Chair: Daniel Potter
Members: Steven Carlip, Bruno Pypendop

**Emeriti**
Chair: James Boggan
Members: Bruce Gates, Amanda Hodson, Jill Joseph, Barry Klein, Catherine Outerbridge, Gregory Pasternack

**AF Excellence in Teaching** (AS representative)
Member: Susette Min

**Faculty Distinguished Research Award**
Chair: Alyssa Thornton
Members: Michele Barbato, Gail Goodman, Nathan Kuppermann, Archana Venkatesan

**Faculty Privilege and Academic Personnel Advisers**
Chair: Julia Simon
Members: Stephen Lewis, Steven Nadler, Gary Raff, David Rapson, Ruihong Zhang

**Faculty Welfare**
Chair: Karen Bales
Members: David Bunch, Sheryl Catz, Reina Engle-Stone, Janet Foley, Valley Stewart, Kathleen Stuart
University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW): Karen Bales
Graduate Council (GC)
Chair: Jeffrey Schank
Vice Chair: Eleonora Grandi
Members: Alexander Aue, Louise Berben, Matthew Gilbert, Kyoungmi Kim, Markus Luty, Christopher Meissner, Pierre Merel, Gregory Miller, Emily Vazquez Enriquez
Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA): Jeffrey Schank

GC Academic Planning and Development
Chair: Louise Berben
Members: R Holland Cheng, Thomas Glaser

GC Bylaws
Chair: Gregory Miller
Member: Hong Ji

GC Courses
Chair: Kyoungmi Kim
Members: James Angelastro, Randy Carney, Gina Dokko, Brandon Kinne, Maja Makagon-stuart, Elizabeth Montano, Jaroslav Trnka

GC Educational Policy
Chair: Alexander Aue
Members: Enoch Baldwin, Thomas Beamish, Ian Campbell, Corrie Decker, Pamela Lein, Maria Mudryj, Elizabeth Prado, Igor Vorobyov, Julie Wyman, Weijian Yang

GC Graduate Student and Postdoctoral Scholar Welfare
Chair: Matthew Gilbert
Members: Christyann Darwent, Paul Wong

GC Program Review
Chair: Christopher Meissner
Members: Thomas Buckley, Hongwu Chen, Joseph Chen, Zoe Drayson, Audrey Fan, Fernanda Ferreira, Margarita Jimenez-Silva, Matthias Koepppe, Michele La Merrill, Lisa Miller, Jie Peng, Wolfgang Polonik, Laurie San martin, Xiaoling Shu, Johnny Terning, Michael Zhang

General Education
Chair: Marina Ellefson
Members: Rebekka Andersen, Adele Igel, Nobuko Koyama, Joel Ledford, Miles Lopes, Miriam Markum, Daniel Stolzenberg

Grade Changes
Chair: Christopher Nitta
Members: Silvia Carrasco Garcia, Gregory Dobbins, Kevin Novan, John Smolenski
Information Technology
Chair: Christiana Drake
Members: Rohan French, Gregory Kuperberg, Jeremy Mason, Anamaria Robles
University Committee on Communications and Computing (UCCC): Christiana Drake

Instructional Space Advisory Subcommittee
Chair: Luca Comai
Members: Dietmar Kueltz, Timothy McNeil, Stephanie Mudge, Brett Snyder

International Education
Chair: Heather Hether
Members: Andre Daccache, David de la Pena, Katherine Eriksson, Jean-Xavier Guinard, David McCourt, Gabrielle Nevitt
University Committee on International Education (UCIE): Heather Hether

Joint Academic Federation/Senate Personnel
Members: Michael Kapovich, Chengfei Liu

Library
Chair: Naoki Saito
Member: Leopoldo Bernucci
University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC): Naoki Saito

P&T Hearings
Chair: Carlton Larson
Members: Carlee Arnett, Zhaojun Bai, Marie Burns, John Conway, Janko Gravner, David Horton, Albert Lin, Frank Loge, Leonor Saiz, Cynthia Schumann, Laramie Taylor, William Usrey

P&T Investigative
Chair: Catherine VandeVoort
Members: Marina Leite, Venkatesan Sundaresan, Judith Van de Water, Xiangdong Zhu
University Committee on Privilege & Tenure (UCPT): Catherine VandeVoort

Planning & Budget
Chair: Robert Brosnan
Members: Stephen Boucher, Satya Dandekar, Lynn Kimsey, Frank Loge, Prasad Naik, Hollis Skaife, Mitchell Sutter, Rena Zieve
University Committee on Planning & Budget (UCPB): Robert Brosnan

Preparatory Education
Chair: Susan Keen
Members: Natalia Caporale, Dana Ferris, Ozcan Gulacar, Timothy Lewis
University Committee on Preparatory Education (UCOPE): Susan Keen

**Public Service**
Chair: Oscar Jorda
Members: Bo Feng, Richard Kravitz, Michele Steffey, Daniel Sumner

**Research**
Chair: Paul Hastings
Members: Sanchita Bhatnagar, Christopher Cappa, Nipavan Chiamvimonvat, Georgia Drakakaki, Christopher Fraser, James Housefield, Beth Levy, Frank Osterloh, Jasquelin Pena, David Rocke, Sabyasachi Sen, Astrid Volder, Bart Weimer, Vladimir Yarov-Yarovoy

University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP): Paul Hastings

**Special Academic Programs**
Chair: Russell Hovey
Members: Claire Goldstein, Miles Lopes, Philippe Rast, Mijke Rhemtulla

**Undergraduate Council**
Chair: Alice Harris
Members: Eliot Atekwana, Gerardo Con Diaz, Marina Ellefson, Yuming He, Russell Hovey, Susan Keen, Erich Muehlegger, Nitin Nitin, Benjamin Shaw, Mitchell Singer, Hulleah Tsinhnahjinnie

University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP): Alice Harris

**Undergraduate Instruction & Program Review**
Chair: Mitchell Singer
Members: Ian Faloona, Debbie Fetter, Tucker Jones, Francis McNally, Mohammad Sadoghi Hamedani, Youngsuk Suh, Kari Watkins, Magdalena Wojcieszak

**Undergraduate Scholarships, Honors & Prizes**
Chair: Qinglan Xia
Members: Jacqueline Barlow, Rebecca Calisi, Xi Chen, David Doty, Katharine Graf Estes, David Gundry, Fuzheng Guo, Michal Kurlaender, Yanhong Liu, Susette Min, Jeannette Money, Gabriella Montinola, Emilija Pantic, Hamed Pirsiavash, Margaret Ronda, Olivier Rubel, Joseph Shen, Yinghui Yang
Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR) Courses at UC Davis

The following UCD courses will fulfill ELWR if taken for a letter grade and passed with a C or higher:

- UWP 007: 4 unit course
- UWP 007Y: 4 unit hybrid course
- UWP 007V: 4 unit fully online course
- UWP 007M: 4 unit course (an ELWR course for multilingual students or students whose primary academic language is not English)
- UWP 007MY: 4 unit hybrid course (an ELWR course for multilingual students or students whose primary academic language is not English)

Students can also complete an ELWR co-course at UCD along with the corresponding English composition course. Completing the co-course with a C or higher and a passing grade in the English composition courses fulfills ELWR:

A co-course, which must be taken at the same time as a lower division writing course:

- UWP 001A: 2 unit course (while also enrolled in UWP 001/UWP 001Y/UWP 001V)
- ENL 003A: 2 unit course (while also enrolled in ENL 003 or ENL 003V)
- NAS 005A: 2 unit course (while also enrolled in NAS 005)

Students can also complete a UC Online course taught by UC Irvine faculty with a C or higher to fulfill ELWR:

- WR 40: 4 unit UC Online course

NOTE: P/NP grade mode is not permitted if the course will be used for satisfaction of the ELWR. Students must take the course for a letter grade and receive a C or higher to fulfill ELWR.

For more information on the Entry Level Writing Requirement go to: http://elw.ucdavis.edu/
Dear Gary and Mary,

We find our campus at yet another budgetary inflection point. Even with recent progress, our structural core deficit remains—and is now further pressured by new labor compensation agreements. We collectively understand that this historical deficit is largely due to years of steady cost increases without commensurate funding from the state, all while tuition was held nearly flat. The recent multi-year compact with the state and the cohort tuition model are promising developments, but they are not enough. Thus in the near term we are tasked with reigning in our costs; and in the long term, should the pinch of public funding continue, with rethinking our revenue and operating models. We have no choice if we wish to maintain the rigor of teaching and learning due to the students of California, and to carry on the promises and advancements of research due to our broader humankind.

At the Committee on Planning and Budget’s (CPB) recent Winter Budget Retreat, Senate and administrative leaders productively discussed these realities and potential solutions. The Senate has continued these discussions internally, including at Executive Council’s February 9 meeting, where members endorsed the principles and actions below.

**Carryforward Funds**

Carryforward funds should not be returned to central campus (“taxed”) in 2023-24 in any wholesale manner. Anecdotally, we have heard that many of these funds are held in faculty accounts designated for specific research purposes, and in departmental accounts designated for managing staff turnover (and retention efforts) and revitalizing in-person scholarly and programmatic events. Taxing those funds would therefore cause more problems than it solves. It would be useful, however, to analyze the nature of carryforward balances to see if, in following years, certain funds could be freed for alternative uses, or if controls should be put in place to avoid excessive carryforward buildup. The Senate welcomes consultations during any such analysis.

There is one exception: for 2023-24, some faculty carryforward may be needed to cover increases in graduate student researcher compensation. Addressing these unplanned costs should be a shared responsibility among principal investigators, departments, deans, and central campus units.

**Unit Budget and Staffing Reviews**

The campus should engage an external consultant to review budget and staffing levels of certain administrative, and perhaps academic, units. Faculty perceive that some units may need “right sizing” to better align with core campus missions; right sizing could mean adjustments to budget and staffing, or to work processes and duties. CPB is committed to providing a framework to guide the consultants’ scope of work.

Such right sizing reviews should be repeated every five years.
Operational Strategy and Realities
That is the end of the Executive Council endorsed actions—more of which may come—but I am compelled to share a few additional thoughts on these budget issues. I, and I imagine you, remain frustrated when year after year, even with sincere attention given to, and action taken on, these issues, we find ourselves overlooking a hole we seem unable to fill. It is not the fault of one person or of a poorly performing institution; by all available metrics and rankings we are meeting our well-publicized educational, research, and service goals. The problem is that we have met these goals while managing through decades of public disinvestment and structural underfunding. We have been forced to operate too lean. As the pandemic made evident, leanness is fragile, breaks systems, and causes people to give up.

Indeed, we can engage in all the incremental fund management and right sizing we want, and we should do so. However, I suspect they will prove necessary but not sufficient to close our deficit. Many faculty are fundamentally opposed to a public land grant institution pursuing any type of “corporate” models or endeavors for revenue or operations. And it is not my intent to opine on if they are right or wrong, but to acknowledge the unfortunate reality: if our public funding continues to decline relative to the base of students and public we are expected—and in some cases, legally required—to serve, then we have no choice but to adjust our revenue streams and operating models. If our enterprise missions and our ability to execute those missions have become mismatched due to tightened public coffers, and if we have already cut our operations down to the bare bones upholding those missions, then no amount of additional austerity can mend the mismatch—not without severe consequences to our students, employees, missions, and the health and economic wellbeing of the public we serve.

I do not intend to sound overly alarmist or to overstate the magnitude of the current core deficit. But should we face further revenue- or expense-side shocks like the ones we have recently experienced, then that deficit could grow quickly, addressable only by blunt, disruptive actions. With the faculty and administration working together, we can do our best to navigate these complexities and make decisions that make sense for our campus before future crises arise. I think our campus is exceptionally transparent with budget processes and decisions, and I have no doubt we will continue to be. Our UC Davis model of shared governance should continue to set an example for the University of California overall.

To close, I have attached a letter written by CPB in the early months of the pandemic-induced financial crisis. Much of its context and ideas are still relevant today, and I think it is worth a collective rereading. The Senate looks forward to continued partnership this budget cycle, and to seeking lasting solutions through robust shared governance.

Sincerely,

Ahmet Palazoglu
Chair, Davis Division of the Academic Senate
Distinguished Professor of Chemical Engineering
University of California, Davis

Enclosed: Committee on Planning and Budget 2020-21 Letter

c: Sarah Mangum, Associate Vice Chancellor, Budget and Institutional Analysis
Kadee Russ, Vice Chair, Davis Division of the Academic Senate
Heather Rose, Chair, Committee on Planning and Budget
Edwin M. Arevalo, Executive Director, Davis Division of the Academic Senate
Kristin Lagattuta  
Chair, Davis Division of the Academic Senate

RE: UC Davis 2020-21 Budget Planning

Dear Kristin:

UC Davis faces a grim financial outlook. The State of California has long been divesting in the University of California on a per-student basis, the cost of public education has been rising, and these long-term trends are now exacerbated by the present COVID-19 crisis. While this grim financial outlook is shared by the UC system as a whole and by many higher education institutions in the United States, there may be unique paths to be followed and opportunities to be discovered to weather this current crisis and position ourselves for long-term success.

The aim of this letter is to offer a perspective from the decades of collective experience of members on the Committee on Planning and Budget and to initiate a broader faculty discussion. Previous crisis budgets and actions have not always respected shared governance or considered Academic Senate input. It is imperative that the administration shares financial data with CPB and the Senate in real time and collaborates with faculty to address creatively our short- and long-term crises. The administration has shared early COVID-19 financial data with CPB, which we appreciate as a first step in a longer collaborative process.

UC Davis’ 2020-21 budget planning process had already started by acknowledging a $20 million structural deficit on core funds, which would grow to $100 million in five years if unchecked. This gap is largely due to the uneven rise in costs compared to increases in base budgets received from the state. Tuition has also held constant for most of the past decade, making this structural deficit largely inevitable. Indeed almost all UC campuses have varying degrees of such deficits. In addition, the state recently announced that it will not only renge its commitment to a 5 percent base budget increase for the UC, but also proposed a 10 percent cut on its overall allocation.

The provost’s plan to reduce reliance on core funds by assigning reduction targets to each administrative and academic unit aims to eliminate the previously identified deficit in two phases by 2025. However, in light of new announcements by the governor and the still largely unknown impact of the COVID-19 crisis on the UC Davis budget (both for the health system and core campus), CPB believes that an austerity plan as proposed (or as envisioned) may indeed achieve its financial targets but at the cost of a fundamentally negative transformative effect, compromising our research, teaching, and service missions. Our missions must remain our first priorities. While previously planned across-the-board cuts (slightly adjusted on a percentage basis by various opaque metrics from the Provost’s
Office) may seem fair, our current drastic circumstances demand fundamental reassessments of our funding priorities. A limited focus on reducing reliance on core funds is the wrong approach.

First and foremost, further budget discussions need to be well informed through a transparent analysis of the current and ongoing financial situation at the administrative and academic unit levels. While there are significant uncertainties associated with potential campus decisions (e.g., moving the fall quarter to remote learning, closing dorms, etc.), as well as the availability of new federal relief funds, it is imperative to have relevant, updated projections to help drive informed decision making.

While austerity actions may alleviate temporarily the budgetary stress, their long-term impacts cannot be overlooked. We strongly advise our campus (and statewide) leadership to avoid such blunt cuts to our operations, which will only reduce the quality of our research and teaching and give the false impression that our campus can operate on less funding while expecting the same results. We should not create new problems or holes from which we cannot emerge.

CPB believes that it is time to step back, consider the bigger picture, and turn the crisis around to redefine what UC Davis will look like in its aftermath. In fact, CPB takes the slogan “To Boldly Go” as the guiding principle of daring and out-of-the-box thinking that is necessary at this time of unprecedented crisis. We should not accept incremental solutions—these will fail to address our fundamental underfunding, deepen the pain of our current crisis, and will erode the excellence of UC Davis in coming years.

In summary, CPB offers the following priorities and principles for establishing a long-term sustainable financial position:

1. **Get ahead of this crisis.** There are indeed uncertainties, but a wait-and-see stance is counterproductive.

2. **Actions must be data-driven and transparent.** Early and often Senate consultation (and consultation with all campus constituencies) is of paramount importance to forge a path with broad consensus.

3. **Protect the core missions: research, teaching, and service.** In particular, with the current crisis, we should accept no compromise that diminishes the quality and quantity of research. Campus should continue to hire and retain excellent and diverse faculty as well as graduate students. The commensurate infrastructure for such research must be maintained and bolstered.

4. **Maintain a well-trained and competent staff.** This is indispensable to our tripartite mission. Policy-covered staff have already had their salaries frozen (as have academic salary ranges). All effort should be taken to avoid further actions that hurt staff operations, hamper morale, and induce unnecessary attrition.

5. **Provide clarity regarding health system and core campus burdens.** The impact of the COVID-19 crisis is felt differentially across the Causeway. The health system and the core campus have access to different relief funds and their revenue streams are also different. The pace for recovery will likely substantially differ.
6. **Pursue alternatives to blanket austerity.** We are experiencing a 1 in 100 year event—we need to think outside the box.

   a. **Borrow.** The UC can issue bonds, potentially in large quantities (e.g., $100 million per campus).

   b. **Use endowment funds.** The UC Chief Investment Officer could issue a “special dividend” to the system from the endowment. This too could be on a large scale (e.g., $100 million per campus). These funds (from bonds or dividends) should be allocated equitably across campuses based on operational needs and losses, not to privilege the schools with larger endowments.

   c. **The state must step up.** The UC president and chancellors need to lobby hard and get the Board of Regents, the legislature, and the governor to support UC. Ideally, the state needs to borrow too and lobby the federal government for funds. Every cut from or by the UC makes the state’s economy even worse. Thus, no guilt: If UC has a way to operate our piece of the economy at full budget, we should do so. Shared sacrifice is not a meaningful concept in macroeconomic terms. If the private sector is hurting, we just make matters even worse if we slash our operations too.

   d. **The state and federal governments should protect financial aid.** Depending on the severity of its financial situation, UC might need to rethink its commitment to spending one third of tuition on financial aid. Financial aid resources should come from state and federal resources—UC Davis and its employees cannot and should not act as a fund to subsidize governments’ failure to provide financial aid. This may degrade access, but everything is being degraded until the state restores funding and the crisis is over.

   e. **If cuts cannot be avoided, they must be strategic.** Make a list of underperforming services. Some compliance and unfunded mandates will be degraded, but that would be acceptable. If something does not serve the core missions, it can go. Across-the-board cuts signify a lack of willingness to identify priorities. We suggest evaluating administrative offices and underperforming centers and units.

CPB is willing to work closely with the Provost’s Office to advance these priorities and has already begun working with senior staff. Given the magnitude of the situation, CPB also requests an urgent meeting with Chancellor May and Provost Hexter to discuss these items.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Ahmet Palazoglu
Chair, Committee on Planning and Budget

c: Richard Tucker, Vice Chair, Davis Division of the Academic Senate
    Edwin M. Arevalo, Executive Director, Davis Division of the Academic Senate
March 24, 2023

AHMET PALAZOOGLU
Academic Senate Chair

Dear Ahmet,

Thank you for your letter of February 13 and the ensuing conversations. I write now to formally respond to your letter on behalf of the Chancellor and myself.

I want to reiterate that there are currently no plans or discussions for central campus to sweep faculty carryforward funds (please see attached March 9, 2023 Budget Framework Letter). During the annual budget meetings, we are asking the deans to discuss balances and planned uses for carryforward funds held in their offices and in the departments they administer. Again, though, faculty-held carryforward funds will be explicitly excluded from these discussions. I do want to express my ongoing appreciation for the shared responsibility we have agreed upon, outlined in my letter of February 16 (attached), to use some faculty funds to help defray increases in costs related to the recent agreement with UAW-represented graduate students.

I greatly appreciate your thoughts regarding the campus’s extraordinary performance, across several decades now, despite disinvestment in public higher education on the part of the state. UC Davis—and the University of California system more broadly—is a remarkable institution, even a sacred trust in which we all believe and for which we all sacrifice, and I share with you a sense that we must find a way to fund our tripartite mission sustainably and fulsomely.

On that note, I am pleased that the campus is going to strategically address how we best accomplish our tripartite mission through the soon-to-be-formed task force and associated working groups that we have discussed in recent weeks. Thank you for providing me with the May 21, 2020 letter you wrote as Chair of the Committee on Planning and Budget that states “CPB believes that it is time to step back, consider the bigger picture, and turn the crisis around to redefine what UC Davis will look like in its aftermath. In fact, CPB takes the slogan “To Boldly Go” as the guiding principle of daring and out-of-the-box thinking that is necessary at this time of unprecedented crisis. We should not accept incremental solutions—these will fail to address our fundamental underfunding, deepen the pain of our current crisis, and will erode the excellence of UC Davis in coming years.” Thank you for your leadership and collaboration as we boldly tackle these issues.

As requested, we will simultaneously engage in a review of budget and staffing levels. As I have mentioned in meetings with Academic Senate leadership, I have frequently heard faculty concerns regarding the lack of departmental staff support, as well as less frequent concerns expressed regarding lack of college or school staff support. As such, I think it is important to look at staffing across the university, not just at central campus administrative units. Moreover, I think it is important to also consider the return on our investments, particularly for staffing in units that generate program or research funds, or reduce faculty burdens. I look forward to working with the Committee on Planning and Budget on this project and am happy to see it repeated every five years.
As always, I look forward to continuing to work closely with you and other leaders in the Academic Senate on long-term solutions. Together, we can help to ensure a bright future for UC Davis.

All the best,

Mary Croughan
Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

Enclosed: 2023-24 Budget Framework Letter March 9, 2023
Provost email to faculty and staff GS PS funding update 2.16.2023

Cc: Gary S. May, Chancellor
Sarah Mangum, Associate Vice Chancellor, Budget and Institutional Analysis
Kadee Russ, Vice Chair, Davis Division of the Academic Senate
Heather Rose, Chair, Committee on Planning and Budget
Edwin M. Arevalo, Executive Director, Davis Division of the Academic Senate
March 9, 2023

DEANS, VICE CHANCELLORS, VICE PROVOSTS AND THE DIRECTOR OF ATHLETICS

SUBJECT: 2023-24 Operating Budget Framework

Dear Colleagues,

Last July, in my 2022-23 Budget Status and Allocations letter, I shared with you that we had continuing and growing budget challenges. Together, we have taken substantial action by achieving $50.7 million in savings toward our five-year goal of $70 million. I am very grateful to you for your determination, innovation, and creativity. Many members of our campus community also submitted hundreds of suggestions to IDEA$ at Work, which will help us realize more revenue and savings. Each of these ideas is currently being reviewed by the Revenue Generation and Institutional Savings Task Force.

Unfortunately, cost pressures on our core funds have exceeded new resources received from state appropriations and tuition revenue, increasing the core fund structural deficit we identified and began addressing in 2020. Even with the good progress we have made together, systemic inflationary pressures, such as significant increases in our utility costs, growing salary and benefit costs, and unanticipated changes in the results of the UCOP funding allocation formula have all exacerbated the budgetary pressures we face. Given these factors, as we plan for fiscal year 2023-24 and beyond, we must take immediate action. We all have grown very weary of operating in a budgetarily constrained environment; however, I believe that we have an opportunity to make necessary and fundamental changes in how we achieve our mission in a sustainable way. Working together, we will build a stable financial foundation for the campus for years to come.

The Governor’s Proposed Budget for 2023-24, issued on January 10th, maintains the multi-year compact between the State and the University of California, providing the University of California with five percent annual increases in state support for five years if progress is made toward specific policy goals. We appreciate the Governor’s continued support in a year when the state’s initial proposed budget projects a $22.5 billion budget deficit. Most other segments of the state budget received flat or decreased funding in the proposed budget. Since the Governor’s budget proposal was released in January, however, we have learned that state revenues are projected to be down another $5 billion, likely adding to the deficit, and the state and federal tax filing deadlines have been extended until October 2023, after the fiscal year 2023-24 budget must be enacted. This
creates significant uncertainty about the state budget process and may require adjustments to our plans and expectations in the coming months as the Legislature and Governor work to finalize a state budget. With all of the above serving as relevant background, I provide the following high-level context about our core fund projections.

In July 2022, we expected to end fiscal year 2022-23 with a core fund structural deficit of $25.1 million. Current projections indicate that we will end the year with a $44.5 million deficit due to the unanticipated issues mentioned above. In fiscal year 2023-24, we are projecting that our state funds and tuition sources will total $1.05 billion, reflecting a year-over-year $22 million increase in state funds and $18 million increase in tuition. Unfortunately, the additional state funds and tuition revenue increases of $40 million will not cover the cost increases on core funds. Our core-funded salary increases across all employees are expected to be $54 million. When these factors are combined, our core fund structural deficit is projected to be $58.5 million at the end of fiscal year 2023-24. These projections include new labor agreements, faculty merits, the Regents’ proposed 4.6 percent salary increase for non-represented faculty and staff, all other known salary increases for represented employees, revenue changes due to enrollment, cohort-based tuition, and the level of state funds we expect to receive through the UCOP funding formula. These projections also already assume that our $70 million in savings targets allocated in 2020 are achieved by fiscal year 2024-25 as planned, and that previous central campus funding commitments are honored. Finally, the UC Budget for Current Operations, approved by the Regents in November 2022, was also not balanced, indicating a need for $67.9 million in additional cost savings or revenue.

Task Force

Once again, UC Davis, and the whole University of California system, finds itself at an inflection point in our history. Meeting our mission of education, research, and service is no longer sustainable under the current funding structure. We must look to new and better models in all that we do. We must make fundamental and transformative changes in how we approach our teaching, research, service, and operations while working to achieve financial sustainability. And we must fulfill our commitments to our students and our employees. To meet these challenges, I am convening a task force to develop and recommend transformative and strategic changes in how we achieve our education, research, and service missions, including developing new operating models that are financially sustainable while maintaining, if not increasing, our ability to achieve our mission and desired goals. The task force will begin work this spring and spend 12 months developing recommendations and action plans, with the goal of implementing changes by fall 2024. The work of this task force will complement work that is underway as part of the Revenue Generation and Institutional Savings Task Force and the Student Success and Equitable Outcomes Task Force, with liaisons ensuring that their respective work is complementary. These groups will also assist us as we prepare for our upcoming Western Association of Schools and Colleges reaccreditation visit.

2023-24 Budget Process
Our circumstances as described above and in recent meetings require that we take immediate action to further address our core fund structural deficit in the short-term while the Joint Task Force works over the next year. We must do this in service of moving key campus priorities forward. For the 2023-24 budget process and planning cycle we will take the following approach:

**Central Campus Investments**

While there are a small number of strategic campus investments we have committed to and will make in the future, I will not accept unit requests for new central campus investments through the budget process in 2023-24, and this restriction may extend through fiscal year 2025-26. This action will reduce the $58.5 million structural deficit by $3.5 million in fiscal year 2023-24 and increase the central campus savings toward reducing the deficit. I expect all of us to address critical needs and priorities aligned with the campus strategic plan responsibly, and within existing unit resources. This approach may require reallocating internal resources to the highest priorities, utilizing carryforward, and critically reviewing all vacant positions for identifying greatest needs. One-time funds used for ongoing needs can only be a short-term solution. Units are expected to develop sustainable plans for these situations and should not expect nor rely upon central campus to replace one-time funds with ongoing resources in the future.

I will continue to allocate funds as described below in support of campus strategic priorities, critical needs, and prior commitments:

- **Student Success and Equitable Outcomes**: The Student Success and Equitable Outcomes Task Force is charged with recommending action plans that will inform campus investments in making significant, measurable progress in addressing student-success metrics and equitable outcomes. This task force complements the transformative work that has been taking place in Undergraduate Education and Enrollment Management over the past two years. The campus has set aside funds to invest in student success. I expect to direct up to $10 million, in combined one-time and ongoing funds, to support this strategic and high-level priority.

- **Funding for Increased Faculty Salary and Benefit Costs**: I will provide full funding for the increased costs of salary and benefits associated with faculty merits and promotions and represented academic salary programs on core funds. The Regents’ budget also proposes range increases on the scales for academics. The final guidance on this program will be forthcoming from UCOP this spring.

- **Faculty Startup Block-Grant Allocations**: I will provide central campus start-up support totaling at least $7 million. I will provide faculty hiring guidance to deans in a separate communication that you can expect to receive within the next two weeks. You should continue to expect hiring authorizations to be limited to critical faculty positions, maintaining focus on rebalancing faculty positions across disciplines, series, and fund sources.

- **Funding for Increased Staff Salary and Benefit Costs**: Units will receive funding for the increased salary and benefit costs associated with core-funded career staff eligible for salary increases through any systemwide salary programs or negotiated agreements. Information on the
final salary program for policy-covered staff will be forthcoming from UCOP this spring. Salary programs for represented staff are based on the relevant bargaining agreements.

- **One-time funds for Academic Student Employees:** As noted in my February 16 communication, central campus will provide one-time funds to maintain current Academic Student Employee FTE, at the new salary and benefit levels, through spring quarter 2024.

- **Funding for GSRs, ARs and Postdocs:** Funding for the contractual salary and benefits increases for existing academic researchers, graduate student researchers, and postdoctoral scholars funded on external contracts and grants already in progress is a shared responsibility. Central campus will provide an estimated $8 million one-time contribution to address these costs. Information on how to access these funds will be sent to all faculty, department chairs, deans, and CAOs in the coming days and will be referenced on the Office of Research webpage.

- **Graduate Student Support Funding:** We will maintain graduate student support programs, including the Graduate Program Fellowship Allocations (Block Grants) with the enrollment metric consistent with 2022-23 levels. This provides units with predictable and flexible funding to meet a variety of needs related to graduate student support.

- **Critical Research and Infrastructure:** $3.9 million of our Facilities and Administration funds will be used for research programs, debt service, lease costs, and operation and maintenance of our physical plant for critical research and infrastructure, including lease support for UC Davis programs in Aggie Square, a small set-aside for the upcoming Grand Challenges building, and new research infrastructure.

- **Capital Program Debt and Deferred Maintenance:** We will continue to set aside an additional $1 million in ongoing core operating funds to increase funding for our capital program, supporting debt-service and deferred-maintenance needs consistent with our multi-year plan for capital investments. It is highly unlikely that we will receive additional state support for these needs, so we must continue to invest in improving and maintaining our capital infrastructure.

- **Other critical needs and activities:** We will continue multi-year funding commitments from prior years and allocate funding for specific known investments that support critical campuswide needs and activities. Budget and Institutional Analysis (BIA) staff will work with units to identify and confirm these items prior to budget meetings. In addition, we will continue to centrally fund our increasing utility commodity costs for non-auxiliary operations.

**Savings Targets**
In the multi-year savings framework established in 2020-21, campus units were asked to achieve $45 million—collectively $9 million annually—in ongoing savings by fiscal year 2024-25. Units have already identified savings of $30.7 million by the end of this fiscal year, putting them on pace to meet their targets.

Over the same five-year period, central campus was charged with identifying $25 million in savings. Central campus has identified $20 million by the end of fiscal year 2023-24. After three years, we have collectively achieved $50.7 million in savings, which is 72 percent of our five-year goal of $70 million. I am deeply grateful to all of you for the significant progress we have made. Unfortunately, the core fund deficit is again growing and, as noted above, we face an uncertain state budget outcome. Therefore, I am provisionally increasing unit savings targets by an additional $9 million collectively and adding one year to the multi-year savings plan. Each unit should plan to achieve another year of their annual savings target amount in 2025-26, bringing the total unit savings targets over six years to $54 million. I say “provisionally” because if our three task forces identify different ways to achieve the needed core fund savings, identify additional revenue, or recommend a different allocation methodology for this additional year of savings targets, I will reconsider this additional year of savings targets. In the meantime, units—including those that report to the Offices of the Chancellor and the Provost—should plan to identify more core fund savings within three years, incorporating these savings into long-term planning, thereby mitigating abrupt impacts to programs and staff. Savings can be achieved not only through program reductions and adjustments, but also by shifting costs to other allowable fund sources, by generating new revenue, or by fundraising that can be used to support activities currently supported with core funds.

As stated above, central campus will continue to provide core-funded salary increases beyond the funds available, while also bridging the structural deficit with one-time funds to the extent possible. Since the structural deficit is held centrally, we are reducing the overall deficit by not funding requests from the budget process.

**Budget Meetings**

I look forward to meeting with you and Academic Senate representatives to discuss your unit finances during our annual budget meetings. In these meetings, we will review your financial status and discuss your carryforward, your unit internal budget allocation practices, your plans to meet the remaining savings targets, the financial challenges and opportunities in your unit and how you are addressing them. While I always enjoy hearing about your accomplishments, please follow the directions provided by BIA and only present your top three accomplishments since we really need to focus on financial aspects of your unit.

**Conclusion**

I know we continue to face great difficulties together, and I understand these budget challenges are compounded by other issues and constraints. I am sorry that these challenges are not only continuing but growing. But I remain heartened by our determined spirit, our commitment to teamwork, and to facing these challenges with our collective wisdom and commitment to our shared goals. I truly believe that UC Davis will come through this as a stronger and more vibrant
university. Thank you for your partnership and all you do each day to help us achieve our goals and fulfill our mission.

All the best,

Mary Croughan
Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

Cc: Chancellor May
    Davis Division Academic Senate Chair Palazoglu
    Academic Senate Committee on Planning and Budget Chair Rose
    Associate Vice Chancellor Mangum
    Assistant Deans and Chief Operating Officers
Dear Colleagues,

I am reaching out to provide information regarding our plan to address the funding shortfall for spring quarter 2023 through spring quarter 2024 for our graduate students, academic researchers and postdoctoral scholars, as well as guidance on graduate student admission strategies for fall quarter 2023. These decisions follow extensive conversations with leaders in the Academic Senate and across campus programs.

We want to reassure you that we recognize it is paramount that we preserve the UC Davis research and teaching mission so that both remain vibrant. This is central to our campus identity. It is central to our commitment to improving the lives of individuals and to making substantial contributions to our state and the world beyond. Thus, we are committing to sustaining our educational and research missions through campus funding sources since it is unlikely that funding will be provided by the UC Office of the President to defray increased costs associated with the new UAW contracts.

Our first priority is meeting our commitments to our existing academic student employees, academic researchers, graduate student researchers and postdoctoral scholars. Central campus administration will be a partner in covering these increased costs. We will do all we can to help carry UC Davis from spring quarter 2023 through spring quarter 2024, but these costs will be a shared responsibility.

We recognize that shared funding between central campus, colleges, schools, units, and faculty in the coming academic year is only a stopgap measure and not a long-term solution. Therefore, we are forming a Joint Academic Senate-Administration Task Force, which will be charged with exploring new educational, research and service models to sustain UC Davis in the decade to come. More details will be shared in the coming weeks.

In the meantime, see below for a summary of how we will address funding issues to sustain the strength of our research and education missions:

**Academic Student Employee (ASE) Support**

It is critical that we continue to support our current level of Academic Student Employees (teaching assistants, readers, tutors and “associate in __”) through spring quarter 2024. The [communication sent to all faculty on January 20](#) stated that we will provide central campus funding for spring quarter 2023 Academic Student Employee (BX) salary and benefit increases using our standard funding practice. Tuition and fee remission will continue to be funded centrally, consistent with current practice. Standard funding practices also will be followed for summer 2023, with additional central funding only available for critical instructional needs.

To support undergraduate educational needs, we also will maintain current Academic Student Employee FTE, with new salary and benefit funding levels, through spring quarter 2024. This entire cost will be funded by central campus administration following the practices noted above. For spring quarter 2023 through spring quarter 2024, this total additional cost for all ASEs will be approximately $10 million. We must stress this level of support will not be available beyond spring quarter 2024. We are providing it now to give UC Davis time to plan for the next academic year and thereafter.
Academic Researchers, Graduate Student Researchers and Postdoctoral Scholars Research Support

For external contracts and grants already in progress, we anticipate a total shortage of approximately $12-14 million from spring quarter 2023 through spring quarter of 2024 due to increased costs for salaries and benefits for academic researchers, graduate student researchers and postdoctoral scholars.

- The message to all faculty sent January 26 stated that funding for salary and benefit increases will be a shared responsibility. For existing employees covered under UAW contracts, Principal Investigators are expected to re-budget their grants and contracts (including training grants) and/or use discretionary or personal research funds to support their academic researchers, graduate student researchers and postdoctoral scholars. It is expected that each Principal Investigator will identify a minimum of $2,500 toward the additional costs for each academic researcher, graduate student researcher and postdoctoral scholar. Graduate Program Fellowship Allocations or “Block Grant” funding may not be used for this purpose.

- Colleges, schools and/or units are expected to augment the above funding by an additional $2,500 toward the additional costs of salary and benefits for each academic researcher, graduate student researcher and postdoctoral scholar addressed above. Graduate Program Fellowship Allocations or “Block Grant” funding may not be used for this purpose.

- For spring quarter 2023 through spring quarter 2024, an estimated $8 million in central campus funds will be used to make up the remaining difference between the $5,000 total in salary and benefits noted above and the final additional costs for each academic researcher, graduate student researcher and postdoctoral scholar. Principal Investigators should request central campus support through the Office of Research; guidelines and a template for such requests will be provided by the Office of Research next week. Requests will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis, taking into consideration other sources of funding that may or may not be available.

- If a Principal Investigator has academic researchers, graduate student researchers or postdoctoral scholars funded from sources other than contracts and grants, including cost-share grant commitments such as training grants, they will be responsible for fully funding the increased cost of salaries and benefits to support their academic researchers, graduate student researchers and postdoctoral scholars.

- For newly hired academic researchers and postdoctoral scholars, central campus funds will not be available. Central campus funds also will not be available for graduate students who matriculated after fall quarter 2022. The Principal Investigator and the college, school and/or unit will be responsible for identifying sufficient funding or making other adjustments.

- Increased salary and benefit costs for Presidential Postdoctoral Fellows and Chancellor’s Postdoctoral Fellows will be funded through central campus funding.

As a reminder, all Principal Investigators are required to plan for the salary and benefit increases in their contract and grant applications submitted on or after February 1, 2023. Visit the Office of Research for more information and resources.

Graduate Program Fellowship Allocations (GPFA or Block Grants)

The fall quarter 2023 Block Grant will remain stable at the fall quarter 2022 levels with the enrollment metric consistent with 2022-2023 levels. This provides the units predictable and flexible funding to meet a variety of needs related to graduate support.
Graduate Student Recruitment and Offers

Keeping in mind that funding of current graduate students and postdoctoral scholars should be your first priority, we recognize that recruitment of incoming graduate students varies by department and will likely be influenced by new salary and benefit costs, as well as other factors. As you examine how many new graduate students you can admit for fall quarter 2023, and if you have not already made admissions offers, please consider reducing enrollment of new Ph.D. students by as much as 20% so that we can take the 2023-2024 academic year to determine new models for our education and research.

You may also consider waitlisting applicants to achieve your targets or admitting more masters-level students. We strongly encourage you to contact Graduate Studies; they can serve as an outstanding partner as you work through these issues. Graduate Studies offers several resources, including a cost calculator and best practice templates for offer letters. Please refer to this Graduate Studies webpage for further updates specific to the new bargaining agreements.

Thank you for the many ways you have gone above and beyond, and for your trust and confidence as we work through these challenges together. We will share more information as it becomes available.

All the best,

Mary Croughan
Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor
Mary S. Croughan  
Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor  

RE: Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) Salary Adjustment Principles  

Dear Mary,  

Enclosed, please find a letter from CPB regarding faculty salary adjustment principles. I want to thank the committee and Chair Rose for their proactive thought on these critical operational decisions.  

Notably, I want to emphasize Principle 4, in which CPB discusses the importance of Academic Senate consultation when considering the components of salary range adjustments. For proposed differential treatment of off-scale and above-scale salaries during range adjustments, UCD-620.IX.B requires that the provost consult with the Senate chair. For this budget cycle (and likely future budget cycles), I would like to ensure that I am given adequate time to share your proposed salary range adjustment plans through the Senate's full Request for Consultation process. At the Senate's fall quarter Representative Assembly meeting, I was specifically asked by departmental representatives to ensure that such a full consultation would take place, and I committed to doing so.  

I would appreciate receiving a letter or proposal outlining your current plan and thinking that I can share with committees through the RFC process. Their opinions can then help inform your final decision.  

Thank you for your attention to CPB’s letter and my request, and for your continued dedicated partnership during another challenging budget cycle.  

Sincerely,  

Ahmet Palazoglu  
Chair, Davis Division of the Academic Senate  
Distinguished Professor of Chemical Engineering  
University of California, Davis  

Enclosed: Committee on Planning and Budget Salary Adjustment Principles  

c: Sarah Mangum, Associate Vice Chancellor, Budget and Institutional Analysis  
Kadec Russ, Vice Chair, Davis Division of the Academic Senate  
Heather Rose, Chair, Committee on Planning and Budget  
Edwin M. Arevalo, Executive Director, Davis Division of the Academic Senate
Ahmet Palazoglu  
Chair, Davis Division of the Academic Senate

RE: Salary Adjustment Principles

Dear Ahmet:

On behalf of the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB), I am enclosing a document that proposes four salary adjustment principles for the administration to consider in their decision-making processes. The CPB is appreciative of the highly productive shared governance relationship that we have fostered with administration and looks forward to continuing conversations about how we can collectively address the fiscal challenges ahead. In sharing these principles, we hope that we can bridge the differences between faculty and administration’s understandings of the salary issue and work together on developing a consultative framework to guide decisions in the future.

Sincerely,

Heather Rose  
Chair, Committee on Planning and Budget

c: Edwin Arevalo, Executive Director, Davis Division of the Academic Senate

Enclosure
CPB Salary Adjustment Principles

Salaries and benefits serve to recruit and retain faculty. Compensation also reflects the earnings potential of employees in other labor market sectors and reflects how the university values its employees.

Economic forces nationwide are putting upward pressure on faculty salaries, which in turn put upward pressure on the costs of higher education. These wage pressures can be difficult to address given that UC Davis currently faces a structural deficit in its core funds. The combination of extra funding from the new UC tuition stabilization plan and the 5% increase in state appropriations to UC is not enough to cover the expected increase in employee compensation required through merits and bargaining agreements. Thus, UC is already drawing on other sources to fund this core expense. In addition to salary pressures, high inflation rates have added to UCD’s costs of non-salary inputs as well, such as utilities, and deferred maintenance is growing as well.

Not only is the university experiencing higher costs, UCD faculty are facing higher prices of their own. The recent divergence between salary range adjustments and inflation rates is particularly concerning. UCD faculty did not receive any range adjustment in 2020-21, when inflation averaged 3.7%. The 3% range adjustment in 2021-22 was far outpaced by inflation of 7.9%. (See Figure 1 and Figure 2). These inadequate cost-of-living adjustments are even more concerning given that UC salaries have not kept pace with salaries at its comparison schools, the Comp 8 (see Figure 3). In 2020-21, UC faculty salaries were 4.1% below this benchmark.

These salary shortfalls are particularly concerning in light of increased faculty workload. Faculty hiring has not kept pace with increased student enrollment (see Table 1 and Table 2). Over the last 10 years, total faculty FTE have grown by 16% (senate faculty by 9%), but undergraduate student enrollment has grown 25%.

Not only is the student to faculty ratio rising, this additional workload is compounded by the pandemic’s relentless demands. For over two years, faculty have pivoted numerous times to address student needs, campus needs, and health needs, while the research for many faculty also became exceedingly complex to conduct. The toll of this devastating world-wide pandemic has only begun to be acknowledged. Additional events, such as wildfires and strikes, have also added layers of complexity to the job.

In light of the rising workload and inflation, it is critical that the university acknowledge the dedication and contributions faculty regularly make. In the financial environment where competing University demands outstrip resources, CPB would like to promote a set of principles governing the decision-making process regarding faculty salary adjustments.

---


2 See the UCPB Report on Faculty Hiring from systemwide comparisons.
Principles
When deciding where to target available funding for on-scale, off-scale, above-scale, and equity adjustments, CPB recommends the following four principles.

1. Flexible
   Campus priorities and salary priorities may change from year to year given the operating environment. Over time, UCOP changes the way it provides its salary directives. Sometimes it directs on-scale salary schedule changes only; sometimes it requires changes to total salaries. Campus budget issues change regularly. The recent collective bargaining settlement for graduate students, postdoctoral scholars, and academic researchers surely adds complexity to budgeting decisions. Past priorities may also influence where future priorities should fall. Salary adjustment policies should be flexible in order to accommodate these changing economic and campus environments.

2. Data Driven
   Any decision about where to allocate salary funds must rely on data to assess the current state of salary issues and the costs of different potential options. Constant evaluation of factors such as equity gains, retention costs, faculty separations due to competing offers, and recruitment losses must be methodically documented so that decision-makers can truly assess where the campus has made improvements and where the campus needs to invest.

3. Transparent
   When making decisions about where to target additional salary funds, it is necessary to highlight the differential impacts each potential plan may have upon the faculty. These uneven impacts are important to acknowledge so that faculty understand the trade-offs associated with pursuing a particular course of action. The CPB has a working document that outlines some of these considerations.

4. Informed by Academic Senate Consultation
   It is critical that administration consult with the Academic Senate when prioritizing the components of salary adjustments. The CPB appreciates the provost’s acknowledgment of the importance of shared governance in her communication to the campus community about future salary adjustments, but the CPB is also concerned that the Provost’s letter from June 27, 2022 maps out future salary plans without such Academic Senate consultation.3

Although the UCD APM 620 states that normally total salaries would be adjusted by the same percentage of any on-scale adjustment, the policy allows the Provost to treat the wage components differentially if responding to a systemwide directive and “following notice and discussion with the Chair of the Academic Senate.” The CPB encourages the Provost to have a robust discussion with Academic Senate Committees such as Planning and Budget, Faculty Welfare, and Academic Personal, rather than just notifying the Senate Chair of decisions. Such an approach would truly embrace the tenet of joint governance and potentially provide broader support for the Provost’s ultimate decision.

---

3 See Provost Croughan’s Letter on 2022-23 Faculty Salary Program (6/27/22).
Conclusion
The CPB recognizes that the issue of faculty salary adjustments is fraught with many challenges where the administration must weigh competing priorities. In an environment with scarce resources, increasing only some salary components has the potential to pit one group of faculty against the other. This potential outcome underscores the importance of including a broad group of faculty in discussions about where to prioritize salary adjustments and, ideally, for UCD to provide regular increases to total salary as well as equity adjustments. When such comprehensive investments are not possible, it is critical that the administration engage meaningfully with the Academic Senate to determine the priorities. Such transparent discussions, and communication about them, will lead to more support for the enacted salary programs.
Figure 1. UCD Salary Scales vs. CPI Increases 1999-2016

Source: UC Academic Council Letter on Faculty Salaries (12/22/17) page 10.

Figure 2. U.S. Monthly Inflation Rate vs. UCD Range Adjustments: 2015-2022

Source: Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers: All Items in U.S. City Average, Percent Change from Year Ago, Monthly, Seasonally Adjusted from Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis. If UCD range adjustment was applied to on-scale only, assumed 75% of that was the adjustment to total salary.
Due to funding constraints, the University has struggled to bring faculty salaries to par with comparators. In 2020-21, UC's faculty salaries were 4.1% below market.

Source: University of California [Budget for Current Operations Context for the Budget Request 2022-23](#). The comparison schools include four private schools (MIT, Yale, Harvard, and Stanford) and four public schools (University of Virginia, University of Michigan, SUNY Buffalo, and University of Illinois Urbana/Champaign).
### Table 1: Enrollment (3QA Headcounts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>23,595</td>
<td>23,923</td>
<td>24,581</td>
<td>25,319</td>
<td>26,463</td>
<td>26,995</td>
<td>28,037</td>
<td>28,771</td>
<td>29,431</td>
<td>29,689</td>
<td>29,699</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Campus</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>-18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Academic</td>
<td>4,023</td>
<td>3,960</td>
<td>3,962</td>
<td>4,074</td>
<td>4,158</td>
<td>4,184</td>
<td>4,210</td>
<td>4,353</td>
<td>4,474</td>
<td>4,515</td>
<td>4,614</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Science</td>
<td>1,886</td>
<td>1,960</td>
<td>1,985</td>
<td>1,934</td>
<td>2,017</td>
<td>1,998</td>
<td>2,040</td>
<td>2,089</td>
<td>2,143</td>
<td>2,159</td>
<td>2,216</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Cred</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>-28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Supporting</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>1,026</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30,948</td>
<td>31,239</td>
<td>31,944</td>
<td>32,724</td>
<td>34,001</td>
<td>34,535</td>
<td>35,779</td>
<td>36,731</td>
<td>37,581</td>
<td>38,035</td>
<td>38,440</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Health Science</td>
<td>29,062</td>
<td>29,279</td>
<td>29,959</td>
<td>30,790</td>
<td>31,984</td>
<td>32,537</td>
<td>33,739</td>
<td>34,642</td>
<td>35,438</td>
<td>35,876</td>
<td>36,224</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: [https://aggiedata.ucdavis.edu/#student](https://aggiedata.ucdavis.edu/#student). These are 3QA rather than just fall of a particular term. They are not FTE. The grand totals from UCD’s aggie data tend to be about 500-600 students lower than UCOP’s data. Student credit hours might be a better measure of workload, but we have no readily available data source for that.

### Table 2: FTE at UCD General Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty - Ladder-rank and Equivalent</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>1,131</td>
<td>1,133</td>
<td>1,139</td>
<td>1,153</td>
<td>1,167</td>
<td>1,222</td>
<td>1,252</td>
<td>1,255</td>
<td>1,277</td>
<td>1,275</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty - Clinical/In-Residence/Adjunct</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty - Lecturers</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Academic Employees</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postdoctoral Scholars</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>-2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Residents</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,860</td>
<td>3,779</td>
<td>3,715</td>
<td>3,778</td>
<td>3,864</td>
<td>3,964</td>
<td>3,972</td>
<td>3,985</td>
<td>3,983</td>
<td>4,025</td>
<td>3,992</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Management Group</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSP - Managers</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSP - Senior Professionals</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>162%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS - Non-Students</td>
<td>4,607</td>
<td>4,650</td>
<td>4,688</td>
<td>4,909</td>
<td>5,055</td>
<td>4,918</td>
<td>5,043</td>
<td>5,107</td>
<td>4,898</td>
<td>4,792</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>-3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Staff</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>1,001</td>
<td>1,059</td>
<td>1,122</td>
<td>1,189</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>1,168</td>
<td>1,201</td>
<td>1,195</td>
<td>1,073</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,928</td>
<td>5,983</td>
<td>6,055</td>
<td>6,352</td>
<td>6,599</td>
<td>6,567</td>
<td>6,817</td>
<td>7,061</td>
<td>7,170</td>
<td>6,949</td>
<td>6,399</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combinations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Academic + Non-Academic</td>
<td>9,788</td>
<td>9,762</td>
<td>9,770</td>
<td>10,130</td>
<td>10,466</td>
<td>10,530</td>
<td>10,789</td>
<td>11,046</td>
<td>11,153</td>
<td>10,974</td>
<td>10,392</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty ALL (Ladder, Clinical, Lecturer)</td>
<td>1,374</td>
<td>1,340</td>
<td>1,361</td>
<td>1,382</td>
<td>1,419</td>
<td>1,456</td>
<td>1,524</td>
<td>1,576</td>
<td>1,569</td>
<td>1,592</td>
<td>1,591</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS (Non-Stud) + Student Staff</td>
<td>5,573</td>
<td>5,651</td>
<td>5,746</td>
<td>6,031</td>
<td>6,243</td>
<td>6,088</td>
<td>6,211</td>
<td>6,305</td>
<td>6,302</td>
<td>6,061</td>
<td>5,469</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSP All + PSS (non stud)</td>
<td>4,952</td>
<td>4,973</td>
<td>4,986</td>
<td>5,220</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>5,407</td>
<td>5,641</td>
<td>5,850</td>
<td>5,965</td>
<td>5,865</td>
<td>5,711</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSP Sen Prof + PSS Non Stud</td>
<td>4,694</td>
<td>4,730</td>
<td>4,772</td>
<td>4,997</td>
<td>5,150</td>
<td>5,144</td>
<td>5,358</td>
<td>5,531</td>
<td>5,611</td>
<td>5,502</td>
<td>5,336</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: [https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/infocenter/employee-fte](https://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/infocenter/employee-fte) These data come from UCOP and include the Davis campus only. UCOP has a separate category for A&NR. It is not clear to us where AES faculty are included.