



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Michael V. Drake, MD
President

October 1, 2020

Office of the President
1111 Franklin St.
Oakland, CA 94607

universityofcalifornia.edu

Director Keely Bosler
Department of Finance
915 L Street
Sacramento, California 95814

The Honorable Holly J. Mitchell
Chair, Joint Legislative Budget Committee
1020 N Street, Room 553
Sacramento, California 95814

CAMPUSES

- Berkeley
- Davis
- Irvine
- UCLA
- Merced
- Riverside
- San Diego
- San Francisco
- Santa Barbara
- Santa Cruz

MEDICAL CENTERS

- Davis
- Irvine
- UCLA
- San Diego
- San Francisco

NATIONAL LABORATORIES

- Lawrence Berkeley
- Lawrence Livermore
- Los Alamos

Dear Director Bosler and Senator Mitchell:

Pursuant to Section 92670 of the Education Code, enclosed is the University of California's biennial report to the Legislature and the Department of Finance on Expenditures for Undergraduate and Graduate Instruction.

If you have any questions regarding this report, Associate Vice President David Alcocer would be pleased to speak with you. He can be reached by telephone at (510) 987-9113, or by e-mail at David.Alcocer@ucop.edu.

Sincerely,

Michael V. Drake
President

Enclosure

- cc:
- Senate Budget and Fiscal Review
 - The Honorable Richard D. Roth, Chair
 - Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Subcommittee #1
 - (Attn: Ms. Anita Lee)
 - (Attn: Ms. Jean-Marie McKinney)
 - The Honorable Kevin McCarty, Chair
 - Assembly Budget Subcommittee #2
 - (Attn: Mr. Mark Martin)
 - (Attn: Ms. Carolyn Nealon)
 - Ms. Jennifer Troia, Joint Legislative Budget Committee
 - Ms. Erika Contreras, Secretary of the Senate
 - Ms. Tina McGee, Legislative Analyst's Office
 - Ms. Amy Leach, Office of the Chief Clerk of the Assembly

Mr. E. Dotson Wilson, Chief Clerk of the Assembly
Mr. Jeff Bell, Department of Finance
Mr. Chris Ferguson, Department of Finance
Ms. Rebecca Kirk, Department of Finance
Mr. Brian Rutledge, Department of Finance
Mr. Gabriel Petek, Legislative Analyst's Office
Ms. Jennifer Pacella, Legislative Analyst's Office
Mr. Jason Constantouros, Legislative Analyst's Office
Executive Vice President and Provost Michael Brown
Vice President Pamela Brown
Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer Nathan Brostrom
Senior Vice President Claire Holmes
Associate Vice President David Alcocer
Associate Vice President and Director Kieran Flaherty

Report on Expenditures for Undergraduate and Graduate Instruction

October 2020

Table of Contents

I. Executive Summary	3
II. Introduction	4
III. The NACUBO Methodology.....	4
IV. UC’s Application of the NACUBO Methodology.....	5
Baseline Costs	5
General Campus vs. Health Sciences	5
STEM/Non-STEM.....	6
Research Addition	6
Weighted Students	6
Cost per Student	7
Fund Source	7
V. Expenditures for Instruction vs. Cost of Education	7
VI. Appendix 1: Campus Expenditure Tables	9
VII. Appendix 2: Education Code Section 92670	12
VIII. Appendix 3: EFI Calculation Flow Chart.....	13

I. Executive Summary

California’s public investment in higher education has fueled economic prosperity, social mobility, and cultural opportunities for decades. The State’s historic commitment has enabled the University of California not only to educate the brightest students – almost 280,000 in 2018-19 alone – but to touch the life of every Californian through its cutting-edge research, medical innovation, agricultural advancement, and other achievements consistent with UC’s three-part mission of instruction, research, and public service.

This report provides information on expenditures for educational activities pursuant to Section 92670 of the Education Code. Consistent with Section 92670, figures are provided at the systemwide level (as shown in Display 1 below) and for each UC campus, and were calculated based on publicly available information¹ and a methodology developed by the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO). Detailed campus figures can be found in Appendix 1, and a description of the NACUBO methodology can be found in the full report.

Display 1: Systemwide Expenditures for Instruction

	Fund Type					
	Systemwide	State Funds	NRT	Other GF	Stud Tuition & Fees	All Other Funds
Undergraduate Students						
General Campus	\$ 27,538	\$ 7,442	\$ 2,647	\$ 114	\$ 12,128	\$ 5,208
STEM Disciplines	\$ 27,770	\$ 7,519	\$ 2,675	\$ 115	\$ 12,212	\$ 5,249
Non-STEM Disciplines	\$ 27,347	\$ 7,378	\$ 2,624	\$ 113	\$ 12,058	\$ 5,174
Graduate Students						
General Campus	\$ 77,216	\$ 14,250	\$ 4,987	\$ 215	\$ 30,806	\$ 26,958
STEM Disciplines	\$ 78,492	\$ 14,431	\$ 5,052	\$ 218	\$ 31,004	\$ 27,787
Non-STEM Disciplines	\$ 75,916	\$ 14,088	\$ 4,929	\$ 212	\$ 30,628	\$ 26,058
Health Sciences	\$ 210,487	\$ 22,655	\$ 8,103	\$ 349	\$ 32,757	\$ 146,622

¹ Detailed figures can be found at: https://www.ucop.edu/operating-budget/files/legreports/20-21/efi_supplementaldata-2020.pdf

II. Introduction

Pursuant to Section 92670 of the Education Code, the University of California is required to report biennially to the Legislature and the Department of Finance expenditures for undergraduate and graduate instruction and research activities, disaggregated by certain categories of students and fund sources. The report is to be submitted on or before October 1 of every other year, beginning in 2014.

For reports prepared on or after January 1, 2017 (i.e., reports submitted in 2018 and future even-numbered years), UC is required to include figures disaggregated by campus and calculated according to a methodology developed by the National Association of College and University Business Officers (NACUBO).

III. The NACUBO Methodology

The NACUBO cost model represents an effort to develop a framework that colleges and universities can use to develop their own estimated expenditures for undergraduate education in a manner that is simple, transparent, and easy to comprehend.

NACUBO provides two sets of general instructions for applying its methodology: one for institutions (like UC) that prepare and submit periodic indirect cost rate proposals (known as “step-down schedules”) based on OMB Circular A-21 to the Federal government, and one for institutions that do not submit such proposals. In calculating campus expenditures for instruction, UC used the first set of instructions. This approach has the advantage of using expenditure figures that were previously compiled and vetted by each UC campus prior to the indirect cost rate negotiations with the Federal government. It does, however, pose two challenges:

- Campuses do not prepare these cost rate studies annually. Among UC campuses, the most recent studies ranged from FY 2012-13 to FY 2018-19.
- Campus financial data collected by the University of California Office of the President does not allow for the consistent identification of some campus-level expenditures that are excluded from those proposals but which NACUBO directs institutions to add back for purposes of applying its formula. In particular, it is not possible to reliably include expenditures classified by NACUBO as “institutional and community costs” when applying the NACUBO methodology. As a result, it is possible that certain cost estimates in this report may be slightly lower than if these expenditures had been included as expenditures for instruction.

The NACUBO methodology presents a framework for calculating the cost of instruction but relies on institutions to make various decisions as they apply that framework. At a fundamental level, it relies on the use of expenditure data from campus step-down schedules. Expenditures shown in the step-down schedules are divided by student enrollment, weighted according to student type. Student weighting is intended to recognize the increased costs associated with instruction for certain groups, particularly graduate students. (NACUBO suggests a weighting of 1.25 for graduates compared to 1 for undergraduates, but acknowledges that research universities may find it appropriate to use a higher

weighting.) The costs divided by weighted student enrollment is then multiplied by the weight of each student type to determine the estimated costs for that type of student.

The NACUBO methodology does not provide direction on how to distinguish costs by health sciences, research, STEM, or fund sources, all of which are required reporting categories under Section 92670. Consequently, in order to meet these requirements, the University adapted the NACUBO methodology when necessary, but in a manner that was consistently applied across all campuses.

NACUBO developed this methodology in order to allow an institution to make meaningful and helpful comparisons of expenditures over time. Recognizing that different institutions may make different decisions in interpreting and applying its methodology, however, NACUBO cautions that the methodology "...was not designed to be a mechanism for collecting national data on college costs or creating industry benchmarks."

IV. UC's Application of the NACUBO Methodology

Baseline Costs

Consistent with the NACUBO methodology, calculations in this report are based upon the latest available step-down schedules for each campus. Because these are only updated every few years, the schedules for some campuses are several years old, ranging from FY 2012-13 to FY 2018-19 across the system.

To bring each step-down schedule up to date and make them comparable to FY 2018-19 student totals, expenditures for the Instruction and Research categories are replaced with the total expenditures by function for Instruction and Research, respectively, from actual FY 2018-19 financial statements. The attendant costs (i.e., Departmental Administration, Student Services, Library, Operations and Maintenance, Facilities Depreciation, Equipment Depreciation, and General Administration) are proportionally adjusted to reflect the change in the main Instruction or Research expenditures from the original schedule to the latest financials. For instance, if expenditures in the Instruction function increased by 20% when replacing FY 2012-13 values in the step-down schedule with FY 2018-19 values from actuals, then Library costs would also go up by 20%. The relationship between those expenditures and the indirect costs are maintained and scaled appropriately.

While the substitution of the most recent Instruction and Research costs and the assumption of a linear relationship with indirect costs may be imperfect, this method preserves some reliance on the step-down schedules as required under NACUBO while accounting for inflationary and enrollment-related increases to campus expenditures, and captures all Instruction and Research costs rather than just the amounts used in the step-down schedules. A visual representation of the University's application of the NACUBO methodology can be found in Appendix 3.

General Campus vs. Health Sciences

Once the adjusted schedules are created, costs need to be identified as either general campus or health science, as well as either STEM or non-STEM. Since the NACUBO methodology provides no guidance for

isolating costs related to these categories, FY 2018-19 campus financial data are used to make this distinction. To split Instruction costs, expenses from all the direct student cost functions (i.e., Instruction and Student Services) are summed, and data from the University's Corporate Financial System (CFS) are used to determine what portion of those expenses are general campus or health science. The resulting split is then applied to the adjusted Instruction schedule. The same method is applied to the Research schedule based upon the share of research expenditures that are attributable to general campus or health science in the CFS.

STEM/Non-STEM

All costs associated with health sciences are presumed to be STEM. To classify the general campus share of costs into STEM and non-STEM categories, each line of the general campus portion of the adjusted schedule is multiplied by a STEM factor. For the Instruction, Departmental Administration, Student Services, Library, and General Administration categories, the STEM factor is based upon the portion of a campus' total student credit hours (SCH) that are deemed STEM-related. For the other categories of Operations and Maintenance, Facilities Depreciation, and Equipment Depreciation, a higher capital factor is utilized to recognize the increased costs of capital for STEM instruction and research.

Research Addition

Research expenditures require an additional level of reduction to recognize that not all expenditures in the Research function are related to students. To determine what portion of research costs to attribute to graduate students, UC compared the actual costs in the Instruction function in FY 2018-19 for graduate students (overall instruction costs multiplied by the portion associated with graduates, based on total SCH) to the total spending in all of the University's core functions of Instruction, Research, and Public Service. This yields a reduction factor that attributes less than a quarter of expenditures in Research to graduates systemwide. The overall adjusted Research schedule is reduced to only reflect this portion.

Weighted Students²

SCH data submitted by campuses include the type of instructor (ladder-ranked faculty, lecturer, etc.) and type of student (undergraduate vs. graduate) for each credit hour. Paired with the total fiscal year salary costs for each type of instructor, the University was able to calculate an average cost per SCH for graduate and undergraduate students.

Comparing these two costs per SCH, UC developed a ratio of graduate to undergraduate credit hours. This ratio was utilized to weight the graduates relative to the undergraduates. In general, graduate SCH are more expensive than undergraduate SCH since they require higher level and more expensive faculty to teach them, often in smaller class sizes.

This weighting was not necessary for the health sciences because those expenditures have been isolated and only apply to graduate health sciences students in this exercise.

² Due to a change in the weighting methodology for graduate students in this report, figures are not directly comparable to those in the 2018 report.

Cost per Student

Finally, the total Instruction costs can be divided by weighted students in the appropriate groupings (general campus and STEM) to yield a base instruction cost per student.

- **Undergraduates:** Base individual cost plus a financial aid component based on per student financial aid expenditure data.
- **General campus graduate students:** Base individual cost multiplied by the weighting factor developed to compare graduate and undergraduate SCH, plus a financial aid component based upon the average financial aid provided to a graduate general campus student. Also include an add-on for research costs, which is the adjusted and discounted research schedule expenditures divided by total actual general campus graduate enrollment.
- **Health sciences graduate students:** The health sciences portion of instruction costs is divided by the total graduate health sciences students. Average per student financial aid costs are added, as well as a research component based on the portion of discounted research applicable to health sciences divided by graduate health sciences enrollment.

Fund Source

Once the estimated total cost for each student type and subgroup is determined, those costs are split by fund source, utilizing FY 2018-19 financial data as a basis. For instruction costs, expenditures under the functions of Instruction and Student Services are categorized as coming from state funds, nonresident tuition, other general funds, student tuition and fees, or all other funds. The same process applies for research costs using just the Research function. Expenditures attributed to a particular fund source reflect several factors, including the proportion of revenue from that fund source relative to other core fund sources and any applicable fund restrictions.

V. Expenditures for Instruction vs. Cost of Education

While this report is focused on what the University is actually spending on instruction, it is important to recognize that actual expenditures on instruction do not represent the cost of educating students – i.e., what the University should be spending to support its core academic programs. Several indicators highlight this point:

- **A rising student-faculty ratio.** The University's current budgeted student-faculty ratio as agreed to with the State is 18.7:1. In contrast, the actual ratio in 2018-19 was an all-time high of 21.9, due primarily to large enrollment increases in recent years that exceeded the levels of enrollment growth funded by the State.
- **A market gap in faculty salaries.** A 2014 total remuneration study of UC general campus ladder-rank faculty conducted by independent consultants concluded that salary and benefits for UC ladder rank faculty lagged the market by 10%, including a nearly 12% gap in cash compensation. (Although this gap has narrowed somewhat since then, faculty salaries across the UC system continued to lag the market by an average of 7.5% in 2018-19.)

- **Graduate student support.** A systemwide survey conducted in spring 2017 indicated that the net stipend offered by UC to students admitted to its academic doctoral programs lagged offers from students' top-choice, non-UC institutions by an average of about \$700.
- **Instructional equipment and technology.** Investments above current levels are needed to keep pace with the equipment and technology that are essential to preparing students to meet the workforce needs of a technology-driven modern economy.
- **Building maintenance.** UC maintains more than 68 million square feet of space eligible for State supported maintenance, nearly 60% of which was constructed more than 30 years ago. Maintenance costs increase as facilities age. Similarly, as programmatic needs evolve, UC must maintain an increasing proportion of facilities with complex mechanical systems to support instructional programs focused on STEM disciplines. These facilities are also more expensive to maintain than ordinary classroom facilities.

VI. Appendix 1: Campus Expenditure Tables

Display 1: Undergraduate Expenditures for Instruction

	Systemwide	Berkeley	Davis	Irvine	Los Angeles	Merced	Riverside	San Diego	San Francisco	Santa Barbara	Santa Cruz
Undergraduates	\$ 27,538	\$ 33,269	\$ 29,258	\$ 23,303	\$ 32,867	\$ 27,820	\$ 24,575	\$ 22,497	\$ -	\$ 25,810	\$ 24,648
State Funds	7,442	6,689	7,186	5,240	6,890	11,113	7,400	4,991		5,877	6,798
NRT	2,647	4,077	3,056	2,880	3,557	331	902	3,173		2,909	1,988
Other GF	114	112	86	122	125	107	109	105		163	237
Stud Tuition & Fees	12,128	14,801	13,652	10,943	13,550	12,729	12,871	10,843		13,193	12,691
All Other Funds	5,208	7,590	5,278	4,117	8,745	3,540	3,293	3,385		3,667	2,934
STEM UG	\$ 27,770	\$ 33,956	\$ 30,147	\$ 23,701	\$ 33,162	\$ 27,672	\$ 25,194	\$ 22,097	\$ -	\$ 25,804	\$ 24,420
State Funds	7,519	6,857	7,454	5,347	6,963	11,037	7,640	4,881		5,876	6,716
NRT	2,675	4,182	3,173	2,940	3,595	329	931	3,102		2,909	1,964
Other GF	115	115	89	125	126	107	113	103		163	235
Stud Tuition & Fees	12,212	15,055	14,004	11,106	13,652	12,674	13,153	10,678		13,191	12,590
All Other Funds	5,249	7,747	5,427	4,183	8,826	3,526	3,357	3,334		3,666	2,915
Non-STEM UG	\$ 27,347	\$ 32,702	\$ 28,352	\$ 22,998	\$ 32,657	\$ 27,973	\$ 24,144	\$ 22,962	\$ -	\$ 25,813	\$ 24,869
State Funds	7,378	6,550	6,912	5,158	6,838	11,192	7,233	5,117		5,878	6,876
NRT	2,624	3,990	2,937	2,834	3,530	333	882	3,256		2,910	2,011
Other GF	113	110	82	120	124	108	107	108		164	240
Stud Tuition & Fees	12,058	14,591	13,294	10,819	13,478	12,785	12,674	11,036		13,195	12,789
All Other Funds	5,174	7,461	5,126	4,067	8,688	3,554	3,248	3,445		3,667	2,952

Display 2: Graduate Expenditures for Instruction (General Campus Only)

	Systemwide	Berkeley	Davis	Irvine	Los Angeles	Merced	Riverside	San Diego	San Francisco	Santa Barbara	Santa Cruz
Graduates - General Campus + Research	\$ 77,216	\$ 89,228	\$ 76,466	\$ 74,910	\$ 79,780	\$ 92,529	\$ 72,460	\$ 67,060		\$ 82,190	\$ 60,444
State Funds	14,250	11,784	13,028	10,687	12,323	30,455	15,238	10,676		12,383	12,437
NRT	4,987	6,976	5,434	5,699	6,191	929	1,864	6,674		5,992	3,603
Other GF	215	192	153	242	218	294	222	221		336	428
Stud Tuition & Fees	30,806	34,557	32,129	30,610	33,156	38,872	33,193	27,682		35,317	27,655
All Other Funds	26,958	35,719	25,722	27,671	27,892	21,979	21,943	21,807		28,163	16,321
STEM Grad GC + Research	\$ 78,492	\$ 92,764	\$ 79,377	\$ 77,271	\$ 80,821	\$ 92,648	\$ 74,802	\$ 66,455	\$ -	\$ 82,707	\$ 59,970
State Funds	14,431	12,126	13,553	10,940	12,466	30,392	15,807	10,463		12,400	12,294
NRT	5,052	7,190	5,662	5,840	6,266	927	1,933	6,535		6,000	3,560
Other GF	218	198	160	248	221	293	231	216		336	423
Stud Tuition & Fees	31,004	35,074	32,816	30,994	33,355	38,827	33,863	27,358		35,344	27,477
All Other Funds	27,787	38,176	27,187	29,249	28,514	22,208	22,969	21,882		28,626	16,217
Non-STEM Grad GC + Research	\$ 75,916	\$ 86,349	\$ 73,007	\$ 72,961	\$ 78,990	\$ 92,021	\$ 69,826	\$ 67,559	\$ -	\$ 81,709	\$ 60,991
State Funds	14,088	11,503	12,462	10,489	12,221	30,427	14,711	10,918		12,366	12,580
NRT	4,929	6,800	5,188	5,588	6,137	928	1,800	6,832		5,983	3,645
Other GF	212	188	146	237	216	294	214	226		336	433
Stud Tuition & Fees	30,628	34,132	31,387	30,310	33,013	38,852	32,574	28,049		35,289	27,833
All Other Funds	26,058	33,726	23,823	26,337	27,404	21,521	20,527	21,535		27,736	16,499

Display 3: Graduate Expenditures for Instruction (Health Sciences)

	Systemwide	Berkeley	Davis	Irvine	Los Angeles	Merced	Riverside	San Diego	San Francisco	Santa Barbara	Santa Cruz
Graduates - Health Sciences + Research	\$ 210,487	\$ 83,334	\$ 224,425	\$ 370,704	\$ 179,468		\$ 208,102	\$ 219,253	\$ 198,843		
State Funds	22,655	13,189	21,614	17,251	17,490		38,588	34,079	22,142		
NRT	8,103	8,076	9,284	9,582	9,058		4,688	22,079	402		
Other GF	349	221	260	407	318		577	729	(15)		
Stud Tuition & Fees	32,757	27,618	34,749	31,192	32,894		51,914	58,079	20,271		
All Other Funds	146,622	34,230	158,518	312,272	119,708		112,335	104,287	156,043		

VII. Appendix 2: Education Code Section 92670

ARTICLE 7.5. Expenditures for Undergraduate and Graduate Instruction and Research Activities

92670. (a) (1) It is the intent of the Legislature, in enacting this section, to ensure that the Legislature has accurate information upon which to base funding decisions relating to the University of California.

(2) The University of California shall report biennially to the Legislature and the Department of Finance, on or before October 1, 2014, and on or before October 1 of each even-numbered year thereafter, on the total costs of education at the University of California. The amounts included in the reports required by this section shall be based on publicly available information.

(b) The report shall identify the costs of undergraduate education, graduate academic education, graduate professional education, and research activities. All four categories listed in this subdivision shall be reported in total and disaggregated separately by health sciences disciplines, disciplines included in paragraph (13) of subdivision (b) of Section 92675, and all other disciplines. For purposes of this report, research for which a student earns credit toward his or her degree program shall be identified as undergraduate education or graduate education.

(c) The costs reported in the reports required by this section shall be prior year actual expenditures, and shall also be reported by fund source, including all of the following:

(1) State General Fund.

(2) Systemwide tuition and fees.

(3) Nonresident tuition and fees and other student fees.

(4) University of California General Funds, including interest on General Fund balances and the portion of indirect cost recovery and patent royalty income used for core educational purposes.

(d) For any report submitted under this section before January 1, 2017, the costs shall, at a minimum, be reported on a systemwide basis. For any report submitted under this section on or after January 1, 2017, the costs shall be reported on both a systemwide and campus-by-campus basis.

(e) A report prepared under this section on or after January 1, 2017, shall include information on costs, disaggregated by campus, based on the methodology developed by the National Association of College and University Business Officers in its February 2002 report, *Explaining College Costs*, and other methodologies determined by the university.

(f) A report to be submitted to the Legislature pursuant to this section shall be submitted in compliance with Section 9795 of the Government Code.

(g) Pursuant to Section 10231.5 of the Government Code, the requirement for submitting a report under this section shall be inoperative on January 1, 2023, pursuant to Section 10231.5 of the Government Code.

(Amended by Stats. 2017, Ch. 802, Sec. 2. (AB 1655) Effective January 1, 2018.)

VIII. Appendix 3: EFI Calculation Flow Chart

