



Carol T. Christ

CHANCELLOR

200 California Hall #1500
Berkeley, CA 94720-1500
510 642-7464
chancellor@berkeley.edu
chancellor.berkeley.edu

August 31, 2023

Commissioner James J. Phillips, Ph.D.
Atlantic Coast Conference
4512 Weybridge Lane
Greensboro, NC 27407

Dear Commissioner Phillips,

The University of California, Berkeley (“Cal”) requests consideration for full membership in the Atlantic Coast Conference (“ACC”) on the terms set forth in the attached Term Sheet, effective August 2, 2024, after the expiration of Cal’s membership in the Pacific 12 Conference. Cal intends to remain a full and active member of the Pac-12 through the 2023-2024 season.

Cal has a rich athletics history and looks forward to enhancing ACC competition across a wide range of sports. Cal has won 103 national team titles in 15 different sports and has 327 individual national champions. Cal athletes have won more than 200 Olympic medals, and since its first national championship in 1920 in football, Cal has had at least one national champion in 88 of 103 years. In the past 20 years, Cal’s football team has played in 11 bowl games, won a conference championship, and fielded 10 first-team All American student-athletes. No NCAA school has turned out more starting Super Bowl quarterbacks than Cal.

Cal athletics are an integral part of the quality and unique character of our university. Cal strives to create leaders of tomorrow, and Cal athletics provide our student-athletes with a world-class training ground to develop the qualities of mind and character essential for future leaders. Our student-athletes, coaches, administrators, alumni, and fans form a vibrant community that celebrates our university’s spirit.

At Cal we believe in pursuing excellence in academics, research, and athletics. We are confident that a partnership with the ACC—with its own long tradition of academic and athletic excellence—would benefit both Cal and all of the existing ACC institutions. Cal is proud of its long association with the Pac-12 Conference, but the time has come for Cal to support its student-athletes by joining a new conference, and we are thrilled for the opportunity to compete in the ACC.

We attach copies of Cal’s most recent accreditation and our most recent Equity in Athletics Act report. We appreciate the ACC’s consideration of Cal’s application.

Carol T. Christ
Chancellor, University of California, Berkeley

James A. Knowlton
Director of Athletics, University of California, Berkeley



Summary of Terms¹

Transaction:	Admission of each of Stanford University and the University of California Berkeley (collectively, the “Universities”) to the Atlantic Coast Conference (the “Conference”) as a full member of the Conference.
Sports:	Each of the Universities will compete in all varsity sports sponsored by both the Conference and such University.
Signing Date:	The date of full execution of a New Member Agreement/Letter by each of the Universities and the Conference.
Effective Date:	Each of the Universities to be admitted to the Conference effective August 2, 2024.
Multi-Media Agreement:	Amended and Restated Multi-Media Agreement, dated July 21, 2016, by and among ESPN, Inc., ESPN Enterprises, Inc. (collectively referred to as “ESPN”) and the Conference, as amended from time to time.
Network Agreement:	Network Agreement, dated July 21, 2016, by and among ESPN and the Conference, as amended from time to time (collectively with the Multi-Media Agreement, “Media Rights Agreements”).
Joinder to Grant of Rights:	Each of the Universities must execute a Joinder to the Grant of Rights, dated April 22, 2023, and the Amended Grant of Rights Agreements, dated July 18, 2016, by and between each of the Conference Universities and the Conference.
ACC Manual:	The 2022-2023 ACC Manual, which includes the Constitution, Bylaws, Sports Operation Code and General Policies and Procedures of the Conference, as amended from time to time.
Media Revenue:	All revenue generated and distributed from the Media Rights Agreements, as each exists as of the Signing Date, but excluding additional revenue arising from the admission of new Conference members, rights or markets (other than the admission of the Universities or any other institutions joining the Conference for the 2024-25 season and their respective relevant media markets).
Other Revenue:	All revenue received by the Conference other than Media Revenue. Other Revenue shall include additional revenue received as a result of any revenue

¹ Consummation of any Transaction is subject to Diligence, an affirmative vote of an absolute 3/4 of the Board of Directors of the Conference, and the parties’ negotiation and execution and delivery of definitive documentation.

	<p>increase under or amendments to the Media Rights Agreement and Network Agreement, in each case effected after the Signing Date (other than (i) additional revenue arising from the admission of the Universities or any other institutions joining the Conference for the 2024-25 season and their respective relevant media markets and (ii) annual increases in revenue currently set forth in the Media Rights Agreements, as they exist as of the Signing Date, that do not arise from the admission of new members of the Conference after the 2024-25 season or relevant media markets).</p>
<p>Distributions:</p>	<p>Pursuant to the terms of the ACC Manual, and subject to payment of such University’s applicable Member Contribution, each of the Universities to receive a distribution from the Conference equal to the distribution paid to all other full participating members.</p> <p>Additionally, each of the Universities will be entitled to full participation in any success incentive program adopted by the Conference.</p>
<p>ACC Championship Travel Cap</p>	<p>Conference Championship aggregated travel expenses for men’s and women’s basketball and all Olympic sports will be capped for each of the Universities at the amount equal to the highest total expenses paid to any current Conference members.</p> <p>Each of the Universities will be reimbursed for participation in the Football Championship according to the policy adopted by the Conference for all Members.</p>
<p>Member Contribution</p>	<p>Each of the Universities to contribute to the Conference an amount equal to a specified percentage of each distribution of Media Revenue, as follows (collectively, the “Member Contribution”):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 67% of distributions of Media Revenue during each of the first 7 years following the Effective Date; • 30% of distributions of Media Revenue during the 8th year following the Effective Date; and • 25% of distributions of Media Revenue during the 9th year following the Effective Date. <p>For the avoidance of doubt, after the 9th year following the Effective Date, the Member Contribution of each of the Universities shall be \$0.</p> <p>Member Contributions will be made around the time of each Conference distribution. The Conference will agree on the exact process and timing for the Member Contributions with each of the Universities.</p>
<p>Withdrawal Payment</p>	<p>Each of the Universities shall immediately be subject to the withdrawal payment obligations in the ACC Manual effective the Signing Date.</p>

<p>Other obligations:</p>	<p>Each of the Universities will comply with all provisions of the Media Rights Agreements and agree to execute any and all assignments, authorizations and approvals to which the other Conference members are a party on the same terms thereof, including but not limited to those relating to the Media Rights Agreements.</p>
<p>Governance:</p>	<p>As of the Effective Date, each of the Universities to have full voting and other governance participation rights, as set forth in the Conference’s governing documents. Prior to the Effective Date, each of the Universities shall have board observation rights, but no voting rights, to the extent the topics discussed affect the future of the Conference at or beyond the Effective Date and provided that no confidentiality or privilege rights are implicated.</p>
<p>Indemnification:</p>	<p>Each of the Universities will agree to indemnify and hold harmless the Conference and its current members against any losses that are imposed upon the Conference or its current members from third-party claims against such University or the Pac-12 conference in the cases entitled <i>In re College Athlete NIL Litigation</i>, Case No. 4:20-cv-03919 (N.D. Cal. June 15, 2020) and <i>Hubbard v. NCAA</i>, Case No. 4:23-cv-01593 (N.D. Cal. April 4, 2023) (collectively, the “NCAA Cases”), which claims arise out of such University’s actions or inaction prior to the Effective Date, but only in proportion to and to the extent such losses are caused by or result from the actions or inaction of such University.</p> <p>To the extent the losses imposed upon the Conference or its current members in connection with the NCAA Cases are not caused by the actions or inaction of the Universities prior to the Effective Date, such losses shall be borne by and apportioned among the current Conference members.</p>
<p>Diligence:</p>	<p>The Conference to share with the Universities relevant documents, including Conference governing documents and, subject to counterparty consent, the Media Rights Agreement and Network Agreement, including any production requirements.</p> <p>Each University to disclose to the Conference any athletics-related liabilities that preexist the Signing Date and, if requested, any related documents.</p>

CHAIR
William A. Ladusaw
University of California, Santa Cruz

VICE CHAIR
Margaret Kasimatis
Loyola Marymount University

Jeffrey Armstrong
California Polytechnic State
University, San Luis Obispo

Janna Bersi
California State University,
Dominguez Hills

Richard Bray
Schools Commission Representative

Linda Buckley
University of the Pacific

Ronald L. Carter
Loma Linda University

William Covino
California State University,
Los Angeles

Christopher T. Cross
Public Member

Reed Dasenbrock
University of Hawaii at Manoa

John Etchemendy
Stanford University

Erin S. Gore
Public Member

Dianne F. Harrison
California State University,
Northridge

Harold Hewitt, Jr.
Chapman University

Barbara Karlin
Golden Gate University

Linda Katehi
University of California, Davis

Adrianna Kezar
University of Southern California

Devorah Lieberman
University of La Verne

Julia Lopez
Public Member

Charles Mac Powell
John F. Kennedy University

Stephen Privett, S.J.
University of San Francisco

Barry Ryan
West Coast University

Sharon Salinger
University of California, Irvine

Sandra Serrano
Community and Junior
Colleges Representative

Ramon Torrecilha
California State University,
Dominguez Hills

Jane V. Wellman
Public Member

Leah Williams
Public Member

PRESIDENT
Mary Ellen Petrisko

March 6, 2015

Nicholas Dirks
Chancellor
University of California, Berkeley
200 California Hall, #1500
Berkeley, CA 94720-1500

Dear Chancellor Dirks:

At its meeting February 18-20, 2015, the Commission considered the report of the review team that conducted the Accreditation Visit (AV) to the University of California, Berkeley (UCB) October 22-24, 2014. Commission members reviewed the institutional report prepared by UC Berkeley prior to the Offsite Review (OSR), any supplemental materials requested by the team following the OSR, and the institution's response to the visiting team report. The Commission appreciated the opportunity to discuss the review with you and your colleagues Catherine Koshland, Vice Chancellor, Under-graduate Education, and Cynthia Schraeger, Assistant Vice Provost, Undergraduate Education. Your comments were helpful in informing the Commission's deliberations.

This reaffirmation review was conducted in keeping with the *2008 Handbook of Accreditation*, which requires institutions to address several components in their institutional reports. With regard to each of these components, as specified for institutions in the transitional Pilot 2 category, the team found the following:

1. *Meaning, integrity, quality, and rigor of the degrees:* The institution had consistently implemented the approach of "locally defined, discipline specific, and faculty-driven" in addressing these quality measures into each of their degree programs. A detailed survey, to which 100% of the 72 divisions and schools responded, verified that the process had been deployed, achievement data had been obtained, and needed improvements implemented – though also noting that some units are in early stages of full integration. The focus on teaching excellence, particularly at the undergraduate level, has been both broadly supported and highly productive.
2. *Achieving core competencies:* The process of setting, assessing, and evaluating learning outcomes is broadly deployed at the department level, particularly with upper-division outcomes in the major. The Reimaging Undergraduate Education initiative has been effectively embraced across the institution.
3. *Defining and promoting student success:* The team reported that academic affairs and student affairs are well integrated around a commitment to evidences of academic achievement as well as degree completion.

4. *Ensuring capacity, effectiveness, and response to changes:* Having reckoned with the severe challenges of the economic downturn and related reductions in state support, the review team was impressed with the manner in which UC Berkeley has deployed its resources. The team was concerned, however, about the environmental elements over which the University has limited, if any, control that will continue to challenge its ability to sustain its world-class reputation.

The Commission commends UC Berkeley in particular for the following:

As noted by the team, the University is commended for its resilience and visionary response in the face of the recent economic downturn and the related financial cutbacks. As noted by the team, these outcomes encompassed strategies “including cutting expenses through the Operational Excellence program, developing metrics-driven assessment of Operational Excellence, generating new revenue through student recruitment and philanthropy, and investing in new programs, particularly those relating to enhancing undergraduate education.”

The team’s report also frequently referenced the University’s multiple initiatives that, together, comprise the Undergraduate Initiative. The Commission commends the University for the vision, coordination, broad support, and promising outcomes related to this core dimension of Berkeley’s mission.

The team was impressed with the pervasive implementation of the values “relating to equity, diversity and inclusion” and the ways in which these values are “central to planning at all levels of the institution.” The Commission commends the degree to which this critical aspect of Berkeley’s mission is so clearly integrated into the fabric of the institution.

The Commission endorses the other commendations made by the team in their report. In the context of encouraging the continuation of the outstanding initiatives and processes already under way at the institution, the Commission wishes to emphasize the following areas:

Undergraduate Initiative. The Commission is impressed with the multiple initiatives under the heading of the Undergraduate Initiative. As expressed by the team, the Commission wishes for this cluster of thoughtful processes to become even more “innovative, expansive, and ambitious,” as it has large potential both for this institution and as a model for others. In particular, the Commission urges the institution more intentionally to evaluate the many undergraduate strategies in support of student success with the purpose of providing adequate resources for those with the highest demonstrated effectiveness. (CFRs 2.10, 2.11, 2.13, 4.1, 4.3)

Faculty Roles and Deployment. The Commission acknowledges the trend at Berkeley, as at most other institutions, to rely more broadly on non-tenure track and adjunct faculty, especially in the delivery of the lower division curriculum. In this context, the Commission urges the institution to continue its evaluation of the most effective ways to fulfill its promises for undergraduate students to enjoy full participation in the benefits of a major research university, including meaningful engagement with research faculty. These efforts to enhance the undergraduate experience should continue to be integrated with Berkeley’s exemplary equity and inclusion programs to ensure that all students equally enjoy the benefits the research university offers. (CFRs 3.1, 3.2, 4.7)

Given the above, the Commission acted to:

1. Receive the team report and reaffirm the accreditation of the University of California Berkeley for a period of ten years.
2. Schedule the next comprehensive review with the Offsite Review in spring 2024 and the Accreditation Visit scheduled for fall 2024.
3. Schedule a Mid-Cycle Review in spring 2020.

In taking this action to reaffirm accreditation, the Commission confirms that the University of California Berkeley has satisfactorily addressed the Core Commitments to Student Learning and Success, Quality and Improvement, and Institutional Integrity, Sustainability, and Accountability. The University of California Berkeley has successfully completed the multi-stage review conducted under the 2008 Standards of Accreditation. Between this action and the time of the next review, the institution is encouraged to maintain its compliance with WSCUC standards and uphold its commitment to continuous quality improvement.

In accordance with Commission policy, a copy of this letter will be sent to UC System President Janet Napolitano. The Commission expects that the team report and this action letter will be posted in a readily accessible location on the University's website and widely disseminated throughout the institution to promote further engagement and improvement and to support the institution's response to the specific issues identified in this letter. The team report and the Commission's action letter will also be posted on the WSCUC website. If the institution wishes to respond to the Commission action on its own website, WSCUC will post a link to that response.

Finally, the Commission wishes to express its appreciation for the extensive work that UC Berkeley undertook in preparing for and supporting this accreditation review. WSCUC is committed to an accreditation process that adds value to institutions while contributing to public accountability, and we thank you for your continued participation in this process. Please contact me if you have any questions about this letter or the action of the Commission.

Sincerely,



Mary Ellen Petrisko
President

MEP/rw

Cc: William Ladusaw, Commission Chair
Cynthia Schrager, ALO
Janet Napolitano, President, UC System
Members of the reaffirmation team
Richard Winn, Senior Vice President

REPORT OF THE WSCUC VISITING TEAM

Pilot 2 Accreditation Visit Review

Institution reviewed: UC - Berkeley

Dates of visit: October 21st (initial meeting of team in Berkeley) -
October 24th (Exit Interview)

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
Reaffirmation of Accreditation

Team Roster

Chair – Mary Sue Coleman, President Emeritus, University of Michigan
Assistant Chair – Chris Cullander, Director (Retired) of Institutional Research, University of
California, San Francisco

Team members

David Fairris, Professor of Economics, University of California, Riverside
Maryann Jacobi Gray, Assistant Provost, University of California, Los Angeles
Jillian Kinzie - Associate Director, Center for Postsecondary Research and
NSSE Institute, School of Education, Indiana University Bloomington
Laura Martin, Coordinator for Institutional Assessment & ALO,
University of California, Merced
WSCUC staff liaison – Richard Winn, Senior Vice President, WSCUC

The team evaluated the institution under the 2008 Standards of Accreditation and prepared this report containing its collective evaluation for consideration and action by the institution and by the WSCUC Senior College and University Commission. The formal action concerning the institution's status is taken by the Commission and is described in a letter from the Commission to the institution. This report and the Commission letter are made available to the public by publication on the WSCUC website.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page numbers

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of the Institution and Reaccreditation Process	1
B. Description of Team’s Process	1
C. Institution’s Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor	3
D. Response to Issues Raised in Previous Commission Actions and Reviews	5

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

A. Essay 2.1) Defining the meaning of degrees and ensuring their integrity, quality, and rigor	6
B. Essay 2.2) Achieving core competencies	6
C. Essay 2.3) Defining and promoting student success	17
D. Essay 2.4) Ensuring institutional capacity and effectiveness in the future and planning for the changing environment for higher education	29
E. Essay 3. Optional essay on institution-specific themes (<i>none submitted</i>)	
F. Essay 4. Integrative Essay, as appropriate (<i>none submitted</i>)	
G. Other topics as needed (<i>none</i>)	

SECTION III – EVALUATION OF ELECTRONIC EXHIBIT PORTFOLIO

A. Compliance Checklist	35
B. Self-review under the Standards	35
C. Required Data Exhibits	35
D. Response to finance review, and retention/graduation review	35
E. Continued momentum in assessing student learning	35
F. Program review	35

SECTION IV – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE TEAM REVIEW

A. Findings	35
B. Commendations	36
C. Recommendations	37

APPENDICES

A. Compliance Checklist	39
B. Credit Hour Policy	39
C. Student Complaints Policy	39
D. Marketing and Recruitment Review	39
E. Off-Campus Locations (if applicable)	39
F. Distance Education (if applicable)	39

SECTION I – OVERVIEW AND CONTEXT

A. Description of Institution and Reaccreditation Process

- Provide **background information** on the mission and nature of the institution, including brief history, location(s), size, levels and kinds of degrees awarded.

General background: see the introductory paragraphs in ‘Institutional Context’, p. 4, http://vpapf.chance.berkeley.edu/wasc/files/UCBerkeley_Institutional-Narrative.pdf

History: see section on ‘Historical Overview’, pp. 4-5, *ibid*.

Size, levels and kinds of degrees awarded: see ‘Facts at a glance’ at <http://www.berkeley.edu/about/fact.shtml>

- Provide information on the institution’s **recent accreditation history**.

See ‘Accreditation History’, p. 10 in

http://vpapf.chance.berkeley.edu/wasc/files/UCBerkeley_Institutional-Narrative.pdf

B. Description of Team’s Process:

Dates for the Offsite Review were established. It proved unworkable to schedule a planning conference call that could accommodate everyone; team members communicated by email instead, reviewing the team worksheet to prepare for the visit. No interviews were required for this review.

One member of the original team encountered scheduling conflicts and withdrew from the team. Two new team members were added, Maryann Jacobi Gray of UCLA and David Fairris of UC Riverside.

All documents for this review were available for download on Box.net. Each team member was also asked to review the 'Report of the WASC Team OSR UC Berkeley' as well as Berkeley's Self-Study. The Chair's email to the team included the preliminary schedule for the AV as an attachment, and Berkeley's ALO emailed the final version of the visit schedule the week before the visit. Binders with material responding to the preliminary lines of inquiry were available for all team members at the hotel prior to their arrival. The team requested and received a link to the Graduate Learning Outcomes (GLOs), and all GLO hyperlinks were tested prior to the visit.

The team met at the Durant Hotel in Berkeley on October 21st, the day before the visit began. The WSCUC staff liaison led a discussion of the visit process, the AV deliverables, decision options available to the team at the end of the AV, and WSCUC's policies on public disclosure. The 'Notification of Confidential Email Account' had been sent to all faculty, staff and students by UC Berkeley on October 1st, and at the team's request, a reminder regarding this account was sent (during the visit) on October 22nd. The account was monitored by the Assistant Chair throughout the visit.

Visit sessions were focused on the original (primary) lines of inquiry, with each session addressing one or more of these. One member of the team was asked to be the discussion lead for each visit session, with a secondary lead identified for each session as well. All members of the team participated in each session. The original lines of inquiry were mapped to the team worksheet lines of inquiry (which elaborated the primary lines of inquiry, and were thus more numerous) to make certain that all the team's concerns were addressed. Additional discussions of online education and program review were requested by the team and were subsequently incorporated into the schedule.

- Indicate whether the institution has **off-campus locations or distance education** programs and, if so, which ones were reviewed as a part of this review. (A separate

report on any such matters should be included as an appendix and should be discussed, as appropriate, within the body of the report.)

UC Berkeley does not have any off-campus locations at present, but has three distance education programs: Electrical Engineering & Computer Science - Integrated Circuits -- Master of Advanced Study; Information and Data Science; and Public Health. All are Masters level programs. The online MPH program was discussed during the Accreditation Visit (AV), but none were reviewed in detail.

D. Institution's Reaccreditation Report and Update: Quality and Rigor

- Was the report well organized and clearly written and presented?
 - Yes. The report was comprehensively descriptive, painting a picture of a complex, sophisticated research university committed to its public mission.
- Did the report accurately portray the condition of the institution?
 - Yes. All clarifications requested were provided.
- What was the extent of institutional involvement in the review and report preparation? How were faculty included in discussion of issues and recommendations?
 - As described in pp. 11-12 of the Institutional Narrative, the Accreditation Steering Committee included representatives from the campus administration, the Academic Senate, the ASUC, and the Graduate Assembly. A staff Working Group was also created. The draft Self-Study under the Standards was circulated to campus leaders, and their input was reviewed by the Steering Committee. The Berkeley Academic Senate worked with the Graduate Division to articulate learning outcomes at the graduate level. To develop a complete understanding of student learning outcomes, how they are evaluated, and how feedback collected is used to revise curricula, the

Steering Committee undertook the Academic Unit Survey, with 100% participation by all academic units.

- The short timeline of the Pilot 2 reviews precluded a review of the final draft of the self-study by the campus community as a whole, so emails to all campus stakeholders from prior Chancellor Robert J. Birgeneau and current Chancellor, Nicholas Dirks were sent to keep them informed of progress.
- There was also a web communication from UC Berkeley's then Chancellor, Robert J. Birgeneau.
- A UC Berkeley Accreditation web page was created that includes all accreditation documents and contact information. This page was updated prior to the Accreditation Visit to reflect changes in the WSCUC team and in UC Berkeley's WSCUC Steering Committee, the dates of the AV, and the notification of the Confidential Email Account.
- Articles on the accreditation review were published in the Daily Californian, the independent student newspaper, to keep various constituencies informed.
- The self-study revealed that preparation for the review had been thorough, insightful, and evidenced-based.
- The review team did not find any significant disconnects between the Self-Study claims and the evidence and documentation provided for them.
- The team made several commendations to UC Berkeley in these areas relating to the various ways in which the review process had increased the institution's understanding of its systems for ensuring educational effectiveness.
- The discussion by videoconference with the institutional leaders was very helpful in defining and refining several lines of inquiry in anticipation of the Accreditation Visit.

D. Response to Issues Raised in Prior Reviews

The most recent Commission action letter (February 1, 2010) asked Berkeley to continue to deepen the integration of student learning outcomes assessment within the departments and to further incorporate such assessment in academic program reviews. The Berkeley self-study documents the campus' efforts to do so; additional information emerged through their responses to several lines of inquiry during the accreditation visit. Several major changes have taken place since Berkeley's last accreditation in 2004 (e.g., the economic turndown in 2008 and the gradual de-funding of higher education in California, which resulted in ongoing financial pressures including unfunded pension obligations), all of which Berkeley responded to in a proactive manner.

Three new online Masters programs are now in place (MAS in Integrated Circuits [began fall, 2013], Information & Data Science [began spring, 2014], and Public Health [began spring, 2012]). The online Public Health Masters is discussed in the Self-Study. An update on all programs – particularly their experience of the assessment of learning outcomes – was requested for the Accreditation Visit.

Berkeley is planning to open a second campus at Richmond Bay, about seven miles (15-20 minute away by car) from the main campus. Questions remain about how this campus will be funded, whether it can or should host classes and educational programs in addition to research, and about transportation between the primary and secondary campus.

Berkeley's recent sharp increase in non-resident undergraduates has contributed to its diversity. The campus faces the challenge of promoting academic success and a sense of inclusion for a wide array of students, including under-represented minority students, international students, and out of state students.

The University has also experienced more aggressive competition for the best faculty, students and staff. One consequence of this may be a continuing shift of primary teaching responsibility from 'regular' to 'other' faculty.

SECTION II – EVALUATION OF INSTITUTIONAL ESSAYS

UC Berkeley combined Essay 2.1) **Defining the meaning of degrees and ensuring their integrity, quality and rigor** and Essay 2.2) **Achieving core competencies** into a single essay entitled “Enhancing Excellence in Our Educational Mission: Quality, Diversity, Rigor and Renewal” (pp. 13-48 in the Self-Study). The team’s review follows:

Grounded in its public, land-grant roots, and with a strong commitment to social mobility for the citizens of California, UC Berkeley outlines a cogent and inspiring commitment to ensuring that students graduate with the capacity to continue to learn and develop, to engage in intelligent discourse, to question and challenge convention, and to contribute to the political, cultural and artistic vibrancy of their communities either as practitioners, participants or patrons. The educational mission is long term – Berkeley students are to be leaders in their fields of choice and in their lifelong pursuit of new learning in an increasingly diverse and global context. The institution acknowledges the mutually reinforcing contributions of the classroom and the campus/residential life experience towards these outcomes.

Ensuring Integrity, Quality and Rigor

In response to the first WSCUC essay topic - defining the meaning of degrees and ensuring integrity, quality and rigor - the Berkeley Self-Study explained that the University’s organizational culture and structure supported the establishment of learning goals and student learning outcome assessment as locally defined, discipline specific, and faculty driven. As part of its preparation for reaffirmation of accreditation, the institution explored this tenet by inventorying how academic units evaluated student learning at each degree level and how the

feedback obtained is used to revise the curricula; how units engage with breadth courses (in the College of Letters and Science), and whether breadth should be managed campus-wide; if units participate in disciplinary accreditation; and how the unit collects evidence of teaching effectiveness. All 72 departments and professional schools and 34 graduate groups as well as the 11 non-department undergraduate interdisciplinary majors participated in the inventory, for a 100% participation rate. (CFR 4.3, 4.7)

Berkeley's report also documents how the institution ensures a culture of faculty responsibility and creativity in defining the educational mission and in particular the commitment to local, faculty-driven control of degree programs. The report documents several specific examples of faculty leadership on curricular modifications and in cross-discipline program initiatives. During the visit, the team learned more about the Academic Program Review process, and various initiatives supported by the office of the Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education, the Center for Teaching and Learning, and academic programs that support and guide Berkeley's commitment to educational quality. (CFR 2.3, 2.4, 3.2, 4.6, 4.7)

Berkeley took seriously the critique made during their last reaffirmation review that they were making slow progress on the assessment of student learning outcomes. In 2010, WSCUC commended the institution for their progress. The Academic Unit Survey results show widespread adoption of learning outcomes across programs, including the creation of curricular maps and the interpretation of evidence. The examples of utilization of assessment findings and integration with departmental culture are promising, but suggest that many programs are at the early stages of using evidence to inform action. However, the team learned of several programs that have used such evidence in planning and curriculum-development (such as Global Policy and Practice, and Legal Studies), demonstrating institutional capacity in this important arena. (CFR 2.1, 2.3, 2.4, 2.6, 2.10, 4.3, 4.4, 4.7)

Although Berkeley has made good progress on the assessment of student learning outcomes, fewer than half of academic programs indicated having "closed the loop" – or using evidence to

make curricular improvements and assessing impact. Notably, the institution has a plan to “meet departments where they are” to enhance their efforts and to close the loop. During the visit, the team learned more about the extent to which Academic Program Review (APR) has demanded that departments map learning outcomes, review evidence, and follow-up on recommendations emerging from the APR process. The extensive developments in the APR process, combined with initiatives to support assessment and improvements in teaching and learning, demonstrate the extent to which Berkeley meets its claim to “support the culture of responsibility, creativity and engagement with departmental and University-wide structures that provide resources to evaluate success, to learn from failures, and to share best practices for classroom teaching.” To ensure program level commitment for quality, Berkeley has enacted a process and structure of Academic Program Review that is complex, extensive, and well-conceived. (CFR 2.7, 4.3, 4.4, 4.6)

Academic Program Review was revamped beginning in 2004, and while the report suggests that as late as 2013 some programs are only nearing the completion of their first cycle of reviews, the team concluded that Berkeley is clearly committed to the process of program reviews. Program reviews have become an integral element in the enhancement of teaching and learning on campus as well as in the commitment to equity, diversity, and inclusion. The visiting team was most impressed with the way in which program reviews were taken seriously by senior leaders in the administration, and how the results of reviews were used in resource allocation decisions at all levels, from facilities and space to faculty hires. In the view of the visiting team, UC-Berkeley is well ahead of the curve in comparison to other, similarly situated public research universities in this regard. (CFR 2.7, 3.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.6)

The partnership between academic programs, the Office of the Vice Chancellor for Undergraduate Education, and the Center for Teaching and Learning seems to be a strong component for ensuring quality and in advancing assessment and improvement efforts. Exemplifying this commitment is Berkeley’s reinvestment in the Center for Teaching and Learning (reestablished in 2012), and the creation of initiatives including the Graduate

Assessment Fellows, Teaching Excellence Colloquium, and the apprentice teachers in Chemistry, to support assessment, improve teaching quality and increase mentorship and community for teacher scholars. (CFR 2.8, 2.9, 4.7)

Teaching Excellence

Teaching excellence receives strong support at Berkeley. While teaching is largely conceived as a function of individual faculty effort, excellence is encouraged by campus-wide support programs that target in-class instruction, broader curricular considerations, and expectations for mentoring. During the visit, several faculty and academic leaders described a noticeable shift emphasizing higher quality teaching, with one long-term faculty member concluding that “teaching has demonstrably improved over the last ten years.” Initiatives receiving additional support via programming by the Center for Teaching and Learning include course-based, in-class teaching and instruction, facilitation of research, assessment, teaching conferences, and include the informal experiential aspects of the Berkeley experience –mentoring and community building. The breadth of support for Graduate Student Instructors, including required departmental pedagogy seminars, workshops on teaching, and a summer institute for Preparing Future Faculty and awards, is commendable. (CFR 2.8, 3.2, 3.4, 4.7)

Again, the structure for promoting teaching excellence is faculty-driven. The Academic Senate’s Committee on Teaching demonstrates a commitment to fostering excellence in teaching. The re-launched Center for Teaching and Learning has made a meaningful contribution to fostering synergy across campus around teaching. The attention to graduate student instructor training is longstanding. New faculty members have only recently been provided a formal introduction to teaching and orientation to teaching resources, but the collaboration with departments and administrative leaders seems strong. In addition, teaching excellence efforts seem to be appropriately focused (given Berkeley’s commitment to faculty-driven and self-assessment culture) on helping faculty assess their teaching, and develop course, curriculum and program initiatives to address what is learned though closing the loop. Finally, seemingly equal

attention is being dedicated to non-Senate faculty and serious attention has been given to graduate instructors. (CFR 2.8, 3.2, 3.4, 4.7)

Teaching and mentoring effectiveness are one of three criteria in the Personnel Review process. Although the process so far has relied heavily on end-of-term course evaluations, Berkeley is exploring additional forms of evidence. In addition, the institution acknowledges a lack of comparative data given the proliferation of different evaluations employed across programs, and is moving toward greater standardization, and online administration. The development of a wider range of evidence (and understanding of the value of different forms of evidence) seems important to create alongside campus efforts to invest in additional teaching effectiveness initiatives. (CFR 2.8, 4.4, 4.7)

Berkeley has made significant strides to ensure educational quality by developing meaningful organizational and structural arrangements to support the establishment of learning outcomes and the use of evidence to improve. Moreover, campus plans for achieving the goals of the Undergraduate Student Learning Initiative (discussed in the following section) will demand persistent attention to teaching excellence. (CFR 2.9, 4.4, 4.6)

Undergraduate Education: Quality and Renewal

UC Berkeley's self-study elaborated a strong commitment to innovate and improve undergraduate education and identified it as an area for additional investment. Toward this end, the campus has been pursuing a wide variety of initiatives, programs, and activities - informed by disaggregated student data on achievement and student's course scheduling and advising needs - that include but are not limited to: a comprehensive review of the breadth curriculum; the Reimagining Undergraduate Education effort in the College of Letters and Science; the Common Good Curriculum (to add seat capacity to courses in high demand that are critical to academic success and timely graduation); a re-formulation of academic advising; a campus climate initiative; re-invigorating the Center for Teaching and Learning; efforts to

promote “vertical learning communities,” and – most recently – the overarching Undergraduate Initiative, spearheaded by a committee co-chaired by the Chancellor and the Vice Chancellor, Undergraduate Education. (CFR 2.1, 2.10, 2.13, 4.1, 4.3, 4.6, 4.7)

Throughout the visit, the team repeatedly heard that undergraduate education is a major priority for the campus. Both the Chancellor and Provost emphasized the importance of undergraduate education to campus overall well-being. The Provost spoke of the benefits of producing a greater sense of community for UCB undergraduates, one that leverages the benefits of a large research university and enables students to benefit from the richness of a diverse institution. This overarching vision was reinforced throughout the visit and is expected to be realized in the work of the Undergraduate Initiative Steering Committee (UGISC). (CFR 4.1, 4.6, 4.8)

The quality of undergraduate education has been steadily examined at Berkeley. The institution embarked on a systematic process for exploring undergraduate learning goals - the Undergraduate Student Learning Initiative (USLI) in 2007 - that required every undergraduate program to articulate learning goals and to map these to the core learning abilities and competencies stipulated in WSCUC standards. (CFR 2.2a) The mapping demonstrates breadth and that the competencies are embedded in the major experience across the disciplines. Learning outcomes for all but a few programs are clearly articulated and transparent (see <http://opa.berkeley.edu/academicprograms/undergraduateGoals.html>). The establishment of learning competencies also benefited from an external perspective in that their development was informed by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) VALUE rubrics. (CFR 2.2a, 2.3, 4.1, 4.3)

A particular strength of the undergraduate program is a commitment to high levels of faculty-student engagement and to the creation of a community of scholars – between both students and faculty and among undergraduate and graduate students - and to undergraduate research experiences. Berkeley takes pride in quality faculty-student engagement, noting that it is an

exception to the myth that “Senate-faculty don’t teach undergraduates” and documenting that “Senate faculty teach 80% of our graduate courses, 63% of upper-division undergraduate major courses, and 40% of lower-division courses.” However, additional data provided to the team during the site visit indicates that lecturers and other non-Senate faculty comprise a growing share of the undergraduate instructional workforce – in fact, the number of ‘Regular Faculty’ was very close to the number of ‘Other Faculty’ – and given the institutional focus on undergraduate education, it is important to ensure that the non-ladder faculty members are adequately integrated into the campus culture and community, with an understanding of institutional goals, resources, plans, and the like. More broadly, this pattern raises important questions about how Berkeley will utilize its future Senate faculty to meet student expectations and needs. (CFR 2.1, 2.5, 3.1, 4.7)

Berkeley has a strong commitment to involving undergraduate students in research. Results from the University of California Undergraduate Experiences Survey (UCUES) support the institution’s claims about undergraduate experiences, including high levels of academic engagement, undergraduate research experience, time on academic tasks, and satisfaction with the educational experience. High proportions of Berkeley first-year students report opportunities for research and creative activities in their courses, and 66% of seniors report working with faculty on research. Again, the team observed widespread support for leveraging undergraduate research to create a strong undergraduate experience, and investing in initiatives like Berkeley Connect and the SMART program, so-called “vertical learning communities”, in which graduate students mentor and share research experiences with undergraduate students. These programs are clearly aligned with Berkeley’s mission and culture. (CFR 2.2a, 2.2b, 2.5, 2.9)

The co-curriculum is also a significant element of undergraduate education at Berkeley. The contribution of the co-curriculum to student learning and success was sufficiently described in the report and related documents. In particular, the example of co-curricular learning outcomes assessment, coordinated by the former Dean of Students and employing the Social

Change Model, was well-done. The visit did not provide the team with additional opportunities to document the vibrant campus culture that contributes to the quality of undergraduate education at Berkeley, but the team noted a robust environment for learning in and outside the classroom, and a commitment by students, student affairs and academic affairs to enhance student learning in all aspects of campus life. (CFR 2.11, 2.13)

During the visit, the team learned that campus leadership believes that student affairs and academic affairs are fairly well-integrated, and that student affairs espouses support for the academic mission. This strong partnership helped foster the establishment of the “One Stop Shop,” supported by the Advising Council (which coordinates and aligns advising at UC Berkeley) to improve and create greater efficiencies for student advising, and enabled additional enhancements to student support services. Although student support programs seem strong, particular elements of academic supports that bridge the curriculum and co-curriculum may need to be evaluated for effectiveness and outcomes. (CFR 2.13, 4.1, 4.6)

Although Berkeley’s report documented the thoughtful piloting and evaluation of the undergraduate mentoring program, Berkeley Connect, and the use of this information to extend it to other departments, the team learned that only limited evaluation of other new or improved academic or co-curricular support services had been undertaken. For example, although Summer Bridge is perceived as very valuable, it was not clear to the team that rigorous efforts had been made to evaluate the actual success of this and some other academic or co-curricular programs on campus. In a time of fiscal austerity (and with an Operational Excellence effort firmly intact), it is important to be able to document impact so that scarce resources can be allocated to their highest valued use. Even when cursory efforts had been made to evaluate programs – through, for example, student surveys or focus groups or a comparison of mean outcomes for “treated” and “control” groups – questions remain about true program impact. (CFR 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 4.6)

By its own admission, the assessment of student learning at Berkeley has been focused mostly on the upper-division major. The campus has only recently begun addressing the breadth curriculum in general education. A significant amount of data was collected in 2012-2013, and has been analyzed and acted on relatively recently. During the visit, the team learned about actions taken by the Letters & Science Executive Committee to approve new breadth courses, to limit the term of breadth course approval, to update the breadth list of courses, and to institute additional analyses (which revealed a need to generate an Executive Committee view of breadth as well as to freshen the explanation of the Breadth Category descriptions). (CFR 2.1, 2.2, 2.10, 4.7)

In addition, the undergraduate curriculum demonstrates intentional structuring to encourage academic breadth through crosscutting curricular requirements, and a unique common element: all Berkeley undergraduates take an American Cultures (AC) course, the only Berkeley campus requirement for graduation (Subject A and American History and Institutions are UC-wide requirements). The American Cultures courses have been rigorously evaluated and informed by relevant research about diversity-related learning outcomes. A limited number of faculty reflected on these findings in summer 2013 and results will also be shared with other faculty during the 2013-14 academic year. Other innovative curricular initiatives related to breadth are also being enacted including Course Threads and Big Ideas. (CFR 2.1, 2.2, 4.7)

The recently-launched Undergraduate Initiative is ambitious, exciting, and critically important to the future of the campus. It will allow faculty, students, and administration to think expansively about what the undergraduate experience at Berkeley can and should become, what it means to receive a liberal education in a research university, and what skills and knowledge students will need for individual fulfillment and for leadership in our rapidly changing society. The initiative also offers an overarching framework to integrate and align the rich profusion of activities already underway at Berkeley. Moving forward, the campus faces the challenge of keeping the scope manageable without losing the visionary and creative quality of the effort. (CFR 4.1, 4.3)

The visiting team recommends that UC Berkeley use the Undergraduate Initiative to frame what it means to obtain a liberal arts education in a research environment generally and in the specific setting and culture of Berkeley. As a corollary, the team recommends that Berkeley be more intentional about the various academic support programs that currently exist on campus, by addressing how the goals of existing programs align with the Undergraduate Initiative. In addition, the team recommends that the campus use the initiative or a closely aligned process to evaluate and winnow the wide array of activities and programs now in place, thereby enabling the campus to invest in those efforts that are most effective. Going forward, the campus will want to utilize data to evaluate the success of existing programs and any newly-created programs.

Graduate Education

Berkeley's graduate education is internationally renowned. It involves about 10,250 students and is enriched by a diverse student body. Like the undergraduate program, the graduate curriculum is also interdisciplinary.

Graduate-level learning outcomes pertaining to skill development have been accepted by the Graduate Council and assessment measures have been specified. During the visit, the team learned that the Graduate Program Outcomes (GPOs) are widely shared, and reflect Berkeley's commitment to enhancing skill development along a student's graduate career trajectory. Results from assessment activities demonstrate a healthy utilization of direct evidence for student learning at the graduate level (more so than at the undergraduate level). In addition, graduate student survey results related to satisfaction with the academic programs are being used to assess and improve graduate programs. The development of program-specific outcomes for graduate education, a common set of expectations for all graduate students, and specific programs to foster graduate student training for academic and other career trajectories, is commendable. The team encourages Berkeley to continue to advance this work

as planned, in particular moving assessment beyond the review of individual students by individual faculty, which was an important next step identified in the self-study. (CFR 2.2b, 2.3)

During the visit, the team learned more about the Graduate Division's strategic plan. It identified four strategic and financial goals: 1) optimize financial support for doctoral students, 2) improve and expand professional development and training for graduate students; 3) enhance administrative services to students and academic programs, and 4) maintain the diversity of the graduate community. These goals are guiding the work of the division and are informing the broader context for graduate education. Progress has been made to expand training for graduate students. Graduate professional development has been enhanced via the SMART mentoring program, which matches undergraduate student mentees with graduate student mentors to conduct research. Moreover, the innovative Graduate Student Assessment Fellows Program supplements graduate preparation by offering opportunities to gain training in assessment of undergraduate student learning and evaluation of educational programs on the Berkeley campus, while at the same time supporting programs and faculty in the conduct of assessment to improve teaching and curriculum. (CFR 2.2b, 3.2, 4.4, 4.6, 4.8)

Berkeley has cautiously and intentionally explored online courses and degree programs. A second annual online learning summit, held in March 2014, included panel presentations and keynote sessions related to the development of Massive Open Online Courses, pedagogical developments in online learning, economic analysis of higher education issues, development of customized online learning platforms, and other matters related to online education. During the visit, the team learned that a limited number of online degree programs, including the Professional Master of Public Health degree, have been developing slowly, with appropriate oversight and review. On-line course and program levels outcomes have been evaluated in comparison to comparable campus-based courses and Berkeley has appropriately identified discrepancies and how these will be addressed and monitored.

Essay 2.3) **Defining and promoting student success** was addressed in UC Berkeley's essay entitled "Student Success: Fostering Access and Excellence" (pp. 51-65 in the Self-Study).

UC Berkeley has articulated a definition of student success that reflects its character and history as a leading research university long committed to the principles of excellence, access, and affordability (CFR 1.2). This definition pairs high expectations for student achievement, as represented in standard metrics for student success (e.g. retention, time-to-degree, and graduation rates), with equally high expectations for student intellectual engagement and learning both at Berkeley and throughout life. Indeed, successful Berkeley graduates are expected to understand there is always more to be learned and discovered, and to possess the skills, expertise, and confidence to continue to develop and apply their own knowledge frameworks in their post-graduate lives. As articulated in the campus' strategic goals, Berkeley graduates are also expected to be engaged citizens, with the co-curriculum instrumental in this development. Thus, at Berkeley, student success is envisioned as a campus-wide responsibility.

As described in the institution's self-study, and confirmed during the accreditation visit, by any measure Berkeley is achieving its goals for student success. Yet, like the most successful institutions, Berkeley is also critically evaluating its achievements, its organizational infrastructure in support of those achievements, and working to improve where data suggest, and the community feels, that improvement is warranted. The sections that follow describe, at the undergraduate and graduate levels, Berkeley's significant achievements with respect to student success and its ongoing efforts to systematically identify and improve the Berkeley experience for all students, including those that have been historically under-represented in higher education.

Undergraduate Student Success

Berkeley's approach to facilitating and evaluating undergraduate student success recognizes higher education as part of the continuum of a student's life experiences, with pre-college

experiences shaping opportunities and preparation, university opportunities formative for post-graduate achievement, and post-graduate achievements as an indicator of success. In keeping with the California Master Plan for Higher Education and Berkeley's vision of access and excellence, Berkeley identifies and admits the most promising students, both freshmen and transfers, applying a holistic approach to admissions that considers the broad accomplishments of its applicants in the context of the opportunities that have been available to them and their educational goals. Once on campus, student success is fostered through a rich array of evolving academic and co-curricular programs including support services that reflect the diversity of undergraduate interests and needs as well as the numerous opportunities afforded by a large research university. (CFR 2.10)

The numbers illustrate Berkeley's unequivocal success in this regard. For example, in keeping with its goals for access and affordability, Berkeley is quite diverse for a highly selective institution. In 2011, 22% of freshmen matriculating from California public high schools came from schools ranked in the lower 50th percentile of schools (assessed by California's Academic Performance Index), 44% of transfer students indicated that neither of their parents had earned a four-year college degree either inside or outside of the U.S., and 25% of domestic transfer students were under-represented minorities. More generally, 37% of all Berkeley undergraduates (nearly 9,600 students) are Pell Grant recipients, a broadly accepted indicator for low income. (CFR 4.5)

Berkeley's graduation statistics highlight the success of these students in completing a Berkeley degree. On average, 82% of freshmen graduate within 4.5 years of entry, and 89% graduate by year 5; at 91% Berkeley's six-year graduation rate exceeds the average of its AAU public peers by 14 percentage points. Transfer students are similarly successful with 76% graduating within 2.5 years and 90% within four. Berkeley students also graduate with lower levels of debt than their peers, with about \$17,000 being the average total debt for undergraduates as compared to \$26,600 nationally and \$18,800 in California. More generally, only about 40% of Berkeley undergraduates borrow to support their education as compared to the national average of 56%

at public four-year colleges and universities. Indeed, about 40% of Berkeley undergraduates pay no tuition due to grants and scholarships. (CFR 2.10, 4.4)

While these numbers point to success writ large, certain populations are not as successful as others. For instance, the average six-year graduation rate for 2004-2006 fall freshmen cohorts was 91% overall, but somewhat lower for International (83%), Pell Recipient (87%), and Chicano/Latino (82%), African American (74%) and American Indian (83%) entrants from the same cohorts. Disparities also exist among transfer student populations, with African American (78%) and American Indian (74%) rates falling below the average overall four year graduation rate of 90% for 2006-2008 transfer cohorts. While the basis for these disparities is at yet not well understood, the elimination of intergroup disparities in undergraduate (and graduate) enrollment, retention, and graduation rates by 2020 is an explicit strategic goal for Berkeley as formally articulated in the Strategic Plan for Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity. (CFR 2.10) The campus' significant efforts to establish unit-level stewardship of the campus equity and inclusion goals ("I and E" as known on campus) are described under Equity, Inclusion and Diversity below.

Equally important to advancing goals for undergraduate student success is the renewed focus on undergraduate education, an initiative supported at the highest levels of the university and one in which the campus is making significant, strategic resource investments. As part of this effort, Berkeley has been examining patterns in undergraduate time-to-degree and degree completion, with the goal of increasing both rates. This has resulted in several important initiatives, with lasting impact on campus planning strategies. For instance, the discovery by the Undergraduate Enrollment Task Force that about 20% of students entering as full-time freshman were taking longer than the median four years to complete their degree led to development of the Common Good Curriculum, and a highly successful, strategic investment in course offerings to eliminate critical bottlenecks in gateway course availability. Beyond addressing time-to-degree, this exercise has advanced the campus's ability to accurately predict course demand and deploy resources to ensure sufficient seat availability. During the visit, the

team learned that the campus plans to support adoption of these planning strategies more broadly as a means to better match resources to student demand, a development the team applauds. (CFR 2.10, 4.2, 4.4, 4.5, 4.6)

Berkeley is also engaged in a comprehensive re-envisioning of undergraduate advising practices on campus under the guidance of a newly established Advising Council. Intended to establish a shared vision of student advising among the over 700 professional advisors on campus, the initiative is also expected to provide a coordinated means to address findings that students who do not declare a major in their second year are less likely to graduate. Central to the project's ability to achieve its goals is the commitment to establishing a common set of assessment standards, including a focus on learning outcomes, for advising units across campus and implementing the practice of assessing advising units on a regular schedule. (CFR 2.11, 2.12, 4.6) The team was impressed with advances in this area, and strongly endorses continued commitment to re-envisioning professional advisors as educators with a significant role to play in cultivating, and strategically assessing student learning in relation to both student and campus goals for learning and success.

Many smaller scale initiatives are also underway to better support the learning and success of Berkeley undergraduates broadly as well as to address the needs of select populations. For instance, through its Re-Imagining Undergraduate Experience at a Public Research Initiative, the College of Letters and Science, which includes 75% of undergraduates, is expanding the adoption of Berkeley Connect, an innovative program designed to develop intellectual communities among undergraduates, graduate students, professors and alumnae within individual departments. The program's design facilitates multiple goals, including connecting undergraduates with the research mission of the university and with possible career pathways as illustrated by alumni, and providing graduate students with professional development as mentors. Graduate Division's SMART Mentoring program similarly enjoins undergraduates and graduate students in mutually beneficial learning experiences. (CFR 2.11)

Under the aegis of the Vice Chancellor for Equity and Inclusion, Berkeley also offers a number of programs specifically targeting under-represented students. Examples include the Biology Scholars Program, the SAGE Scholar Program, and the Professional Development Program. Berkeley also provides a number of standard academic support services through the campus resources like the Student Learning Center, and its programming including tutoring, Summer Bridge, and the Transfer, Re-entry, and Student Parent Center (TRSP). Berkeley's self-study included many other examples, rounding out a picture of diverse programming that address student needs, often through initiatives that intersect directly with student priorities and interests. (CFR 2.11)

Notable in the written descriptions of a number of these initiatives was the explicit alignment with overarching institutional priorities, the inclusion of findings illustrating the success of these programs, or plans to develop comprehensive approaches to assessing the efficacy of the efforts. (CFR 2.11, 4.6) Discussions during the site visit, however, suggested that attention to assessment and program evaluation was not as systematically and broadly adopted as it should be if Berkeley intends to identify the underlying reasons for disparities in metrics of student success and, in turn, determine the efficacy of programs and services intended to address those differences. In a time of ongoing fiscal austerity, it is essential that programs have precise objectives that reflect higher institutional priorities, that achievement of those objectives be rigorously examined to support continued improvement in support of intended outcomes, and that scarce resources be allocated to their highest valued use. Going forward, the team encourages Berkeley to carefully evaluate the efficacy of these diverse programs identifying clear, measurable goals, and evaluating the extent to which they are achieved. Further, it will be important to continue to affirm the relationship of these diverse initiatives to Berkeley's evolving vision for undergraduate education, ensuring alignment, and evaluating efficacy as a means for determining the most effective strategies for meeting campus goals and prioritizing resources for those with demonstrable impact. (CFR 2.10, 2.11, 4.3, 4.4, 4.6)

Graduate Student Success

Berkeley is equally committed to ensuring and advancing student success at the graduate level. As is the case at the undergraduate level, student success is a responsibility shared by the faculty and the administration. The Graduate Council of the Academic Senate establishes policy for graduate education on behalf of Berkeley faculty. The Graduate Division, in collaboration with academic departments and campus support units, implements educational policy through a complementary set of administrative services and professional development programming in support of departments and students. The team saw much evidence of the productivity of this academic-administrative partnership to the mutual benefit of the students and the institution. (CFR 3.4, 4.6)

Through the work of the Graduate Division, Berkeley is actively pursuing the complementary goals of promoting timely degree completion and readiness for post-graduate success in academic and non-academic careers. Reducing doctoral time-to-degree has and will continue to be a particular focus of the Division's work, an emphasis the team strongly encourages. Over the period 1999-2014, the overall mean elapsed time from matriculation to degree for PhD recipients declined from 6.9 to 6.5 years. Among sub-populations, rates also generally declined during that same period. There is, however, considerable variation among those populations. Over the last 10 years, non-U.S. citizens have completed degrees about a year faster (~ 5.8 years) than U.S. citizens and permanent residents (~ 6.9 years). White (~6.9 years), Asian American (~6.6 years), and Native American (~6.6) students have also completed their degrees more quickly than African American (~7.3 years) and Hispanic (~7.2 years) students. As the team learned during the visit, interpreting differences among subpopulations is complicated. Some groups, for instance African Americans, are disproportionately enrolled in degrees that generally take longer to complete (e.g. humanities degrees), while others, for instance non-U.S. citizens, are disproportionately represented in disciplines with historically shorter time-to-degrees (e.g. STEM fields). (CFR 2.10, 4.4, 4.5)

Overall ten-year completion rates have also advanced considerably over the last 25 years; the current rate of 74% represents a 10 percentage point increase over the lowest rate in the prior 15 year interval. As with time-to-degree, these rates vary considerably among subpopulations. During the visit the team learned that one of the Division's strategic goals going forward is to work cooperatively with other campus units to develop new strategies to maintain and expand recruitment and retention of graduate students from diverse backgrounds. The team strongly endorses this goal, recognizing the significant number of Berkeley graduates that successfully pursue academic careers, and thus the contribution Berkeley could make to diversifying the academy. (CFR 2.10)

Essential to the Division's efforts to facilitate continued focus on reducing the time-to-degree and degree completion rates are the reports it distributes annually to each department. Each report summarizes a set of key performance indicators identified by Graduate Council as the best means for assessing the extent to which programs are meeting shared objectives for graduate education. The data set is robust, providing a comprehensive picture of the program appropriate for planning purposes; it includes both quantitative metrics of student success, disaggregated by subpopulations - number of degrees awarded, time-to-degree, degree completion rates, and application and acceptance rates – together with measures of student satisfaction with the academic experience, including advising and opportunities for professional development. (CFR 2.10, 4.4, 4.5) The reports also include key information on sources of funding for doctoral students, as well as a “funding gap modeler” to make transparent the discrepancy between available funding and needed support. Providing programs with the ability to track and manage multiple sources of support for graduate students is one of several mechanisms by which the Division intends to support programs in achieving another of its strategic goals – to help programs provide full financial support to doctoral students for five years. Enabling departments to strategically manage their resources in support of student success is an important initiative that the team applauds. (CFR 4.2)

The annual provision of these data sets also provides the Graduate Division with the opportunity to systematically engage departments in examining their enrollment data to identify ways in which to improve student achievement. As the team learned during the visit, the Division is actively meeting with programs to address questions related to time-to-degree and completion rates as part of its overall support for enrollment management, starting with establishing appropriate enrollment targets. The Division has also been piloting and carefully assessing strategies to improve time-to-degree. (CFR 4.3, 4.4) The team commends Berkeley for its progressive work, and encourages continued investment in these key activities.

Berkeley is equally committed to providing co-curricular support and programming to further the success of its graduate students. Toward this end, the Division offers workshops to promote development of writing and editing skills, and programs to develop mentoring skills, including the previously mentioned SMART program. The Division's remarkable Graduate Student Instructor Teaching and Resource Center is instrumental to the effort, offering diverse programming to develop skills in teaching and mentoring appropriate for academic and non-academic careers including credit-bearing courses, certificates, workshops, and the Summer Institute for Preparing Future Faculty. Significantly, these efforts reflect the effective partnership between the Division and the Graduate Council, including the Council's subcommittees on Graduate Student Instructor Affairs and Professional Development. Going forward, Graduate Division has prioritized a continued focus on supporting the development of skills traditionally valued for tenure track employment, such as teaching and academic writing, and to expand support for these and other skills applicable to a variety of career paths. The team strongly endorses this continued focus on providing graduate students with these important opportunities for career preparation. (CFR 2.10, 2.13, 3.2)

Overall, the team left the site visit impressed with the shared vision and extent of collaboration and cooperation between Graduate Division and the Academic Senate. Also notable was the extent to which the Division's strategic plans were shared by staff and the energy with which these priorities are being implemented. Although not emphasized in the self-study, it is clear

that the Division is skilled in using data to inform planning and decision making. Division leadership described how data on the quality of the administrative support the Division provides to students and academic programs is being used to revise practices, and how the results and proposed actions had been shared with stakeholders as a means to validate the findings and proposed actions. However, reducing doctoral time-to-degree must remain a particular focus of the Division's work. The team also learned about select examples of the assessment of co-curricular programs in relation to key program objectives. These are model practices that will inevitably help the Division successfully advance its strategic goals of over the next three to five years in support of graduate student success. (CFR 2.10, 4.7, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4)

Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity

The Division of Equity, Inclusion and Diversity is central to Berkeley's efforts to develop a robust, data-driven, systematic approach to advancing its goals for reducing disparities in student success at both graduate and undergraduate levels. Established in 2007, under the leadership of the Vice Chancellor for Equity and Inclusion (the first position of its kind in the University of California system), the Division provides both visible leadership and significant material support for advancing the campus' Strategic Plan for Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity, a comprehensive approach to embedding the principles of excellence, equity, and inclusion into every campus unit – academic and administrative. (CFR 1.5)

A key part of the campus' strategic plan to eliminate disparities is the expectation that all academic departments develop and implement a strategic plan for equity, inclusion and diversity. Since the project was initiated in 2009, 31 of approximately 65 departments have or are in the process of completing a plan. The team learned that the multiple dimensions of equity and inclusion are examined as part of the planning process, including undergraduate, graduate student, faculty, and staff demographics, departmental climate, departmental vision, leadership, and messaging, and curriculum, research and teaching. Strategic plans are then focused on high priority challenges and needs. (CFR 4.3)

Discussions with faculty representatives illustrated the positive effects of this planning process. Efforts to improve faculty and graduate student diversity, department climate for under-represented groups, and the academic success of students from under-represented populations were described. Faculty consistently identified the expertise provided by staff from the Division of Equity and Inclusion as essential to the success of these activities. Strategic deployment of staff in support of institutional priorities appears to be a hallmark of Berkeley planning, and a key to the success of its most effective initiatives. The Academic Program Review support team, described below, is another example of this approach to strategically supporting institutional priorities. (CFR 4.2)

Systematic attention to equity, inclusion and diversity is also ensured through the requirement that departmental contributions to this institutional goal be examined as part of the campus's key process in support of institutional strategic planning - Academic Program Review (APR). A focus on equity and inclusion is supported materially through the presence of a representative from the Division of Equity and Inclusion on the APR support team (a group of staff that directly assist programs with required elements of self-study), by a program review process which solicits substantive input from the Diversity, Equity, and Campus Climate committee of the Academic Senate, and by the inclusion of the Vice Chancellor for Equity and Inclusion on the Periodic Review Oversight Committee. Sample action letters stemming from reviews illustrated the priority placed on inclusion and equity in the APR process, and the team learned that the program review analyst maintains a database of required actions, actively following-up with programs to ensure they are addressed. (CFR 4.4)

Discussion with faculty, staff, representatives from the Division of Equity and Inclusion and the Program Review Oversight Committee clearly indicated that planning and evaluation related to equity, inclusion and diversity are fully integrated into APR. To date, however, these efforts have been more focused on planning than on assessment or accountability – the two components essential to fully realizing the impact of the significant work that has been accomplished thus far and ensuring achievement of the goals for reducing disparities in student

success. Further, although curriculum, teaching and research is examined as part of the strategic planning process, student learning, particularly as it relates to equity in learning outcomes, is not. Yet, this is the single most important educational outcome, and it can be examined directly. (CFR 1.5, 4.7)

Looking forward, the team encourages Berkeley to pursue its plans to more systematically assess the extent to which plans for equity and inclusion have been achieved, evaluate the effectiveness of programs and interventions intended to promote diversity, equity and inclusion, and broadly disseminate effective practices and other lessons learned. The team also strongly encourages Berkeley to consider examining the extent to which intended learning outcomes are achieved equally by under-represented and majority populations, as demonstrated directly through student work. Toward this end, the team suggests that the campus evaluate the benefits of integrating this kind of direct look at student success into the metrics it encourages programs to review as part of the equity and inclusion self-assessment and strategic planning process and that are examined during academic program review. The Center for Teaching and Learning would seem to be a natural partner for this kind of action research. (CFR 1.5, 4.7)

To achieve the campus goal of eliminating disparities in student success – undergraduate and graduate - by 2020, it will also be important for departments to evaluate progress in relation to plans at intervals shorter than the eight-year program review cycle. Emerging plans to implement mid-cycle reviews and develop departmental dashboards would seem productive in this regard. The team strongly encourages Berkeley to pursue these, or to identify other, mechanisms to ensure regular departmental-level attention to plans for improving equity, inclusion, diversity, and climate. (CFR 1.5, 4.4)

Finally, during the visit the team learned that only academic departments benefit from regular engagement in periodic program review, and that program reviews of student support units were typically only undertaken upon request of a senate committee or other body. While the

team whole-heartedly agrees with Berkeley's philosophy of purposeful evaluation rather than evaluation for the sake of evaluation, the team also notes that non-academic units, and the institution more generally, benefit equally from periodic self-reflection and the input of experts external to the unit, and encourages Berkeley to find a way to establish sustainable periodic reviews of its academic support units. (CFR 2.11, 4.4, 4.6)

Conclusion

Since UCB's previous review for reaffirmation of accreditation, Berkeley has undertaken significant steps to strengthen integration of activities across the campus, most critically developing infrastructure to overcome barriers to shared understandings across disparate units, including in relation to student success. Principal among them has been Berkeley's implementation of an Enterprise Data Warehouse and related institutional reporting portal with dashboard tools, Cal Answers, under the Institutional Data Management and Governance Initiative. This tool has already been critical to advancing Berkeley's goals for student success by facilitating on-demand access to key performance indicators to facilitate understanding, analysis and improvement, as necessary. (CFR 4.5)

Also critical is the integration of these goals into ongoing institutional planning and decision making processes, including most importantly Academic Program Review. As described above, a number of the new support initiatives include explicit plans to articulate and assess goals and objectives that are themselves explicitly aligned with Berkeley's strategic goals and mission. The campus is encouraged to pursue and broaden engagement in the assessment of its support programs, thereby increasing capacity at the local level (ex. unit) to monitor success through the development of clear missions, goals, objectives and related metrics, and to demonstrate their alignment with the Berkeley mission and higher level priorities. (CFR 2.11, 4.6)

Essay 2.4) **Ensuring institutional capacity and effectiveness in the future, and planning for the changing environment for higher education** was addressed in two essays by UC Berkeley, “Financial Sustainability: Strategic Responses to a Changing Environment” (pp 67-85) and “Future Priorities, Future Directions” (pp. 88-91) in the Self-Study.

Overview of Financial Challenges

The University of California, Berkeley is one of the world’s best and most prominent institutions. It has a history and reputation for serving multiple missions extraordinarily well. New leadership in the offices of the chancellor and provost coupled with the WSCUC accreditation review have offered the University the opportunity to examine each of its missions with the goal of sustaining and expanding the excellence for which it is so widely recognized. (CFR 1.3)

The review team was impressed with the manner in which UC Berkeley has deployed its resources, but we were repeatedly reminded by institutional leaders that sustaining excellence will be an enormous challenge in an era when state support is declining or remaining virtually flat, making the University more and more dependent on the development of new revenue.

This new reality would be manageable for UC Berkeley if other factors were under the control of the institution, but they are not. The review team was deeply troubled by the fact that the Office of the President of the UC System and State Government mandated a tuition freeze at all UC schools for several years. In addition, discussions currently underway may result in a “cap” on out of state and international students at the undergraduate level. The confluence of both of these factors will have dire consequences for the campus in the absence of dramatic increases in state support for university operations (and including capital construction and deferred maintenance funds).

The review team notes that UC Berkeley has been astoundingly resilient throughout the great recession (which was accompanied with dramatic cuts in state support) and beyond, largely because it had three important levers to manage with support from the Office of the President: increasing tuition, recruitment of out of state students, and enhanced philanthropy. If two of these options are removed, it will be virtually impossible for the institution to compete effectively in the highly competitive arena of public and private university peers.

The situation that UC Berkeley faces is all the more troubling because the team noted the remarkable success and progress that institutional leaders have achieved in cost-cutting and containment through the Operational Excellence program. It is clear to this review team that Berkeley has taken efficiency in operations as a primary and ongoing mandate; however, we are convinced that no institution can cut its way to excellence. Berkeley is simply not an outlier in educational costs given the breadth and excellence of the academic offerings and research opportunities it provides for all students.

The review team did note that the Office of the President has promoted a strategy of regular and programmed tuition increases for UC campuses, thus giving students (and their families) predictable educational costs and the institutions a stable funding stream. In this scenario, enhanced and regular increases in state support could make feasible reasonable caps on out of state students. In other words, UC Berkeley can reasonably focus on giving California students priority if the state is willing to pay its share for access to the best educational opportunity in the country (note: the UC Regents approved systemwide tuition increases of up to 5% per year for the next five years at their most recent meeting on November 20th, 2014).

Within the past few years, UC Berkeley has placed a renewed emphasis on the undergraduate experience. The review team was impressed with the progress and new programs that have emerged. It is also clear that Berkeley has taken to heart the issue of diversity as a critical component of excellence in 21st century higher education. With new recruitment and assessment tools, Berkeley has provided departments and units with tremendous support in

keeping diversity, success and educational excellence as a top priority for everyone within the University. While the team makes a few recommendations for linking these efforts across the University, we applaud the careful and rational approaches that the various tools employ.

Financial Issues at UC Berkeley

As a consequence of a funding cycle that is beyond the control of the UC Berkeley campus, the review team was not given any in depth documents pertaining to the budget preparation or proposals. As part of the UC system, the campus does not have independent control over this issue, a fact that was clearly understood by the team. The detailed budget proposal and documents are not available until late November 2014 and thus the team did not review these.

It is the understanding of the team through the self-study that Berkeley is experiencing a structural budget deficit due to a variety of factors: a pension system that is underfunded, increases in health care costs, a dramatic decline in state support over the past decade and restrictions on tuition-setting authority. Berkeley has responded aggressively to these factors, as permitted by the University system and the state.

Cost reductions and containment have been tackled through the Operational Excellence program and this has been highly successful resulting in savings projected at \$75 million annually (which include initiatives like FTE and position management, streamlined and coordinated procurement systems, end to end process initiatives and controls, and IT rationalization, among many other actions). The operations program will continue into the foreseeable future with a robust savings target. In addition, in the early years of the recession Berkeley was able to increase tuition, increase numbers of out of state and international students, enhance intellectual property revenue, and invest in a highly successful philanthropic program to mitigate some of the detrimental effects of the sharp decline in state support. The team's concerns regarding admission standards for international applicants were satisfactorily

addressed, and the increased level of support for international matriculants was noted and commended. (CFR 4.1, 4.2)

In recognition of the financial circumstance in which it finds itself, Berkeley has conducted scenario planning for annual budgets for the next few years. This planning consists of 'most favorable', 'most likely', and 'difficult' budget scenarios. In recent years UC system campuses have changed from a model using a permanent base budget with incremental growth to a comprehensive budgeting system wherein each unit develops a comprehensive plan with all funds reflected and which is now visible and transparent to the central administration. All requests for funding are aggregated and central administrators meet quarterly with units to monitor all revenues and spending rates. With this strategy and real time access to data, the University has been able to monitor and quickly implement a course correction if revenues and expenditures are not matched. (CFR 4.1, 4.2)

Another factor that has created difficulties for all UC campuses is the abandonment by the state of capital project and deferred maintenance funding. Responsibility for raising revenue for such purposes has now fallen to the individual university campuses.

The university leadership team is heartened by the directive from the Office of the President of the University of California that a three year financial plan for the system will be forthcoming and that a package of regular annual tuition increases coupled with additional state support (including capital project and deferred maintenance funding) will be proposed to the governing board and the legislature. If these revenue enhancements are realized, Berkeley will be able to continue to invest in access and excellence with enormous benefit to California and the entire nation's economy. In contrast, if the most difficult budget scenario emerges, Berkeley will be able to remain a solid public university, but its national and global impact will simply erode over time.

The review team was enormously impressed with the dedication and perseverance of faculty and administrators at Berkeley, all of whom are intently focused on retaining the excellence for which the University is so well known. We do note that in this era of constrained resources that the UC campuses have differing needs and “levers” to deploy to generate revenue. This reality prompts the team to recommend that the time may have come to give campuses more flexibility from the central administration office in Sacramento without damaging the very positive aspects of the entire UC system.

Richmond Bay Global Campus

This 107 acre site (about 8 miles from the UC Berkeley campus) has been owned by the UC System for over 60 years. During this time, the site was managed jointly by Berkeley and the Lawrence Livermore Laboratory. There are a number of buildings on the site and a population of about 300 people working there every day. Currently, the facilities are used for large scale research projects such as development of driverless vehicles, studies of wave motion and the like. Third party entities, like the Environmental Protection Agency rent space and UC Berkeley also uses some of the space to store library materials and various collections. The carrying cost for this entity is \$2.4 million per year.

Recently the U.S. Department of Energy has decided that Lawrence Livermore Laboratory will not expand on the site. Consequently, the development and use of Richmond Bay will be determined solely by UC Berkeley in the future. In anticipation of additional expansion on this site, the University has carried out a comprehensive land use study of this site and has proposed a 40 to 50 year development plan that will include expanded research and educational facilities. The capacity of Richmond Bay for permanent structures is on the order of 5 million square feet. In order to promote closer partnerships with the private sector, Berkeley is hoping to attract research and development funding from major corporations that mirror the investments at the Mission Bay campus of the University of California, San Francisco. Another goal is to use the site to support faculty and student commercialization and entrepreneurial

activities. Ultimately, this site may evolve as a global campus attracting the best and brightest students from all over the world. (CFR 4.1, 4.2)

Toward this end, the University has hired a real estate expert who worked to develop Mission Bay and has proposed phase 1, which will consist of the development of 200,000 to 400,000 net square feet of research space.

The evaluation team did note that Richmond Bay is some distance from the main campus and that efficient and convenient transportation would be a critical factor for the site. University officials are clearly aware of this issue and are cognizant that it will be important to develop a sense of community and openness on the site and to work diligently with the Richmond community to have a positive impact on economic development for that region. While a comprehensive funding plan is not yet in place, the evaluation team was reassured that UC Berkeley officials are taking a reasoned and careful approach to the use of this land asset and that Richmond Bay will be an important resource for the future. (CFR 3.5)

SECTION III – EVALUATION OF ELECTRONIC EXHIBIT PORTFOLIO

- A. Compliance Checklist – see
<http://vpapf.chance.berkeley.edu/wasc/files/UCBerkeley-Required-Data-Exhibits.pdf>
- B. Self-review under the Standards -
http://vpapf.chance.berkeley.edu/wasc/files/UCBerkeley_Institutional-Narrative.pdf
- C. Required Data Exhibits -
<http://vpapf.chance.berkeley.edu/wasc/files/UCBerkeley-Required-Data-Exhibits.pdf>
- D. Response to previous reviews, including Commission actions, finance review, and retention/graduation review, as appropriate – please see UC Berkeley’s Retention and Graduation Narrative (April 2013) at http://vpapf.chance.berkeley.edu/wasc/files/WASC-Student-Success_Narrative-and-Templates.pdf , and the WASC Response to Retention and Graduation Narrative (May 2013) at http://vpapf.chance.berkeley.edu/wasc/files/UCB_R-G_FinalReport_050713.pdf
- E. Assessment of student learning – see Self-Review, p. 32 ff
- F. Program review – see Self-Review, p. 25 ff.

SECTION IV – FINDINGS, COMMENDATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings

The University of California, Berkeley represents the best of higher education in the United States. As was made abundantly clear during this site visit, the University is not resting on its laurels; rather it has thoughtfully and aggressively found ways to re-examine and refresh each part of its multiple missions since the last WASC review and reaccreditation.

With a new focus on data analysis, serious and consequential program evaluations, undergraduate education both in and outside the classroom, diversity and inclusion strategies and myriad experimental programs to assure student success at all levels, UC Berkeley has clearly demonstrated that it meets and exceeds the requirements for reaccreditation.

The overarching Commendations and Recommendations follow.

Commendations

The team commends Berkeley for

1. Quality, thoroughness, clarity, and depth of its self-study. The report provided a comprehensive portrayal of a highly developed and complex institution.
2. Resilience and resolve in the face of seriously constrained resources, including cutting expenses through the Operational Excellence program, developing metrics-driven assessment of Operational Excellence, generating new revenue through student recruitment and philanthropy, and investing in new programs, particularly those relating to enhancing undergraduate education.
3. Proactive and innovative thinking about ways to mentor and retain new faculty, for the fact that it is tracking its success in doing so, and for the broad institutional commitment to this process.
4. Systematic inquiry regarding undergraduate learning goals, for its efforts to study and inventory how the various units evaluate student learning, for the implementation of the AAC&U Value Rubrics and for the development of outcomes for graduate education and a common set of stated expectations for all graduate students.

5. Steadily increasing graduation rates for undergraduate students, creating and using Cal Answers to provide data-driven solutions, instituting a normative time to degree through careful analysis of degree requirements, and creating the Common Good Curriculum.
6. The renewed commitment to undergraduate education as exemplified by programs like the SMART initiative, Berkeley Connect, Big Ideas courses, the Advising Council, and responsive programming in the Center for Teaching and Learning, and finally culminating in the Undergraduate Initiative.
7. The seemingly effective collaboration between the academic senate and the administration at all levels. In the team's view this represents shared governance at its best to the great benefit of the University.
8. Making issues relating to equity, diversity and inclusion central to planning at all levels of the institution. These efforts have been well supported centrally and are now a part of the fabric of the institution.

Recommendations

The visiting team recommends that Berkeley

1. Use the undergraduate initiative to establish an innovative, expansive, and ambitious vision for what it means to obtain a liberal arts education in the research environment generally and in the specific setting and culture of Berkeley. Following this vision, the team recommends that Berkeley be more intentional about the various academic support programs that currently exist on campus, addressing how the goals of existing programs align with the Undergraduate Initiative and evaluating and winnowing the wide array of activities and programs now in place, thereby enabling the campus to invest in those efforts that are most effective in support of its

vision for undergraduate education. The campus will also want to utilize data to evaluate the success of existing programs and any newly-created programs.

2. Give sustained thought to the deployment of “other faculty” relative to “regular faculty.” Given the increasing reliance on non-tenure track faculty especially at the lower division level, UC-Berkeley will want to ensure that it is fulfilling its promises to students that they will benefit from participation in a research university, learn from research faculty, and engage in research under their direction. Looking ahead, the campus faces the challenge of determining how best to configure its faculty in order to support the mission of advancing knowledge while simultaneously meeting student needs.

3. Accelerate its efforts to understand, at the doctoral level, the factors driving relatively long times-to-degree and relatively high attrition rates, and develops interventions to reduce time-to-degree and increase completion rates, thereby reducing costs to both individual students and to the institution, and in support of continued excellence in graduate education.

4. Continue to advance campus goals to reduce differential time-to-degree and graduation rates by helping departments hold themselves accountable for achieving equity, inclusion, and diversity goals, by means of, for example, mid-cycle reviews. In addition, the team perceives opportunities to build stronger connections between the university’s equity, diversity and inclusion efforts and other educational enhancement programs, such as the Center for Teaching and Learning.

5. Continue its efforts to work with the UC Office of the President, other UC campuses, and the State of California to establish a more predictable and rational tuition policy. The campus needs this in order to plan effectively, and students and their families need it for the same reason. Holding tuition flat can only lead to increased pressures in the future for both students and the institution. An especially worrisome scenario combines anemic state support with flat

tuition and caps on non-resident enrollment. Such a situation would have dire consequences for Berkeley's ability to maintain competitiveness, quality, access, and excellence.

6. Engage in a collaborative and thoughtful process with the Office of the President and other campuses in the system to consider how it can achieve greater autonomy and flexibility without damage to the long-term future of the campus or the system.

APPENDICES

- A. Compliance Checklist – see <http://vpapf.chance.berkeley.edu/wasc/files/UCBerkeley-Required-Data-Exhibits.pdf>
- B. Credit Hour – see *ibid*, required Data Exhibits 1.7k
- C. Student Complaints – see *ibid*, required Data Exhibits 1.7b for policy – The Confidential Account received more than 30 emails, but nearly all were personal issues or not relevant to this review.
- D. Marketing and Recruitment – see *ibid*, required Data Exhibits 2.13 & 3.3b
- E. Off-Campus Locations, as appropriate – none as yet
- F. Distance Education, as appropriate – not reviewed

2022 EADA Survey

Institution: (110635)

User ID: E1106351

Screening Questions

Please answer these questions carefully as your responses will determine which subsequent data entry screens are appropriate for your institution.

1. How will you report Operating (Game-day) Expenses?

- By Team Per Participant

2. Select the type of varsity sports teams at your institution.

- Men's Teams
- Women's Teams
- Coed Teams

3. Do any of your teams have assistant coaches?

- Yes
- Men's Teams
- Women's Teams
- Coed Teams
- No

If you save the data on this screen, then return to the screen to make changes, note the following:

- 1) If you select an additional type of team remember to include associated data for that type of team on subsequent screens;
- 2) If you delete a type of team but have already entered associated data on other screens, all associated data for that type of team will be deleted from subsequent

screens. However, because the survey system has to recalculate the totals, you must re-save every screen.

Sports Selection - Men's and Women's Teams

Select the varsity sports teams at your institution.

Sport	Men's	Women's	Sport	Men's	Women's
Archery	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Badminton	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Baseball	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		Basketball	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Beach Volleyball	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Bowling	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cross Country	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Diving	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Equestrian	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fencing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Field Hockey		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Football	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Golf	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Gymnastics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Ice Hockey	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Lacrosse	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Rifle	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Rodeo	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Rowing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Sailing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Skiing	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Soccer	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Softball		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Squash	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Swimming	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Swimming and Diving (combined)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Synchronized Swimming		<input type="checkbox"/>	Table Tennis	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Team Handball	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Tennis	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Track and Field (Indoor)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Track and Field (Outdoor)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Track and Field	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Volleyball	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

and Cross
Country
(combined)

Water Polo	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Weight Lifting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Wrestling	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other Varsity Sports (Specify sports in the caveat box.)*	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Caveat (Specify Other Varsity Sports):

*Use the caveat to list the "Other Varsity Sports" if you checked the box above. You should only include intercollegiate varsity sports in your EADA disclosures.

*The caveat on this screen is for internal use and does not appear on the EADA Dissemination Website (public site). If you want information to appear on the public site, enter it on the Athletic Participation screen.

Other sports include Men's Rugby.

If you save the data on this screen, then return to the screen to make changes, note the following:

- 1) If you select an additional team remember to include associated data for that sport on subsequent screens;
- 2) If you delete a sport but have already entered associated data on other screens, all associated data for that sport will be deleted from subsequent screens. However, because the survey system has to recalculate the totals, you must re-save every screen.

Athletics Participation - Men's and Women's Teams

Enter the number of participants as of the day of the first scheduled contest.

Varsity Teams

Men's Teams

Women's Teams

Baseball

Basketball

Beach Volleyball		19
Field Hockey		31
Football	121	
Golf	14	10
Gymnastics	21	20
Lacrosse		36
Rowing	64	75
Soccer	28	38
Softball		24
Swimming and Diving (combined)	42	36
Swimming	40	32
Diving	2	4
Tennis	10	10
Track and Field and Cross Country (combined)	128	122
Track and Field (Indoor)	54	55
Track and Field (Outdoor)	54	53
Cross Country		

20	14
----	----

Volleyball

18

Water Polo

29	30
----	----

Other Sports

59

Total Participants Men's and Women's Teams

574	498
-----	-----

Unduplicated Count of Participants

(This is a head count. If an individual participates on more than one team, count that individual only once on this line.)

501	430
-----	-----

CAVEAT

*For each men's or women's team that includes opposite sex participants, specify the number of male and the number of female students on that team in this caveat box.

This does not apply for coed teams.

*If you selected **Other Sports**, specify which team(s) are included.

*Additionally, provide any other clarifying information here.

- 1) Other sports include Men's Rugby.

2)The above numbers include practice players from the following sports:
Women's
Basketball, 14 male practice players.

If you save the data on this screen, then return to the screen to make changes, please note you must re-save every screen because the survey system has to recalculate the totals.

Head Coaches - Men's Teams

For each men's team, indicate whether the head coach is male or female, was assigned to the team on a full-time or part-time basis, and whether the coach was employed by the institution on a full-time basis or on a part-time or volunteer basis, by entering a 1 in the appropriate field.

The Swimming and Diving (combined) fields allow up to 2 head coaches. The Track and Field and Cross Country (combined) fields allow up to 3.

Male Head Coaches

Female Head Coaches

Varsity Teams	Assigned to Team on a Full-Time Basis	Assigned to Team on a Part-Time Basis	Full-Time Institution Employee	Part-Time Institution Employee or Volunteer	Assigned to Team on a Full-Time Basis	Assigned to Team on a Part-Time Basis	Full-Time Institution Employee	Part-Time Institution Employee or Volunteer	Total Head Coaches
Baseball	1		1						1
Basketball	1		1						1
Football	1		1						1
Golf	1		1						1
Gymnastics	1		1						1
Rowing	1		1						1
Soccer	1		1						1
Swimming and Diving (combined)	1		1			1	1		2
Tennis	1		1						1
Track and Field and Cross Country (combined)						1	1		1
Water Polo	1		1						1
Other Sports	1		1						1
Coaching Position	11	0	11	0	0	2	2	0	13

Totals

CAVEAT

Other sports include Men's Rugby.

Head Coaches - Women's Teams

For each women's team, indicate whether the head coach is male or female, was assigned to the team on a full-time or part-time basis, and whether the coach was employed by the institution on a full-time basis or on a part-time or volunteer basis, by entering a 1 in the appropriate field.

The Swimming and Diving (combined) fields allow up to 2 head coaches. The Track and Field and Cross Country (combined) fields allow up to 3.

Male Head Coaches

Female Head Coaches

Varsity Teams	Male Head Coaches				Female Head Coaches				Total Head Coaches
	Assigned to Team on a Full-Time Basis	Assigned to Team on a Part-Time Basis	Full-Time Institution Employee	Part-Time Institution Employee or Volunteer	Assigned to Team on a Full-Time Basis	Assigned to Team on a Part-Time Basis	Full-Time Institution Employee	Part-Time Institution Employee or Volunteer	
Basketball	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="1"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="1"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="1"/>
Beach Volleyball	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="1"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="1"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="1"/>
Field Hockey	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="1"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="1"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="1"/>
Golf	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="1"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="1"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="1"/>
Gymnastics	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="1"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="1"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="1"/>
Lacrosse	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="1"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="1"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="1"/>

Rowing	1		1						1
Soccer	1		1						1
Softball					1		1		1
Swimming and Diving (combined)					1	1	2		2
Tennis					1		1		1
Track and Field and Cross Country (combined)						1	1		1
Volleyball	1		1						1
Water Polo					1		1		1
Coaching Position Totals	3	0	3	0	10	2	12	0	15

CAVEAT

The Women's Gymnastics program has two full-time head coaches. Due to survey limitations, only one is represented here. The second coach has been added to the

Head Coaches' Salaries - Men's and Women's Teams

Enter only salaries and bonuses that your institution pays head coaches as compensation for coaching. Do not include benefits on this screen. Do not include volunteer coaches in calculating the average salary and the Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Total. For help calculating the FTE total click on the Instructions link on this screen.

Men's Teams **Women's Teams**

Average Annual Institutional Salary per Head Coaching Position <i>(for coaching duties only)</i>	611,064	168,185
Number of Head Coaching Positions Used to Calculate the Average	13	15
Number of Volunteer Head Coaching Positions <i>(Do not include these coaches in your salary or FTE calculations.)</i>	0	0
Average Annual Institutional Salary per Full-time equivalent (FTE)	681,289	184,683
Sum of Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Positions Used to Calculate the Average	11.66	13.66

CAVEAT

The Women's Gymnastics program has two full-time head coaches. Due to survey limitations, only one is represented here. The second coach has been added to the

Assistant Coaches - Men's Teams

For each men's team, indicate whether the assistant coach is male or female, was assigned to the team on a full-time or part-time basis, and whether the coach was employed by the institution on a full-time basis or on a part-time or volunteer basis, by entering a 1 in the appropriate field.

Male Assistant Coaches

Female Assistant Coaches

Varsity Teams	Assigned to Team on a Full-Time Basis	Assigned to Team on a Part-Time Basis	Full-Time Institution Employee	Part-Time Institution Employee or Volunteer	Assigned to Team on a Full-Time Basis	Assigned to Team on a Part-Time Basis	Full-Time Institution Employee	Part-Time Institution Employee or Volunteer	Total Assistant Coaches
---------------	---------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	--------------------------------	---	---------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	--------------------------------	---	-------------------------

Baseball	2	1	2	1					3
Basketball	3		3						3
Football	10		10						10
Golf	1	1	1	1					2
Gymnastics	1	2	1	2					3
Rowing	2	2	2	2					4
Soccer	2	1	2	1					3
Swimming and Diving (combined)	1	2	1	2					3
Tennis	1	1	1	1					2
Track and Field and Cross Country (combined)		5	4	1		4	1	3	9
Water Polo	1	2	1	2					3
Other Sports	1	3	1	3					4
Coaching Position Totals	25	20	29	16	0	4	1	3	49

CAVEAT

Other sports include Men's Rugby.

Assistant Coaches - Women's Teams

For each women's team, indicate whether the assistant coach is male or female, was assigned to the team on a full-time or part-time basis, and whether the coach was employed by the institution on a full-time basis or on a part-time or volunteer basis, by entering a 1 in the appropriate field.

Male Assistant Coaches

Female Assistant Coaches

Varsity Teams	Male Assistant Coaches				Female Assistant Coaches				Total Assistant Coaches
	Assigned to Team on a Full-Time Basis	Assigned to Team on a Part-Time Basis	Full-Time Institution Employee	Part-Time Institution Employee or Volunteer	Assigned to Team on a Full-Time Basis	Assigned to Team on a Part-Time Basis	Full-Time Institution Employee	Part-Time Institution Employee or Volunteer	
Basketball	1		1		2		2		3
Beach Volleyball	1		1						1
Field Hockey	1		1		1	1	1	1	3
Golf		1		1	1	1	1	1	3
Gymnastics	1		1		1	1	1	1	3
Lacrosse					2		2		2
Rowing					3	1	3	1	4
Soccer					1	1	1	1	2

Softball					2	1	2	1	3
Swimming and Diving (combined)		1		1	1		1		2
Tennis	1	1	1	1					2
Track and Field and Cross Country (combined)		5	4	1		4	1	3	9
Volleyball	1	1	1	1	1		1		3
Water Polo	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	4
Coaching Position Totals	7	10	11	6	16	11	17	10	44

CAVEAT

The Women's Gymnastics program has two full-time head coaches. Due to survey limitations, only one is represented here. The second coach has been added to the

Assistant Coaches' Salaries - Men's and Women's Teams

Enter only salaries and bonuses that your institution pays assistant coaches as compensation for coaching. Do not include benefits on this screen. Do not include volunteer coaches in calculating the average salary and the Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Total. For help calculating the FTE total click on the Instructions link on this screen.

Men's Teams **Women's Teams**

Average Annual Institutional Salary per Assistant Coaching Position
(for coaching duties only)

201,300	78,206
---------	--------

Number of Assistant Coaching Positions Used to Calculate the Average	<input type="text" value="30"/>	<input type="text" value="28"/>
Number of Volunteer Assistant Coaching Positions <i>(Do not include these coaches in your salary or FTE calculations.)</i>	<input type="text" value="19"/>	<input type="text" value="16"/>
Average Annual Institutional Salary per Full-time equivalent (FTE)	<input type="text" value="219,600"/>	<input type="text" value="85,873"/>
Sum of Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) Positions Used to Calculate the Average	<input type="text" value="27.50"/>	<input type="text" value="25.50"/>

CAVEAT

The Women's Gymnastics program has two full-time head coaches. Due to survey limitations, only one is represented here. The second coach has been added to the

Athletically Related Student Aid - Men's and Women's Teams

Athletically related student aid is any scholarship, grant, or other form of financial assistance, offered by an institution, the terms of which require the recipient to participate in a program of intercollegiate athletics at the institution. Other student aid, of which a student-athlete simply happens to be the recipient, is not athletically related student aid. If you do not have any aid to report, enter a 0.

	Men's Teams	Women's Teams	Total
Amount of Aid	<input type="text" value="7,185,513"/>	<input type="text" value="5,943,224"/>	<input type="text" value="13,128,737"/>
Ratio (percent)	<input type="text" value="55"/>	<input type="text" value="45"/>	100%

CAVEAT

Recruiting Expenses - Men's and Women's Teams

Recruiting expenses are all expenses an institution incurs attributable to recruiting activities. This includes, but is not limited to, expenses for lodging, meals, telephone use, and transportation (including vehicles used for recruiting purposes) for both recruits and personnel engaged in recruiting, and other expenses for official and unofficial visits, and all other expenses related to recruiting. If you do not have any recruiting expenses to report, enter a 0.

	Men's Teams	Women's Teams	Total
Total	1,445,637	604,050	2,049,687

CAVEAT

Operating (Game-Day) Expenses - Men's and Women's Teams by Team

Operating expenses are all expenses an institution incurs attributable to home, away, and neutral-site intercollegiate athletic contests (commonly known as "game-day expenses"), for (A) Lodging, meals, transportation, uniforms, and equipment for coaches, team members, support staff (including, but not limited to team managers and trainers), and others; and (B) Officials.

For a sport with a men's team and a women's team that have a combined budget, click [here](#) for special instructions. Report actual numbers, not budgeted or estimated numbers. Please do not round beyond the next dollar.

Varsity Teams	Men's Teams			Women's Teams			Total Operating Expenses
	Participants	Operating Expenses per Participant	By Team	Participants	Operating Expenses per Participant	By Team	
Basketball	18	83,687	1,506,369	29	37,548	1,088,883	2,595,252
Football	121	59,151	7,157,271				7,157,271

Baseball	40	18,902	756,070			756,070	
Beach Volleyball				19	10,883	206,785	206,785
Field Hockey				31	10,400	322,395	322,395
Golf	14	23,208	324,915	10	16,685	166,847	491,762
Gymnastics	21	7,657	160,800	20	23,795	475,897	636,697
Lacrosse				36	7,999	287,970	287,970
Rowing	64	9,576	612,834	75	5,390	404,242	1,017,076
Soccer	28	13,107	367,004	38	8,196	311,455	678,459
Softball				24	21,726	521,413	521,413
Swimming and Diving (combined)	42	9,846	413,537	36	9,241	332,664	746,201
Tennis	10	20,129	201,293	10	27,447	274,465	475,758
Track and Field and Cross Country (combined)	128	4,048	518,090	122	4,080	497,772	1,015,862
Volleyball				18	23,439	421,908	421,908
Water Polo	29	7,009	203,274	30	8,480	254,399	457,673
Other Sports	59	4,912	289,802				289,802
Total Operating	574		12,511,25	498		5,567,095	18,078,35

**Expenses
Men's and
Women's
Teams**

CAVEAT

Other sports include Men's Rugby.

Note: This screen is for game-day expenses only.

Total Expenses - Men's and Women's Teams

Enter all expenses attributable to intercollegiate athletic activities. This includes appearance guarantees and options, athletically related student aid, contract services, equipment, fundraising activities, operating expenses, promotional activities, recruiting expenses, salaries and benefits, supplies, travel, and any other expenses attributable to intercollegiate athletic activities.

Report actual numbers, not budgeted or estimated numbers. Please do not round beyond the next dollar.

Varsity Teams	Men's Teams	Women's Teams	Total
Basketball	7,532,218	4,356,537	11,888,755
Football	33,865,471		33,865,471
Baseball	2,162,568		2,162,568
Beach Volleyball		550,649	550,649
Field Hockey		1,074,379	1,074,379
Golf	971,947	759,549	1,731,496
Gymnastics	473,346	1,800,953	2,274,299

Lacrosse		874,768	874,768
Rowing	1,894,200	1,767,088	3,661,288
Soccer	1,102,651	1,355,653	2,458,304
Softball		1,556,864	1,556,864
Swimming and Diving (combined)	1,777,395	1,588,818	3,366,213
Tennis	684,142	1,037,311	1,721,453
Track and Field and Cross Country (combined)	1,356,718	1,520,659	2,877,377
Volleyball		1,772,398	1,772,398
Water Polo	790,546	994,331	1,784,877
Other Sports	803,909		803,909
Total Expenses of all Sports, Except Football and Basketball, Combined	12,017,422	16,653,420	28,670,842
Total Expenses Men's and Women's Teams	53,415,111	21,009,957	74,425,068
Not Allocated by Gender/Sport (Expenses not attributable to a particular sport or sports)			40,064,156
Grand Total Expenses			114,489,224

CAVEAT

Other sports include Men's Rugby.

Total Revenues - Men's and Women's Teams

Your total revenues must cover your total expenses.

Enter all revenues attributable to intercollegiate athletic activities. This includes revenues from appearance guarantees and options, an athletic conference, tournament or bowl games, concessions, contributions from alumni and others, institutional support, program advertising and sales, radio and television, royalties, signage and other sponsorships, sport camps, state or other government support, student activity fees, ticket and luxury box sales, and any other revenues attributable to intercollegiate athletic activities.

Report actual numbers, not budgeted or estimated numbers. Please do not round beyond the next dollar.

Varsity Teams	Men's Teams	Women's Teams	Total
Basketball	8,809,580	1,356,086	10,165,666
Football	43,642,210		43,642,210
Baseball	1,274,361		1,274,361
Beach Volleyball		974,609	974,609
Field Hockey		1,001,357	1,001,357
Golf	1,044,784	1,348,274	2,393,058
Gymnastics	203,347	1,113,256	1,316,603
Lacrosse		1,015,712	1,015,712
Rowing	1,229,764	1,085,135	2,314,899
Soccer	152,135	945,904	1,098,039
Softball		1,041,142	1,041,142
Swimming and Diving (combined)	1,040,664	1,158,255	2,198,919

Tennis	339,118	1,070,087	1,409,205
Track and Field and Cross Country (combined)	216,852	1,096,251	1,313,103
Volleyball		1,017,640	1,017,640
Water Polo	229,621	1,004,566	1,234,187
Other Sports	1,014,358		1,014,358
Total Revenues of all Sports, Except Football and Basketball, Combined	6,745,004	13,872,188	20,617,192
Total Revenues Men's and Women's Teams	59,196,794	15,228,274	74,425,068
Not Allocated by Gender/Sport (Revenues not attributable to a particular sport or sports)			43,790,488
Grand Total for all Teams (includes by team and not allocated by gender/sport)			118,215,556

CAVEAT

Other sports include Men's Rugby.
 Non-Program revenue was allocated to Other Women's Sports to offset a negative balance per EADA instructions.

Summary - Men's and Women's Teams

Your Grand Total Revenues must be equal to or greater than your Grand Total Expenses or you will not be able to lock your survey.

	Men's Teams	Women's Teams	Total
1 <u>Total of Head Coaches' Salaries</u>	7,943,832	2,522,775	10,466,607

2	<u>Total of Assistant Coaches' Salaries</u>	6,039,000	2,189,768	8,228,768
3	<u>Total Salaries (Lines 1+2)</u>	13,982,832	4,712,543	18,695,375
4	<u>Athletically Related Student Aid</u>	7,185,513	5,943,224	13,128,737
5	<u>Recruiting Expenses</u>	1,445,637	604,050	2,049,687
6	<u>Operating (Game-Day) Expenses</u>	12,511,259	5,567,095	18,078,354
7	<u>Summary of Subset Expenses (Lines 3+4+5+6)</u>	35,125,241	16,826,912	51,952,153
8	<u>Total Expenses for Teams</u>	53,415,111	21,009,957	74,425,068
9	<u>Total Expenses for Teams Minus Subset Expenses (Line 8 – Line 7)</u>	18,289,870	4,183,045	22,472,915
10	<u>Not Allocated Expenses</u>			40,064,156
11	<u>Grand Total Expenses (Lines 8+10)</u>			114,489,224
12	<u>Total Revenues for Teams</u>	59,196,794	15,228,274	74,425,068
13	<u>Not Allocated Revenues</u>			43,790,488
14	<u>Grand Total Revenues (Lines 12+13)</u>			118,215,556
15	<u>Total Revenues for Teams minus Total Expenses for Teams (Line 12-Line 8)</u>	5,781,683	-5,781,683	0
16	<u>Grand Total Revenues Minus Grand Total Expenses (Line 14- Line 11)</u>			✓ 26,332

To return to a data entry screen, click on the link in the [Navigation Menu](#).
 To proceed to the Supplemental Information screen, click on the link in the [Navigation Menu](#) or click on the "Next" button on this screen.

Supplemental Information (optional)

This screen may be used to help the reader better understand the data you have provided, or to help a prospective student-athlete make an informed choice of an athletics program.

This information will be viewable on the EADA public website. Please do not include the names of individuals or write messages to the help desk.

To explain specific data entered on a previous screen, please use the caveat box on that screen.