

Student Services Subcommittee Report to the Budget Advisory Committee

July 15, 2009

Executive Summary of Recommendations

The Student Services Budget Committee has identified service reductions, program elimination, program consolidation, and service protection for consideration by the Budget Advisory Committee. While some of these recommendations may intersect, common themes run throughout such as: reduction of in-person hours for all services; change in service delivery; using student staff to relieve some of the more routine responsibilities of career staff; consolidation of duplicative or similar services; elimination of programs that are underutilized or highly specialized; further examination of functions that feel “core” in nature, but may not be a priority in these budget times; and protection of particular services essential to the University.

Background

The Student Services Subcommittee membership included 6 faculty, 9 staff and administrators and 2 students (Appendix 1). The committee met a total of 8 times throughout winter and spring quarters, and the three co-chairs and two support staff met frequently to coordinate the work of the group.

The subcommittee began its work by developing a set of principles that could be used to guide its evaluations of programs (Appendix 2). In addition, the staff supporting the subcommittee was asked to develop, with input from members, dean’s offices and administrative offices, a comprehensive list of services available to undergraduate, graduate and professional students. This list included mainly those student service programs that are supported by General Funds and student fees.

The list of services was aggregated by unit and by service type, using definitions commonly specified in the regents’ budget with some modification (Appendix 3). Each service type was then assigned to a task group of two or more subcommittee members, generally one faculty member and one staff member, for detailed research and analysis. The task groups developed questions that were partially standardized across task groups. The individual(s) responsible for delivery of each service was then asked to answer the questions either in writing or in face-to-face conversations with the task group. Staff and administrators recused themselves from all evaluations of those services for which they have any responsibility.

The goal of each task group was to identify the extent to which a given student service was consistent with the principles identified by the subcommittee. To assist in that evaluation, a scoring rubric was developed (Appendix 4). This rubric provided a scale of 1-4 (weakest to essential) to be used to describe how well a particular activity supports each principle. Each task group was asked to evaluate each of the services for which it was responsible and to make recommendations to the full subcommittee as to which services should be examined in more detail because they offer a potential for budgetary savings and which should not be considered further, either because the service is essential to meeting the mission of the campus or because the potential budgetary savings were deemed to be too small.

The subcommittee categorized its recommendations in three groups:

- Category A represents actions that can be taken without further detailed review;
- Category B includes recommendations regarding areas that seem appropriate for further review with the goal of identifying reductions; and
- Category C represents areas in which the potential for savings is small or the service is considered essential.

To support the recommendations of the subcommittee, Appendix 5 provides more detailed comments on the services that were examined in detail.

We note that the Student Services Subcommittee's scope was incredibly broad---the range of student services is considerable, and they are subject to various restrictions due to legal requirements (mandated by the Federal government, for instance) or due to the source of funding (some are paid by student referenda fees, for instance).

This leads to one recommendation: the campus cannot easily cut services funded by student referenda fees, and it presumably cannot do so unilaterally. However, student representatives might be approached to respond to proposed cuts in the services funded by general funds---would they prefer to redirect some of their fees to preserve any services they deem more essential, that are about to be curtailed or eliminated?

Category A Recommendations (be adopted without further review)

Service Reductions

1. Student service units and departments that provide walk-in information services should limit service hours to 9:00-12:00 and 1:00-4:00 (optionally at 12:00-1:00PM). Smaller campus offices should consider shorter customer service hours. Certain offices, such as the Internship and Career Center (ICC), should consider appointments only. With the availability of information via the internet, the need for walk-in hours has decreased. Offices that have reduced their service hours have found that students are able to adjust their schedules in such a way that their needs can be met (although specialized services may need to be provided at different hours). If all units adopt a similar schedule, student expectations can be aligned with that schedule across campus. The potential savings are generally in the area of improved productivity, as staff is freed to focus on high-priority tasks, and the reduction in resources devoted to both primary and back-up coverage for "front desk" services. The subcommittee recommends that similar hours be considered for units that serve faculty and staff.
2. The ICC should reduce the number of career fairs, courses, workshops, and Career Discovery Groups to consolidate interest and staff time devoted to these events. This may result in reduced staffing needs.
3. All units providing social and cultural services should explore the following as cost-saving measures: reduction of hours, increased collaboration without the loss of identities, reduction or elimination of printing and mailing paper flyers and increased use of electronic social networking to advertise programs and events.

Service Delivery Change

1. Student service units and departments that provide walk-in information services should expand the use of students and peer-advisors, especially those eligible for work-study funding to meet their service hour needs. Several units on the campus have successfully increased the number of students, especially those eligible for work-study, which they employ to provide basic “front-desk” services. With proper guidance and training, these students can provide highly effective services, thereby freeing career staff to focus on more critical administrative tasks. This change will enable units to maintain high quality services to current and prospective students with reduced state funding. Engaging students with on-campus employment is also known to have a beneficial impact on retention and completion while building a stronger sense of campus community.
2. The ICC should prepare more web-based materials instead of printed materials. This may result in initial additional expenses, but would save resources long term.

Program Consolidation

1. There may be overlap in graduate and pre-professional advising services offered by Advising Services and the ICC with some possible savings in utilizing the ICC’s Interfolio Recommendation Letter Services. We understand that the Advising Services unit is being disbanded and key functions redistributed to other units in Student Affairs. As part of this reorganization, the potential for efficiencies with ICC should be revisited. The LSC should also be renamed to better reflect its greater role in academic support and retention. LSC should take responsibility for retention of undergraduates and seeing through the implementation of STAR Committee’ Report recommendations. The LSC should discontinue publicizing writing services to graduate students because it does not have the capacity to offer such services. Instead, this service could be more effectively provided by the University Writing Program (UWP) in collaboration with the Office of Graduate Studies.
2. The College of Engineering could remand the writing of Transfer Admission Agreements back to Undergraduate Admissions to enhance the unit’s focus and efficiency in advising and academic support.
3. Undergraduate Admissions should shift some effort away from pre-admission outreach toward increasing the yield of admitted students, which has been low and declining in recent years.
4. Core funds for CRESS should be withdrawn to shift this program to self-supporting status based on the less central contributions of CRESS to the academic mission.

Program Elimination

1. The Center for Leadership Learning could be discontinued for a savings of \$104,000 (1 staff FTE, 4 student staff FTE + operational costs). This is recommended because the center is not as critical to the core of the mission of the university as other student services that provide academic support directly correlated to the retention of undergraduates.

Other

1. The collection of data concerning the sources of funding (referenda fees and general funds) is essential. Such data must provide the basis for discussions with ASUCD

Category B Recommendations (areas requiring further evaluation)

Service Reduction

1. As the Advising Service unit is disbanded and key functions redistributed, the following recommendations should be considered: Reduce the scope of existing Student Advising services; converting staff contact into improved online information, guidance and social support; or into increased involvement of more peer advisors and fewer fulltime career advisers.
2. Reduce the scope of professional exam orientation and preparation services offered by the Law School and Medical School.
3. CAPS should cut its workshops and similar mental health educational outreach efforts not funded with categorical Registration Fee funds in order preserve student clients' access to mental health professional staff.
4. Some colleges seem to devote considerable resources to activities that can be defined as "enhancements" for students who are not experiencing difficulties. Such activities are valuable as they add to the experience of students who are thriving. While very beneficial, such activities do not directly increase retention or graduation rates and should be considered for reduction or elimination.
5. Efforts go towards providing after hour activities in the Memorial Union and the staffing of these activities. We recommend further discussion as to the priority that should be given to this service by the Memorial Union, excluding the game area and bowling alley (a revenue-generating entity). The relative potential for budget savings estimated at \$100,000. The potential negative impacts include the loss of a safe venue and valuable activities for students and that the MU becomes a large vacant space after hours. Metrics and data that might be used to evaluate this suggestion include the operating budget for Memorial Union. Additional consultation with the Director, Memorial Union Auxiliary Services, is warranted.
6. Explore options to centralize the Office of Intercollegiate Athletics (ICA) development and marketing efforts with the central campus efforts. A synergy of purpose, training, and resources could occur that might reduce duplicative efforts and benefit both entities by increasing communications between the campus and ICA. The relative potential for budget savings is unknown. The potential negative impacts include the fact that centralization of marketing and development might reduce communications with ICA and therefore the potential effectiveness of the marketing and development efforts for Athletics. Metrics and data that might be used to evaluate this suggestion include the operating budget for Athletics marketing and development efforts and a report of the income generated. Additional consultation with Athletics, the Central Development Office and University Communications office is warranted.
7. A reduction of two or more of the four ethnic community Retention Coordinator positions within the Learning Skills Center (LSC) with a savings of about \$150,000 or more (2-3 SAO III FTE + operational costs) should be explored. The recent reorganization within Student Affairs consolidated retention and academic support services (Retention Coordinators, with the staff of the EOP, STEP, SSS, Transfer and Re-entry Programs). These functions serve the same ethnic communities and appear to be a duplication of services. Consolidation provides leadership with an opportunity to

establish collaboration among these services and with the similar services that are provided by the four SAOIII staff advisors of Chicano/a Studies, Asian American Studies, Native American Studies and African and African- American Studies. The SAO's have a charge to conduct Outreach and provide Retention, Advising and Academic Support Services to the ethnic communities that they represent. In addition, the reorganization offers an opportunity to collaborate more closely and consistency with the SAO academic counselors in each college who have an interest in the advising, academic support and retention of underrepresented ethnic minorities at UC Davis.

Service Delivery Change

1. The Student Health Center should consider a more entrepreneurial "fee for service" component of their activities that could generate income.
2. The campus should explore centralizing a resource to monitor compliance with various federal and state regulations. At present, the Office of Financial Aid devotes considerable staff time (their assessment) for coordinating and verifying campus compliance with regulations that, if violated, would jeopardize our student's eligibility for federal and state financial aid programs.
3. The committee believes that the Student Life units in Student Affairs have potential to more effectively coordinate some of the services and program being offered.

Program Consolidation

1. Some duplication of effort or expertise may characterize the work of Advising Services staff and staff working through the Law School and Medical School to orient undergraduate students to the LSAT and MCAT exams. Closer collaboration among staff from these different units might lead to more effective and/or cost-effective services.
2. Student Affairs should examine Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) and Cowell Student Health Service to determine if it would be more efficient to consolidate these two units. It is our understanding that some other institutions nest their mental health unit within their overall health unit.
3. The work of Undergraduate Admissions is cyclic in nature, and it should make an effort to improve efficiencies, and reduce any "down-time" among the staff. In particular, staff performing "seasonal" duties may be able to fill in during otherwise slow times. This may result in a long-term reduction in staffing needs and may already be underway.
4. Consideration should be given to investing in improved "communication" between our many computer systems (i.e., DaFIS, Banner, and Payroll). This should lead to potential savings and efficiencies across many areas of campus particularly in the area of financial aid awards to facilitate coordination and continued compliance with Federal award limit regulations.
5. Merging Graduate Student Support with the Financial Aid Office (including professional financial aid programs on campus) may avoid some duplication of staff. Elimination of duplicative positions would provide savings, perhaps at the cost of "turn-around time" in service.
6. A number of areas of the Teaching Resources Center should be examined for possible reduction. These include support for faculty teaching, the Scantron service for course evaluations (eliminate with on-line evaluations), the mini-grant program and the SPEAK test (should be able to use results of new TOEFL in its place). Some consideration should be given to better coordinate (or centralize) TA orientation and training. Some

units provide their own while others rely on the TRC, resulting in duplication of effort. Decisions could be informed by existing qualitative evaluation data of the various programs. The additional review could be conducted jointly by representatives of the Undergraduate Council and the Graduate Council.

7. A quantitative and qualitative review of the Davis Honors Challenge should be initiated to ensure that it is meeting the needs of the campus in a cost-effective manner. This review should be conducted by the Academic Senate, but with a broader committee than the Special Programs Committee of the Undergraduate Council.
8. Assessment of the need for 3 separate faculty directors for each of the 3 study abroad programs should be undertaken. It seems likely that this number could be reduced without reducing the quality of the programs.
9. All student service activities (advising in particular), which occur in both departments and colleges, should be monitored to ensure that there exists a minimum of duplication of capabilities or services provided.
10. Each dean's office should compile data on the amount of time each advisor spends on various components of the job---for instance, dealing with problems as opposed to students simply needing more information about a major. Specifically, how much time goes into monitoring minimum progress should be learned. If this is a significant portion of the budget for advising, ways to streamline should be sought.

Program Elimination

1. The administration needs to determine if services related to "life after UC Davis" through the ICC is an appropriate dedication of core resources (upwards of \$1+ million per year at the undergraduate level).
2. The UC Davis Quarter Abroad program should be discontinued if it does not demonstrate substantial progress toward becoming self-supporting by 2010-2011 and serving a broader cross-section of the undergraduate population.
3. Campus Events could be eliminated via the use of automation and expanded and coordinated support from Campus Recreation and/or the Memorial Union. The relative potential for budget savings is unknown, but there are likely no potential negative impacts. Metrics and data that might be used to evaluate this suggestion include the operating budget for Campus Events, and a list of services provided by Campus Events. Additional consultation with the program directors is warranted.
4. Division I Athletic programs are required to field 16 sports. UC Davis currently has 27 sports, all of which are minimally funded. We recommend further review regarding the long-term goals of ICA, i.e., the breadths of teams supported and their expected quality vis-a-vis the resources available. An across the board reduction in funding for all programs does not appear a viable option at this point. The relative potential for budget savings is considerable although many of the fund sources are restricted and not available for other purposes. The potential negative impacts include that a reduction in the number of teams will eliminate the sports programs likely for a long time. Considerable negative impact is to be expected on student morale and potential development/marketing efforts. Reducing entire programs is not guaranteed to benefit the remaining athletics programs, though properly resourcing the remaining programs should be a priority. The metrics and data that might be used to evaluate this suggestion include the operating budget for each sport/team, the general operating budget for Athletics and income generated by development and marketing. Additional consultation

5. The Undergraduate Admission, Outreach and Recruitment Unit in the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences could be eliminated for a savings of about \$200,000, (1 MSP FTE, 1 SAOI FTE, 1 AAIH FTE, + operational costs) because this is a direct function and responsibility of Undergraduate Admission and it should be remanded to Undergraduate Admissions.

Other

1. Review of additional information regarding costs in comparison to the available assessment reports should be pursued in order to assess the extent to which the Language Learning Center is adequately funded.
2. Funding for the Undergraduate Research Center is temporary at this time (for two years); a decision as to whether to continue funding should be made on the basis of an assessment of its success in meeting its goals.

Category C Recommendations (no changes recommended based on the importance of the service or the limited potential for savings; not meant to be inclusive)

Program Preservation

1. Due to the specialized nature and, in some cases, the curriculum/accreditation requirements, the professional school efforts in internships and career placement should be preserved.
2. Career advising is available at the College level; however, this appears to be provided by faculty in connection with normal degree/major advising and does not seem to be in conflict with the services available at the ICC.
3. Based on the centrality of writing to the education of undergraduate and graduate students, the Subcommittee does not recommend reductions in the University Writing Program. This program may require increased funding to handle the increase of graduate students and graduate programs seeking its services and to help the campus meet the revised GE requirements.
4. It appears that the Integrated Studies Program brings high value to the campus for a relatively modest investment. However, in the future, there may be opportunities to seek endowment funding as has been done at other universities.
5. Implementation of the Integrated Course Management System by the Office of the University Registrar should be protected from budget cuts and ensured ongoing funding for it to remain an effective campus resource.
6. Because the UC Davis Summer Abroad (UCDSA) program is self-supporting and because it meets important educational objectives, the subcommittee does not recommend targeting this program for reduction. However, it is important that UCDSA continue to cover its fair share of the costs of running the Education Abroad Center.
7. Department advising should be protected, to the extent possible. An uncounted but significant cost from further reductions will result in increased reliance on faculty. It is inefficient for all faculty to learn some details that one or two advisors can cover for

even very large majors. Moreover, relying on faculty would take them away from other activities---teaching and research---for which staff time cannot substitute.

8. We recommend that priority be given to those advising activities, and other student services, that increase retention/graduation rates for “at risk” students; such areas should be protected, as they seem likely to do the most to improve student outcomes.
9. Funds expended by the Deans and departments in support of cultural and social services are generally relatively small and not primarily sourced from general funds. Therefore, we do not believe additional external investigation would be time well spent.
10. Transfer and Veteran’s Services are part of the recent Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs restructuring plan. The existing Transfer Task Force is better positioned to offer recommendations for Transfer Services. The new Veteran’s Educational Benefits bill should give pause to further evaluation of those services.

Appendix 1 - Student Services Subcommittee Membership

Co-Chairs

Patricia Turner	Undergraduate Studies/Letters & Science
Thomas Famula	CA&ES/Senate
Jeffery Gibeling	Graduate Studies/Engineering

Staff

Christine McUmbler	ORMP
Nancy Flagg	Student Affairs

Members

James Chalfant	Agricultural & Environmental Science
Ralph Aldredge	Engineering
Jon Wagner	Education
Jim McClain	Letters & Science
Nicole Baumgarth	Veterinary Medicine
Hector Cuevas	Graduate Studies
Roy Rai	School of Medicine
Lora Jo Bossio	Student Affairs
Leslye Hays	Office of Research
Joe Chatham	President – ASUCD
Milaika Singleton	Chair - Graduate Student Association
Nona Richardson	Athletics/Academic Federation

Appendix 2 - Student Services Principles for Evaluating Student Services

1. Services central or closely related to the academic mission should be protected and even augmented in special cases. Services more distant from the academic mission need to meet a high standard of enhancing student welfare.
2. Priority should be given to services that enhance retention and degree completion while seeking opportunity to improve quality.
3. Decisions should be based on evaluations of program effectiveness, including both quantitative and qualitative assessment. The opinions of students, staff and faculty regarding the value of a service are important qualitative measures.
4. Program evaluation should consider the number of students served, the nature of population served and the contribution of a service to cross- or multi-cultural experience.
5. Priority should be given to programs that promote both physical and mental health and enhance personal safety.
6. Services should be provided at the appropriate level of centralization/decentralization to avoid duplication.

Appendix 3 - Student Service Types

<i>Counseling</i>	Counseling assists students with scholastic performance, choice of major, personal concerns, assessing interests and aptitudes, or exploring career opportunities.
<i>Academic Support Services</i>	Academic support services offer individual and group tutorial services in writing, mathematics, study skills, and preparation for graduate and professional school exams. Also includes assistance with internships and career exploration.
<i>Cultural and Social Activities</i>	A wide range of cultural and social activities enhances the quality of life for students and the campus community. Such activities include music, dance and drama events, speakers, and sports activities.
<i>Campus admissions and registrar operations</i>	Campus admissions and registrar operations include the processing of applications for admission, enrollment and registration of students, scheduling of courses, maintaining and updating of student academic records, preparing of diplomas, and reporting of statistics.
<i>Campus financial aid offices</i>	Campus financial aid offices counsel students about their financing options; determine and monitor the eligibility of students for financial assistance; and develop financial aid packages for students, which include scholarships, fellowships, grants, loans, and work-study jobs from federal, State, UC, and private sources.
<i>Health and Wellness; Services to students with disabilities</i>	Services to students with disabilities include readers for the blind, interpreters for the deaf, note-taker services, mobility assistance, provision of adaptive educational equipment, disability-related counseling. Also includes clinical health services and wellness programs.
<i>Curriculum Enhancement</i>	Services that support the instructional curriculum with academic programs. May be offered by faculty or professional staff through non-academic units.

Appendix 4 - Student Services Scoring Rubric

Student Services Budget Committee
 Service Evaluation Rubric
 _____ Service

Principles	Weakest	Weak	Appropriate	Essential
Academic Mission				
Time to Degree & Retention				
Program Effectiveness				
Diversity & Multicultural Experience				
Physical & Mental Health and Safety				
Prospects for Centralization				

Appendix 5 – Summaries from Task Groups within the Student Service Budget Committee

Counseling/Advising

The subcommittee did not have time to talk to nearly as many people as it would have liked. But, it did form the clear conclusion that advising can be thought of usefully as distinct in departments and colleges. Departmental advising tends to be focused on courses specific to the major. Students encountering academic difficulty, personal problems, and general “what major?” kind of decisions seem to be largely dealt with at the college level. The subcommittee did not perceive a great deal of duplication, but this needs to be monitored and studied.

Concerning department advising, our conclusion is that it is unlikely that this area will ever be characterized by excess capacity; departments seem likely to be so constrained that it is unlikely that too many resources will be put into this area; more likely, departments will find advising to be an area where cuts are necessitated, as departmental budgets shrink. Often, advising staff are performing multiple functions, and it also seems likely that the grouping of these functions and the amount of time available for advising specifically will be governed more by responses to attrition and budget cuts than by optimization.

Larger programs seem to make extensive use of peer advisors, and have already concluded that limiting walk-in hours, use of web-based FAQs, and emailing to majors are means to expand service with a limited number of possible contact hours for the professional advising staff.

The subcommittee doesn't have a clear sense concerning college-level advising budgets, and whether colleges will pare these services below what is optimal. It does observe, based also on the comments of other members of our committee, that the activities of college advisors consist of a larger share of what we might call “enrichment” activities, as opposed to the broad category we might call “problems”. The latter is essential; particularly when students are experiencing personal, academic, or financial crises, the availability of an advisor seems key to making the difference between the student exiting without a degree or getting back on a good path to success. The subcommittee feels very strongly that these services must be maintained, if not enhanced where possible and justified. The subcommittee believes that further data-collection and analysis about the enforcement of normal progress would be valuable.

Enrichment activities, on the other hand, are a luxury. They may help persuade a few good students to come to Davis instead of another institution, and they certainly play a role in enhancing the student experience for such students. The subcommittee's conclusion, though, is that such students will succeed anyway; in such dire times, these are services that should be examined closely to determine if they are needed. The subcommittee suspects most are popular, well-done, and non-essential.

Academic Support Services

Internships and Career Placement Services: Internship and career placement services are provided to undergraduate, graduate, School of Veterinary Medicine and, to a lesser extent, School of Education and Graduate School of Management students by the Internship and Career Center (ICC). The ICC facilitates 6,000 internships annually, coordinates 8 annual career fairs, conducts seminars and workshops on interview techniques and résumé writing, provides career

counseling, and promotes Career Discovery Groups in connection with academic departments. Staffing levels at the ICC are comparable to those at UC Irvine, Los Angeles and San Diego.

The Schools of Law and Medicine facilitate internal internships, externships, and career placement due to the specialized nature of these schools. The School of Education provides career opportunities in the form of student teaching as part of the curriculum.

These student services are rated appropriate and essential related to the principles developed by the Student Services Budget Committee in the areas of retention and program effectiveness. These services rated less favorably in the areas of diversity and multicultural experience and physical and mental health and safety. With regard to the academic mission, internships and career placement services are viewed as helping to develop “engaged leaders” and promote public service.

The Learning Skills Center (LSC): Under the recent Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs Division reorganization plan places the major academic support/retention programs and services previously provided by the dissolved Advising Services Unit such as EOP, Transfer, Reentry, and Veteran Services alongside LSC’s SSS (Student Support Services), four ethnic community Retention Coordinators, and summer and yearlong STEP program. All of these services provide outreach, advising, academic support and social programs and services to similar at risk, first generation, underrepresented, socially and economically disadvantaged and non-traditional undergraduate student populations. Budgets and staffing can in many ways be consolidated to produce budget, staff and operational savings. For example, we did not see a need to continue to have four fulltime Retention Coordinators, each focused on a particular community because the EOP, SSS, STEP and Ethnic Studies fulltime staff carry out similar functions with a focus in the same communities.

Under the recent Vice Chancellor of Student Affairs reorganization plan the graduate and pre-professional advising services will be housed in the LSC. This type of advising is not an academic support role and does not fit with the LSC however the services align well with the ICC.

Center for Leadership Learning (CLL): The CLL has already undergone reorganization with a reduction in staff from 3 staff FTE’s to 1 staff FTE and four half time student FTE’s. It has also changed from only allowing residents of LaRue to be part of the program to allowing students campus wide to participate in its leadership certificate and seminar programs. The center also provides administrative support for the Leadership Minor offered to all students through the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences. The center also engages staff and undergraduate/graduate student volunteers to lead the many leadership seminars throughout the year. The center is under excellent leadership of its SAOII director, Christine Navarro and is a model of being run efficiently with minimal staffing (including student staff) and engaging both faculty and staff to teach leadership classes and seminars.

College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences Undergraduate Education Office: This unit offers many worthwhile and excellent advising and academic support services. There is one area that duplicates the work of Undergraduate Admissions and that is its Undergraduate Admission Outreach and Recruitment Unit with four fulltime staff (1 MSP level FTE, 2 SAO’s FTE’s and 1 AA FTE.). The purpose of this unit is to ensure an adequate number of

undergraduate applicants to AES and its respective majors through attendance at College Fairs and related recruitment events as well as marketing and branding efforts.

College of Engineering Undergraduate Education Office: This unit offers many worthwhile and excellent advising and academic support services. There is one area that duplicates the work of Undergraduate Admissions and that is it's the writing of all Transfer Admissions Agreements (TAGS) for all transfer students.

Test Preparation: Provided as a table attached at the end of this appendix.

Cultural and Social Activities

Cultural and social activities in the professional schools generally serve to assist students as they transition to their new school and career field. The funds used vary from self-assessed fees via student organizations to private funds and extramural grants, as well as some general funds. Some efficiency might be possible within a particular program, i.e. School of Medicine, but would not be practical between different schools.

Cultural and social activities in the Undergraduate Colleges generally serve to assist students as they transition to college and their major/department. The funds used are private or general funds and in some situations, program responsibilities are part of a faculty teaching workload. Some efficiency might be possible within a particular college, but not likely across departments.

The Memorial Union provides leisure activities that create a destination in their facilities for students. Many of the programs that have been developed provide activity on campus during the evening hours. They target a broad constituency group. Many of the programs are either sponsored in collaboration with Student Affairs partners, student organizations, or student government. Their goal is not to duplicate programs already in existence but provide alternative activities for all to enjoy. They provide activities in the following program areas: Arts & Lecture Series, Performances, Leisure Activities, Comedy & Film and Special Events.

Campus Recreation currently manages eleven different program areas, and has more than 2 million user contacts annually. The bulk of the funding comes from student self assessed fees and income generated by some of the programs. They do have some registration fee dollars as well.

Primary focus for Athletics is on the participants of sport programs in an effort to realize their fullest potential, both academically and athletically. A secondary objective is to provide a source of entertainment and positive esprit de corps for the general student population, the university community, alumni, and fans of Aggie Athletics

While the departments within Student Life (Women's Resources and Research Center; Student Recruitment and Retention Center; Cross Cultural Center; Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender Resource Center, Student Affairs officers within the Ethnic Studies Program; Student Programs and Activities Center) are relatively small units with small budgets, their impact on the quality of student life, campus vitality, student retention and connections to the academic core of the campus is quite extensive. They reach a large and diverse number of students in ways that research tells us are important predictors of a "sense of belonging" in the first year of college. The funding is a combination of Registration fee dollars and student self assessed fees. These units range in size from 1 FTE to 8 FTE.

Campus Admissions and Registrar Operations

Undergraduate Admissions and Office of the University Registrar: Undergraduate Admission (UA) and the Office of the University Registrar (OUR) are administratively connected to through the Office of the Vice-Chancellor for Student Affairs. The two units provide essential services in support of the academic mission of the University, both at the graduate and undergraduate level. It's probably fair to say that UC Davis could not function as a University without the support of the variety of services provided by the UA and OUR. For example the UA is the lead unit for increasing diversity on the campus. The OUR provides all of the campus' catalogue, course and grade management, and the source of data for evaluating students, past and present.

One difficulty in our efforts to identify permanent budget cuts starting 2010-2011 has been the need for "temporary" cuts in the present and next fiscal year. These cuts are widely acknowledged actually to be permanent, or at least long-term, and these decisions are already being made. Therefore, not only are we making recommendations about the future budgetary savings, but we are reviewing cuts already made or planned.

Undergraduate Admissions: As the numbers of freshman applicants for fall-quarter admission has substantially increased over the past few years the admission rate has sharply decreased. For example, as shown below, the number of applicants seeking to enroll in the fall quarter of 2006 was 32,635, while 42,379 sought admission for the fall quarter of 2009 (a 30% increase). The admission rate declined from 67.8% to 47.5% over this same period, however. This is, of course, good news as it signifies markedly increasing interest in our campus and more admission selectivity on our part. On the other hand, our freshman enrollment yield rate has declined slightly from 24.9% for fall 2006 to 23.3% for fall 2008. This is not in itself surprising since one might expect lower enrollment yields with increased selectivity. However, the fact that our freshman enrollment yield is considerably lower than that at other comparable and more selective university campuses suggests room for improvement; for example, enrollment yields at The University of Michigan, Georgia Tech, UC Berkeley, UCLA and Purdue for fall 2008 were 46%, 42%, 41%, 37%, and 32%, respectively¹.

Continued enrollment increases at UC Davis in the near future aren't expected due to budget constraints. However, the number of applicants for admission at UC Davis may very well continue to increase; this is uncertain. In any case, shifting of resources from general outreach (directed toward increasing the number of applicants) toward increasing enrollment yield rates is advised in light of decreasing resources. This could result in an increase in the selectivity and quality of our student body, without an increase in the number of enrolled students. It is suggested, therefore, that more resources be allocated toward convincing admitted students to attend UC Davis and less toward general outreach directed at potential applicants, with the goal of achieving net monetary savings. Notwithstanding this recommendation, we realize that it may be desirable to maintain efforts directed at increasing the diversity of our student body.

Undergraduate Admissions has noted that yields may be substantially improved by "decentralizing" yield events (such as *Decision Davis*) and increasing the participation of departments and Colleges. This worked particularly well in 2009, for the College of Engineering (COE). However, COE has a relatively small number of prospective students, a small number of departments, and Engineering facilities are very concentrated geographically.

Thus, departments, deans' offices and the UA will have to work very carefully toward changing the style of post-admission activities.

Summary of Admission Statistics: (from UC Davis Undergraduate Admissions—October Snapshots)

Year	Applicants	Admit Rate	Enroll Yield
2006	32,635	67.8%	24.9%
2007	35,128	58.6%	24.1%
2008	40,625	52.6%	23.3%
2009	42,379	47.5%	TBD

¹<http://talk.collegeconfidential.com/college-search-selection/730073-how-do-yields-compare-top-colleges.html>

It is our understanding that the current Director of UA, Pamela Burnett, will not be replaced upon her retirement and that the existing University Registrar, Frank Wada, will serve as the Executive Director of UA and University Registrar. Although we are in general agreement with this, we would like to see that some explanation is provided of how this administrative change is consistent with the BAC planning principles. Specifically, we are concerned about a potential substantial increase in workload for the Executive Director of UA and OUR in order to provide the high quality of administrative oversight for the two units.

Office of the University Registrar (OUR): The OUR has already undertaken the acquisition of an Integrated Course Management System (ICMS). It is hoped that this software will greatly improve the efficiency across the campus, as well as for some OUR services. However, for the ICMS to be an effective tool for faculty and staff, the OUR, the departments, deans' offices, and Academic Senate will have to make sure that the course requirements and degree data bases are kept up to date. This will be a challenge, with the departure of important personnel such as Ms. Keitha Hunter. In addition, the implementation of the ICMS will require ongoing funding to assure that it remains an effective campus resource. Online services may also be applied to other functions of the OUR. As hours for in-person services are decreased, efforts should be made to reduce the loss of service overall.

Financial Aid

Financial aid is segmented into several offices, depending upon the students to be served (e.g., undergraduate, graduate, professional). Each has its own peculiar needs/services/mission. That office with the greatest impact across campus is the Financial Aid Office, a division that focuses on undergraduates. The delivery of service here is quite different from that of Graduate Financial Aid. For undergraduates, awards are usually direct to students; whereas for graduates there must be coordination of awards between Graduate Studies, graduate groups and academic departments (including the Financial Aid Office). Professional students are less complicated than graduate students, but the specialized needs of law students, as distinct from medical students, suggests that consolidation of these programs is unlikely to lead to substantial savings in resources or efficiency. Nevertheless, in searching for areas where our suggestions may lead to significant impact, there are several common threads.

Health and Wellness:

The subcommittee members charged with reviewing health and wellness services on campus focused their attention on the Student Disability Center (SDC), Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) and Student Health Services (SHS).

Student Health Services (SHS) provides UC Davis students with wellness, illness, and injury care. Services are available to all registered students, regardless of insurance. Students pay small fees for most services.

The Student Disability Center (SDS) promotes independence and integrated participation in campus life for students with disabilities. The SDC is staffed by professional Disability Specialists who specialize in different areas of disability: learning, vision, hearing, medical, psychological, and mobility. These professionals each work with an assigned caseload of students, determining their eligibility for academic accommodations and ensuring the provision of accommodations necessary to allow the students to participate meaningfully in educational opportunities on campus.

The mission of Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) is to enhance the mental health, interpersonal relationships, academic performance and career development of students attending UC Davis. CAPS services are also designed to assist all members of the campus community to develop a healthy campus learning environment.

Curriculum Enhancement

University Writing Program (UWP): The role of the UWP is to facilitate the teaching of written communication across the curriculum. The program was founded to serve the needs of undergraduate education by teaching faculty and graduate students to teach writing in their disciplines. The UWP will play a central role in implementation of the new GE writing requirement. In recent years, the director has proposed to expand services to graduate students (and has actually implemented the Graduate Writing Fellows program), but this expansion has not been funded by the campus. The UWP employs both Academic Senate faculty and Lecturers. Workshops are all evaluated and the faculty conducts research in the areas of writing across the curriculum and writing in the discipline. Additional comparative assessments have been proposed. The program has attained a strong national ranking in a relatively short period of time.

Integrated Studies Program (ISP): The ISP is a traditional residential honors program. First-year students are selected because they have received a Regent's Scholarship or similar scholarship. The current director has expanded the program to cover all four years and expanded the cohort slightly. The key benefit is still in attracting talented students to UC Davis rather than them going to other good schools and in building alumni affection. There are many examples of student success, including a high percentage who complete within 4 years and a high number continuing their education. The program conducts regular assessments; only one formal review was conducted about 8 years ago.

Cooperative Research and Extension Services for Schools Center (CRESSS): CRESSS administers core programs funded by the University and a significant array of externally funded programs including four California Subject Matter Professional Development Projects and the Center for Community School Partnerships. It is not directly connected to the academic

mission and engages students (mainly PhD students in evaluation studies) to a limited extent. Some overhead from extramural grants supports core functions of the School of Education. Thus, it provides a financial and goodwill benefit to the School. Core funds of about \$300,000 support mainly administrative services, but there is an effort to make the center self-supporting through increased overhead rates.

Teaching Resources Center (TRC): The TRC offers a range of programs that are designed to enhance teaching and learning for undergraduates, graduate students and faculty. In recent years, the TRC has made an effort to better integrate the disparate aspects of its many programs. The unit also anticipates benefits from closer collaboration with other units reporting to the Vice Provost - Undergraduate Studies when it relocates this fall. Some of the programs offered by the TRC are mandated (e.g. TA orientation, Freshman Seminar Program), some have evolved to meet specific needs (e.g. TA Consultants, and the Summer Institute on Teaching Technology) and some are unfunded (e.g. Outstanding Graduate Teaching Award, Distinguished Teaching Award event). Most of the core program budget for the TRC is devoted to support of graduate student instructors. The majority of the budget for programs comes as essentially a pass-through from the Undergraduate Instructional Improvement Fund or the Provost.

Davis Honors Challenge (DHC): (Also reviewed by Academic Support Services) The DHC program attempts to provide an interdisciplinary experience appropriate to smaller institutions with a focus on leadership and teamwork skills. It is not truly an honors experience in that students self-select for the program. The program spans all four years of the undergraduate experience and engages a significant number of faculty who offer research seminars to small groups of students. Faculty are compensated for these seminars and for serving as coordinators of the 3rd and 4th year cohorts. In total, just over 500 students are served by the program, although that number may be scaled back. There has been no effective, quantitative assessment of the program over its 12 year history, although the Special Programs Committee of the Undergraduate Council is charged with that task. However, there are national data to suggest that engaging students in the first year, providing support through networks that span all four years and helping connect them to the campus community increase retention and completion rates. Vice Provost Turner is promoting administrative efficiency among several programs including the Davis Honor's Challenge. We also recommend a review to determine if the program is cost effectively meeting the needs of the campus.

Language Learning Center (LLC): The LLC provides a central site for technology-based language pedagogy. It supports language courses and English as a Second Language instruction. The services provided by the LLC are fairly standard for an institution like UC Davis.

Undergraduate Research Center (URC): The URC began operation in 2008-09 after several years of planning. It provides individual advising services to undergraduate students who are interested in obtaining a research experience, provides referrals of students to potential faculty mentors, hosts undergraduate research programs (e.g. CAMP and MURPPS) and organizes the annual Undergraduate Research, Scholarship and Creative Activities Conference. The URC is modeled after similar centers at other institutions (including some within UC).

Study Abroad Programs: The various opportunities for primarily undergraduate students to study abroad report to the Vice Provost of University Outreach and International Programs and are administered through the Education Abroad Center (EAC). The three specific programs are the UC Education Abroad Program (EAP), the UC Davis Quarter Abroad Program (UCDQA)

and the UC Davis Summer Abroad Program (UCDSA). In addition, the EAC provides advice to students who wish to participate in non-UC study abroad (NUCSA) programs. While the programs themselves are really in the category of Instruction and Research because they provide academic opportunities, the significant overhead associated with establishing successful programs and providing support and advice to students represents a student service. Each program also has a 50% time faculty director, one of whom serves as the convening director of the EAC. Together, the three programs serve approximately 1000 students per year, of which 2/3 are from the College of Letters and Sciences. Summer Abroad is now the largest program (in terms of student headcount), followed by EAP and then UCDQA.

EAP is a systemwide program presently managed through UCOP. It has been the subject of several reviews in recent years and there is active discussion regarding how it might be restructured and how the cost model might be altered. There is some concern regarding the impact of the new cost model on the campuses. While it is likely that EAP will continue in some form, it appears to be too early to understand how EAP will be structured in the future and how the new cost model will impact the campus.

The UCDQA has been in existence for about 10 years and represents an example of the trend toward short-term programs rather than the traditional full academic year model of EAP. There are few other examples within the UC system. Current participation rates in UCDQA are about 150 students per year. UCDQA has been asked to become self-supporting, which will require that an additional administrative cost be paid by the student participants. It is not clear whether a self-supporting model will be sustainable or whether students will choose other opportunities (e.g. UCDSA or third-party providers). It appears that the program serves a very narrow population.

The UCDSA program serves approximately 450 students (66% UC Davis, 30% other UC and 3% non-UC) per year who are interested in study abroad opportunities outside of the regular academic year. Both the number of sites and the number of students has increased steadily over the past several years. UCDSA has been self-supporting for several years and could exist outside of the EAC if necessary. Students have borne the extra administrative costs of the program.

Biology Undergraduate Scholars Program (BUSP): The BUSP program is funded from extramural sources, primarily NIH and the Howard Hughes Medical Institute (HHMI). Campus funding is only provided to backstop the extramural funding as needed. Retention of a coordinator has been challenging, especially across uncertain grant cycles. Core campus funding for the coordinator would be helpful in providing stability for the program but seems unlikely in the current fiscal environment.

Professors for the Future (PFTF): The PFTF is a professional development program for graduate students and postdoctoral scholars based on a leadership through development model. Its primary goals are the help prepare fellows for leadership roles in academia. The selection process is highly competitive with only 12 fellows selected to participate each year. These are already highly motivated students so their best effort is a given. There is data to suggest that the program is successful in achieving its goals. Staff resource commitment is low (.50 FTE + 5% of director time) with most significant cost coming in the form of stipend payments to the 12 fellows. Similar programs at other universities have been cut or eliminated.

Preparing Students for Professional/Graduate School Exams/Certification

Program Dimensions & Summary by Unit

1 = *Population Served*: A= UCD undergrads, B= UCD grads, C= prospective UCD grads

2 = *Service Goals*: A= information/advising; B= exam format prep/guidance; C= master exam content

3 = *Service Format*: A= referral; B= online info; C= print info; D= individual advising; E= workshops; F=mentoring/tutoring; G= workshop series; H= coursework

4 = *Personnel / Staffing*: A= informal peer; B= trained peer advisors; C= clerical staff; D= advising staff; E= technical staff; F= faculty; G= alumni

5 = *Funding*: A= student affairs; B= campus I&R; C= professional school fees; D= extramural grants

ADMIN	1 POP	2GOAL	3FORM	4STAFF	5FUNDS	SUMMARY
Student Affairs: Advising Services	A	A	A, B, C, D, E	B, D	Student Affairs	-Focus is on advising, orientation and academic planning. Does not provide exam preparation services (refers students to off-campus vendors for those). Several Student Affairs Offices and student peer advisors provide 30 workshops/quarter and 5000 student contacts per year. Special attention to GRE, LSAT and MCAT, but focus is on academic planning and grad/prof school application process—not just exams.
Graduate Studies	C	A	A	None	None	-Does not provide exam preparation workshops or advising for undergraduates with the exception of a couple grant-funded programs for underrepresented students - the UC LEADS and the McNair Scholars (both serve only students who are program participants).
ICC	A	A	A	None	None	-Does not provide exam preparation workshops, advising or tutorial assistance. Does work with students on preparing resumes and documenting professional skills.
COLLEGES	1 POP	2GOAL	3FORM	4STAFF	5FUNDS	SUMMARY
AES	A	A	A	None	None	NA
CBS	A	A	A	None	None	NA
Engineering	A	A, B, C	A, D, E, F H	A, D, F, G	[Indeter minate]	-Engineering graduates in some fields (principally civil engineering) must take the Fundamentals of Engineering exam to become Engineers in Training. This is usually taken during the senior year. In recent years, an engineering professional fraternity, Theta Tau, has sponsored review sessions prior to the FE exam. They recruit faculty and graduate students to conduct these sessions. -A student affairs officer in Engineering provides pre-graduate services and co-teaches a “Gearing up for Grad School” seminar each year.
L&S	A	A	A	None	None	NA
PROF SCHLS	1 POP	2GOAL	3FORM	4STAFF	5FUNDS	SUMMARY

Education	B	B,C	H	F	UCD I&R	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Student service staff refer undergrads to books, online resources etc. related to CBEST & CSET. -Students admitted to the post-bac teacher credential program are encouraged to take and pass the California CBEST/CSET prior to beginning the program, but those who fall short get faculty assistance. -Post-baccalaureate students are prepared for professional certification by having elements of the PACT (State certification) process built into course curricula.
Law	B, C	A, B, C	A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H	B, C, D, F, G	Prof school fees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Extensive program of “academic success services” for currently enrolled graduate students. Program includes: resources center, tutoring, Bar exam preparation, workshops, practice exams, personal academic counseling and study plan assessment, etc. Personnel include faculty director, support staff, and upper level graduate student tutors/TA’s. Specialized services for students in each year of law school: L1, L2, L3, etc. School also uses the same software/format for course exams as used on the Bar exam. -Extensive outreach program for prospective students run by Law School admissions office, including summer and academic year workshops, institutes, assistance with LSAT prep and law school application process. Strong equity agenda. -American Bar Association: Strong ABA expectation for law schools to have their own tutoring/support program to prepare students for Bar exam. UCD program is strong but not nearly as full-featured as other top tier law schools.
GSM	NA	NA	A	None	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Does not currently offer any exam/certification preparation services. MBAs don’t have licensing requirements like state boards or the bar exam. Some GSM students take the CPA exam and earn other financial credentials but GSM provides only what is covered in the curriculum.
Medicine	A,B,C	A, B, C	A,B,C,D, E, F, H,	B, C,D, F	Prof school fees, extra-mural grants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Detailed online guidance for prospective students about MCATs & med school application process. -Intensive, 1-year post-bac study program that prepares 15 disadvantaged students/yr for MCAT and med school application process. Funded by California Endowment.-Additional MCAT preparation program for educationally and socio-economically disadvantaged students: spring quarter course plus Kaplan MCAT prep course, mentoring, advising, etc. -Extensive online resources to orient current Med School students to medical board exams (USMLE). Complemented by workshops, mentoring, etc.
Vet Med	B	B, C	A, E, G	A, F, G	None	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Vet Med does not offer formal NAVLE preparation other than the general veterinary education provided by program curricula. Students themselves organize series of evening instruction sessions given by faculty and residents on topics that are thought to be important for boards. These start early in their senior clinical year and finish just before the boards start.