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May 28, 2024

Darnell Hunt
Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost

Re: Joint Rebuilding and Renewal Task Force Report

At the April 25, 2024, meeting of the Executive Board (EB), members reviewed the joint Rebuilding and Renewal Task Force report and the feedback of divisional Academic Senate committees and councils. EB members voted unanimously to approve a motion where the Executive Board:

- endorsed the fundamental conclusion of the joint task force to increase the number of faculty and provide new resources, contextualizing their endorsement in UCLA’s transformation (e.g., new pedagogy forms, research challenges);
- requested Administration to make and share clear-cut milestones, and share transparent data with the Council on Planning and Budget in order for the Academic Senate to advise on budget cuts needed to meet faculty rebuilding and renewal milestones;
- and recommended that UCLA implement UCPB Best Practices Report recommendations to increase Senate involvement in budget-related decisions and strategic planning.

Members concluded that both data and experience confirm the problems identified in this report go back decades; the campus needs to implement solutions. In addition to the shocking numbers that affect faculty workload, members observed that faculty have absorbed a lot of additional labor due to the recession and then the pandemic. They shared that it is harder than ever to recruit and retain faculty. It is time for the university to re-prioritize and support faculty better.

Members affirmed the need for clear data and milestones in order to make tough budget decisions that allow for sustained progress in rebuilding the Senate faculty. They observed that truly competitive salaries would solve a lot of the related concerns (e.g., high cost of housing and childcare), and that the millions of dollars of expenditures on systems (e.g., procurement, Ascend, UCPath) and other initiatives could have been used to hire and retain faculty. In order to achieve campus goals related to teaching and research, the campus need more faculty. As such, the Administration needs to create, and meet, specific and measurable milestones.

Lastly, members noted that faculty have thus far resisted using Senate authority to reset reasonable boundaries in the face of these ever-increasing demands. Initiatives such as increased enrollment, flexibility in instructional modality, establishment of new degree programs and class size need faculty buy-in to succeed.

The Executive Board requests a response that addresses Senate feedback and includes next steps to develop a plan for both data-sharing practices and achievable milestones in order to implement the report recommendations.
The Academic Senate appreciates the opportunity to advise on this important report.

Sincerely,

Andrea Kasko  
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

Encl.

Cc: Kathy Bawn, Vice Chair/Chair Elect, UCLA Academic Senate  
Jessica Cattelino, Immediate Past Chair, UCLA Academic Senate  
April de Stefano, Executive Director, UCLA Academic Senate  
Adriana Rosalez, Administrative Analyst, UCLA Academic Senate  
Emily Rose, Assistant Provost & Chief of Staff to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost
DATE: April 4, 2024

TO: Andrea M. Kasko, Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

RE: Report of the Joint Faculty Rebuilding and Renewal Task Force

The Faculty Executive Committee for the Luskin School of Public Affairs agrees in strongest terms with “increasing ladder faculty.” UCLA has lowest rate of ladder faculty increase, largest increase in student-ladder faculty ratio in the UC system (To get back to where we were in 2003, we would need to hire 373 ladder faculty). We agree strongly with need to increase faculty salaries and trim administrative staff where necessary (not for EDI support or other related critical goals towards making UCLA more inclusive and diverse).

The trimming administrative staff is necessary, there is concern that the least paid and least secured staff will be targeted for such trimming, when it is their labor most needed to run departments and process student enrollment and financial aid needs. Some suggest that UCLA needs to trim senior administration where necessary, but ultimately, we need increased state financial support.

We support creating a committee to investigate facilitating housing access for faculty. As p.12 of report indicates, “faculty morale is low.” Faculty are overworked, salaries do not keep up with cost of living, and the overworking makes it difficult in many fields to find time to do research that advances our careers, represents our passions, and our contributions to society, (our research time also creates a basis of merit and advancement that we need to be able to cover costs of living in Los Angeles). These factors are especially stressors for first generation faculty who most likely cannot rely on intergenerational family wealth to afford living in LA and who are often our more diverse faculty (Black, Brown, Native American, among others) who have historically been underrepresented in the academy.

It would also be helpful to know more about the source of ladder faculty stagnation—whether it is in authorizing faculty lines, or recruiting/retention, or both. The report focuses mostly on challenges in recruiting and retention, however there is not information that compares search success and retention across time or across campuses. Certainly, there are some big warning signs about UCLA’s ability to attract faculty and we all see the problems with morale/cost of living/workload. Missing from the report is any attention to the process for authorizing ladder searches. Retention cannot be the only reason UCLA is lagging so far behind the other campuses. We searching at a rate to keep up with losses.

Thank you for your considerations.

Veronica Herrera
Associate Professor of Urban Planning and Political Science
Faculty Executive Committee Chair, Luskin School of Public Affairs, UCLA
April 2, 2024

Andrea Kasko, Chair
Academic Senate

Re: Report of the Joint Faculty Rebuilding and Renewal Task Force

Dear Chair Kasko,

At its March 5, 2024, meeting, The Faculty Welfare Committee (FWC) reviewed the Report of the Joint Faculty Rebuilding and Renewal Task Force.

FWC strongly agreed with the issues and recommendations identified within the report. It highlights many of the issues and concerns regularly discussed by FWC, including the increased difficulty in recruiting faculty to UCLA, falling faculty salaries with respect to the cost of living in Los Angeles, the lack of affordable, available faculty housing and places in the daycare/school’s system, the limited value of increasing administrator positions/salaries, and the need for better recruitment of postdoctoral fellows to support the research mission of the university.

The FWC notes that these issues have been raised for decades and that these continuing problems are only getting worse. Thus, it has become critical that the administration immediately address them. Most notably, the FWC notes:

1. The campus has not kept pace with hiring ladder-rank faculty. The FWC strongly supports the recommendation that UCLA hire 369 ladder-rank faculty across the schools to thereby return to the 2010 student-to-faculty ratios. Since 2010, there has been a worrying and disproportionate hiring of non-ladder faculty (65% increase) compared to ladder-rank faculty (1% increase) during a period when the undergraduate body increased by 26%. It is unacceptable for the FWC to replace ladder faculty with non-tenure track faculty. This undermines the teaching and research mission of the university, as well as diminishing our structure of shared governance. The FWC thus requests an explanation for the slow rate of hiring ladder-rank faculty and the lack of additional FTEs.

2. The campus needs to invest in further faculty housing and the UCLA schools’ system. The FWC requests that the university conduct further studies to assess investing in the Los Angeles residential market. Other UC campuses have access to affordable housing; given the cost of living in Los Angeles, it is now essential that UCLA make similar investments. Education also remains a central issue for the FWC; access to affordable daycare and K-12 schools is a critical quality of life issue for faculty families.

3. Faculty are at a breaking point. The FWC is concerned that fewer faculty are being asked to teach more with diminished resources, which is in stark contrast to the continued proliferation of administrative positions.

4. UCLA needs to find new revenue sources. The FWC recognizes that significant investment is needed to rebuild the faculty. We support the report’s recommendations to advocate for restoring state funding levels and work to support these goals with increased philanthropy.
We thank you for the opportunity to opine. If you have questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at butlersj@ucla.edu or via the Committee analyst, Renee Rouzan-Kay, at rrouzankay@senate.ucla.edu.

Sincerely,

Samantha Butler, Chair
Faculty Welfare Committee

cc: Kathleen Bawn, Vice Chair/Chair-Elect, Academic Senate
Jessica Cattelino, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
April de Stefano, Executive Director, Academic Senate
Renee Rouzan-Kay, Senior Policy Analyst, Faculty Welfare Committee
Members of the Faculty Welfare Committee
MEMORANDUM

To: Darnell Hunt, Executive Vice Chancellor Provost
Andrea Kasko, Academic Senate Chair

From: Efrain Kristal, Interim Chair, College Faculty Executive Committee

Date: April 2, 2024

Re: Response to the Joint Rebuilding and Renewal Task Force Report

The College Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the Joint Rebuilding and Renewal Task Force Report, dated February 2024. The report and its findings were reviewed via email between March 13th and March 30th, 2024. This response consolidates the main ideas shared by our faculty, including the broader context of recent discussions and faculty concerns.

Overall, College FEC members commend the task force for identifying critical issues impacting faculty recruitment and retention at UCLA. The task force addressed an enormous problem, using direct and specific language, and supported the claims and findings with clear evidence.

The College FEC wholeheartedly supports the recommendation regarding robust ladder faculty hiring, salary increases, and incentives as essential for attracting and retaining top faculty in their respective fields. The report states the need for salaries to keep “pace,” and while that is crucial, there is also a need for increased predictability in regard to increases, in terms of the criteria used to make decisions regarding them. The Ladder system is well positioned to prevent salary compression as long as there is predictability. An oversight of the report is that there is no mention of increased access to the Lab School or the Geffen Academy, or any increased quality education options for the children of faculty. Waiting on the completion of Los Angeles public transit developments may be an option for long term strategies related to housing and education but is certainly not helpful in this current critical time. By giving further consideration to additional benefits to improve faculty retention, such as additional retirement options, increased access to UCLA child education resources, and housing resources, there is much potential to employ said benefits for hiring and retention.

Smaller class sizes coupled with the assistance of Teaching Assistants (TAs) would undoubtedly improve faculty experiences, allowing for more personalized instruction and greater engagement with students. Moreover, reducing bureaucratic demands and hurdles is crucial in alleviating unnecessary stress and burdens on faculty members. The College FEC’s interpretation of recommendation #4 (Evaluate carefully the current level of administrative staff. We recognize
the value of administrative personnel and the needs we have had to build the administrative apparatus in certain areas including EDI, support for the increasing number of students, and (less so) faculty. It is important that campus be cognizant of the need to trim administrators where possible and think carefully before establishing new positions.) is in regard to high-level administrative staff, rather than departmental staff, the latter of whom keep departments operating smoothly and efficiently. As such, it is imperative to recognize the indispensable role of departmental level staff in supporting faculty and students, thus necessitating their increase and retention in regards to the faculty experience. Anything that makes faculty jobs easier will make it easier to attract and retain quality faculty. Ultimately, simultaneously prioritizing initiatives that ease faculty responsibilities as well as bolstering compensation and benefits will enhance faculty satisfaction and bolster our ability to attract and retain high-quality faculty members, a factor crucial to the long-term success of our institution. When considering other administrative positions, specifically those of a higher-level, now is the time to take a critical look at the number of those positions as well as the overall salary costs, to make sure there is a sense of proportion with respect to resources allotted to the faculty in general, and more particularly for faculty that can be called to participate in the decision-making process.

The College FEC appreciated the various ideas for generating income; however, while there are perhaps some benefits of increasing online course offerings and possibly creating online undergraduate programs, it is essential to tread carefully. While these programs could provide much-needed financial support and expand access to education, particularly for those unable to pursue on-campus learning, concerns about maintaining quality and preserving the traditional college experience must be addressed. We must ensure that online offerings complement rather than detract from our core mission of research and teaching.

Additional points that the committee would have appreciated seeing in the report include acknowledging the disproportionate challenges faced by certain areas of campus. For example, in the Life Sciences Division of the College, there is a pressing need for FTEs. Currently, the division's undergraduate-to-faculty ratio stands at approximately 80:1, which significantly surpasses any other College Division at UCLA. While we recognize that this level of detail may exceed the scope of the report's current focus, we believe that emphasizing the staggering statistics within the Life Sciences could effectively underscore the magnitude and disproportionate nature of the problem at hand.

As always, our membership appreciates the consultative process and welcomes the opportunity to participate in the discussion of important matters like this. You are welcome to contact us with questions.
April 1, 2024

Andrea Kasko, Chair
Academic Senate

Re: Report of the Joint Faculty Rebuilding and Renewal Task Force

Dear Chair Kasko,

The Council on Planning and Budget (CPB) discussed the Report of the Joint Faculty Rebuilding and Renewal Task Force at its meeting on March 18, 2024. Members unanimously agreed to provide feedback to the Executive Board (12 in favor, 0 oppose, 0 abstain). [Student vote: 2 in favor, 0 oppose, 0 abstain.]

Members shared the following comments.

Several members questioned the source of funding for proposed initiatives, expressing skepticism about their feasibility. They also shared dissatisfaction with the lack of clarity regarding the allocation of resources, particularly regarding faculty benefits. Many highlighted concerns about the impact on UCLA teaching quality and called for a deeper examination of where things went awry. While acknowledging the decision to proceed with proposed changes, members stressed the imperative of addressing associated costs, suggesting necessary adjustments to faculty workload and course credit allocations. Moreover, members critiqued the document as largely aspirational, lacking concrete action plans and solutions, and emphasized the necessity of outlining priorities and next steps to identify resource allocation strategies and achieve the stated goals. They advocated for a thorough analysis to understand the root causes of existing challenges, including structural incentives favoring non-tenure track faculty hires. Members also suggested separate faculty discussions to avoid dilution of outcomes from task forces and reports, urging for practical suggestions aligned with the current budget climate. Finally, members proposed exploring avenues within the Academic Senate to systematically address ongoing concerns.

If you have any questions for us, please do not hesitate to contact me at emmerich@humnet.ucla.edu or via the Council’s analyst, Elizabeth Feller, at efeller@senate.ucla.edu.

Best regards,
Michael Emmerich, Chair
Council on Planning and Budget

cc: Kathleen Bawn, Vice Chair/Chair-Elect, Academic Senate
    Jessica Cattelino, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
    April de Stefano, Executive Director, Academic Senate
    Elizabeth Feller, Associate Director, Academic Senate
    Members of the Council on Planning and Budget
March 28, 2024

To: Andrea Kasko, Chair
UCLA Academic Senate

Re: Report of the Joint Faculty Rebuilding and Renewal Task Force

At its meeting on March 12, 2024, the Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (CODEI) discussed the Report of the Joint Faculty Rebuilding and Renewal Task Force. The committee appreciates that this report provided data that is important as UCLA continues to grow. Members also agreed that the report highlighted areas of concern that should be addressed.

Committee members found that the information provided was worrisome, especially when looking at the hiring of ladder faculty. The report highlighted the reality that the university is now feeling the effects of its long hiring freeze and the attempts to solve these issues are not working.

The committee shared a concern that there is often conversations about expanding the number of students admitted to the university, but rarely is there discussion about increasing the number of faculty.

Committee members agreed that the University should hire more faculty. Through this effort, the University should place a special emphasis on increasing diversity within the faculty, especially when hiring ladder faculty.

We appreciate the opportunity to review the report and provide comments. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me (thall@mednet.ucla.edu) or Academic Senate Policy Analyst, Lilia Valdez (lvaldez@senate.ucla.edu).

Sincerely,

Theodore Hall, Chair
Committee on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion

cc: Kathy Bawn, Vice Chair/Chair-Elect, UCLA Academic Senate
Jessica Cattelino, Immediate Past Chair, UCLA Academic Senate
April de Stefano, Executive Director, UCLA Academic Senate
Lilia Valdez, Senior Policy Analyst, UCLA Academic Senate
Members of the Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion
March 27, 2024

Andrea Kasko, Chair
Academic Senate

Re: Report of the Joint Faculty Rebuilding and Renewal Task Force

Dear Chair Kasko,

At its meeting on March 6, 2024, the Council on Research (COR) reviewed and discussed the Report of the Joint Faculty Rebuilding and Renewal Task Force.

Members offered comments expressing concern regarding the state of ladder rank faculty. Members also voiced alarm at the pronounced decline in the ratio of ladder faculty to students and the challenges in recruiting replacements for retired faculty. This sentiment was characterized by shock and a deep-seated concern about the impending consequences. Members suggested that given the structural deficits facing the university, implementing proposed solutions is imperative.

Members agreed that it would be insightful to scrutinize the rate of hiring across administrative staff, faculty, and students. They noted that while the rate of administrative staff hiring has increased, faculty hires have declined significantly. This trend underscores the marked degradation in faculty numbers and the prevalence of non-renewals.

Further discussion ensued, with some members attributing the decline in faculty numbers to issues stemming from graduate student concerns. Members raised concerns regarding the feasibility of the recommendations presented, given the budgetary realities and constraints faced by the institution. The ramifications of the pandemic, including severed ties and the subsequent need for rebuilding, were emphasized as factors needing acknowledgment and fostering.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment. If you have any questions for us, please do not hesitate to contact me at asampath@jsei.ucla.edu or via the Council’s analyst, Elizabeth Feller, at efeller@senate.ucla.edu.

Sincerely,

Alapakkam Sampath, Chair
Council on Research
cc: Kathleen Bawn, Vice Chair/Chair-Elect, Academic Senate
Jessica Cattelino, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
April de Stefano, Executive Director, Academic Senate
Elizabeth Feller, Associate Director, Academic Senate
Members of the Council on Research
March 27, 2024

To: Andrea Kasko, Chair, Academic Senate

From: Catherine Sugar, Chair, Undergraduate Council

Re: Joint Rebuilding and Renewal Task Force Report

The Undergraduate Council independently reviewed the report of the Joint Rebuilding and Renewal Task Force.

Among those that responded, some members expressed concern about the absence of discussion of issues related to undergraduate education. While recognizing that the task force had limited time to address many complex topics, members felt that the report’s lack of engagement with instructional challenges represents a significant omission in the current environment. In recent years, faculty labor has been greatly impacted by a confluence of factors including the pandemic, new labor contracts, increasing demand for hybrid teaching modalities and accommodations, and the rise of AI. UCLA faculty need additional resources, training, and support to handle these numerous challenges, and right now they are simply being expected to absorb them. The Undergraduate Council encourages the task force to continue addressing these important issues, which deserve further serious consideration.

Thank you for the opportunity to opine. If you have any questions, please contact me via the Undergraduate Council analyst, Julia Nelsen, at jnelsen@senate.ucla.edu.

cc: Kathleen Bawn, Vice Chair/Chair-Elect, Academic Senate
    Jessica Cattelino, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
    April de Stefano, Executive Director, Academic Senate
    Julia Nelsen, Principal Policy Analyst, UCLA Academic Senate
March 21, 2024

To: Andrea Kasko, Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

From: Brooke Scelza, Chair, Graduate Council

Re: Joint Rebuilding and Renewal Task Force Report

Graduate Council members independently reviewed the Joint Rebuilding and Renewal Task Force Report. Most members did not have comments.

Of the members who responded, one commented that the loss of ladder faculty is a problem and appreciates that the issue is being highlighted. The member expressed reservations about self-supporting degree programs created for revenue as the member is unsure that the programs incentivize the deficits identified —namely, the loss of ladder research faculty.

One member expressed endorsement of the report, particularly the priorities to:
- increase ladder faculty-to-student ratio by hiring more ladder faculty
- the development of non-salary compensation and support services for faculty, including a task force to identify and stimulate or fund the real estate development of faculty housing
- the development of resources to assist partners seeking local employment
- the development of a clearing house for information regarding childcare, real estate agents, and neighborhoods

We appreciate the opportunity to express our views on this matter. If you have any questions, please contact us via Graduate Council Analyst, Emily Le, at ele@senate.ucla.edu.
Joint Rebuilding and Renewal Task Force Report

Michael Levine (Task Force Co-Chair)
Kathleen McGarry (Task Force Co-Chair)
Allison Baird-James
  Erin Debenport
  Megan Sweeney
  Roger Wakimoto

February 2024
Summary of Recommendations

1. Increase the number of ladder faculty. This task is difficult but of primary importance in maintaining our standing among R1 institutions. For the UCLA campus as a whole, we estimate that an additional 369 ladder faculty hires are needed to return to the student to ladder faculty ratios of 2010-2011. Even in challenging financial times of austerity, it is essential that we continue to hire. As the number above indicates, it is difficult enough to maintain the current size of the faculty with continued hiring, and it would be nearly impossible to catch up if there were a period of inactivity.

2. Faculty salaries must also keep pace with rises in the cost of living and increases in the compensation offered by peer institutions.

3. Form a committee to investigate possible new options for faculty housing both within the Westwood area and further afield, with members drawn from the faculty and administration with relevant expertise in the real estate market, housing trends, urban planning, and related fields.

4. Evaluate carefully the current level of administrative staff. We recognize the value of administrative personnel and the needs we have had to build the administrative apparatus in certain areas including EDI, support for the increasing number of students, and (less so) faculty. It is important that campus be cognizant of the need to trim administrators where possible and think carefully before establishing new positions.

5. Designate a point person or office on campus to provide information, engage in outreach and help departments take advantage of existing programs like the Chancellor's Postdoctoral Fellows Program and the Presidential Fellows Program. Assistance with applications and the provision of knowledge about the program will likely increase both the number of applications and the probability of success.

6. Leverage UCLA’s reputation and contacts in the Greater Los Angeles area to assist partners of recruited faculty who are seeking employment. Designate a point person or office (Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Development or Career Development) to take on this task.

7. Provide a clearing house on campus for information about living in Los Angeles including local schools and childcare options, experienced real estate agents, neighborhoods, etc. This could be done through an office (e.g. the office of the Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Development) or simply by maintaining a database with a well-functioning dashboard or search component.

8. We recommend that the Senate and Administration charge a new joint committee to develop in more detail and oversee a pandemic recovery five-year plan as recommended by the MCIF-WG.
Introduction

The charge to the Task Force was to assess the feasibility of interventions and to develop an ambitious, holistic, and exemplary package of actions with resources, deadlines and deliverables to improve UCLA’s student-to-faculty ratio, mitigate pandemic losses to faculty research and wellbeing, support ongoing pandemic-related instructional needs, and plan for enrollment growth and a bright future of teaching, research, and service at UCLA.

More specifically the Task Force was requested to seek to:

- Improve the student-to-faculty ratio
- Increase faculty hiring while advancing diversity goals
- Increase tenure density (proportion of tenure-track faculty)
- Increase faculty salaries
- Provide pandemic teaching relief (e.g., sabbatical credit program and/or teaching releases)
- Launch a pandemic research recovery funding program
- Increase teaching support (e.g., labor, expertise, technology)

After reviewing our charge and prioritizing the possibilities for rebuilding faculty and ensuring their future success, the Task Force agreed that faculty hiring and retention should be the items on which we focus most of our time and resources. At the end of the report, we briefly address some of the issues associated with the pandemic.

In the first section of this report, we summarize recent trends in faculty staffing at both the ladder and non-ladder faculty levels, and what these trends imply for our students. We then examine several issues that affect both hiring and retention of faculty and present our recommendations on how we might address these difficulties. Finally, we have concerns regarding faculty salaries and compensation more broadly, particularly in this inflationary climate and given the high cost of living in Los Angeles. This issue strongly impacts our ability to hire and to retain faculty as well as the morale of all faculty. We understand the budgetary pressures facing UCLA, but these issues must not be ignored.

We understand that many, if not most, of our recommendations require substantial funding. Given UCLA’s current budgetary structural deficit, new sources of revenue will be needed to support these programs, expenses in other areas may need to be reduced, and funding may need to be shifted away from some current initiatives. We recognize that there are no easy answers. We discuss the funding issues briefly at the end of the report although we do not attempt a comprehensive discussion of the topic.

Trends in Hiring

Tenure-track faculty are a core component of UCLA and are central to its role as an R1 university. These faculty are on the forefront of science and creative activities and their talents and the
contributions they make to advance the knowledge in their various fields are key factors in what makes us the number one public university. Faculty play a crucial role not only in our research mission, but in our teaching mission as well. Undergraduate and graduate students learn from and work alongside these eminent scholars as do postdoctoral fellows and academic researchers, contributing to research and learning experiences that are unmatched by even the best liberal arts colleges.

In carrying out the teaching mission of the university, tenure-track faculty are aided by the talents of a large pool of lecturers and adjunct faculty. However, in recent years, the emphasis in hiring has been on these non-tenure-track positions, creating a sharp rise in the ratio of students to tenure-track faculty. This trend has been noted nationwide (e.g., Flaherty, 2022), and indeed exists strongly throughout the UC system. Between 2011 and 2022, Senate ladder-rank faculty and equivalent in the UC system increased by 19 percent while non-Senate lecturers increased by 43 percent (Table 1). As also noted in a recent University of California Committee on Planning and Budget report, with an increase in ladder faculty of just 4 percent, UCLA falls at the very bottom among UC campuses in terms of percentage growth in Senate faculty during this period, lagging substantially behind every campus except UCSF—a campus that does not have an undergraduate program (University Committee on Planning and Budget, 2022). At the same time, UCLA had an increase of 45 percent in non-senate lecturers, placing it at the top among UC campuses (excluding UCSF) in the ratio of lecturer to ladder faculty hires and highlighting the rapid dilution of ladder faculty among our ranks. This change has important repercussions for the experiences of our undergraduates. As column 4 of Table 1 shows, UCLA stands out, along with Berkeley, in the increase in the ratio of students to ladder faculty, rising by over 13 percent during this time.

To drill down further into the faculty numbers at UCLA, we next turn to unpublished data provided by Academic Planning and Budget (Table 2). Looking now at data over a slightly longer period of time—October 2010 (the earliest year for which we have data) to October 2022 (the most recent)—the number of ladder faculty at UCLA remained substantially unchanged, rising from 1,808 to 1,829—just over a 1 percent increase. In contrast, the number of non-ladder faculty rose from 1,579 to 2,726, an increase of roughly 73 percent. Certainly, UCLA is a vast organization encompassing a large and growing Health System as well as the General Campus. If we exclude UC Health from these figures, the number of ladder faculty increased from 1,313 to 1,370, while the number of non-ladder faculty increased from 346 to 572, increases of 4.3 percent

---

1 Lecturers with security of employment (LSOEs) and Lecturers with Potential Security of Employment (LPSOEs) are counted among ladder faculty.
2 We are grateful to Albert Biscarra, Assistant Director of Institutional Research in UCLA Academic Planning and Budget who patiently helped us with numerous data requests and repeated revisions to our report.
3 Of the 1808 ladder faculty at the start of the period, 8.51 were LSOE/LPSOEs. As with the total number of ladder faculty, the number of LSOE/LPSOE stayed relatively unchanged, rising to just 12 by the end of our period of observation.
4 Consistent with the UCLA definitions used by APB, we define “non-ladder faculty” as all lecturers and those in clinical, visiting, adjunct, and in-residence professor titles.
5 We take this terminology from that used in the data supplied by Academic Planning and Budget. “General Campus” excludes UC Health.
and 65.3 percent.\(^6\) Within the College of Letters and Science, where nearly 79 percent of undergraduates are housed,\(^7\) the number of ladder faculty rose from 792 to 810, an increase of just 2.3 percent while the number of non-ladder faculty grew from 185 to 311, representing an increase of 68.1 percent. These dramatic differences are clearly illustrated in Figure 1.

This stagnation in the growth of ladder faculty/tenure-track faculty comes at a time when our student population is increasing. As Table 2 again shows, over this same period (2010 to 2022), the number of undergraduate students increased from 26,151 to 32,372 and the number of graduate students from 11,995 to 14,007, increases of 24 and 17 percent, leading to an increase in the total student population of 8,233 (22 percent). Excluding UC Health from these data, the number of undergraduates on the General Campus rose from 25,399 to 31,532 and the number of graduate students from 9,623 to 11,482, representing growth of 24 and 19 percent. For the College of Letters and Science, the number of undergraduates increased from 20,288 to 25,493 and the number of graduate students increased from 2,617 to 3,127, representing growth of 26 and 19 percent.

These differences in growth rates between students and ladder faculty have led to substantial increases over time in student to ladder faculty ratios. The ratio of students to ladder faculty for UCLA rose from 21.1 in Fall 2010 to 25.4 in Fall 2022, a 20 percent increase. The change is similar for the General Campus alone (excluding UC Health), with the ratio of students to ladder faculty rising from 26.7 in 2010 to 31.4 in 2022, an increase of 18 percent. In the College of Letters and Science, the change in the student-faculty ratio is even more dramatic, rising from 28.9 to 35.3, or 22.1 percent. (Similar changes are found when limiting the student counts to undergraduate students.)

At the same time that the student to ladder faculty ratio was rising, the ratio of students to non-ladder faculty was actually falling. Across campus the ratio of students to non-ladder faculty decreased from 24.2 to 17.0, (a decline of 30 percent). For both the General Campus and for the College alone, the student to non-ladder faculty ratios declined by 25.7% and 25.6%, respectively. These changes shown in Table 2 are illustrated more plainly in Figure 2 and again point to a dramatic change in the tenure density on campus. Alarmingly, the ladder to non-ladder faculty ratio on campus declined by over 35 percent (36.4) and by 36.8 percent for the General Campus and 39.5 percent in the college—where the lion’s share of undergraduate instruction occurs.

If we are to return to the 2010 ratios for students to ladder faculty, we estimate that we need to hire an additional 369 ladder faculty across campus (net of any attrition). If we execute this calculation for the General Campus alone (excluding UC Health) the required increase in ladder faculty needed to return to the 2010-11 student to ladder faculty ratio is 241, and for the College of Letters and Science an additional 180 ladder faculty would be needed.

\(^6\) We note that UCLA launched the Geffen Academy during this period, however, the hiring of teachers at Geffen does not impact our numbers. In 2022-2023, the Geffen Academy had 54 teachers, and although these teachers were originally classified as lecturers, in 2022-2023 they were included in the job classification “Other Academic” and thus not in the figures we report.

\(^7\) https://www.ucla.edu/about/facts-and-figures
These are dramatic increases. Even if the financial resources were available, it would be a difficult task. However, it is critical that the University works quickly and effectively to rebuild the relative ranks of ladder faculty. We understand that this shift to non-ladder faculty came at a time of severe budgetary pressures and that expanding the number of tenure-track faculty is more costly than continuing to expand the pool of non-tenure-track faculty. However, failing to invest in ladder faculty at this juncture risks diluting our impact as a top research university. Absent tenure-track faculty, we jeopardize our record of success in obtaining grants, providing the intellectual and scientific leadership that California has become known for, and certainly our place as the number one public university in the country. We also deprive our undergraduates of the chance to work on original research with the leaders in the various fields—an option that makes attendance at an R1 institution distinct from what liberal arts colleges can typically provide. We have worked extremely hard to achieve our success in these areas and once our prominence is lost, it is difficult to see how it can be regained.

**Strategies for Hiring**

Even with a strong institutional commitment to hire, attracting talented faculty to UCLA and retaining our current faculty is difficult. We are located in one of the highest cost of living regions in the country and simply cannot compete with private universities in terms of resources. Many faculty who are at UCLA came (and stayed) because they believe in our public mission to serve, but the continual erosion of what we have built and the change in many aspects of the job, makes that commitment increasingly difficult.

The Task Force focused much of its discussion on how best to maximize our success in hiring and in retaining the caliber of scholars befitting our reputation. The need for allocating additional resources to faculty is clear. We also looked at creative ways to more effectively employ those scarce resources that we do have and to potentially expanding existing models that have proven to be successful.

**Existing Programs and Infrastructure**

Two programs that continue to bring new faculty members to campus are the UC President's and Chancellor's postdoctoral programs [https://ppfp.ucop.edu/info/about-ppfp/; https://www.postdoc.ucla.edu/prospective-postdoctoral-scholars/chancellors-postdoctoral-fellowship-program/]. The incentives attached to these programs provide partial salary support for up to five years for Fellows later hired into tenure-track positions. These incentives make the programs a potentially fruitful avenue for hiring junior faculty. UCLA necessarily competes with other UC campuses for Fellows, and while we have been successful in the past in attracting candidates at the postdoctoral level, we have been far less successful in converting those postdoctoral fellows into tenure-track hires. Over the past five years, UCLA has hosted 32 Chancellor's Fellows, two of whom stayed at UCLA as ladder faculty, and 38 Presidential Fellows,
none of whom have remained at UCLA. (These numbers include the current cohorts of Chancellor’s and Presidential Fellows, and it is too early to assess the employment outcomes for those arriving as post-doctoral fellows in 2021-2022 and 2022-2023.)

While there is potential in these programs, the Task Force has found that there are gaps in knowledge across campus in understanding how to best take advantage of them and even with regard to their existence. Expanding knowledge about these opportunities through outreach and additional informational materials would be very helpful. We recommend that there be a point person on campus to aid in recruitment, publicizing and providing information about the programs and support with the application process. Such an individual with this specialized knowledge could help ensure we are maximizing our opportunities within the system and attracting some of the very best from a diverse pool of potential hires. It might also be worthwhile to examine outcomes for past fellows to observe where they went after UCLA and why they did not remain.

A closely related program is the set of Chancellor’s postdoctoral fellowships, coordinated by the Institute for American Cultures (IAC) and UCLA’s Ethnic Studies Centers. These postdoctoral fellows are funded by the office of the Vice Chancellor for Research and Creative Activities and through the Rising to the Challenge (RTC), Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI), and Bruins Rising initiatives. These three new initiatives are aimed at recruiting diverse faculty scholars whose teaching, mentoring and/or research fit within the program guidelines, and while the numbers are small relative to our needs, they are proving to be successful. There is a commitment of 33 new ladder FTEs over the next 5-7 years through these initiatives (10 for RTC, 15 for HSI and 8 for Bruins Rising) and 17 faculty have been hired—often using only 50 percent of an FTE from the initiatives with the deans matching the other 50 percent, thus demonstrating the ability of the faculty and deans to leverage new hiring resources.

While there are positive signs from these programs, they only address a small portion of our needs. We simply need more tenure-track lines throughout campus. We highlight these efforts here to raise awareness of existing avenues for recruiting and our success in recruiting a more diverse faculty. However, we acknowledge that these approaches alone will not remedy the decade long decline in our tenure density.

One difficulty with respect to hiring is determining how best to allocate the positions across campus units. Patterns of student enrollment have changed substantially over time with some areas experiencing far more rapid growth in the number of students than others, and some even witnessing a decline. These changes have led to an imbalance in student-faculty ratios across campus. It is necessary to correct some of these imbalances, or at least move in that direction, by doing more than just adjusting the allocation of new lines going forward. A thoughtful distribution of resources must similarly recognize differences in teaching modalities that dictate, to some extent, effective student-faculty ratios. Some disciplines are more amenable to large lectures, some require smaller classrooms, some need laboratories, performance spaces, etc. There is no single ratio that can be applied throughout campus and balancing the needs of various units remains difficult. Thus, although we urge the campus to increase significantly the number of
ladder faculty, we make no recommendations regarding areas which should be prioritized. Instead, we suggest the use of UCLA’s current strategic planning as a potential guiding document.

While the need for new positions is obvious, even when positions are available, bureaucratic demands can impact the process of extending offers, lengthen the time required to provide an official offer letter and package, and potentially discourage candidates who may have competing options. For tenured positions, offers require input from the academic senate, adding another step, albeit a crucial one, to the hiring process. Continued work on all sides to streamline this process and provide regular updates as to the status of an offer would be helpful in improving our success rate in hiring.

Onboarding faculty can also be a challenge, especially for those that require sophisticated wet laboratories. The costs and length of time to set up these facilities can be excessive. The recently established Research Concierge Program (https://www3.research.ucla.edu/rcp) has successfully addressed this issue although the demand for these services exceeds current resources. Our Research Concierge Program is one of the few organized efforts to onboard faculty in the country. Expanding this program and adopting similar programs in other areas would be helpful. Help with navigating other issues faced by faculty moving to UCLA could be folded into this program, including items such as managing the movement of graduate students from a former institution to UCLA to accompany a PI. The arrival experience can do much to color a new faculty member’s attitude towards UCLA and to improve our success in later retentions.

Finally, we wish to emphasize that it is not just hiring that is needed but hiring in excess of replacing departures. UCLA is very active in hiring, but many of these hires simply replace recent losses with no net gain. For example, from our annual corporate report, during 5 of the 6 last years, UCLA hired approximately 465 tenure-track faculty (data were unavailable for one year; non-ladder faculty are not included in these data). In the same time frame slightly over 400 faculty separated from the university, the great majority retiring as emeriti—leading to only a small net increase in faculty from what appears to have been a large number of hires.

UCLA faculty are also frequent targets of offers from other universities. The office of the Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Development has kept track of retention offers and the data indicate that UCLA has been extremely successful in retaining faculty with an approximate 80 percent success rate against competing offers. Unsurprisingly, the main reasons that faculty provide for remaining are similar to those articulated in national surveys (salary, quality of colleagues, and the reputation of the department or institution—all of which point to the need to continue to invest in faculty lest we begin a spiral downward).

**Non-salary Compensation Possibilities**

Even when there are lines to hire new faculty, many recruitment or retention efforts fail because of the high cost of living in Los Angeles, particularly in terms of housing. These costs, coupled with our inability to compete with other universities on salary, summer support, and research
funding make it difficult to attract the highest caliber faculty. Other challenges include the cost of childcare, schooling for older children and spousal/partner employment. We offer here a few ideas for mitigating these challenges but call on faculty and the administration to work together and to think creatively about ways to share information and leverage our existing resources and strengths to develop additional options that might be employed.

First, housing remains an ever-present concern. Westwood, and the Westside of Los Angeles in general is an attractive (and expensive) place to live. Even with the most recent fluctuations in the housing market, rents and home prices remain far higher than almost anywhere else in the country, with the exception of similar costs in a handful of other major cities. In addition to new and continued efforts to secure faculty housing in the Westwood area through public/private partnerships, new builds, and purchases of existing apartment buildings (or repurposing other structures for housing), we recommend that UCLA explore the possibility of providing housing options in other neighborhoods as well. The expansion of the Purple Line and the UCLA stop on that route provide potential opportunities to extend the number of locations that could be attractive for faculty to live. Existing housing complexes or commercial buildings in areas served by the Purple Line as well as connecting routes, may provide opportunities for creative solutions as some of these areas have been overbuilt with regard to office space, space that could possibly be converted to housing. The establishment of the new downtown campus provides an important opportunity for housing options for faculty near that location. Present market conditions suggest that further investment in that area could prove to be a smart financial strategy that could benefit both faculty and students. The newly acquired campus in the South Bay, with more affordable areas a short commute away, may also provide opportunities for innovative housing developments. Relatedly, Los Angeles is in the process of mapping out a plan for a new transportation route into the San Fernando Valley through the Sepulveda Corridor Project. Options such as these, outside the Westwood area, whether it be downtown, the South Bay, or the Valley, would appeal to various groups of faculty: faculty with joint careers to consider, those who prefer a downtown lifestyle, or those with considerations regarding the schooling of children. New housing projects ought to be designed with attention to those amenities that are crucial to faculty, such as the availability of childcare and access to public transportation.

In acting quickly regarding expanding housing options, UCLA may be able to take advantage of the current market and explore opportunities that will be quite attractive in the not-too-distant future, as is the case with the recent purchase of the Westside Pavilion. With different timelines, profit motives, and financing opportunities relative to the private sector, UCLA could position itself to secure opportunities that may not be considered by others.

---


These are complex issues and require a breadth of knowledge about the real estate market, the preferences of faculty, trends in housing, etc. Solutions are also likely to be found by thinking outside of the box. Fortunately, UCLA has experts in these and related areas (such as the Anderson School Forecast, as well as faculty whose research is in areas such as macroeconomic trends, real estate, law, and urban planning). We recommend the formation of a committee to take on the task of assessing various options and strategies for expanding faculty access to housing, and that members of the committee consist of both those on the administrative and the faculty sides with relevant expertise.

UCLA should have an advantage over many of our competitors in the availability of attractive employment options for spouses and partners. We are located in a large and vibrant city with a diverse employment base providing ample opportunities for partners who seek employment both inside and outside academe. However, we have not exploited this advantage. Some employment assistance for partners on campus is provided by the office of the Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Development (https://apo.ucla.edu/faculty-resources/career-development) and assistance has also been provided on an ad hoc basis, typically through the efforts of department chairs, but much more needs to be done.

We encourage UCLA to leverage its size and the scope of its reach to do more for partner employment. The office of the Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Development could provide outreach to the community more broadly to identify opportunities for off campus employment. We propose that this office or a single point person on campus be charged with developing contacts outside of UCLA and reaching out to neighboring academic and non-academic institutions to help recruited faculty and their partners to learn about opportunities in various industries. (A dedicated position in the Career Development Office could also be used as we currently provide such a service to alumni.) We imagine that many employers would be pleased to be provided with a lead on a great new hire, particularly in this tight labor market. Attention paid to partners can make an enormous difference not just in the decision to accept an offer, but in the loyalty to UCLA. And a partner with an appealing job will help in retaining the faculty member in the future.

Finally, following the successful model of the service offered in the Geffen School of Medicine, the Task Force proposes that UCLA provide assistance in navigating life in Los Angeles. UCLA could establish an office on campus (or designate an existing office) to create a database of information for faculty. Such a resource could include anything from employment opportunities for partners or other household members, to contact information for real estate agents who have worked with faculty before and know our system of real estate loans, to local schooling options for children. More broadly, simple help with settling into a new community as well as dealing with UCLA’s bureaucracy, that of the city of Los Angeles, and other information, would be helpful to new arrivals. While such a service would serve the needs of newly recruited faculty, it is also likely to prove valuable to existing faculty when they have a change in circumstances (e.g., a recently tenured professor who wishes to buy a home or a new parent searching for day care or schools).

---

10 The office of the Associate Vice Chancellor for Faculty Development would be an obvious choice to serve this role.
There is a great deal of practical knowledge on campus that could be shared to make Los Angeles a more affordable and enjoyable place, but such information is unevenly distributed across our large campus and should be made widely available at a central location that department chairs and deans can regularly offer to new recruits. There is no sense in reinventing the wheel every time someone is hired. If there are not sufficient resources to create such an office or point person on campus, the simple maintenance of a database containing such information would be helpful information for deans and chairs.

Faculty Salaries

Faculty salaries at UCLA have always struggled to keep pace with those in our comparison group and fall even further behind when considering the high cost of living. Salaries and the cost of living dramatically impact our ability to hire and retain faculty. With the recent increases in inflation, this issue has become even more salient. We understand that funds for increasing faculty salaries are scarce, but we cannot let the purchasing power of faculty continue to be eroded by increases in the cost of living.

Indeed, it is possible that we could save money in the long run by retaining top faculty who might otherwise leave the University frustrated by their inability to purchase a home or find good schooling options for children. When professors leave, it is costly to replace them (searches are expensive and not always successful and start-up packages in some fields are large). It is perhaps even more costly not to replace them (the workload grows, the productivity falls for those faculty who remain at the University, and the student experience is diminished through larger classes and reduced time with ladder faculty). In addition, our best research faculty bring in grants, obtain patents, and play key roles in our mission to serve the people of California. Losing top faculty because of budgetary issues risks destroying the stellar research institution we have built. While bringing in top faculty can aid in attracting more esteemed scholars, losing such faculty can have a snowballing effect in the other direction. It is far easier to maintain an exceptional reputation than to rebuild one once lost.

This year President Drake authorized a 4.6 percent range increase in the salary scales for faculty and staff. However, this increase was limited to the portion of salary that is on scale, which is the portion over which he has authority. At UCLA, virtually all faculty also have an off-scale component to their salaries. The UCLA Chancellor authorized a 4.6 percent increase in the off-scale component so this year both components of faculty salary increased, something that has not always been the case in past years. Increases in the on-scale portion alone contribute to the continued erosion of salaries in real terms. We note also that as has become the practice, this increase went into effect in October, so it was in effect for only three-quarters of the year. While this increase was greatly appreciated, the effective annual increase of 3.45 percent was accompanied by year-over-year inflation from July 1, 2021, to June 30, 2022 of 9 percent.\footnote{https://www.bls.gov/data/inflation_calculator.htm}
While we know there are budgetary constraints, faculty cannot be left behind. As conversations with faculty that members of the Task Force have had throughout this process, and letters directed to the group indicate, morale is low. Faculty are frustrated and at the breaking point, and we are increasingly likely to lose our most valuable researchers to other institutions or to professions that can offer more attractive packages. Finally, we want to stress the importance of continuing to strive for faculty diversity. Not only is it the right thing to do for many reasons, both historic and contemporary, but having a more diverse faculty enhances the professional and pedagogical experiences for everyone on campus by creating a more inclusive environment.

Other Faculty Issues

While the decline in the fraction of tenure-track faculty, the increase in the student-ladder faculty ratio and in class size, and the need for salary increases and cost of living adjustments occupied much of our discussion, and are foremost in the minds of faculty, we are keenly aware of the continued sacrifices faculty have been asked to make and the additional work they have shouldered. This situation too merits attention.

The COVID-19 pandemic obviously resulted in a significant increase in workload as faculty pivoted to remote learning and still today, often continue to make remote learning possible for impacted students. Faculty were not able to meet and interact with their colleagues at conferences that were fully remote, a situation that likely harmed junior faculty the most as they were just launching their careers. The pandemic also brought a variety of personal out-of-pocket costs (e.g., paying for internet and computers for home, for example) and added stress.

While these are real concerns, many of the current issues existed prior to Covid and have continued to manifest themselves as UCLA grapples with growing demands on its resources. The faculty simply cannot be asked to take on more of this burden and must be provided with relief from many of the demands that have been placed upon them. We note here a few of the most obvious avenues along which improvements can be made but acknowledge that this list is incomplete.

The experiences of faculty who are managing research grants, running centers, inviting speakers and scholars, and other academic work would be improved by putting into place better systems for procurement, hiring, and reimbursement, among other bureaucratic processes. These improvements could involve modernizing our extremely old systems, increasing staff support in key areas, allowing for faster processing, and disseminating of clear instructions and contact information for relevant offices, allowing faculty to accomplish these tasks most efficiently. The new strategic plan includes a goal to become a more effective institution by working to eliminate bureaucracy in our administrative areas. We wholeheartedly support this objective. Certainly, our campus is hampered in some ways by UC-wide restrictions and regulations in addition to Federal and State laws, but we ought to do all we can locally to improve the situation within the strictures imposed from elsewhere.
Data from the UC Employee Headcount show that the rate of increase in Campus administration and staff has differed greatly across various job classifications. The senior leadership group, which essentially includes the Vice Chancellors and the University Librarian, decreased by 25 percent (from 15 to 12). The number of Vice Provosts has remained relatively constant, varying from 3-4 over the period from 2011-2023. Associate Vice Chancellors and Associate Deans are typically faculty positions and do not count as administrative staff. MSP-Managers (MSP-Managers include Assistant Vice Chancellors, Assistant Vice Provosts, Assistant Deans and other staff that provide leadership and professional expertise at the highest levels to their units) also decreased, but by a smaller 13 percent (from 873 to 761). The increases in staff at UCLA were primarily in increases in support staff such as MSP-Senior Professionals, which increased by 78 percent (from 728 to 1,295) and non-student Professional and Support Staff which increased by 42 percent (from 8,054 to 11,397). Some of these increases come from two newly established administrative offices: Equity, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) and Strategic Communications. And the newly created Luskin Center was responsible for 155 new staff FTE. While the Task Force understands and appreciates the important role that administration plays in the conduct of university business, we urge the Administration to look for efficiencies and to streamline the number of positions across the campus.

More generally, as the teaching landscape changes with new methods and technologies, faculty need assistance across a variety of dimensions. They need consistent and easily located information regarding their responsibilities to students, their options, and what resources are available on campus. The administration and the Academic Senate should work jointly to provide this guidance. Many faculty would like to embrace ideas of active learning, engage with new learning platforms, and employ other modes for reaching students, but are unsure how to proceed. If we are to provide the type of education our students deserve, we need to provide more assistance to faculty in adapting to this new environment.

The increased use of the Teacher Professor series could play an important role both in meeting the needs of our students and in helping ladder faculty access the resources they need to excel in the classroom. Teaching professors often conduct research related to education and are on top of new developments in teaching modalities. They can thus be a key resource for ladder faculty and assist in the development of new courses and curricula advances.

Post-pandemic shifts in student expectations and demands, and increased needs for both academic and non-academic support also pose new challenges for faculty. These changes have been noted locally, as reflected in a recent letter circulated by UCLA’s Department of Anthropology, and nationally as discussed in the pages of publications such as the Chronicle of Higher Education. The new Vice Provost for Teaching and Learning should work jointly with the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils. Actively engaging and assisting faculty in these areas can result not only in better teaching but can also go part-way to allay the fears that UCLA is simply adding to the administrative ranks with this new title with little benefit to faculty.

These teaching issues are exacerbated by the increases in class size. While it may not seem like more work to deliver a lecture to 150 rather than 100 students, a 50 percent increase in the...
number of students means a 50 percent increase in email from students, similarly greater demand in office hours and for appointments, more work managing TAs, more grading, and more time needed simply to address student issues that regularly arise. As UCLA enrolls ever more students in the coming years, these issues are likely to grow rather than lessen, and speak once again to the need for more faculty to meet the growing number of students.

Current Financial Position

UCLA has witnessed large declines in state funding over the period covered by this report, 2009-2010 to 2021-2022. This decline in state support has been partially offset by an increase in tuition revenues coming from out-of-state students. These changes are illustrated in Figure 3 which shows the composition of UCLA’s total revenue in 2009-2010 and in 2021-2022. Additionally, while UCLA has experienced significant increases in expenses overtime, state support has declined sharply as indicated in Figure 4. With the recent requirement to increase the number of students on campus overall, and decrease in the number of students from out-of-state, as well as the increases in costs associated with the recent labor contract settlements and the general rise in operating costs, UCLA now faces a structural deficit. In an effort to fund the various recommendations in this report, new income streams will need to be identified, current expenses will need to be reduced and some resources will need to be reallocated.

Additional Income Sources

There is unquestionably a need for more funding to provide the resources we need to maintain our status as the number one public university and to equip faculty and staff with the tools they need to succeed in their work. In this section we outline three approaches to generating additional income to support both the establishment of new faculty lines and the retention of our existing faculty. These approaches are the creation of: 1) new endowed chairs; 2) self-supporting degree programs; and 3) online programs. In presenting these approaches, we recognize that these are not one-size-fits-all solutions to our financial concerns, nor do these represent an exhaustive list of potential revenue sources. Rather, we view this as a starting point and a summary of perhaps some of the more fruitful strategies we might implement.

Our donors have given generously to UCLA and there are currently almost 600 endowed chairs on campus, over 250 in the Medical School and about 340 across the rest of the campus. Going forward, we see substantial potential to expand the number of such chairs and we encourage departments and units to work closely with their development teams to identify potential donors and to interest them in supporting faculty and faculty research more broadly with endowments. Presently, in almost all schools the interest earned on the endowments for these chairs is provided to the faculty member who holds the chair and is used primarily to support the research program of the faculty member or to support portions of their salary. In one school, Engineering, a portion of the interest flowing from the endowment for some newly established chairs is shared with the school itself to help fund programs in the school or new faculty lines. In another school, Law, the interest from the endowment goes to the school and is distributed by the Faculty Advisory
Committee, benefiting a large number of faculty. These approaches, if adopted more broadly, will provide an advantage to the University as a whole by providing additional funding to the units which could be used to support new faculty lines. Of course, endowed chairs also allow for the creation of attractive hiring packages that will enhance our ability to recruit and retain top scholars, so it is important to ensure that the chair holder receives a meaningful financial benefit as well as to ensure that the wishes and intentions of the donor are honored.

While it must be done with caution, the creation of new self-supporting degree programs provides a potentially powerful source of additional income. Such programs, often terminal master’s or professional degrees, receive no state support but generate substantial tuition revenue that flows directly to the campus. As detailed on the Academic Planning and Budget (APB) website (https://apb.ucla.edu/academic-planning/self-supporting-programs) such programs “...have the potential to generate resources that would enhance the quality, access, and affordability of core academic programs and departments.” By extension, faculty hiring could also be bolstered with revenues from such programs. Self-supporting programs can benefit the community in numerous ways. They allow the university to draw on the interests and expertise of our faculty to meet the needs for training in areas that are not currently being met by state-supported programs. They allow for pedagogical innovation and alternative scheduling that can extend the reach of UCLA and provide greater access to the quality education and stellar reputation for which UCLA is known. And they help us fill the need for trained specialists in a variety of areas that are vital to the economic growth of the Los Angeles region, particularly at the professional level. For example, the Masters in Quantum Science that was established in 2020-2021, fills a workforce need for more people qualified to research and design quantum technologies.

We note, however, that any self-supporting program, new or existing, must be mindful of the need to maintain a quality educational experience. We are first and foremost an academic institution, centered on research and teaching. We cannot sacrifice our core mission simply to raise funds. To that end, mechanisms need to be put in place to ensure that self-supporting programs do not negatively affect state-supported students, faculty research, or the quality of campus life. Such programs must cover their entire costs, both explicit and implicit, and should make every effort to provide financial assistance and access to deserving students.

Finally, the Task Force considered the possibility of creating fully online programs. While UCLA has reaffirmed its commitment to focusing on in-person education in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic, and we strongly support that commitment, new resources for designing and implementing online courses have also been developed. Based on the popularity of online programs at other R1 universities such as Arizona State University, the University of Florida, the University of Maryland, and our own program in Engineering, we believe that these programs could prove to be a significant source of funds and would not place additional strain on already crowded classrooms, dining halls, and student housing. Again, an advantage of this approach is that it may facilitate access to a UCLA education for students for whom on-campus learning is not

---

12 The website also contains a list of all self-supporting programs at UCLA.
an option, including those who cannot afford to relocate to Los Angeles or who have substantial work or family obligations that make regular attendance on campus difficult or impossible.

However, we certainly recognize concerns about the ability to offer quality in a remote environment. There is also substantial concern about the loss of the college experience, where students regularly interact with one another, engage in discussions outside the classroom, and garner skills in areas such as leadership and teamwork. We also want to avoid creating the potential for a two-track system with in-person instruction for those who can afford it and online options for those who cannot. As such these programs might most effectively be employed in professional and graduate areas. Perhaps moving more cautiously in this direction on an undergraduate level, UCLA could expand its online course offerings during summer sessions. Departments are already using summer courses, including online courses, as a key source of revenue, using income from these programs to fund staff salaries, graduate student research, and other costs that cannot be met by limited state funding. These revenue-sharing programs are currently under review by the team responsible for the transition to the Bruin Budget Model, potentially affecting these revenue streams.

In each of these cases, we recognize that units differ in their likelihood of success. The ability to secure funding from individual or corporate donors varies widely by discipline and division as does the likely popularity of self-supporting programs and online courses. The campus will have to work hard to ensure that units with fewer opportunities in these dimensions are not left behind. We also note that at an institution such as UCLA, we have many talented faculty and staff who no doubt have additional ideas to bring funds to the university as well as ways to build on the ideas explored here. We encourage input from these constituencies.

Finally, we wish to emphasize the importance of outreach to the Governor, state legislators, and the public, regarding the need to increase dramatically funding for UCLA as well as for the entire system. While these efforts are likely more efficiently led by the Office of the President, faculty and students should play a key role in advocating on behalf of our university system (ideally, with proper education on how to effectively communicate to legislators). We need to be sure that policymakers and the public understand the vital role UCLA plays in education, innovation, and in the community more broadly.

Pandemic Recovery

Systemwide, a Joint-Senate-Administration Mitigating COVID-19 Impacts on Faculty Working Group (MCIF-WG) developed a series of five recommendations intended to help mitigate the negative effects of the pandemic on faculty. These recommendations are:

1. To encourage and provide resources on the use of COVID-19 Opportunities and Challenges Statements at campuses, both for individual faculty and on behalf of departments;

---

13 We note that online undergraduate programs are becoming increasingly common, and students may come to expect such an option. Some successful programs include those at Texas A&M, Oregon State, and George Washington University,
2. To encourage timely file submission for all faculty with a commitment to a holistic academic advancement file review that incorporates Achievement Relative to Opportunities (ARO) principles;

3. To establish critical funding programs to rehabilitate UC’s research recovery and to support teaching/service duty modification programs that give faculty the bandwidth to discover and advance knowledge;

4. To prepare to implement a proposed Pandemic Sabbatical Credit Program if approved (dependent on the UC Provost and Executive Vice President agreement with MCIF-WG recommendation to approve);

5. To develop a five-year plan later to structure the implementation of all other MCIF-WG recommendations over the long-term.

Our present Task-Force would like to recommend that the Senate and Administration charge a new joint committee to develop in more detail and oversee a five-year plan recommended by the MCIF-WG. Such a Task-Force would provide continuity for our campus responses to mitigate the long-term effects of the pandemic.

In addition, some of the recommendations of the MCIF-WG have already been addressed on our campus but they need to be continued to help faculty move forward with their careers. We have already provided two programs in which funding was made available to the faculty for research support and one for teaching releases. We should continue these programs. To continue such programs the Vice Chancellor for Research and Creative Activity has agreed to provide $1.0M for research support for a similar program designed to aid faculty whose research programs were negatively affected by the pandemic. The Task Force recommends additional resources should be provided by the administration for a teaching release program when faculty need to rebuild their research programs.

In terms of faculty advancement in rank and step we have also recommended that faculty and department chairs have to opportunity to provide a COVID 19 Opportunities and Challenges Statement or Pandemic Impact Statement. We request that the department chair in their letter about faculty accomplishments indicate how the pandemic has affected their research field in general and the faculty member can explain in their statement how they were affected individually.

Conclusions and Recommendations

While much of this document is focused on the need to recruit new and retain existing faculty, we want to end by ensuring that the well-being of faculty more generally is given an equally important role. Many of our best faculty are intensely loyal to UCLA and would be loath to leave. That said, it is becoming increasingly difficult to continue to invest in UCLA as more and more demands are made on faculty. Much of the goodwill and enthusiasm exhibited by faculty over the years has been whittled away as the demands placed on them have continued to increase. We have heard many times that the job has changed greatly. Classes are overcrowded, there are additional teaching demands in terms of providing remote instruction, and difficulties with the increased use of technology in the classroom. There are also staffing issues and growing administrative
burdens. As we have pointed out, salaries are falling further behind relative to the cost of living. We encourage attention to faculty well-being broadly, to the implementation of creative solutions, and to the continued cooperation of faculty and administration, a partnership that has helped UCLA achieve its ranking as the number one public university in the country and the number 15th overall. This ranking is not free, but the people of California deserve our continued efforts to provide the best in terms of teaching, research, and service.
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Table 1: Percentage Growth in Faculty FTE Counts, Senate Ladder-Rank Faculty and Equivalent versus Non-Senate Lecturers
October 2011 to October 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>% Change in Ladder Faculty</th>
<th>% Change in Non-Senate Lecturers</th>
<th>Ratio of Lecturer to Ladder Faculty Growth</th>
<th>% Change in Ratio of Students to Ladder Faculty*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berkeley</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Los Angeles</strong></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td><strong>10.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>13.3%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merced</td>
<td>141%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-27.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-6.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco**</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>-89%</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemwide total</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


* Student enrollment counts are the total of undergraduate and graduate students.
**We emphasize that the data from UCSF should be understood to be from a campus that does not train undergraduates and only trains medical doctors. The faculty staffing needs thus differ from those of the other 9 campuses.
# Table 2: Faculty and Student Counts, Fall 2010 and Fall 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>General Campus</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>General Campus</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>General Campus</th>
<th>College</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty Numbers:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladder</td>
<td>1,808</td>
<td>1,313</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>1,829</td>
<td>1,370</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-ladder</td>
<td>1,579</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>2,726</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students Numbers:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38,146</td>
<td>35,022</td>
<td>22,905</td>
<td>46,379</td>
<td>43,014</td>
<td>28,620</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>26,151</td>
<td>25,399</td>
<td>20,288</td>
<td>32,372</td>
<td>31,532</td>
<td>25,493</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>11,995</td>
<td>9,623</td>
<td>2,617</td>
<td>14,007</td>
<td>11,482</td>
<td>3,127</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student to Faculty Ratios:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ladder faculty</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to non-ladder faculty*</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>101.2</td>
<td>123.7</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>-29.8</td>
<td>-25.7</td>
<td>-25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty ratio:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ladder to non-ladder</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>-36.4</td>
<td>-36.8</td>
<td>-39.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Unpublished UCLA Dashboard data, accessed 2/14/2024. * Non-Ladder faculty includes Professor-in-Residence, Professor of Clinical (e.g., Medicine), Visiting Professor, Adjunct Professor, Health Sciences Clinical Professor, and lecturers.
Figure 1: Percent Increase in Ladder and Non-Ladder Faculty
2010-2011 to 2022-2023

Source: See Table 2
Figure 2: Percent Increase in Student-Faculty Ratios 2010-2011 to 2022-2023

Source: See Table 2
Figure 3: Revenue Sources Supporting Core Activities

Notes: See the reports for details on the various components of the reported categories.
Sources: [https://ucla.app.box.com/v/acct-pdf-AFR-09-10](https://ucla.app.box.com/v/acct-pdf-AFR-09-10)
Figure 4: State Appropriations Over Time as Proportion of Total Revenues

Source: UCLA Annual financial reports, various years.
Figure 5: Nominal and Real ($2022) Expenditures Over Time

Source: UCLA Annual Financial Reports, various years. (Numbers in thousands)