

Report on University of California State-Supported Summer Instruction

The Budget Act of 2001, Section 6440-001-0001, Provision 25 requests information from the University of California regarding its plans for a fully State-supported summer term at all its campuses. This report responds to that request. The specific excerpt states:

...It is further the intent of the Legislature that the University of California provide a campus-by-campus five-year plan that includes summer enrollment targets at all University of California general campuses, reflecting rapid growth in each summer after 2001. At a minimum, this plan shall also identify the changes the University of California is making to its summer term in the following areas: incentives provided to increase summer enrollment, financial aid packages, student services, the breadth and quality of instruction, and faculty and nonfaculty compensation, duties, and employment standards. The University of California shall submit the plan to the fiscal committees of the Legislature no later than January 15, 2002.

Background

The University of California is pursuing a number of options for accommodating the large increases in enrollment projected through 2010. In addition to expanding during the regular academic year, and to providing more off-campus instructional opportunities for students, campuses are expanding their summer programs and shifting them from self-support to State and student fee support. This report briefly summarizes the planning context and experiences of summer 2001, the first year in which, thanks to State support, students were able to pay fees equivalent, on a per-unit basis, to fees paid during the regular academic year. It was also the year in which the State provided full marginal cost funding for summer instruction at three campuses, Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Santa Barbara. The report also contains the plan for summer enrollments through summer 2010.

Two key actions were taken in the most recent two State Budget Acts, 2000-01 and 2001-02.

- In 2000-01, the State Budget Act provided \$13.8 million to the University to be used to reduce UC students' summer 2001 fees to a level equivalent to fees paid in the regular academic year. The University allocated these funds to all campuses that had summer fees that exceeded, on a per-unit basis, academic year fees.
- The 2001-02 State Budget Act provided funding for 3,422 FTE summer students at UC Berkeley, Los Angeles and Santa Barbara. These funds, plus those

provided in the 2000-01 budget, represent full marginal cost support for the summer 2000 enrollments at these three campuses.

State support clearly made a difference. Enrollments increased at all campuses as compared to summer 2000, as did the number of courses and the participation of UC faculty. Thousands of students benefited from the financial aid made available under new fee policies. With State funding secure at three campuses, more substantial academic changes can be implemented in coming years to increase student enrollment and faculty participation. The remaining campuses are poised to expand their programs similarly when full State funding is provided for their summer instruction.

Summer 2001 enrollment

There were significant increases in summer 2001 instruction as compared to summer 2000 instruction. These increases were most notable at Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Santa Barbara as Table 1 shows. No students were turned away.

Table 1
Summer 2000 and Summer 2001 FTE Enrollments

	Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Santa Barbara	Other 5 Campuses	Total
Total FTE Enrollment Summer 2001	5,470	4,217	9,687
Student FTE Increase over Summer 2000	2,004 58%	867 26%	2,871 42%
Total Headcount Enrollment Summer 2001	26,762	25,297	52,059
Student Headcount Increase over Summer 2000	8,203 44%	4,176 20%	12,379 31%

It is also important to note that an increase of this magnitude in summer FTE requires far larger headcount enrollment than may be immediately apparent. One student attending full time in the summer equals one-third of a year-average (fall, winter, spring) FTE; three full-time students equal one FTE in the summer. However, most students attend part time in the summer; it takes six students taking half a courseload in the summer to equal one year-average FTE. The Table 2 shows these relationships for summers 2000 and 2001.

Table 2
Summer 2000 and Summer 2001 Headcount Enrollments

	Summer 2000 Actual	Summer 2001 actual
Headcount	39,680	52,059
FTE	6,816	9,687
Headcount to FTE ratio	5.8 students = 1 FTE	5.4 students = 1 FTE

Planning context for summer 2001

Planning for summer 2001 was marked by uncertainty, both about funding and about student interest. In the event that State funding was not approved, campuses needed to plan programs that would be financially self-supporting.

Three UC campuses — Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Santa Barbara — learned in November 2000 that they were to be included in the Governor’s 2001-02 Budget for full State funding of summer instruction. Planning for summer 2001 was already well-underway in order to produce publications with course offerings, schedules and fees before the end of the calendar year and to open registration early in 2001. Thus, the majority of course offerings and faculty were already confirmed about nine months before the summer session opened, about the same time we learned of the Governor’s support for State-funded summer instruction.

Because these indications of State support came late in the academic- and course-planning process, the timing did not allow for extensive planning of new courses. Campuses also did not know what to expect in terms of student response to lower fees and other inducements to enrolling in summer courses. It was generally assumed that enrollments would increase, but there was no way to predict how many additional courses should be added until registrations started coming in during the spring.

In addition, as California’s economy declined in early 2001, there was continuing uncertainty throughout the spring budget hearings about the ability to keep summer funding in the budget.

Given the late start, uncertainty about funding throughout the spring, the late signing of the Budget, and appropriation of the funds halfway through the summer, well after the summer sessions began, the three campuses slated for State funding were understandably

reluctant to introduce permanent commitments (e.g., hiring of new faculty) or new courses that could prove financially detrimental to the campus if enrollments were low and State funding did not materialize.

The remaining campuses, not slated for full summer funding in the 2001-02 budget had their own financial concerns. They also received 2000-01 funding to buy down student fees; however, large increases in enrollment could prove costly to them because the fee buydown covered only summer 1999 enrollments. Additional students—attracted by the lower fees—were therefore unsubsidized and their fee revenue would fall short of the actual cost of their instruction.

Incentives to increase summer enrollment

The two most effective incentives for more students to attend in the summer were lower fees than those charged in previous summers, and availability of financial aid.

Fees. All campuses benefited from the \$13.8 million in State funds that were part of the 1999-00 Budget Act. This funding covered the loss of fee income resulting from a reduction of summer 2001 student fees to a level equivalent to per-unit fees paid during the regular academic year.¹ At campuses with relatively high summer fees, the effects of the reduction in fees provided a strong incentive for enrolling in summer 2001. As the memory of higher summer fees fades, however, other incentives may become necessary.

The currently funded fee buydown is tied to summer 1999 enrollments, so campuses not yet receiving full State funding may find it difficult to cover the costs of their summer programs if summer enrollments rise too high above the 1999 levels. Campuses lose money on the additional students because they are prohibited from raising fees above the average per-unit level and the State is not providing funds to cover the shortfall. The Governor's budget proposal for 2002-03 includes additional funding to replace the loss of fee income due to additional enrollment in summer 2001, an approach which would help to alleviate the situation until full funding can be made available.

Since Berkeley, Los Angeles and Santa Barbara did receive full State funding for summer 2001 in the 2001-02 Budget Act, their costs of instruction are covered. Building their summer programs on the expectation that they would receive this funding (even though not signed into law until well into the summer) these three campuses made additional efforts to attract students. For example, the Santa Barbara campus capped fees at eight units to encourage students to increase their unit loads. UCLA provided rebates to seniors who graduated at the end of summer, rather than returning in the fall. UC students enrolling at these three campuses did not pay the summer application fees typically charged in previous years.

¹ Campuses whose summer fees exceeded the average per-unit level received funding, on the basis of their summer 1999 enrollments, for the shortfall in revenues caused by reducing fees. Fees at the Santa Cruz campus were below the average per-unit level, so students did not see a reduction in their fees in summer 2001, nor did the campus receive any of the fee buyout.

Financial aid. The expectation of full State funding for summer instruction meant that Berkeley, Los Angeles and Santa Barbara could provide financial aid similar to what is provided students during the regular academic year. Many details remain to be worked out, and new agreements need to be negotiated with federal and State agencies about summer aid available through them, before summer financial aid is truly equivalent to the regular year. In addition, both funding and administrative issues need to be resolved before campuses can provide financial aid to UC students enrolling at a different UC campus during the summer. Such cross-campus enrollment will give many students the option to return home and attend a nearby UC campus during the summer. Despite these policy obstacles, Berkeley, Los Angeles and Santa Barbara were able to provide \$20.6 million in financial aid to nearly 11,300 students. Of the total, \$7.7 million came from UC financial aid programs, including over \$4.8 million in new UC financial aid funds that were not available in previous summers.

Other incentives. Financial incentives played the major role in increasing enrollments, and will continue to be important in future summers to attract students away from other activities they might choose to do. In addition, campuses are considering other incentives. Some examples include the development of academic minors that can be achieved only through summer enrollment, priority consideration in campus housing, access to distinguished visiting faculty, and research support for undergraduate projects. Summer's more flexible calendar makes it easier to create intensive courses, short-term travel-study programs, internships for credit, and other creative course structures. The shorter summer calendar (campuses offer sessions ranging from three to ten weeks) and part-time attendance make it possible for students to continue to earn money during the summer, so they may be more willing to enroll than if the summer calendar were the same length as a full quarter.

Student Services

In a self-supporting summer environment, additional services mean higher fees and there are fewer students who need assistance, so student services have typically been scaled back somewhat during the summer. However, in a State-supported environment more services can and should be available to students. Campuses are learning what level and type of services ought to be provided due to enrollment growth and rising student expectations. In Summer 2001, Berkeley, Los Angeles and Santa Barbara provided the same services they have provided in previous summers, since they had no way of estimating how many additional students would be attending. Priorities for the future, for all campuses granted State support for summer, will be to ensure that academic advising, learning centers, counseling, recreation and other services are available to students.

Breadth and Quality of Instruction

As a general rule, courses taught during a self-supporting summer have to be capable of drawing enough students to cover the cost of offering those courses. Summer session directors work closely with departments to identify summer courses that will attract

students and meet departmental objectives. Departments often use the summer as an opportunity to provide gateway courses that satisfy prerequisites, and impacted courses that cannot meet student demand during the regular year.

In a State-supported environment, the “bottom line” does not drive summer course offerings in quite the same way. It will be possible, for example, to offer courses that would be too expensive to offer in a self-supporting summer. Because attendance in summer is still a student choice, course offerings must be able to attract students to enroll in the summer. Gateway courses and impacted courses will continue to be an important part of the summer offerings. As enrollments grow, departments will be able to provide more breadth of courses. They may also decide to offer some popular courses only in the summer as a way of attracting students.

Since summer enrollment is projected to be roughly 40 percent of an average term’s academic enrollment in the regular year, the summer curriculum will have fewer course offerings than the regular academic year. Each campus will develop its own areas of summer focus — e.g., bridge programs for entering freshmen and transfers, lower division general education courses, summer-only minors, courses for graduating seniors — which will determine the courses that are offered.

There are several ways to address the quality of summer courses, although precise and definitive measurement of quality is difficult to accomplish. Three different approaches have been identified, although not yet systematically implemented.

- Student evaluations. Student evaluations of summer courses tend to be very positive, and often exceed the evaluations of the same courses taught in the regular academic year. Students often have more access to their professors in the summer, especially if there are fewer students in the course or if they are taking less than a full load, allowing them more time to take advantage of professors’ office hours.
- Grade point average. Campuses can evaluate the quality of their summer courses by comparing the GPA of students taking the same courses during the regular academic year. Informal studies indicate that GPAs are equivalent in the summer, showing that summer courses are not “easy grades.”
- Faculty teaching profile. It is expected that with State-funding more regular rank faculty will teach summer courses in coming years. At Berkeley, Los Angeles and Santa Barbara, nearly 40 percent more regular-rank faculty taught in summer 2001 than in summer 2000. An informal study of summer 2001 shows that for the most part, the same types of faculty are teaching courses in the summer as are teaching those same courses in the regular academic year.

While it is the intent of the University that campuses offer summer programs that are of the same academic caliber and quality as in the regular academic year, it is also expected that faculty will take advantage of the opportunities summer provides for innovation.

They may experiment with teaching courses in different ways from the more traditional format used in the regular year. Campuses also have the opportunity to invite distinguished faculty from other universities to teach during the summer. The summer may provide more opportunities to incorporate field studies, trips or use of technology.

Given the potential differences in the summer curriculum, it may not always be possible to draw exact comparisons to the regular academic year. It should be noted that in order for summer to attract students, courses must be well integrated into the regular year curriculum and assist, rather than impede progress towards a degree. This requirement of integration creates the conditions for comparable quality.

Faculty and nonfaculty compensation, duties, and employment standards

Faculty and nonfaculty (staff) working in the summer are employed under the same regulations and expectations of employment as during the regular academic year. Any issues for exclusively represented employees (e.g., lecturers and teaching assistants) that are specific to summer employment will be handled through contract negotiations. At some campuses, staff in certain departments are traditionally furloughed in the summer months. As these campuses become State-funded, it will probably become necessary to recall these employees to provide the services required by a larger summer enrollment.

Faculty. There are two ways faculty can be compensated during the summer. First, since they work on academic year (nine-month) contracts, they can teach in the summer for additional (overload) pay. Overload teaching has been the practice for many years. Many faculty welcome the opportunity for extra income for at least some summers during their career. The disadvantage to overload teaching is that it diverts faculty from doing research, which generally is conducted during the time the faculty member is not otherwise required to teach (i.e., during the summer). If overload teaching is carried on over too many years, a faculty member's research may decline and affect his or her accomplishments as a faculty member of a research university. Junior faculty, often in most need of additional income, may lose valuable time needed to enhance their research portfolio necessary for becoming tenured members of the academic community.

The second way a faculty member can be compensated during the summer, available only at fully State-funded campuses, is to switch teaching assignments from one term (fall, winter, or spring) to the summer. There is no overload pay involved in this switch. The faculty member would then move research activities typically done in the summer into the "off" term. While this sounds like a simple arrangement that could be accomplished easily, there are issues yet to be resolved about possible conflicts with the terms of some research grants, unavailability of the faculty member for participation in required governance activities, such as departmental searches for new faculty, and technical issues related to pay and retirement. There appears to be interest on the part of some faculty for teaching in the summer under this arrangement, particularly those who may prefer to conduct their research and attend professional meetings at a different time of year.

Campus divisions of the Academic Senate are working with academic administration to determine the best ways of increasing faculty teaching in the summer. Beginning in 2001, to provide an additional incentive for faculty willing to teach on an overload basis, both the University and academic year faculty began making contributions to Defined Contribution Plan (DCP) retirement accounts for work performed during the summer. It is expected that such DCP contributions will eventually be extended to eligible research and overload teaching pay earned during any term that is not part of a faculty member's academic-year contract. For those faculty who switch teaching assignments from another term, normal retirement plan (UCRP) service credit and pension calculation for academic year appointees will not be affected. Their participation in summer instruction will be increased through individual interest or departmental teaching assignments.

Planning context for summer 2002

With full State funding, Berkeley, Los Angeles and Santa Barbara are now in a position of financial stability that allows them to build summer programs that will attract and accommodate significant increases in enrollment.

The remaining five campuses have already started their planning for summer 2002, watching with interest the experiences of Berkeley, Los Angeles and Santa Barbara. The Governor's proposed budget for 2002-03 only includes funding to convert Davis to State-supported summer instruction. Given the State's fiscal situation, it is unclear when similar funding will be provided for the remaining four campuses. However, funding for the last four campuses will continue to be a high priority each year in our budget.

Even with the lower fees students pay in the summer, the probable delay in State funding means the remaining campuses will not be able to increase their enrollments substantially beyond 2001 summer levels (although no students will be turned away). The two major reasons enrollment will increase slowly are the unavailability of financial aid and lack of sufficient financial support to develop new courses that will attract more students.

An additional burden on these four campuses during this funding delay is an agreement in the Partnership that requires review of new classroom and class laboratory space to be made on the assumption of 40 percent of a campus's enrollments occurring in the summer. Without State funding for summer this goal is not achievable, and the longer funding is delayed, the more difficult this constraint on new classroom and class laboratory space will become.

Nevertheless, the University remains committed to expanding summer enrollment if the State is willing to fund it. The University's enrollments continue to grow as increasing numbers of Californians graduate from high school, and these efforts to expand summer programs remain one of the University's primary responses to meeting its commitments to accommodating them.

Enrollment target and plan

The University's plan, if provided full State funding for current and future summer enrollments, is to increase its summer program to 24,000 FTE students by 2010. This represents an increase of 17,200 FTE students over summer 2000, and an increase of 14,200 over summer 2001 FTE enrollments.

A campus-by-campus plan for the first five years of this growth period (through summer 2010) is attached. Growth to 24,000 year-average FTE students in 2010 is based on the following assumptions:

- Continued funding for summer instruction at Berkeley, Los Angeles and Santa Barbara, the three UC campuses that became fully State-funded in the 2001-02 budget.
- Full State funding for the Davis campus's summer instruction in summer 2002.
- Delay of State funding for summer instruction at the remaining campuses with summer programs (Irvine, Riverside, San Diego, and Santa Cruz) until summer 2003.
- A modest increase in actual enrollment in summer 2002, followed by accelerated growth that will allow the University to achieve its targeted enrollment of 24,000 year-average FTE by 2010.

Given the fact, described earlier in this report, that it takes three fully enrolled students to produce one year-average FTE in the summer, this plan is aggressive when expressed in headcount, as Table 3 below shows.

Table 3
Projected Headcount and FTE Enrollment

	Summer 2000 Actual	Summer 2001 actual	Summer 2006 Projected	Summer 2010 projected
Headcount	39,680	52,059	51,600 full time; 103,200 half time	72,000 full time; 144,000 half time
FTE	6,816	9,687	17,200	24,000
Headcount to FTE ratio	5.8 students = 1 FTE	5.4 students = 1 FTE	3.0 full time; 6.0 half time students = 1 FTE	3.0 full time; 6.0 half time students = 1 FTE

Conclusion

While the University is committed to expanding summer instruction and is planning for that expansion to be aggressive, this process is an evolving one in which much remains to be learned, particularly about students' interest in attending and how curricular choices, available services, and faculty involvement will affect that. The plan set out here may be accomplished faster or slower than it indicates, depending on unforeseen circumstances, and the delay in State funding for the remaining four campuses is unfortunate for maintaining planning momentum. However, the experience of summer 2001 indicates that there is interest on the part of both faculty and students to increase the use of summer for instruction to accommodate growing enrollments. Hopefully the funding delay will be of short duration so that campuses will be able to develop summer programs quickly and responsively.

University of California

Planned Summer Year-Average Equivalent (FTE) Enrollments -- UC Students Only*

REVISED

	2000 <i>Actual</i>	2001 <i>Actual</i>	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Berkeley	1,390	1,925	2,150	2,380	2,610	2,840	3,070	3,300	3,530	3,760	4,000
Davis	824	933	1,120	1,290	1,460	1,630	1,800	1,970	2,140	2,310	2,500
Irvine	971	1,240	1,240	1,510	1,780	2,050	2,320	2,590	2,860	3,130	3,400
Los Angeles	1,222	2,099	2,200	2,430	2,660	2,890	3,120	3,350	3,580	3,810	4,000
Merced					100	220	340	460	580	700	800
Riverside	430	636	636	810	980	1,150	1,320	1,490	1,660	1,830	2,000
San Diego	775	906	906	1,220	1,530	1,840	2,150	2,460	2,770	3,080	3,400
Santa Barbara	854	1,446	1,550	1,670	1,790	1,910	2,030	2,150	2,270	2,390	2,500
Santa Cruz	<u>351</u>	<u>502</u>	<u>502</u>	<u>610</u>	<u>720</u>	<u>830</u>	<u>940</u>	<u>1,050</u>	<u>1,160</u>	<u>1,270</u>	<u>1,400</u>
Total	6,817	9,687	10,304	11,920	13,630	15,360	17,090	18,820	20,550	22,280	24,000
Increase		2,870	617	1,616	1,710	1,730	1,730	1,730	1,730	1,730	1,720

*includes summer education credential students

Note: Summer 2000 actuals have been corrected