

# Report on Summer 2001 Instruction at the University of California

## Summary

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 support. This report addresses the 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.

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 State funds are provided for their summer instruction.

## Reporting Requirements and State Budget Context

The Partnership Agreement with the Governor expects the following with respect to reporting on summer:

Implement more extensive use of existing facilities to accommodate enrollment demands and to help alleviate enrollment pressures during the regular academic year.

- Reach agreement with the Administration and the Legislature on a plan for phasing in implementation of a State-supported summer term on a campus-by-campus basis beginning in summer 2001. The phasing plan should be based on the assumption that fees, financial aid, and the quality of programs should be similar to that offered during the regular academic year.

Performance data: Include phasing plan in final agreement on budget for 2000-01. By October 1 each year provide a progress report on implementation of year-round operations.

- Examine incentives to encourage more students to attend classes in the summer and more faculty to teach in the summer.

Performance data: Report by October 1, 2000 on incentives to encourage more students to attend class in the summer and more faculty to teach in the summer.

The report to the Department of Finance that follows reflects actions taken in 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.

This report on implementation of the first State-funded summer at the University of California presents the following information:

- Planning context
- Facts about summer 2001
- Incentives for increasing student enrollment and faculty teaching
- Expectations for future summers

### **Planning Context**

Three UC campuses—Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Santa Barbara—learned late in their planning cycle for summer 2001 that they were to be included in the Governor's 2001-02 Budget for full State funding of summer instruction.

Campuses typically plan their summer program at the end of the preceding summer and early fall. Publications with course offerings, schedules and fees are produced before the end of the calendar year. Registration for summer courses opens as early as November for some courses (e.g., popular travel courses), but more typically begins in February or March. Additional courses can be added, and courses with low enrollments can be dropped after the catalog is produced. Nevertheless, the majority of course offerings and faculty are already confirmed about nine months before the summer session opens.

In November 2000, Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Santa Barbara were advised that State funding for summer 2001 seemed likely. The Governor's Budget in January 2001 confirmed the priority the State was giving full funding for summer programs.

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.

As California's economy declined in early 2001, there was continuing uncertainty throughout the spring budget hearings about 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 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.

Nevertheless, despite financial uncertainties and the late timing of funding with respect to planning, 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.

### **Facts about Summer at Berkeley, Los Angeles, Santa Barbara, and Other UC Campuses**

#### Enrollments

Enrollment grew on all campuses, but increases at Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Santa Barbara were especially significant. Clearly, the additional effort invested because of the availability of full State funding made a difference for those three campuses that went beyond the positive effect of lower fees on other UC campuses.

	<b>Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Santa Barbara</b>	<b>Other 5 Campuses</b>	<b>Total</b>
Total FTE Enrollment Summer 2001	5,400	4,200	9,600
Student FTE Increase over Summer 2000	1,930 56%	860 26%	2,790 41%
Total Headcount Enrollment Summer 2001	26,600	26,200	52,800
Student Headcount Increase over Summer 2000	Estimated 8,050 <sup>1</sup> 43%	5,050 24%	13,100 33%

<sup>1</sup> Berkeley's Summer 2000 headcount data report duplicated students (i.e., one student enrolling in two separate sessions was reported as two students). The growth in headcount students shown here is based on an estimate of unduplicated students at Berkeley.

As in other summers, most summer students were undergraduates—averaging 95 percent for UC as a whole, as well as the three State-funded campuses.

In addition to enrolling in larger numbers, students also took more units than in previous summers. On average, undergraduates at Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Santa Barbara increased their average units per student from 8.3 to 9.0<sup>2</sup>, which resulted in greater increases to FTE than to headcount.

### Courses

The three campuses used various strategies with respect to accommodating increased enrollments. For the most part, given the late start in planning, they relied primarily on increasing enrollments in classes already planned for summer 2001, and added new sections when enrollments exceeded capacity. However, they also added new courses; the overall increase over courses offered in summer 2000 was 28 percent.

The partially State-funded campuses increased their course offerings by about seven percent.

### Faculty

Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Santa Barbara increased the total number of faculty teaching in the summer by 24 percent over summer 2000. Since most teaching commitments had already been made by the time State summer funding seemed secure, there was less increase in the number of regular-rank faculty teaching than will be possible in future summers. Nevertheless, over 150 additional regular-rank faculty and lecturers<sup>3</sup> taught in summer 2001, a 27 percent increase over the previous summer.

The total number of faculty teaching at the partially State-funded campus increased by seven percent, with a two to three percent decrease in the number of regular-rank faculty and lecturers as compared to summer 2000.

### Financial Aid

The University is committed to providing financial aid to students in the summer, in a manner as nearly equivalent to aid provided in the regular academic year as possible. In summer 2001, a third of student fee revenues was set aside for financial aid at Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Santa Barbara, and the number of aid recipients there increased significantly compared to summer 2000 when little, if any aid was available to students enrolled in the summer. Approximately 8,000 students at these three campuses received nearly \$4.4 million in financial aid.

---

<sup>2</sup> Berkeley's semester units converted to quarter units for comparability to Los Angeles and Santa Barbara.

<sup>3</sup> These two groups of faculty represent the normal teaching cohort in the regular academic year; increases were nearly evenly divided between the two groups. There were an additional 74 regular-rank faculty and 78 lecturers in summer 2001.

### Classroom Use

One of the primary reasons for increasing summer enrollments is to avoid the need for construction of as many classrooms and class labs as would be necessary if enrollments increased only in the regular academic year. Data systems to track summer use of classrooms and class labs are still being developed at campuses. During the standard instructional hours of 8 a.m. and 5 p.m., Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Santa Barbara used 61 to 86 percent of their available classrooms at the peak of their summer 2001 scheduling. Indications are that classroom use—both in number of rooms scheduled, and number of hours rooms were scheduled—did increase over previous years, as would be expected to accommodate the new courses and sections.

It should be noted that classrooms and class labs are less available for regular instruction in the summer than they are during the regular academic year. Competing high priority summer uses include special programs for high school and younger students, orientation programs for incoming freshmen and transfers, academic conferences hosted by the campus, and maintenance and renewal work that takes rooms out of commission for days or weeks at a time.

### Incentives Provided to Students and Faculty

It was assumed that in addition to lower fees, incentives would be necessary to change decades-old summer patterns, both for students and for faculty. The three campuses expecting full State funding instituted additional incentives, in the event that lower student fees did not bring in enough additional student enrollments. They also experimented with ways of increasing the numbers of faculty to match more closely the teaching profile of the regular academic year.

### Student Incentives

The primary incentive for increasing student summer enrollment was lower fees, made possible by the State's buying down fees to make them equal, on a per-unit basis, to fees paid in the regular academic year. The savings to students ranged from nothing at those campuses where fees were already low, to nearly 50 percent. In addition, none of the campuses charged non-resident tuition, and in some cases they charged graduate students the same per-unit fee charged to undergraduates.

Every campus experienced growth, but growth at Berkeley, Los Angeles and Santa Barbara was 56 percent as compared to 26 percent for the other campuses. Consequently, it can be assumed that growth of 26 percent was due to fee reductions and 30 percent to other actions taken by Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Santa Barbara.

- Additional fee incentives. Santa Barbara capped its fees at 8 units to encourage students to enroll in more than 8 units. The campus also provided funding for a for-credit summer undergraduate research program—\$500 per student for travel and materials. UC students from any campus enrolling at Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Santa Barbara did not pay the application fees normally charged in the summer. In years past these fees have been as high as \$300-\$325.
- Publicity. While not an incentive per se, massive publicity efforts at Berkeley, Santa Barbara, and Los Angeles seem to have paid off. In addition to mass media

(bus advertising, radio spots, newspaper inserts, and frequent advertisements) campuses targeted students through e-mail campaigns, inserts in billing statements, departmental advising, and attention-grabbing gimmicks, such as an informative “treasure hunt” that offered free summer classes as the prize. Campuses also targeted students from other UC campuses who might be returning to their home communities for the summer. Nearly 1,200 students—approximately 200 FTE—left their own campus for the summer to enroll at Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Santa Barbara.<sup>4</sup>

- Courses. New courses were added, where possible, to attract additional enrollments. Despite the financial risk involved in the event State funding did not get approved, Santa Barbara added over 150 new courses (about half in the Linguistics Institute, which will move to another university the next time it is offered). Berkeley experimented with new ways of teaching calculus that provided that course’s several hundred enrolled students with more access to faculty. Several departments not represented in previous summers added classes at UCLA, for a total of 60 departments offering courses.

These three campuses added courses that are heavily impacted during the regular academic year, offering an incentive to students having difficulty completing requirements for some majors. The campuses also added new sections when enrollments exceeded capacity in existing courses so that students would not have to be turned away. As just one example, UCLA increased its number of English 4 sections (a required writing course) from 5 to 14.

### Faculty Incentives

With uncertainty surrounding State funding until after summer sessions were underway, and with both faculty and student interest in summer programs unknown, the three campuses were cautious in implementing new faculty incentives for summer teaching. The incentive used most was the same used for self-supporting summer sessions—additional pay above their nine-month (academic year) contract. Santa Barbara increased the salary level for regular-rank faculty for overload teaching; Berkeley increased it for some regular-rank faculty. At Santa Barbara, regular-rank faculty who taught a regular 3- to 5-unit summer 2001 course also received an additional per-course stipend of \$1,500, which was put into a departmental account to be used by these faculty for instructional improvement purposes or in support of their research.

Beginning in 2001, both the University and academic-year faculty began making contributions to Defined Contribution Plan (DCP) retirement accounts for work performed during the summer, that is, for research and for overload teaching. This new program was instituted because faculty work in the summer does not otherwise count toward calculation of retirement benefits.

One of the successful incentives for encouraging faculty participation in the self-supporting summer “economy” has been to return surplus revenue to departments whose

---

<sup>4</sup> Nearly 2,500 students from all UC campuses enrolled at a campus other than their own—approximately 800 FTE.

courses generated the income. These highly valued funds are then used at the discretion of the department for supporting graduate students, recruiting new faculty, making capital improvements and meeting other departmental priorities. A challenge for campuses as they move to State-supported summer is how to maintain their ability to generate these funds; higher faculty salaries for overload teaching may encourage additional teaching, but will cut into departmental revenues.

Another significant challenge is how to redistribute teaching assignments throughout the year so that faculty are not working on an overload basis— i.e., teaching in all terms on a year-round basis. Overload teaching takes time away from research duties that are required both by the faculty members' contracts with the University and by their external research funding agencies. Both Santa Barbara and Berkeley experimented in limited ways with individual faculty members shifting part of their required teaching loads to the summer, and moving research activities to another term. This approach, while introducing myriad complications yet to be resolved, has the merit of ensuring that faculty are able to devote a part of their year (quarter or semester) to research. Campuses report interest on the part of some faculty in participating in future summers on the basis of redistributed workload.<sup>5</sup>

### **Expectations for Future Summers**

There are two major topics to address with respect to the future. The first is how the three campuses that now have fully State-supported summer instruction will attract and accommodate increasing summer enrollments. The second topic is the future plans for funding the remaining partially funded campuses.

#### Fully State-funded Campuses

Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Santa Barbara now face the challenge of modifying their summer programs to meet the expectations that came with State funding. For example, they are expected to increase their enrollments substantially, contributing their share toward a total UC summer enrollment currently projected to be 24,000 FTE by 2010. Another expectation is that State-funded summer will enable students to graduate earlier or to substitute summer for another term's enrollment, in order to accommodate additional students in their place. And, campuses are expected to provide programs equivalent in quality to programs (academic programs as well as student services) provided in the regular academic year. Given their experiences with experiments tried in summer 2001, the assurance of continued State funding, and the additional time they have to plan for summer 2002, they can be expected to make progress toward each of these goals.

---

<sup>5</sup> Campuses could contract with faculty to change their academic year (fall, winter, and spring quarters; fall and spring semesters) so that summer is substituted for another term. Such a change would mean that a faculty member would be expected to carry out all contractual duties in the summer. This raises issues about faculty participation in required departmental activities and governance that take place in the regular academic year: recruitments, tenure review, and other required governance activities that require full departmental presence. Simply shifting teaching assignments—but not all faculty obligations—to the summer avoids the problem of faculty being absent from the department during the regular academic year.

It will take time to assess success in some areas—for example, a few years may have to pass to see the effects of summer enrollment on students’ time-to-degree. Similarly, it will take time to recruit and provide accommodation for the new faculty positions that have come with State funding. However, some successes, such as increases in summer enrollments, will be immediately evident.

One of the hallmarks of summer instruction is that it can be different in many ways from instruction in the regular academic year. In fact, these differences are often what attract students and faculty. To be successful, therefore, the summer instructional program will have to provide opportunities not otherwise available, in venues and classroom configurations not generally used at other times of the year. Each campus is looking at ways to optimize the unique features afforded by a summer calendar, without sacrificing academic quality. Some examples of campus thinking:

- Summer-only courses. One idea is to create “summer-only” minors. For example, business and economics are two majors that cannot accommodate all interested students. Many students might be satisfied with a minor, which could be accomplished by making the necessary courses available in the summer only.
- Summer bridge. Campuses are interested in expanding existing programs and creating new courses for incoming freshmen and transfers to ease their transition into UC.
- Expanded travel. The shorter summer calendar and the fact that many campus activities are curtailed during the summer (e.g., music and sports organizations, social groups, student government) mean that many students may find summer travel-study programs attractive, not just overseas, but throughout the United States. Campuses are considering adding more of these opportunities; the University’s Education Abroad Program is also developing summer instructional programs that will provide students with a full quarter’s worth of credit.
- Expanded undergraduate research. Because many faculty are already engaged in summer research, they may be able to incorporate unit-bearing instructional activities for undergraduates. Students would benefit even more directly in the scholarship activities of a research university than time permits in the regular academic year.

It is important to point out that summer may look different in many ways from the regular academic year without sacrificing quality. Summer courses will continue to be approved by the faculty, be academically coordinated with the regular academic year, provide students with full UC credit, and meet UC graduation requirements and requirements of the major. Summer is, however, an opportune time for students to take gateway courses, particularly challenging subjects that require intensive study, and special offerings, which may make the distribution of courses and the type of faculty who teach them different in summer than in the regular year.

As departments devise ways of making it possible and desirable for more of their faculty to teach during the summer, courses will increasingly be taught by similar configurations



of faculty as teach those courses during the regular academic year. That is, if a course is usually taught by regular-rank faculty or lecturers, the same will be true in the summer. However, summer provides an opportunity not generally available during the regular year, for offering teaching positions to outstanding visiting faculty from other high-caliber institutions. Campuses will continue to want to provide courses that give students access to these individuals; in fact, such courses are seen to be an incentive for student enrollment.

### Partially-funded Campuses

The remaining campuses have a different challenge. They are in the same situation as Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Santa Barbara were in late 2000. That is, they are hoping to receive the remaining funding for their summer enrollments (the summer buyout). Through the fee buydown they have already increased their summer enrollments by 25 percent. These additional students have received the benefit of lower fees, but the campuses have not received funding to cover the shortfall between fees and summer expenses. If the summer programs at these campuses are going to survive in their semi-self-supporting state, they cannot afford for long to continue increasing summer enrollments.

There are other problems that develop for these campuses by delaying State funding. They are unable to offer students financial aid when they enroll on these campuses in the summer, creating a disincentive for students to enroll. They are caught in a bind with regard to classroom construction—they are unable to increase enrollment in the summer toward the 40 percent expected before new classrooms can be proposed, but unable to build classrooms for the growth already occurring in the rest of the year. The remaining campuses are also deeply concerned about losing momentum in implementing expanded instruction in the summer. It is difficult under any circumstances to redesign a culture, requiring major efforts on the part of faculty and administrators, above and beyond their normal workload. Uncertainty about State funding for summer can easily deflate the energy UC is encouraging them to invest in this essential effort.

### **Conclusion**

UC has embraced the necessity of expanded summer instruction but needs full State funding to accomplish on all campuses what Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Santa Barbara have begun to achieve.