

The Regents of the University of California

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

March 15, 2001

The Committee on Educational Policy met on the above date at the James E. West Alumni Center, Los Angeles campus.

Members present: Regents Atkinson, Bagley, Connerly, Davies, Fong, O. Johnson, S. Johnson, Lansing, Montoya, Preuss, and Sayles; Advisory members T. Davis, Morrison, and Seymour

In attendance: Regents Hopkinson, Kohn, Kozberg, Lee, Marcus, Miura, and Moores, Faculty Representatives Cowan and Viswanathan, Secretary Trivette, General Counsel Holst, Provost King, Senior Vice Presidents Darling and Mullinix, Vice Presidents Broome, Gomes, and Hershman, Chancellors Berdahl, Bishop, Cicerone, Dynes, Orbach, Tomlinson-Keasey, Vanderhoef, and Yang, Executive Vice Chancellor Simpson representing Chancellor Greenwood, Laboratory Director Shank, and Recording Secretary Nietfeld

The meeting convened at 12:30 p.m. with Committee Chair Montoya presiding.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of January 18, 2001 were approved.

2. EXPANDED SUMMER INSTRUCTION: RESPONDING TO TIDAL WAVE II

Provost King recalled that the growth faced by the University of California – at least 52,600 more students between 2000-01 and 2010-11 – has created substantial pressure to expand summer instruction. While accommodating this number of students will require many solutions, including increasing enrollment in fall, winter, and spring, expanding the Education Abroad Program and the University program in Washington, D.C, and exploring other off-campus instructional options, summer must be a major component of a comprehensive solution. The University cannot accommodate this level of growth without expanding instruction in the summer.

Growth presents special challenges for the campuses whose growth is most physically constrained by long range development plan or environmental issues, by Coastal Commission requirements, or by community agreements. Berkeley and Santa Barbara face special pressures because of the constraints of previously approved long range development plans and community agreements; they need to implement their summer programs quickly because it is the only major solution open to them, other than the difficult and lengthy process of revising prior agreements. The Los Angeles

campus needs summer expansion in order to minimize population growth during the regular session to diminish traffic, parking, and other physical impacts. Other campuses are feeling these necessities too and are not far behind the initial three in their planning. With applications rising, increased projections of high school graduates from the Department of Finance Population Unit, and new commitments to increase transfer enrollments, the projection of 52,600 students over ten years may be an underestimate. For all these reasons, the pressure to expand summer is real and intense.

The Governor and the legislature have been helpful in supporting this expansion. The 2000-01 budget provided funds to reduce student fees at all UC campuses in summer 2001 to the same level that students pay during the regular year, which should encourage greater student attendance. The University's Partnership Agreement with the Governor includes clear statements of his support for summer expansion, and the 2001-02 Governor's budget includes funding for existing summer enrollment at Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Santa Barbara as the first phase of a buyout of all existing summer funding in return for increased enrollment and increased offerings. The legislature has just begun to consider the Governor's proposal during its annual budget process, and it is important to emphasize that these three first-phase campuses are making commitments to expand programs in summer 2001 on the assumption that they will be funded and will continue to be so.

Provost King noted that each campus is in a different situation with regard to summer, which makes it crucial to allow the flexibility that will enable varied solutions to emerge. Some campuses are magnets because they are in summer resort communities, while for others, summer heat may limit their appeal and will add significant utilities costs. At the same time, some campuses are facing the challenge of very substantial growth in fall, winter, and spring as well as summer, a combination which brings special coordination challenges. Because of these varying situations, the development of expanded summer instruction will need to evolve over several years. While the three initial campuses are making concerted efforts to expand summer 2001, it cannot be viewed as typical of what will ultimately emerge on these campuses or elsewhere in the system. For example, staffing courses in summer 2001 will necessitate hiring current faculty to teach an extra term because the normal hiring process for additional regular rank faculty cannot move that fast. In the future it is expected that more students and faculty will choose to treat the summer as one of three quarters, shifting their current summer activities to another term, but in this summer that will be rare.

Provost King emphasized that the transition to summer requires many fundamental changes that will run counter to established national patterns. Traditionally, summer in a research university is a time for research to be conducted, for travel to academic conferences, and for hosting visitors who enrich research programs – important activities that must continue but whose timing will have to be rethought and merged with summer course work. There is no other major research university in the country that offers substantial course work year round. In addition, off-campus employment opportunities and internships for students are traditionally offered in the summer, and long-standing and valuable service and outreach programs make use of campus space. These long-established

campus and national modes of academic operation will be a challenge to the University's faculty and students in making expanded summer instruction a success.

It also represents a change for the University's summer session organizations. In the past summer session operations were expected to be self-sufficient. By necessity, their course offerings tended to be ones that could attract enough students at a low enough cost to be viable. On several campuses summer sessions generated revenue for departments to use in other quarters, which made it attractive for them to participate. Now State funding will enable campuses to broaden their summer offerings, but the reward structure is likely to change substantially as the funds flow top-down instead of bottom-up, and whole new efforts such as summer financial aid and student services must be implemented.

Provost King introduced the panel of Executive Vice Chancellors who would speak in greater detail on the summer 2001 programs on their campuses: Mr. Paul Gray, Berkeley campus; Mr. Rory Hume, Los Angeles campus; and Ms. Ilene Nagel, Santa Barbara campus.

Vice Chancellor Gray explained that his presentation would focus on incentives to encourage students to enroll in the summer. He emphasized the fact that while all of the campuses are pursuing multifaceted approaches to increased enrollment demand, the summer session is a critical element in this planning. The campuses are committed to maintaining the quality of the undergraduate educational experience in the face of this growth. This fact has important implications for the ways in which the campuses implement their summer expansion programs. For the Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Santa Barbara campuses, the years 2001 and 2002 will represent transition years as they move to the goal of year-round operations. Vice Chancellor Gray noted that most of the University's summer sessions are driven by demand, with admission available to anyone who is interested in attending. In order for the programs to grow, the campuses need to encourage more of their own students to attend. Money is a critical issue for students as they consider summer enrollment. Full funding from the State will allow the campuses to create a fee structure that is more attractive to students, with a per-unit fee that relates to the fees students pay during the regular quarter. This will result on average in a forty percent reduction in the cost of summer session. A number of other financial incentives will be offered on each of the three campuses. For example, a graduation bonus is being considered for students who graduate following the summer session. At Santa Barbara consideration is being given to capping the unit fee at eight units. UCLA will offer a summer research opportunity at no charge to the students. Another important element of the picture for students is financial aid. Provision of financial aid during the summer quarter will be a critical element in attracting students to attend. State funding will generate a pool of funds that will greatly increase the campuses' ability to offer financial aid. On the other hand, funding for financial aid in the summer is not enhanced by the sources that students have available during the regular school year, including federal funding and Cal Grants. All three campuses are engaged in marketing and advertising initiatives to encourage students to

enroll during the summer. There has been a dramatic increase in the number of students enrolling at both Berkeley and UCLA, where the enrollment period is open.

Vice Chancellor Nagel stressed the importance of offering excellent academic programs in the summer, and she referred to two characteristics which define an educationally rich experience. The students must have the opportunity to take courses from ladder faculty and the ability to select their curriculum from a broad array of courses. For 2001, one of the challenges is to increase the participation of UC faculty in summer courses and the breadth of course offerings. Prior to 2001, the goal for the summer session was that it be self-supporting. As a result, the choice of who taught in the summer and the number of courses offered were driven by economic considerations. Few ladder faculty were recruited for summer teaching. As a result of State funding for summer 2001, the campuses will be able to provide resources to departments that are willing to have ladder faculty teach gateway and high-enrollment courses. The campuses are also experimenting with increasing the compensation package for faculty. The attempt will be made to carefully monitor the effects of these various incentives for participation in the summer sessions. Vice Chancellor Nagel provided some projections for the summer sessions, aggregated across the three campuses. In 2000 there were 197 ladder faculty teaching during the summer session. In 2001, the campuses have commitments from 291 faculty members to teach in the summer, which is a projected increase of 48 percent. The number of courses taught by ladder faculty will increase from 294 to 330. The number of courses offered will increase by 16 percent. The goal will be to continue to increase the percentage of ladder faculty who teach in the summer session, moving to a model where faculty members will choose to teach in the summer in exchange for not teaching in another quarter. The campuses' goal is to demonstrate that the summer session is one of the viable options for accommodating increased enrollment demand.

Vice Chancellor Hume observed that, with State funding for summer sessions, there will be new incentives for students and faculty to participate. In addition, the campuses will be provided with the opportunity to develop new bridge programs, particularly in engineering and the sciences. The University is working with community colleges to increase the number of students who transfer, but many of these students come to the campuses without having completed the required courses. Bridge programs can now be offered at a lower cost during the summer to assist these transfer students. General education clusters have become a major feature of undergraduate education, particularly at UCLA, and will be offered during the summer session. The number of undergraduate summer research programs will also increase. The campuses have always relied upon the summer for an opportunity to provide extra courses in high-demand areas such as psychology. Vice Chancellor Hume stressed that each of the campuses is aware of the fact that the new summer sessions should not harm the research activities of the University. The funding that is provided to faculty for their summer research is important to California's economy as well as to the University itself, as many research facilities are funded by indirect costs on federal contracts and grants. Other ongoing programs of importance to the campuses are academic enrichment programs for students who need assistance, as well as programs for high school

teachers. Many of the campuses' outreach activities take place during the summer. Academic conferences are another important element during the summer, and the University's campuses are attractive to conference planners.

Vice Chancellor Hume then played a recording by the Berkeley Octet which advertised the summer session.

Regent Montoya requested information about retirement benefits for faculty members who teach during the summer. Provost King stated that the intention would be to continue to provide retirement credit for each three quarters a faculty member teachers. The administration is looking into the possibility of an additional defined contribution plan for those professors who choose to teach for a fourth quarter or third semester.

Regent Miura raised the issue of courses that are offered by University Extension during the summer session. She also asked whether there would be increased compensation for department chairs during the summer. Vice Chancellor Hume noted that each campus is different. At the Los Angeles campus, the summer session office is administered by Extension. The courses which are offered are regular ones which are available for credit for UCLA students, students from other campuses, and students from other universities. Mr. Hume did not anticipate an increase in the stipend for department chairs. Vice Chancellor Nagel reported that all of the courses offered at Santa Barbara during the summer are regular courses.

Regent Hopkinson raised a series of questions. She was interested in knowing how many students had attended summer sessions last year. In addition, she asked if the campuses had set a goal with respect to participation in summer 2001. A further question was whether the scholastic support provided to students was the same as for the regular school year. She asked if there was sufficient diversity in the course offerings to be helpful to a wide variety of students. She requested comment on how the campuses would meet their teaching needs on a year-round basis. Regent Hopkinson also wanted to know if incentives were being provided for graduate students who teach during the summer. A further issue is the number of summer courses permitted for a student to qualify for athletic eligibility. She asked if the University planned to work with the NCAA to address this issue. Finally, she wanted to know what the University's ultimate objective was with respect to the summer session as it reaches the peak of Tidal Wave II.

Provost King acknowledged that it would be necessary to work with the NCAA on the question of athletic eligibility. With regard to financial aid, he stressed that while funding for financial aid will be available from student fees, other sources of funding are not available during the summer. The University will need to work to change the policy that does not permit federal financial aid to be awarded for summer sessions. With respect to faculty, the Provost reiterated the fact that the goal will be to have faculty members continue to carry a normal teaching load in order to provide uninterrupted time to carry out their research. Although there may be some faculty teaching

overload, it will be necessary over time to increase the size of the faculty proportionate to enrollment.

Vice Chancellor Gray continued that last year 9,000 students enrolled in the summer session at the Berkeley campus, with an FTE equivalent of 1,500. Vice Chancellor Hume reported a 10,000 student headcount, with 1,250 FTEs. Vice Chancellor Nagel added that at Santa Barbara 5,700 students took 7.5 units on average.

Turning to longer-term issues, Vice Chancellor Gray reported that the Office of the President had asked the campuses to develop a detailed, long-term plan for submission to the legislature. The Berkeley campus will pursue a goal of 3,500 FTE for the summer semester. For 2001 the anticipation is that there will be a 20 percent increase in enrollment relative to summer 2000.

President Atkinson observed that the overall goal for the system would be to enroll forty percent of the students in the summer session. Vice President Hershman reported that this issue had been the subject of a major discussion in the University's recent hearings before the legislature. The University will plan to provide the legislature and the Regents with a multi-year plan campus by campus. Of the ultimately 210,000 students, approximately 24,000 FTE would be expected to enroll during the summer. Provost King noted that forty percent is a very ambitious goal.

Vice Chancellor Hume commented on the diversity of courses that the Los Angeles campus is able to offer during the summer. Summer sessions are currently heavily biased towards the upper division because students are prepared to spend the money necessary in order to graduate early. The campus hopes that lower division courses will become more attractive.

Vice Chancellor Nagel reported that, by contrast, the Santa Barbara campus tended to offer more lower-division courses during the summer. It is in the process of adding more upper-division offerings in order to facilitate a decrease in the time to degree. Graduate students at Santa Barbara became interested in the shift towards year-round operations and proposed the creation of a task force to address issues such as the fact that graduate students were able to teach their own courses during the summer. The campus administration has proposed a three-campus task force for graduate students which will address their issues.

Chancellor Berdahl commented on the issue of athletic eligibility. He noted that the purpose of the NCAA regulation which specifies that athletes can only take 25 percent of the courses during the summer was to ensure that they are enrolled for a sufficient number of courses during the rest of the year. Regent Hopkinson stressed that if the University moves to year-round operations, this issue must be taken into consideration.

Regent Lansing observed that one intention with increased reliance on summer enrollment will be to change the culture of the University such that each quarter is the same. She believed that many

students would respond positively to the opportunity to enroll in the summer, particularly if the courses are attractive to them. She asked if the administration views year-round operations as a goal and whether such a goal was unique to the University of California.

President Atkinson pointed out that other states do not face the enrollment demands that will be experienced in California. He anticipated that most universities would retain their present summer session structure.

Regent Lansing predicted that, as the University moves to year-round operations, employers will adjust to the fact that students are available to work at times other than the summer. She supported the initiative because it will offer greater flexibility to members of the University community.

Faculty Representative Cowan pointed out that faculty support for the initiative is crucial to its success. He noted that departments typically conduct their business on a three-quarter or two-semester cycle. The movement to year-round operations could potentially affect the ability of departments to do their business. The faculty believe that these issues can be addressed over the long term. The Academic Senate is focusing its attention on summer 2002, with the anticipation that the remaining campuses will benefit from the learning experiences at Berkeley, Los Angeles, and Santa Barbara. The administration will need to provide incentives not only to faculty to participate but also to departments as a whole.

Regent O. Johnson reported that the community colleges are moving to 15-week semesters and pointed out that this should be taken into consideration in the context of transfer students. Provost King agreed that this would be a significant issue, as would be the fact that all of the campuses do not follow the same academic calendar.

Regent Preuss referred to the fact that anyone can enroll during a summer session, resulting in students with very different levels of ability. Vice Chancellor Gray acknowledged that this could present a problem, although summer enrollment for 2001 is expected to be dominated by UC students. This issue will need to be considered in the context of greatly expanded summer enrollments. He confirmed for Regent Preuss that the non-UC students will continue to pay the higher, unsubsidized fee. Provost King stressed that no UC student would be precluded from enrolling during the summer.

President Atkinson observed that year-round operations are being instituted as one way to meet the demands of Tidal Wave II. At the same time, the transition will provide an opportunity to generate a new educational image for the University as it enters the 21st century.

3. **QUARTERLY REPORT ON PRIVATE SUPPORT**

In accordance with the Schedule of Reports, the **Quarterly Report on Private Support** for the period October 1 through December 31, 2000 was submitted for information.

[The report was mailed to all Regents in advance of the meeting, and a copy is on file in the Office of the Secretary.]

The meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary