Davis Division Academic Senate

Request for Consultation Responses

Summer Sessions Whitepaper - Version 1

December 13, 2013

Budget and Institutional Analysis recently released the Summer Sessions budget model whitepaper version 1. The paper discusses the management of summer sessions in light of the new budget model. Among other proprosals is shifting management of summer sessions to the appropriate college/school.

Council of School & College Faculty Chairs (EDUCATION)

December 13, 2013 1:51 PM

Response continued on next page.

Council of School and Faculty Chairs (School of Education)
Response to Request for Consultation: Incentive-Based Model Summer Sessions (IBMSS) Program. Version 1; October, 2013.

December12th, 2013.

The Faculty and the FEC of the School of Education discussed the IBMSS Paper at the Dec. 9th, 2013 Faculty and FEC meetings. Here we present some key issues outlined by the faculty with the goal of informing future revisions of the Working Paper.

As a professional school that offers GE undergraduate courses and an Education Minor, the effect of this proposal on our unit may be less in some ways than for other units. Nonetheless, we, too, will feel its impact, if undergraduate course offerings are considered. Here we outline some key issues to consider in future revisions.

General concerns: The model proposes many substantive changes. But, the draft leaves out discussion of some possible and unfortunate consequences. For example:

(1) Units and faculty concerned about accruing maximum Student Credit Hour (SCR) yields and meeting Student Faculty Ratio (SFR) targets, during the academic year, might reasonably opt not to participate or reduce their participation in summer offerings.

(2) Faculty participation might be low given the ceilings stipulated for summer salary. While recruiting advanced graduate students as instructors might be an interim solution, the instructional experience for students might be different and potentially not comparable to instruction provided in a course taught by regular faculty. This may be a concern especially for struggling students.

(3) The incentive for units will be to offer courses that attract the largest numbers of students possible in a summer program. This may draw away enrollments from courses offered during the year, affecting the availability of TA positions for graduate students.

Lead concern: The consequences of the new funding formulas are not addressed with sufficient detail to help units understand how these changes might impact their budgets by participation in summer course offerings. We very much appreciate the detailed response prepared by the College of Engineering, demonstrating how this proposal might impact their budget. We concur with the concern that taxing units up front with a pre-set percentage would make many summer course offerings unviable at worst and risky at the very least. We support the idea of targeting "profits" after expenses as the basis for the unit tax.

We do appreciate the potential for flexibility given to units in using the yield dollars from summer offerings to support year-round courses. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Council of School & College Faculty Chairs (ENGINEERING)

December 2, 2013 2:27 PM

The College of Engineering's response is attached below.

Response continued on next page.

Date: December 2, 2013

From: College of Engineering Faculty Executive Committee
Re: Summer Sessions Whitepaper Version 1

Two aspects of the proposed summer session budget model concern our committee.

First, a simple analysis shows that the proposed "incentive based bedget model" is actually a disincentive based model. Calculations performed by several of the College of Engineering Departments suggest that whereas the College ran a $34,846 surplus from summer sessions in 2013, it will run a $136,000 loss in 2014 if it maintains its summer course offerings. In fact, even if one assumes optimistically that all of the $7.1M (32% of the projected revenue) income returned to the Deans goes to the Departments, even courses with relatively large summer enrollments by the College of Engineering standards will run large losses. For example, consider two well attended courses offered by the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering: E6, a 4-units course taken by students in the sophomore year, and E100, a 3 units junior level course. Both of these course were offered in the summer session of 2013, and had 38 and 42 enrolled students respectively (many other COE summer courses have a lower enrollment). Based on the projected 2014 formula (32% of $271 per SCH= $87.50 per SCH) the projected 2014 revenue appears below, next to the actual costs (instructor and TA stipends) for 2013, showing that both of these courses would have run large losses.

Subject	Course	Units	Enrollment	Projected Revenue	Actual Costs	Loss
ENG	6	4	38	$13,300	$16,367	($3,067)
	100	3	42	$11,025	$15,963	($4,938)

Given that these are some of the larger summer courses offered by the College of Engineering, it is clear that the proposed funding model will force all Departments in the College to reduce significantly the number of courses they offer, and to staff the remaining courses with graduate student instructors and use fewer TAs than for regular academic year classes. These outcomes are really unfortunate since they will probably lengthen the time to degree of students who typically use summer classes tio make sure they stay on track for a 4 year graduation.

If one examines the proposed budget model, it is not difficult to see that instead of representing a new incentive based budget model, it is actually an example of traditional centralized UCD budget modelling where the Campus bureaucracy collects its money first and distribute a few crumbs to the teaching units, together with 90% of the program's costs. Indeed, starting with the estimated $22M in summer sessions revenue, and subtracting 1/3rd in financial aid, which reduces the revenue to $15.5M, one sees that $6M are immediately taken off the top to pay for budget backfills that are unrelated to summer sessions, together with transition funds. Factoring the Provost's 20% share of the revenue, teaching units will effectively function with a 200% overhead on their operations since they will receive at best 32% of the overall summer session income. This is likely to create a death spiral for the summer session program, since as class offerings are reduced, fewer classes will be left to support the $6M in stranded costs that proposed budget is trying to extract from summer sessions. Thus, it can be fairly argued that the proposed budget model will be lose (to the department's finances) - lose (in the long run to the Campus's finances when the death spiral takes effect) - lose (to the students who will have fewer course offerings to choose from).

It is not difficult to see that the proposed budget model could easily be restructured to make it win-win-win to all parties. Instead of attempting to collect the $6M in budget cutbacks backfill upfront, the Campus should consider collecting a portion of these funds at the backend as a tax on profits made by offering units. Even if the tax is large, all units will be incentivized to grow the summer program for the benefits of all participants in the long run. A good example of a successful program of this type is the Pilot Program introduced by the Graduate Division to encourage units to increase the number of Masters students in their programs.

A second concern raised by some College of Engineering faculty members is the limit of 1/9th of summer salary with a $10,400 cap for teaching a summer course. While this limit is fair for 3 units classes, several courses offered by the College have 4 or 5 units, so that the current ceiling functions as a disincentive for summer teaching by faculty members. This has forced s number of Departments to hire advanced PhD students as summer session instructors. To further incentivise summer session teaching, faculty should have fhe option of depositing the money into a research account similar to the method of compensation for freshman seminars.

Finally, some departments indicated that the rapid roll out of the new budget model will disadvantage many students who have planned their coursework assuming that they would be able to take key courses in their majors next summer. Many of these courses will now have to be cancelled. Therefore, the Provost should allocate the $0.5M in transition funds directly to departments for next summer only. This would allow departments to offer these classes one last time, while warning future students that they will no longer be offered.

Council of School & College Faculty Chairs (LS: SOC SCI)

December 2, 2013 5:47 PM

The L&S Executive Committee discussed the summer sessions document and received input from the DSS Steering Committee as well. The proposal seems reasonable given that a larger share of net revenue may go to the divisions, and the new procedure may result in better decisions about what courses to offer in the summer, across the divisions. However, we suggest that the various steering committees consult with their deans regarding how the resources will be allocated within each division. One concern is that minimum enrollment figures are higher in the new model, and this may make it harder to offer required summer classes for majors, which don't always have high enrollments (e.g. summer fieldwork courses, summer laboratory courses). A second concern is that some departments and fields (e.g., English composition) cannot be taught in large classes, so departments with such courses may be hindered by a system that rewards departments with large courses. A third concern is that the salary formula may make it difficult for faculty to teach in the summer. A fourth concern is that the summer tuition seems to be "in-state" for all students, whether they are CA residents or not. This seems to result in a huge loss of funds for the university, and it might cause nonresident students to avoid certain classes during the school year and take them at a lower cost during the summer.

Council of School & College Faculty Chairs (MANAGEMENT)

December 11, 2013 11:29 AM

Dear all,

Further to reading to this summer session white paper, our Senior Asst Dean Carl Gayden followed up with Sarah Magnum in BIA and then Kimberly Pulliam further clarified the scope as follows: "The paper does not apply to professional school and health sciences summer instruction. This is stated in the Scope section on the bottom of page 2."

May I request you to state this point more clearly with emphasis? Thanks, Prasad.

Elections, Rules & Jurisdiction

December 17, 2013 4:20 PM

No response at this time.

Graduate Council

December 13, 2013 10:31 AM

Response continued on next page.

UC DAVIS: ACADEMIC SENATE
GRADUATE COUNCIL

December 12, 2013

RFC: SUMMER SESSIONS INCENTIVE-BASED BUDGET WHITEPAPER VERSION 1

The Graduate Council accepted the recommendations of the Academic Planning and Development (APD) Committee at its December 6, 2013 meeting in consideration of the above-mentioned Academic Senate Request for Consultation (AS RFC).

The Graduate Council accepted the recommendations, as follows, from the APD Committee.

APD discussions led to the suggestion that the effects of the summer session budget model on the amount and nature of summer graduate student support through TAs and other instructional employment, including identification of which programs will be most likely effected, and the extent of this effect, be assessed. In addition the effect of this model on associated academic year graduate student instructionally related support should also be considered (through changes in which quarter's courses are offered and course enrollment).

One Graduate Council member asked, "Who will carry out the requested assessment? Will it be based on existing historical enrollment data?"

The Graduate Council submits the APD committee's comments, as accepted by consensus, at our meeting as the Council's assessment of the "Summer Sessions Whitepaper Version 1" RFC**.**

Sincerely,

Rachael E. Goodhue, Chair
Graduate Council

/vm

C: Gina Anderson, Academic Senate Executive Director

HArCS Steering Committee (Write-in)

December 18, 2013 10:32 AM

The HArCS Steering Committee appreciates the opportunity to respond to the Summer Sessions white paper. Our committee discussed the “Incentive-Based Budget Model: Summer Sessions Program” at our December 4 meeting. Dean Owens and Assistant Dean Blake participated in that discussion. We are of course concerned, as the document itself notes, that the proposed model may well be disadvantageous to HArCS. Our division teaches many courses such as foreign languages, English composition, and writing-intensive courses that must be conducted in small classes. While we regard this as strength of our division, small classes are relatively expensive, and so much of our teaching is not compatible with the “incentives” in this model. The model may also have the effect of not only encouraging larger classes but also use of the most inexpensive instructors. Thus we are concerned that AI’s, Lecturers, and visiting instructors may receive preference over ladder faculty. Dean Owens appointed a Summer Sessions Advisory Group to formulate principles and policies that will allow the division to offer an appropriate selection of courses while meeting the constraints of reduced per student funding. The Dean is confident that with careful planning the division can successfully meet the challenges of the new model. We applaud Dean Owens’s thoughtful planning but we continue to be concerned that the incentives for large classes taught with inexpensive instructors may be difficult to resist. We would, therefore, urge the Committee on Planning and Budget to consider alterations to the proposed model which might increase funding without providing disincentives to many of most important courses. In particular, we were surprised to discover that in summer session, unlike the academic year, continuing international students pay the same $271 per unit fee as do in-state students. We do not understand why this anomaly exists. It seems especially surprising in light of the administration’s decision to admit 5000 additional international students in order to take advantage of the higher fees such students must pay. We suggest that continuing international students pay the same $340 per unit fee that is currently charged to non-UC students for summer sessions. There may be other possibilities for revenue that are not presently incorporated into this proposal. Thanks for giving us the opportunity to provide feedback on the new incentive-based budget model.

Planning & Budget

December 17, 2013 4:20 PM

CPB discussed the Summer Sessions Whitepaper – Version 1. CPB understands that the goal is to provide incentives to departments who use summer session to reduce time to degree, etc. and for summer session to be included as part of the new campus budget model. However, the committee is concerned that allocating arbitrary taxes against the summer session budget seems to be against the whole spirit of the new budget model.

Research

December 17, 2013 4:20 PM

No response at this time.

Undergraduate Council

December 13, 2013 4:34 PM

Response continued on next 2 pages.

We recognize the importance of reducing time to degree. Decisions based on financial considerations alone do not sufficiently incentivize departments to use summer session to meet the goal of reducing time to degree. Achieving this goal requires not only the availability of high enrollment courses, but also availability of high demand courses or required smaller courses such as intensive language courses, writing courses, labs, and “bottleneck” courses (e.g. ECS 30, EME 50, MAT 67, MAT 125, MIC 104). We are concerned that this policy may have already affected course offerings for 2014. Departments should determine which courses most need to be offered in summer. In response to principle number three, we would like greater specificity regarding budgetary transparency from dean to department.