State-Supported Summer Instruction:  Summary of Program Plans, Implementation, and Results

Campus: Sacramento
Prepared by: Larry D. Glasmire, Director of Special Programs and Enrollment Analysis
E-mail: glasmirel@csus.edu

2001/2002 Budget Act Language asks the CSU to submit a five-year plan regarding year-round operations in January 2002. We will be requesting campuses to submit five-year summer enrollment proposals after the 2002/2003 FTES targets are finalized in mid-November. We are asking now for the campus to draft a preliminary response to the Budget Act Language that asks us to “identify the changes [the campus][has made, is making, or is planning to make] 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, faculty and non-faculty compensation, duties and employment standards.”

Every campus must submit a preliminary response by the campus’ Opening Fall due date (see Attachment A-1). Campuses that have not as yet offered state-supported summer instruction should submit plans. Campuses that first offered state-supported summer instruction in summer 2001 should submit information about changes made in summer 2001 as well as plans. Campuses that offered state-supported instruction before Summer 2001 should address the campus history, current situation, and future plans.

2. Complete the top section of this form and beginning on page 3, please provide the campus’ preliminary response.
3. Save the WORD document as 0102_EPR_B1_xxx, where xxx is replaced with any number of letters to identify the campus.
4. E-mail the complete WORD document to Marsha Hirano-Nakanishi, mhirano-nakanishi@calstate.edu by the campus’ Opening Fall due date (see Attachment A-1 and Note 1 below).
5. Hirano-Nakanishi will coordinate review of the campus’ preliminary response at the Chancellor’s Office and will get back to the person named at top of this sheet with any questions or requests for additional clarification. The person listed at the top of this sheet should be authorized to approve release to state officials of the campus’ response to State-Supported Summer Instruction: Summary of Plans, Implementation, and Results.

1 Campuses with Opening Fall 2001 due dates in September may have until October 1st to submit a preliminary response.
For campuses that held state-supported summer 2001 instruction, the following specific areas of interest also must be addressed.

**Academic Instructional Offerings and Student Demand.** Please describe the schedule of classes the campus offered and student response. Please specifically describe about how many early summer entrants who will be first-time freshmen in fall 2001 enrolled in the summer to improve their English and/or mathematics proficiency and how the campus addressed their varying needs. Please make any other observations about the types of students the campus attracted to its state-supported summer programs, e.g., seniors in certain degree programs, beginning teachers taking courses to upgrade to a “clear” credential, etc. The Chancellor’s Office will be developing an advisory to assist in developing specifications for providing profile information about state-supported summer instruction in comparison with fall or spring terms based on use of ERSS and APDB files; please provide the names, titles, and e-mail addresses of campus institutional researchers and academic analysts who may be interested in participating in this activity.

**Instructional Calendar, Incentives, Fees, Financial Aid and Other Student Services.** Please describe your summer session calendar (e.g., length of sessions, start dates, end dates, etc.). Did your campus implement the “summer term per unit fee option”? Did your campus pro-rate any campus-based fees for the summer? If so, describe what was done. Briefly describe any special efforts your campus used to attract summer enrollments in state-supported programs (e.g., special advertising, institutional waivers, institutional financial aid). If you now are able, please provide a rough percentage of students receiving financial aid during summer 2001; Mary Robinson will calculate official, detailed figures through regular college-year reporting processes.

**Employment Issues.** About how many individual faculty/instructors and full-time equivalent faculty were involved in providing state-supported summer instruction? If you now are able, please indicate the extent to which these instructors were tenured/tenure-track faculty versus lecturers. If you now are able, please indicate the extent to which the tenured/tenure-track faculty were paid on the basis of “extra pay for extra work.” Please provide any additional information that is relevant to issues of faculty and non-faculty compensation, duties and employment standards. The Chancellor’s Office will be developing an advisory to assist in developing specifications for providing term profiles about instructional faculty by term using APDB and PIMS; please provide the names, titles, and e-mail addresses of campus institutional researchers and academic analysts who may be interested in participating in this activity.

**Success Factors and Other Issues.** Briefly identify those activities that appear to have been most significant to the success of your state-supported summer instruction. Every campus converting sections for matriculated students from self-support to state-support overachieved marginally-funded summer 2001 targets. Were any non-instructional programs displaced due to the implementation of the robust state-supported summer? What, if any role, did your Extended Education/Continuing Education program perform in administering your state-supported summer term? Briefly describe things that the campus will do differently next summer.
Academic Instructional Offerings and Student Demand

Our campus opted to offer a unique “hybrid” approach to our schedule for 2001. We offered about 65% of our courses as part of the state-supported summer “semester” and about 35% in our self-support Regional and Continuing Education program.

The criteria for determining which courses to offer in state-supported summer were developed in consultation with the college deans, and the senior administration at a combined retreat in mid October. The following criteria were developed:

- Overall, the university committed to convert about half or the Summer 2000 self-support FTES to state support in 2001 and the remainder in 2002
- Most courses offered in our pilot 2000 state support summer program would be offered in 2001
- Consider programmatic goals first, not just courses (i.e., identify specific majors and develop year-round schedule to improve time to degree)
- Identify large programs (high number of majors) where success is likely
- Identify courses taught before in self-support summer with high enrollment
- Identify courses with multiple sections in Fall/Spring and move one or more sections to Summer
- Identify high demand General Education courses offered Fall/Spring and move one or more sections to Summer
- Consider a mix of GE categories

Using the above criteria, college deans consulted with their departments and submitted summer 2001 schedule proposals to the Provost by December 1. The Provost approved the schedule by the end of the first week in December. As a result of this process, five of our seven colleges offered courses in the state-support program and two offered courses exclusively in the self-support program. The five colleges who offered courses in the state-support program also offered some courses in the self-support program.

Matriculated CSUS students were able to register for courses in both the state-support and self-support programs for the same fee (State University Fee + miscellaneous campus fees) based on the combined number of units in both programs. For example, a student who took 3 units in state-support and 6 units in self-support paid one fee based on a total of 9 units.

The state-support schedule initially offered about 245 course sections. Only 10% of the sections were cancelled because of low enrollment (compared to about 20% in the self-support program). Six additional sections were added because of student demand. Our FTES target for Summer 2001 was 440 (annualized). We achieved an actual FTES of 551 (annualized), 25% more than target. Student demand was high for most programs. The following chart shows the top five academic programs based on annualized FTES generated:
Seniors completing upper division GE and/or other graduation requirements and graduate students pursuing teaching credential programs made up the majority of our summer students. This is not surprising given the course offerings. The actual class level distribution was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>1,774</td>
<td>52.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,358</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In two previous state-supported pilot programs in the summer, we have been unsuccessful in convincing new freshmen to “start early” to complete remedial work, other than those who have participated in our Summer Bridge program. We expanded our Summer Bridge program in 2001 to about 160 students (almost double the number in 2000). These students took 6-week intensive remedial courses as part of Summer Bridge, but the courses were not included in the state-support summer program. We enrolled just over 200 “early entrant transitory” students, but most were either new transfers or graduate students admitted for Fall 2001.

**Instructional Calendar, Incentives, Fees, Financial Aid and Other Student Services.**

Our state-supported summer calendar was defined as a 12-week term with two 6-week sessions and a 12-week session. Some shorter courses were also offered as long as they fit within the boundaries of one of the 6 or 12-week sessions. The calendar was as follows:

- Session A, Early Summer Session 6/4/01 through 7/14/01
- Session B, Late Summer Session 7/16/01 through 8/25/01
- Session C, Full Summer Session 6/4/01 through 8/25/01
We did not implement the “summer per unit fee option.” Our fees for summer 2001 were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Undergraduate</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-6 units</td>
<td>$445</td>
<td>$469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7+ units</td>
<td>$745</td>
<td>$784</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fees noted above included the applicable State University Fee, plus two “pro-rated” campus-based fees. The campus-based fee component was $31 per student as follows:

- University Union Fee: $25 per student ($71 for Fall/Spring semesters)
- Student Body Association Fee: $6 per student ($107 during Fall/Spring semesters)

We included these two fees because our previous self-support fee structure included fees for these two programs and we wanted to ensure that similar revenue was generated to support the programs. To determine the amount of the fees for the state-support program, we multiplied the campus-based fee portion of the self-support fee by an estimated average unit load for the state-support summer students. We are considering additional campus-based fees for future summers (e.g., Student Health Center) and possible increases in the existing campus-based fees charged to summer students. We anticipate that the fees will be substantially less than the Fall/Spring fees, at least in the short-term. As noted previously, all matriculated students paid the same total registration fees based on the combination of units taken in the state-supported and self-supported summer programs.

To publicize our state-supported program, we produced a flyer with a complete list of courses being offered and inserted it into two editions of our campus newspaper. The inserts were placed in the two editions just prior to the availability of the printed class schedule. We included fee information, dates for the summer sessions and a web address on the flyer for students to access more information about the program. The flyer was also distributed to all departments and key student service offices for students to pick up as they visited these offices. The preliminary summer course list was available on our campus website in early February. The summer schedule was incorporated into our 2001/02 Annual Schedule of Classes, which was available April 16. We used our telephone and web registration system to encourage students to register for summer in the same way they register for other courses.

Regarding financial aid, we disbursed over $1 million in financial aid to about 725 summer students, about 22% of those who enrolled in the state-support program.
Employment Issues

About 160 faculty were involved in providing state-supported summer instruction. The majority of the faculty taught one or two courses. Sixty percent of the faculty members who taught in summer were tenure/tenure track and the other 40% were part-time lecturers. Of the 96 tenure/tenure track faculty, 91 were paid on the basis of “extra pay for extra work.” Only five tenure/tenure track faculty opted to spread their academic year workload over summer, fall and spring.

Our campus negotiated a local MOU with our faculty, which was approved by the C.O. and C.F.A., to address faculty employment and bargaining issues in the year-round context. Based on our local MOU, faculty members who taught for extra pay were paid on the basis of $\frac{1}{30}$th of their academic year salary times the number of WTU’s taught in summer. Part-time lecturers were paid on a similar pro-rated basis. One of the provisions of our local MOU was to provide an option for faculty to teach a “low enrolled” class at the lower Summer Session pay rate (Class Code 2357), if mutually agreed to by the faculty member, department chair and dean. This provision was negotiated with eleven faculty members instead of canceling the courses due to low enrollment.

Success Factors and Other Issues

We were successful because of careful planning and the involvement of the entire campus community. Excellent cooperation from the college deans in developing the criteria for the courses to be offered resulted in a schedule that was approved by the Provost with little or no modification. The departments and colleges did an excellent job of promoting the course offerings in addition to the campus-wide promotional efforts.

Because of our “hybrid” approach with both a state-support and self-support summer program it was essential that we have cooperation from our Regional and Continuing Education division. The self-support (RCE) summer schedule incorporated information about the state-support schedule and registration procedures. The RCE support staff worked very closely with staff on the state-support side to clarify registration procedures for students, especially those taking courses in both programs. Although our extended education program did not have a direct administrative role, they were very helpful in developing the processes to enable matriculated students to take courses in both programs. They also provided advising support to students who were sometimes confused by the two different programs and assisted with administrative processes (e.g., grade processing at the end of each session – something they had been used to performing in previous summer terms). The support of our extended education dean and her staff was an extremely important element to our success.

As far as plans for summer 2002, we will fully convert to a state-supported summer term, eliminating the extended education summer term entirely. We also believe that we must include more “structure” in the summer schedule and limit the number of “starting and
ending” times for courses to the defined 6-week and 12-week sessions. We believe there is too much confusion on the part of students, faculty and staff about registration dates, refund deadlines, census dates, etc.