



*Chair, Academic Council and Assembly of the Academic Senate*  
*Telephone: (510) 987-9303*  
*Fax: (510) 763-0309*  
*Email: [John.Oakley@ucop.edu](mailto:John.Oakley@ucop.edu)*

*Faculty Representative to the Board of Regents*  
*University of California*  
*1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor*  
*Oakland, California 94607-5200*

July 6, 2006

**RORY HUME**  
**PROVOST AND SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT, ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

**RE: Academic Council Approval of University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) Preliminary Recommendations on Summer-Session Instruction**

Dear Rory,

I am pleased to inform you of the Academic Council's June 21, 2006, endorsement of the enclosed preliminary thoughts and recommendations from the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) regarding summer-session instruction at UC. UCEP intends for these preliminary thoughts and recommendations to be used as a first step in the Academic Planning Council's formulation of a comprehensive, systemwide policy for assuring excellence in summer-session instruction. UCEP's memorandum also sets forth options for further review of specific aspects of summer instruction and support services at the campuses.

On behalf of the Academic Council, I respectfully request that the enclosed document be forwarded to the Academic Planning Council and considered at the upcoming teleconference on July 7, 2006.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "John Oakley".

John Oakley, Chair  
Academic Senate

Copy: Academic Council  
María Bertero-Barceló, Academic Senate Executive Director

Encl: 1



**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY (UCEP)**

**DENISE SEGURA, CHAIR**

[segura@soc.ucsb.edu](mailto:segura@soc.ucsb.edu)

The Academic Council  
1111 Franklin Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Oakland, CA 94607-5200  
Phone: (510) 987-9467  
Fax: (510) 763-0309

June 19, 2006

JOHN OAKLEY, CHAIR  
ACADEMIC COUNCIL

**Re: Summer Instruction**

Dear John,

At the request of the Academic Planning Council (APC) and Provost Hume, the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) reviewed a draft of Proposed Academic Guidelines for Summer Session from the Office of the Provost (attached). Some UCEP members had the opportunity to share the draft guidelines with their respective committees on educational policy. The committee as a whole discussed the issue of summer session at our meeting on June 5, 2006, and we offer these preliminary thoughts and recommendations for the future study of this issue to the Academic Council for consideration.

UCEP agrees that it is critical for the University to articulate its policies for using State and student fee funds to meet the academic objective of providing a high quality education to students. Consistency across courses offered for regular credit is integral to this instructional excellence, which means that classes taught during summer session must be “substantively equivalent” to those offered during the regular academic year. In addition, support services for students must be available at a level commensurate with summer enrollment. It is critical that campuses use new state-funded FTE intended to support Summer instruction in a way that achieves this goal. As a first step in formulating educational policy for summer session, UCEP recommends the following:

*Campuses should begin reviewing and evaluating how their summer session models interact with their overall educational goals.*

UCEP’s discussion revealed that the academic needs of students, student characteristics (e.g., socio-economic status, employment), and instruction by faculty vary across the campuses. The range of classes offered in Summer also varies. Understanding campus models and their “deliverables” will be helpful in systemwide planning for summer vis-à-vis instructional and support service needs. There should be consideration of how students are using Summer session toward their long term goal of graduation - whether they are using it to lighten their regular year load, to make up previous work, to shorten their time to graduation, or other related issues. Each of these should be evaluated as to whether summer school goals for each campus are being met

and how summer session and regular session curriculum are consistent and equivalent. Each campus should seek to understand and document the performance of students who enroll in summer session and the role of summer session in graduation rates. Finally, campuses should consider how their regular term policies related to disqualification and normal progress should be interpreted in the summer.

*The appropriate Senate committees should evaluate whether the 3, 5, and 6-week courses offered during summer session are “substantively equivalent” to the 10-week quarter or 15-week semester courses offered during the regular year.*

UCEP members differed in their assessment of the substantive equivalence of summer courses. At least one campus’ CEP opined that classes taught in less than ten weeks could never be substantively equivalent to courses offered during the regular academic quarter in terms of mastering concepts, theories, and knowledge. On the other hand, summer allows for immersion in certain fields—e.g., languages and writing, which may be highly desirable. UCEP strongly recommends that analysis of the comparability of courses in summer with the regular academic year be done attentive to diversity across the academic disciplines in methods and theoretical concepts essential for students to master. Teaching in a condensed format should only be done when it is pedagogically and intellectually sound.

*Campuses should review the services available to students on each campus to ensure that the cost and availability of housing, tutorial help, library hours, and health services are equivalent to the regular academic year.*

Is it possible to have “regular” instruction during summer if supportive services similar to those offered during the regular academic year are not available? Evidence from some of the campuses, particularly regarding housing, suggest that these critical items may not be equivalently available during summer for students and may pose an important barrier to summer enrollment. Another potential problem area is that administrative services in the departments are not designed for a full year system. Maximizing the quality of summer instruction may require additional staff support.

*The University should engage in serious study, campus by campus, of strategies to develop summer enrollment and faculty participation in instruction.*

UCEP believes that each campus should consider whether or not there are situations where summer enrollment should be required, and if so, under what circumstances (e.g., one year of summer session for double majors to facilitate timely graduation). In addition, UCEP believes that enough variation in faculty involvement across campuses exists to suggest that strategies to enhance instruction by faculty—e.g. financial incentives or the ability to exchange a spring or winter term for the summer term might be identified that could be considered on other campuses. Summer can be an ideal opportunity for pedagogical experimentation and diversification, giving faculty a chance to try out new courses and expand their teaching repertoire; there was concern, however, that full summer session could have an adverse effect on experimental research and internships, given that many experiments are timed to coincide with summer availability of graduate and undergraduate students. In addition, the current status of the use of a higher percentage of graduate instructors of record in the summer compared to the regular sessions should be examined with regard to the overall quality of instruction. Opportunities for instruction by doctoral students are important elements of many graduate programs, and

performance should be evaluated to ensure that academic quality is substantially equivalent to that offered by regular faculty.

*Consider integrating the Office or Division of Summer Sessions with the Office or Division of Undergraduate Studies.*

UCEP found that communication and coordination of courses across campuses between the office in charge of summer session and the Division of Undergraduate Studies is uneven. On many campuses these two entities have their own deans or administrators. One problem is the coordination of courses typically taught sequentially during the regular academic year. It is critical to identify which course sequences may work better in the summer and which should be offered during the regular year only. In addition, summer teaching evaluations tend to be different than those gathered during the regular academic year, a fact that should be addressed, particularly if more faculty become involved in summer instruction. Summer and regular academic year instruction might be better integrated if current separate entities were structurally integrated.

UCEP's makes these observations and preliminary recommendations in the spirit of maintaining the excellence of undergraduate instruction. The reviews of specific aspects of summer instruction and support services during summer could be done in a couple of ways: The Provost could request responses from campuses who would gather the information through the aegis of their existing planning committees. Alternatively, the Provost might create a committee or Task Force to review summer session guidelines and gather data suggested by UCEP and other relevant consultants. Solidifying the guidelines for summer instruction is critical to maximizing the opportunity for all campuses to develop programs that are substantively equivalent to those offered during the regular year, and thereby meeting the expectations of the Legislature and the public.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Denise A. Segura". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Denise Segura  
Chair, UCEP

cc: UCEP members  
Executive Director Bertero-Barceló