

June 30, 2000

To: Marsha A. Chandler, Senior Vice Chancellor-Academic Affairs

Re: Summer Session Task Force Report

## I. Summary

After reviewing considerable input from faculty, department chairs, and students, and from UC-wide documents and reports, we find that UCSD's Summer Session is on the whole working well. It is operating at minimum cost because it is able to take advantage of infrastructure developed for the regular academic year. However, this situation is beginning to stress departments and campus support services and will need to be addressed in order to meet the new enrollment targets. We would not recommend an organizational change unless the State proceeds to provide funding for the summer as it currently does for the FWS quarters. In this event, the Summer Session should again become part of Academic Affairs. Regardless, Summer Session needs to become a more integral part of the regular departmental programs and planning if we are to meet the projected growth. We found universal rejection of any possibility that Summer Session evolve to become the equivalent of a full fourth quarter of the regular year. It is unlikely that Departments will substantially increase their participation in Summer Session without significant incentives to them and to their faculty. Further, they express considerable caution about the impact of expanded Summer Session on the quality of instruction throughout the year. While we discuss many ideas which may be useful to meet the need for increased Summer Session enrollments, we recommend that the following specific issues be given serious consideration:

- The Summer Session registration fee should be increased from \$40 to at least \$100, which would still leave the UCSD Summer Session program as the least expensive in the entire UC system. The additional funds are needed for student financial aid, departmental support, incentives for teachers, and for campus support services.
- The campus should work with UCOP to seek State support to extend student Cal Grants to a fourth quarter.
- The campus should work with UCOP to seek contributions to faculty retirement funds based on summer teaching compensation.
- Establish a minimum salary level for teaching which would raise the compensation for the lowest ladder rank faculty, and also raise the salary cap at the full Professor level.
- Work with laboratory-based departments to establish compressed three-week 'turbo' laboratory courses in late August and early September.
- Develop an early admission program for transfer students that begins during the summer.
- Evaluate the possibility of an early admission program for entering freshman that begins in the summer.
- Increase the incentive funds available to departments and shift the Summer Session revenue allocation methodology from 'bottleneck' course TAs to student enrollments in all courses.
- Encourage the use of emeriti, visiting professors, postdoctoral scholars, and advanced graduate students to complement the pool of ladder rank faculty. Provide faculty mentors for the graduate students and postdocs.
- Work with CEP to encourage pilot programs and innovative teaching, such as on-line instruction and compressed turbo courses, during the Summer Session.

In the following sections we review some of the background for our report, and then expand on our recommendations and discuss incentives for students, faculty, and departments, as well as several new initiatives.

## II. Introduction and Background

We were charged to look broadly at Summer Session objectives and programmatic and operational issues, as part of the campus commitment to meet the rapid enrollment increases expected during this next decade. Currently the campus projects that Summer Session enrollments may nearly triple from about 700 UC student FTE in 1999 to 2000 UC student FTE by 2010. A FTE student is defined as one student taking 15 units. Since students rarely take a full unit load during the summer, these FTE targets mean that the student headcount must increase substantially during the summers ahead of us. This growth will place an increasing demand on faculty time, and on departmental, campus and student support services. The committee considered its charge with the understanding that we were not being asked to consider a full fourth quarter of instruction and that the funding stream would remain the same, i.e., Summer Session would continue to operate without State funding in a non-profit mode. It appears that this funding stream may change in the near future so that Summer Session can be funded similarly to the normal FWS quarters by the State. If this happens, summer instructional organization would most appropriately be changed so that it becomes an integral part of Academic Affairs and the academic departments. Regardless, some of the incentives and issues we discuss below would still be relevant since it would almost certainly remain at the faculty's discretion to teach or not during the summer, and at the students' discretion to take courses during the summer.

We have spent considerable time obtaining input from faculty and departments, and have benefited from other reports. A questionnaire was sent to each Department Chair, and personal interviews were subsequently held with each Chair. A separate questionnaire was sent to all faculty who had taught in Summer Session during the past two years. With the help of our student representative, we were also able to take advantage of an AS-UCSD student survey process to obtain answers to a few questions from the undergraduates. Telephone interviews were also conducted with Summer Session directors throughout the UC system. We were also able to discuss many of the student-related issues with Vice Chancellor Watson. The complete responses are lengthy so we have included only the questionnaires and summaries of responses in the appendix. We also benefited from the recent March 2000 UC-wide Report of the Workgroup on Student Incentives for Summer Enrollment. The document is too long to include as a general appendix, but we attach a copy for your interest.

Responses from Chairs and faculty did not reveal any striking concerns about Summer Session. There is substantial variation, depending on discipline and departmental size, regarding the value of Summer Session to their programs, their faculty participation, and their use of non-ladder rank faculty. While most departments appreciate the usefulness of Summer Session to their students, and most believe it has a positive impact on their academic programs, few departments wish to encourage their faculty, especially Assistant Professors, to teach in the summer because of the need for and value of summer research. The use of non-ladder rank faculty to teach is widespread, and departments respect and feel comfortable with their ability to maintain the quality of instruction for their summer offerings. A strong majority supported the use of non-ladder rank faculty, although there was considerable variation regarding which type was appropriate, e.g., graduate students, post-doctoral scholars, lecturers, visitors, and/or emeriti, and for which courses. For example, one department was against any use of graduate students, while others felt that using advanced Ph.D. students is very appropriate, perhaps better than part-time Lecturers, and quite useful for the graduate student. Some felt that graduate students or postdoctoral scholars should only teach in lower division courses, while others felt that upper division instruction is more appropriate, because of the narrower focus of material than in the typical large lower division course. The idea of having faculty mentors for this type of student teaching is seen as valuable. There was much less variability and concern about the use of visiting faculty and emeriti, and this in fact could be

seen as an incentive for some departments. It is our feeling that, similar to the academic year, the appropriate use of non-ladder rank faculty should be left as much as possible to the disciplines and departments provided there is a measure of the quality of the teaching and academic performance of the students. As enrollments grow, departments will need to assess the balance of non-ladder rank faculty throughout the entire year.

The strong majority perception among departments and faculty is that academic standards are maintained during the summer and that student academic performance is about the same as the regular year. Several faculty felt the summer instructional experience was even better because of the smaller classes and motivated students, while others were concerned about the numbers of students who repeat courses in the summer, and the need to decrease the amount of material. Current campus support resources and TA support do not seem to be a significant problem, except in isolated cases and specialized laboratory courses. Despite the current process that requires Chairs to approve Summer Session courses, we found that many departments did not feel that Summer Session was an integral part of their academic planning and that it is left primarily to individual faculty to propose courses. Many departments felt participation would increase if Summer Session was better integrated with the departmental program planning, although it was difficult to extract specific suggestions for accomplishing this goal. Because of the course content, some departments felt they could participate more if the length of course time could be made flexible. There was universal rejection of any possibility that Summer Session evolve into a fourth quarter.

The student questionnaire was appended to an AS-UCSD survey held on library walk during the spring quarter. Students feel that the primary factors which would increase their participation in Summer Session would be offering more courses and reducing costs. Other factors noted were more financial aid, housing, better time schedules, and better advertising. The decision to carry a full load is directly tied to course availability and economic considerations -- cost, financial aid, and summer employment.

At most of the UC campuses (exceptions are UCB and UCD) Summer Session is housed together with or directly under University Extension. At UCB and UCD Summer Session reports to a Vice Provost. Most summer programs operate like ours, with faculty and departments proposing courses to the Summer Session office. The most significant exception is UCLA, which is in its fourth year of a revenue sharing program. There the curriculum proposals and summer programs are run more autonomously by the departments, which receive a share of the profits based on enrollment.

Student Affairs and Summer Session also provided us with a great deal of useful information. Table 1 provides a profile of headcount enrollment for summer 1999. The data show that Summer Session serves a broad spectrum of students and programs similar to the regular year, and that the performance based on GPA is nearly the same as the regular year, supporting the perception of faculty and departments. Table 2 compares enrollments and courses in the departments and programs from 1996 to 1999. The number of courses offered has seen little change, while the enrollments have increased by about 19% during these four years. Early registration data for this coming summer 2000 (as of 6/2/00) project that enrollments will increase nearly 24% in one year when compared to last summer. Table 2 also shows that about 81% of the students are UC students, and 77% are from UCSD. One of the objectives for future summers should be to increase the course offerings, especially at the upper division level, to help students graduate on time. Table 3 shows preliminary data for this coming 2000 session. Compared to other UC campuses, UCSD tied with UCLA in 1999 for the highest participation rate (30%) of ladder rank faculty teaching in Summer Session, and the UCSD figure for this coming summer will increase to 38%. Assistant Professors do not participate much in the teaching, likely because of the need to do research during the summer and their relatively low stipend. Approximately two-

thirds of the students take only one course in one session. Table 4 provides some 1999 comparisons between the UC campuses. Our enrollments are comparable, especially given our FWS enrollments. We have operated at very low cost, and offer fewer courses than most campuses. Table 5 provides a comparison of costs for the coming 2000 session. The average cost to the student for one course is about \$500 UC wide, while the cost at UCSD is \$360. Because the effect of a substantial cost increase on enrollments is not clear, and because of the student concern over costs, we are recommending that you consider an increase of \$60 in the registration fee. Funds generated by a fee increase are necessary to be able to offer the more robust program that will be necessary to meet the enrollment growth projections. Table 6 shows that Summer Session has been able, to a modest degree, to offer some flexibility in the weeks of instruction. As we noted above this may be important to some departments. Table 7 is a history of Summer Session scholarship support, a form of financial aid, over the past 12 years. Based on our other input, we feel the need is greater than presently available.

### **III. Increased Summer Session Fees**

It is unlikely that Departments will substantially increase their participation in summer session without significant incentives to them and to their faculty. Most of the incentives and initiatives discussed below will require additional funding. At UCB and UCLA, where costs to students are the highest, formal profit sharing models have been instituted. Departments are provided a financial package, based on substantial profit sharing, to offer robust programs. At UCLA last year \$2.7M was returned to departments based on productivity. Not surprisingly, table 5 indicates that UCLA had the highest cost per course to the students. By comparison, at UCSD \$100K was returned to selected departments based on enrollments in 'bottleneck' courses. We felt the UCLA type of profit sharing model is too costly for students and could lead to some abuse by motivating departments to make a profit through high enrollment courses with lower cost instruction. However, these models do motivate departments to actively participate in the planning of their Summer Session programs and must be regarded as a positive aspect of revenue sharing.

We are recommending a less ambitious plan. Using a modest registration fee increase, combined with existing budget surpluses such as funds currently used for the 'bottleneck' courses, a new fund should be established to support the incentives and initiatives we are proposing in this report. Currently \$100K is distributed to departments who offer 'bottleneck' courses, and their share is based on TA allocations. This fund was established by the SVCAA many years ago to provide an incentive to selected departments. We feel it has served its purpose, that the funding algorithm is outdated, that a much larger fund is needed to provide incentives to all departments, and that such profit sharing should be based equitably on enrollment workloads.

The increased funds would be needed to directly support financial aid and campus resources, but we hope that a substantial amount could be allocated equitably to all participating departments. This would permit the departments considerable flexibility in using the funds to help expand their Summer Session programs. For example, some departments may wish to use the revenue return directly to augment special course resources like staffing or laboratory equipment, while others may use the funds to provide special incentive funds to faculty, such as mini-grants or mentoring stipends for training support of graduate students and postdoctoral scholars, or to provide funds to offer an upper division course that would not normally be financially viable to Summer Session. While a thorough financial analysis will be necessary to substantiate the preliminary one we were able to do, it seems that the \$60 fee increase we propose represents a minimum level necessary to generate incremental funds to support incentives that will help meet the projected enrollment targets. The new fee would leave the cost for four summer units slightly below the pro-rated cost for four units during the academic year. Increasing only the registration fee, and not the course unit cost, would also encourage students to take more

than one course in one session. We also recommend a lower registration fee for those students who enroll in both Summer Sessions. It would be worthwhile to have some feedback on the usefulness of the new incremental funds before larger fee and/or course unit increases are phased in during future years. Assessment of the creative use of such additional funds would also be a beneficial prelude to possible future State funding of Summer Session.

Although the incentives and initiatives we discuss briefly below are clearly interrelated, we discuss them in subsections based on incentives and initiatives.

#### **IV. Proposed Incentives and Initiatives**

##### **A. Student Incentives**

###### **(1) Financial Aid**

Students will obviously regard a fee increase as a disincentive. To overcome this, there must be serious consideration of other incentives for them. Financial aid has consistently been raised as the most important issue. As Table 7 shows, less than \$30,000 of new incremental funds would double the recent annual expenditures for UCSD Summer Session scholarships, which peaked at \$31,255 in 1997 and amounted to \$25,523 in 1999. However, to have a significant impact there should also be a serious effort to encourage UCOP to work with the State to extend the Cal Grants to the summer, treating Summer Session as equivalent to a fourth quarter for financial aid eligibility calculations. If Summer Session becomes a more integral part of students' academic programs, this should generate extra financial aid eligibility credits because students could not be expected to be employed during summer, as current calculations assume.

###### **(2) Support Services**

As enrollments grow and financial aid and other student services are impacted more than presently, it will be necessary to extend incremental funding to these areas to provide an adequate learning environment for Summer Session students. As examples, we foresee needs in the Registrar's Office, student financial aid, academic advising in the Colleges and departments, computing services, and the library. The library estimates that the incremental cost to very modestly expand summer hours by two hours M-F would cost approximately \$25,000 unless additional volunteers were found. Such support issues will need to be addressed beyond this committee's ability and then incorporated into the proposed fee increase discussions. It was not clear that housing was a significant issue for most Summer Session students, but this could be examined more closely than we have been able to do.

###### **(3) Expanded Course Offerings**

The expansion of course offerings, especially in impacted courses and upper division courses, should be very beneficial to students and their time-to-degree, and should be a clear goal of providing new incentive funding to faculty and departments. We also discussed the impact of increasing student research opportunities during the summer, certainly a valuable experience for our students. To encourage this, there needs to be more widespread departmental acceptance of independent study course credit to fulfill major degree requirements. A reduced registration fee and nominal unit cost for special studies courses during the summer should also be considered.

## **B. Faculty Incentives**

### **(1) Salary**

It will be a challenge to induce additional ladder rank faculty (LRF) to teach in Summer Session. In view of the commitment to the research, their primary motivation for summer teaching is additional salary. It is likely that most faculty who are willing and interested in teaching summer session are already doing so. The trade-off between research time and augmented income is most serious for the Assistant Professor. The departments and the faculty are well aware of this conflict. Regardless, we strongly feel that there should be a higher level minimum base salary for faculty who teach. The current scale at UCSD is tied to 8.5% of the academic year salary and could result in an Assistant Professor being paid less than a TA, based on the proposed TA salary increases. We would propose that the minimum salary for faculty be set at the Associate Professor--Step I rate, or approximately \$5000 for one course. Given the low numbers of Assistant Professors who wish to teach Summer Session, this increase should not have a large effect on costs. At the other extreme, there is presently a locally imposed salary cap of \$7500 per course, which currently affects all full Professors at or above Step V. Since 45% of all campus faculty are at or above Step V, and 42% of the General Campus faculty, this cap affects a significant portion of potential Summer Session faculty. We propose that the cap be raised to at least \$8000, and that the basis for imposing it be re-examined. We understand that senior professors teaching small classes is a serious budget issue, but perhaps some combination of step and class enrollments should be used to trigger a cap. We should also note that the 8.5% policy is not held uniformly at every campus and, because of the potential change to State funding, there are discussions at UCOP about possible use of other summer teaching salary factors, such as units and weeks, or basing the salary on 1/9<sup>th</sup> (11%) of the academic year salary per course, based on the 9-course full teaching load. The campus needs to remain informed of these discussions because of the budget ramifications and possible cost to the students if instituted without additional State funding.

### **(2.) Retirement Credit**

A significant incentive for faculty to teach in summer would be for UC to include summer teaching compensation in the retirement contributions. We understand that such discussions are underway at the systemwide level, and we recommend that UCSD support this initiative.

### **(3.) Non-salary Grants and Research Funds**

Another incentive which might be useful in some disciplines or faculty situations would be to augment the teaching salary with small non-salary grants, or permit faculty to take the equivalent of the teaching salary as non-salaried (and non-taxed) funds for their research.

### **(4.) Exchange of Teaching in FWS**

There was also considerable discussion about departments permitting faculty to teach in summer in lieu of one quarter's teaching during FWS -- a straightforward trade in time of teaching with no added compensation. For example, a faculty member agrees to teach a course in the Summer Session in order to be relieved of a course in the winter quarter; this would affect neither sabbatical leave credit nor release of the faculty from other departmental responsibilities. The trade off to some faculty would be the opportunity to pursue a particular

research project more heavily for 10 weeks during the winter quarter in exchange for contributing to the department's teaching program for five weeks in the summer. Then, rather than hiring a Lecturer for the summer, the department could use the equivalent Summer Session funding to hire a winter quarter Lecturer. Without some additional type of compensation, it is unlikely that many faculty would be enthusiastic about extending their teaching efforts and associated departmental responsibilities into the summer. However, we see nothing wrong with the proposal, provided it does not result in added pressure on faculty to teach in summer, and the department can balance the quality of teaching using a similar mix of ladder rank faculty and non-ladder rank faculty between the regular year and the summer. Because of the rapid enrollment growth on campus and the necessary interim use of more non-ladder rank faculty throughout the year, this concern about the balance between quality and cost is not limited to the Summer Session.

### **C. Departmental Incentives**

#### **(1.) Increased Support for Staffing and Operational Costs**

The recent decision to include Summer Session workload credit in the General Campus budget allocation process has removed a significant disincentive for departmental participation in Summer Session. However, additional incentives to departments are required if Summer Session is to be significantly expanded. There are needs for increased support in staffing and operational costs. Because of existing vacation and maintenance schedules, departments must be able to hire additional staff and technicians and pay for additional supplies and expenses. As we mentioned above, departments have been accommodating the Summer Session by using infrastructure maintained with academic year-based State funds.

#### **(2.) Increased Autonomy in Curriculum Planning**

Chairs of several departments mentioned a desire to have more autonomy in curriculum planning than is permitted under the current system. If departments are to become more involved in the summer planning process, they will require flexible discretionary funds to attract teachers and possibly augment Summer Session funding for special courses. A significant portion of any new funds will be necessary in these departmental expenditure areas, especially for laboratory courses or departments with large enrollments. Another use of additional discretionary Summer Session funds by departments could be to permit them to augment a capped salary or otherwise low salary established by Summer Session in order to permit selected academically desirable courses to be offered. For example, when a department teaches a large service course that generates incremental discretionary funding, they could then also offer a small upper division course at their discretion.

#### **(3.) More Flexible Scheduling**

A more flexible Summer Session schedule, beyond the usual five-week session, may encourage departments to teach specific courses. There seems to be some desirability in isolated cases to offer both longer and shorter schedules, and to consider weekends. The drawback is staff cost in the Registrar's Office to generate the schedule and classroom assignments. There would likely be a need to support investment in additional software and programming time. It is not clear how flexibility would impact the students' summer scheduling, but it may not be serious until more enroll in several courses.

Although not an incentive per se, several departments indicated that they wanted better and more timely feedback on teaching evaluations for the Summer Session. After reviewing the current system used by the Summer Session office, it is not clear where the problem lies, but better communication of the effort and the results is desirable and would make departments more involved in the overall process.

#### **D. New Initiatives**

There are several new initiatives that we feel are worthy of further consideration. We will discuss them succinctly and hope that they can be brought forward for wider discussion in the appropriate faculty, department, and administrative venues. Not all of these ideas will work for every component of the campus, but each may contribute to helping the campus meet the enrollment challenges we will face. By and large they are based on making optimal use of the resources that are already available to us.

##### **(1.) Compressed Turbo Courses**

Many schools offer compressed intercession courses between semesters that have proven popular. Given our Summer Session scheduling and late start of the academic year in September, we feel departments could consider offering a variety of short 3-4 week summer ‘turbo’ courses in early September. In particular this may be appropriate for some laboratory courses, improving the efficient use of limited resources. Summer jobs are winding down for students, and many students could see this opportunity as a means to focus on and eliminate a time-consuming course or a scheduling problem. Faculty and staff, especially those with children, are often back from vacations and meetings after Labor Day. Labs are not in use for outreach activities and may already be geared up for the new academic year. Postdoctoral scholars and advanced graduate students could participate without compromising their research activities for as long a time as required during the regular 10-week academic year. Because of the intensity in contact time and preparation of such courses, we recommend that faculty be compensated the same as for a regular Summer Session course. Student laboratory fees should not exceed those imposed for the same course during the regular year, or Summer Session, and any requisite incremental support funds should be subsidized by new funding. Again, scheduling is an issue to resolve with such courses, especially for transfer students whose orientations often occur in early September. There could also be an issue of overlap with the second Summer Session.

##### **(2.) Transfer Student Early Admission**

Our ability to accommodate more transfer students is an essential component of enrollment growth. Transfer students often have lower division courses to take in specific majors, and they have difficulty with the transition to the intensity of the quarter system. We suggest that a good use of existing facilities and courses would be an early admission program for transfer students. Since many community colleges end in May, it might be possible to attract transfer students for both Summer Sessions, so that they could complete up to 12 units during the summer. They could live on campus, at least for the summer months, to become better integrated at UCSD. They would be able to assess their potential for success at UCSD, and it would improve their overall time-to-degree. Such a program should be discussed by the Academic Senate Admissions Committee, together with Student Affairs and the Colleges. It might be particularly useful in selected majors in which courses equivalent to prerequisites for the upper division major are not available at the community colleges. Such an early admission program could require that transfer students apply in the fall for this program. The program would require special advising at both the College and departmental levels to coordinate an effective program for each

student. It would also place a burden on the Colleges because of existing orientation schedules which currently end just at the beginning of Summer Session.

### (3.) Freshman Early Admission

A longer-range concept to take advantage of the Summer Session would be an early freshman admissions program. The target group in this instance is the students who just miss our admissions cut-off and who then typically go to other UC campuses, a community college, or out of state. They would be granted admission to UCSD on the condition that they agree to come early and start their freshman level courses in the summer. These added freshman students should help reduce our need to accept more students from a later referral pool who are often less qualified. They would also off-set the normal enrollment attrition which occurs in winter and spring, maintaining a higher average FTE enrollment level throughout the year.

While they would likely not be given on-campus housing for the regular year, one serious obstacle to admitting more freshman, they could have summer housing on campus, acclimate to the campus and community, and be in a good position to find off-campus housing for the academic year. Since many freshman courses are already offered in Summer Session, and most Colleges offer their core courses in summer, it should be possible to bring these students to UCSD without generating many new courses. The impact, and resource need, would be on College advising. An additional suggestion for such a program would be to make it major specific, or College specific, to help with impacted majors, or to balance student loads across the campus.

This idea of offering early admission to good students who want to attend UCSD and who would not normally be admitted seems better to us than the one used by several other UC campuses of guaranteeing late admission by one or more quarters if students agree to go to a community college to start their college program. The early freshman would take our courses, have better advising, and their transition to a regular program should be much smoother. We feel the idea merits consideration by the Admissions Committee, the Colleges, and Student Affairs. Like the early transfer student program, such a program should help us meet enrollment FTE goals by maximizing the use of existing Summer Session facilities and course offerings. It should also be a positive influence on overall student quality.

### (4.) Mentoring for Graduate and Post-doctoral Instructors

We mentioned above that the use of non-ladder rank faculty will be a necessary interim measure independent of Summer Session growth. The use of different types of non-ladder rank faculty will vary considerably by discipline and department. However, one concept we would encourage is to provide incremental funds to permit faculty mentors to be associated with the use of advanced graduate students and even post-doctoral scholars. The usefulness of the faculty mentor is being tested in the new Summer Graduate Teaching Fellows program, initiated this summer on a pilot basis. The funding requirements would be small but, at the margin, could have a significant impact on the quality of instruction.

### (5.) Support for Innovative Teaching

The campus needs to be creative to meet the challenges of enrollment growth if we are to maintain the quality of instruction and attention to undergraduate students. Summer Session often has the advantage of smaller classes and motivated students and would seem to be a good time for departments and faculty to experiment with teaching pedagogy and methodologies. There is a growing interest in using on-line technologies to

augment traditional teaching methods, and we would hope that there can be appropriate incentives and support from both the administration and the Senate, with proper oversight by CEP, to encourage pilot programs in this area. Innovation in web-based instruction will require campus resources. Other ideas could include variations of the turbo course concept or flexible scheduling in special courses. Anything learned from the Summer Session will likely be useful during the regular academic year.

Submitted on behalf of the Summer Session Task Force by

David R. Miller, Chair

Summer Session Task Force:

Tom Bond (Revelle College)  
Jacqueline Hanson (University Libraries)  
Daniel Harvey (Chemistry & Biochemistry)  
Paul Kube (CSE)  
Jennifer Lee (UG student representative)  
David Luft (History)  
David Miller (Academic Affairs/MAE), *Chair*  
Hans Paar (Physics)  
Carol Padden (Communication)  
Carlos Waisman (Sociology)  
Cynthia Walk (Literature)  
Mary Walshok (Extended Studies & Public Service)  
Jil Warn (Summer Session)  
Gabriele Wienhausen (Biology/CEP Chair)

## Summer Session Task Force Report

### Appendices

#### Appendix

- I Summary of Responses to Department Chair Interviews
- II Summary of Responses to Questionnaire to Faculty Who Taught in Summer Session, 1998 & 1999
- III Associated Students-UCSD Summer Session Survey, April 2000 – Results Summary
- IV Table 1: “UCSD Summer Session Enrollment - Total Undergraduate Enrollment, 1999”
- V Table 2: “UCSD Summer Session Course Enrollments and Total Number Courses Taught, 1996-99”
- VI Table 3: “UCSD Summer Session 2000 -- Faculty and Student Data”
- VII Table 4: “Summer Session 1999 – UCSD / Systemwide Comparisons”
- VIII Table 5: “Summer Session Fees – Eight UC Campuses -- Summer 2000”
- IX Table 6: “UCSD Summer Session 2000 -- Summary of Variable Schedule Courses”
- X Table 7: “UCSD Summer Session – Scholarships History, 1987 - 1999”

**Summer Session Task Force**  
**SUMMARY\* OF RESPONSES TO DEPARTMENT CHAIR INTERVIEWS**

4/21/00

1. In what ways does the current Summer Session program impact your departmental academic programs – positively and/or negatively -- and how could the integration of the Summer and academic year courses be improved?				
POSITIVELY	POSITIVES & NEGATIVES	LITTLE IMPACT	N/A	# OF RESP.
10 (42%)	5 (21%)	6 (25%)	3 (12%)	24 (100%)
2. Is your department interested in substantially increasing Summer Session enrollment and expanding course offerings so that the Summer program will be better integrated with the academic year curriculum? If so, what kinds of incentives would be useful in helping the department work toward that goal? Currently the academic departments receive TA support and workload credit for teaching in Summer Session. What other specific incentives would you like to see that might increase your department's involvement in Summer Session -- from the viewpoint of making Summer Session participation more attractive to the department, the faculty, and the students?				
YES	NO	INCREASE ENROLLMENTS IN EXISTING COURSES	NO STRONG FEELINGS	# OF RESP.
11 (46%)	8 (33%)	1 (4%)	4 (17%)	24 (100%)
3. Do you think a more flexible format (e.g., compressed laboratory classes, or courses offered over a longer or shorter number of weeks) would benefit your department?				
OK	YES	NO	N/A	# OF RESP.
10 (42%)	11 (46%)	1 (4%)	2 (8%)	24 (100%)
4. What are your views on non-ladder rank faculty (including visitors, postdoctoral scholars, and advanced Ph.D. students) teaching your courses during Summer Session?				
OK / FAVOR	OPPOSED	N/A	# OF RESPONSES	
18 (75%)	6 (25%)	0 (0%)	24 (100%)	
5. Are there any problems associated with having non-ladder rank faculty teach Summer Session courses, or any special issues in the area of Student Affairs that result from your department's participation in Summer Session?				
YES	NO	N/A	# OF RESPONSES	
4 (16%)	10 (42%)	10 (42%)	24 (100%)	
6. Does your department approach the Summer Session curriculum by offering primarily courses proposed by individual faculty members, or do you develop a set of Summer Session course offerings from the perspective of programmatic coherence and then recruit faculty to teach needed courses?				
PLAN CURRICULUM	FACULTY DRIVEN	MIXTURE	N/A	# OF RESP.
7 (29%)	7 (29%)	3 (13%)	7 (29%)	24 (100%)

\* -- the percentages expressed are a qualitative interpretation based on more detailed oral summaries of interviews conducted by task force members

**SUMMARY\* OF RESPONSES TO DEPARTMENT CHAIR INTERVIEWS**

7. What is your impression of the quality of courses offered by your department during Summer Session compared with the academic year courses?					
SAME	BETTER	DIFFERENT	N/A	# OF RESP.	
13 (54%)	1 (4%)	3 (13%)	7 (29%)	24 (100%)	
8. Do you think there is any distinction in the academic performance of students taking classes during Summer Session compared to students enrolled during the regular academic year?					
SAME	BETTER	WORSE	UNABLE TO JUDGE	N/A	# OF RESP.
7 (29%)	4 (17%)	1 (4%)	8 (33%)	4 (17%)	24 (100%)
9. Do you and your colleagues find the level of support services during Summer Session adequate (library, academic computing, student advising, etc)?					
ADEQUATE	INADEQUATE	UNABLE TO JUDGE		N/A	# OF RESP.
11 (46%)	5 (21%)	1 (4%)		7 (29%)	24 (100%)

\* -- the percentages expressed are a qualitative interpretation based on more detailed oral summaries of interviews conducted by task force members

**Summer Session Task Force**  
**SUMMARY\* OF RESPONSES TO “QUESTIONNAIRE FOR**  
**FACULTY WHO TAUGHT IN SUMMER SESSION, 1998 & 1999”**

4/21/00

1. In your Summer Session course(s), have you found it necessary to alter your normal syllabus or course requirements to accommodate the 5-week sessions?			
YES	NO	OTHER	# OF RESPONSES
15 (54%)	11 (39%)	2 (7%)	28 (100%)
2. Have you had to make any accommodations for lack of resources -- limited access to the Library, computing facilities, student advising services, etc.?			
YES	NO	OTHER	# OF RESPONSES
4 (14%)	24 (86%)	0 (0%)	28 (100%)
3. Have you observed any difference in the academic performance of students taking classes during Summer Session compared to students during the regular academic year?			
YES	NO	OTHER	# OF RESPONSES
18 (64%)	8 (29%)	2 (7%)	28 (100%)
4. Do you use essentially the same grading scale for evaluating Summer Session students that is used to assign grades during the academic year?			
YES	NO	OTHER	# OF RESPONSES
27 (96%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)	28 (100%)
5. Have you had access to the same level and quality of instructional resources (staff support, TA/Reader assistance, etc.) for Summer Session courses that is typically provided during the academic year? If not, please describe what is lacking.			
YES	NO	OTHER	# OF RESPONSES
18 (64%)	8 (29%)	2 (7%)	28 (100%)
6. Have you found that compensation for teaching during Summer is fair? If not, please elaborate.			
YES	NO	OTHER	# OF RESPONSES
17 (61%)	11 (39%)	0 (0%)	28 (100%)
7. Is it your sense that Summer Session course offerings are well coordinated with the departmental (or college) academic programs. If not, how could the integration be improved?			
YES	NO	OTHER	# OF RESPONSES
20 (77%)	3 (11.5%)	3 (11.5%)	26 (93%)
8. Do you have any general comments, suggestions, or questions? <i>(too numerous to include here)</i>			

\* -- the percentages expressed are a qualitative interpretation based on more detailed written responses

**ASSOCIATED STUDENTS-UCSD SUMMER SESSION SURVEY - APRIL, 2000 - RESULTS SUMMARY**

Note: 716 students completed the AS-UCSD Survey April 18 - 19, 2000. This summary reflects the most frequently mentioned responses to questions listed below. The percentages expressed are a qualitative interpretation based on more detailed written responses and should not be interpreted as verbatim answers.

1. As a student, what do you think is mostly needed that will encourage more students to take Summer Session classes?								
MORE COURSES	LOWER TUITION COSTS	MORE FINANCIAL AID	HOUSING	BETTER TIMES/ SCHEDULES	BETTER ADVERTISING			
252 (35%)	235 (33%)	73 (10%)	51 (7%)	32 (4%)	28 (4%)			
2. What improvements would you like to see with Summer Session courses?								
MORE COURSES	LOWER TUITION COSTS	BETTER TIMES/ SCHEDULES	SHORTER CLASS TIME	GOOD PROFESSORS				
279 (39%)	111 (16%)	66 (9%)	29 (4%)	28 (4%)				
3. What would it take for you to carry a full load (i.e., 12 units) during the summer?								
LOWER TUITION COSTS	MORE FINANCIAL AID	MORE COURSES	NO JOB	WOULD NOT TAKE FULL LOAD	EASIER COURSES/ WORKLOAD	GRADUATING (ON TIME OR EARLIER)	ALREADY TAKING FULL LOAD	TIME
89 (12%)	80 (11%)	66 (9%)	50 (7%)	44 (6%)	35 (5%)	34 (5%)	31 (4%)	21 (4%)

Table 1: UCSD Summer Session Enrollment  
 Total Undergraduate Enrollment  
 1999

	TOTAL ENROLLMENT						Total Unduplicated Head Count	
	Summer Session 1		Summer Session 2		Summer Session 3		N	%
	N	%	N	%	N	%		
<b>Gender</b>								
Female	1,836	50.3%	1,420	53.7%	532	59.8%	2,945	52.5%
Male	1,800	49.3%	1,217	46.0%	340	38.2%	2,627	46.9%
Undeclared/Missing	<u>17</u>	<u>0.5%</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>0.2%</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>1.9%</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>0.6%</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,653</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>2,643</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>889</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>5,607</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Ethnicity</b>								
African Am.	56	1.5%	58	2.2%	13	1.5%	99	1.8%
Asian	1,011	27.7%	752	28.5%	135	15.2%	1,436	25.6%
Mexican Am.	218	6.0%	213	8.1%	101	11.4%	429	7.7%
Filipino	306	8.4%	238	9.0%	73	8.2%	444	7.9%
Latino	66	1.8%	64	2.4%	24	2.7%	118	2.1%
Native Am.	18	0.5%	18	0.7%	5	0.6%	31	0.6%
Caucasian	1,060	29.0%	745	28.2%	180	20.2%	1,538	27.4%
Other/Undeclared/Missing	<u>918</u>	<u>25.1%</u>	<u>555</u>	<u>21.0%</u>	<u>358</u>	<u>40.3%</u>	<u>1,512</u>	<u>27.0%</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,653</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>2,643</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>889</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>5,607</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Disc. Area</b>								
<i>UCSD:</i>								
Arts	80	2.2%	56	2.1%	23	2.6%	126	2.2%
Humanities	126	3.4%	100	3.8%	36	4.0%	200	3.6%
Engineering	717	19.6%	418	15.8%	37	4.2%	895	16.0%
Science/Math	1,029	28.2%	834	31.6%	72	8.1%	1,415	25.2%
Social Science	862	23.6%	721	27.3%	185	20.8%	1,312	23.4%
Undec./Spec.	121	3.3%	92	3.5%	13	1.5%	182	3.2%
<i>Summer Ses. (non-UCSD)*</i>	<u>718</u>	<u>19.7%</u>	<u>422</u>	<u>16.0%</u>	<u>523</u>	<u>58.8%</u>	<u>1,477</u>	<u>26.3%</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,653</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>2,643</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>889</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>5,607</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>College</b>								
<i>UCSD:</i>								
Revelle	608	16.6%	489	18.5%	78	8.8%	869	15.5%
John Muir	535	14.6%	429	16.2%	72	8.1%	789	14.1%
T. Marshall	601	16.5%	448	17.0%	62	7.0%	833	14.9%
Earl Warren	856	23.4%	571	21.6%	82	9.2%	1,128	20.1%
E. Roosevelt	335	9.2%	284	10.7%	72	8.1%	511	9.1%
<i>Summer Ses. (non-UCSD)*</i>	<u>718</u>	<u>19.7%</u>	<u>422</u>	<u>16.0%</u>	<u>523</u>	<u>58.8%</u>	<u>1,477</u>	<u>26.3%</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,653</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>2,643</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>889</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>5,607</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Class Level</b>								
Freshman	739	20.2%	445	16.8%	502	56.5%	1,491	26.6%
Sophomore	385	10.5%	297	11.2%	38	4.3%	533	9.5%
Junior	869	23.8%	650	24.6%	88	9.9%	1,213	21.6%
Senior	1,656	45.3%	1,246	47.1%	259	29.1%	2,359	42.1%
Missing	<u>4</u>	<u>0.1%</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>0.2%</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>0.2%</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>0.2%</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,653</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>2,643</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>889</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>5,607</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Mean</b>								
Summer Session GPA	3.00		3.05		3.53		3.07	
Sum. Session Units Passed	4.98		4.88		5.96		6.43	
Total GPA	2.92		2.92		3.24		2.96	
Total Units Passed	118.96		125.52		76.64		112.10	

\* Includes other UC's, other colleges, high school students, etc.

Table 2 -- UCSD Summer Session Course Enrollments and Total Number Courses Taught, 1996-1999\*

2/11/00

Department	Division	Summer 1999		Summer 1998		Summer 1997		Summer 1996	
		Enrollment	# Courses	Enrollment	# Courses	Enrollment	# Courses	Enrollment	# Courses
Literature	A&H	320	16	299	14	247	12	254	12
History		255	7	238	7	170	7	176	7
Visual Arts		196	7	187	7	165	6	157	7
Philosophy		195	5	121	4	129	3	135	5
Music		46	4	76	4	88	4	60	4
Theatre		55	4	16	2	34	3	45	3
		1067	43	937	38	833	35	827	38
CSE	JSOE	476	12	383	9	325	8	297	8
AMES		300	9	168	8	129	6	111	5
ECE		164	4	149	5	599	16	145	5
BE		0	0	0	0	0		0	0
MAE		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
SE		n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
		940	25	700	22	1053	30	553	18
Biology	Nat Sci	1479	20	1438	15	1270	18	1257	22
Physics		248	4	539	9	494	9	414	10
Math		558	11	480	10	388	10	446	13
Chem/Bioch		629	9	421	6	491	8	487	6
		2914	44	2878	40	2643	45	2604	51
Psychology	Soc Sci	1186	30	1054	27	1063	27	994	24
Economics		684	15	689	14	175	5	591	14
Poli Sci		421	9	273	8	318	9	474	19
Linguistics		301	22	316	26	414	26	305	23
Commun		244	7	208	8	191	7	180	8
Sociology		97	5	144	6	178	5	220	8
Anthro		77	2	53	2	75	3	36	2
Cog Sci		74	2	27	1	68	2	21	1
Ethn Studies		0	0	0	0	19	1	25	1
		3084	92	2764	92	2501	85	2846	100
<b>TOTAL</b>		8005	204	7279	192	7030	195	6830	207

\*headcount enrollment totals below are considerably lower, reflecting students who enroll in 2 or more courses;

data above includes academic departments ONLY; program enrollments listed below

## Appendix V

Program	Division	Summer 1999		Summer 1998		Summer 1997		Summer 1996	
		Enrollment	# Courses	Enrollment	# Courses	Enrollment	# Courses	Enrollment	# Courses
AIP	Soc Sci	114	6	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chin Studies	A&H	75	7	0	0	78	6	71	6
Cont Issues	A&H	0	0	0	0	0	0	149	1
ESL	A&H	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	1
Humanities	A&H	56	2	71	2	28	1	24	1
Japn Studies	A&H	33	3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Law & Soc	Soc Sci	28	1	0	0	43	1	29	1
MMW	A&H	140	3	102	3	72	3	63	3
Muir Wrtg	A&H	0	0	0	0	47	4	33	3
STPA	Soc Sci	47	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subject A	A&H	19	1	20	1	0	0	0	0
TEP	Soc Sci	467	21	265	19	522	25	320	20
USP	Soc Sci	15	1	29	2	23	1	41	3
Gender Stu	Soc Sci	19	1	18	1	0	0	0	0
Warren Wrtg	A&H	67	5	68	5	41	3	40	3
<b>TOTAL Programs</b>		1080	53	573	33	854	44	776	42
<b>Depts + Programs</b>		9085	257	7852	225	7884	239	7606	249
<b>Headcount Enrollment:</b>									
UG (UC)		5790	not applicable	6434	not applicable	not available	not applicable	not available	not applicable
UG (non-UC)		305	"	incl w/above	"	"	"	"	"
Graduate (UC)		94	"	806	"	"	"	"	"
Other		1098	"	189	"	"	"	"	"
<b>Total Headcount:</b>		7287	"	7429	"	"	"	"	"
% UC Students		81%		77.40%	"	"	"	"	"
% UCSD Students		77%		not avail	"	"	"	"	"
<b>FTE Enrollment:</b>									
UG (UC)		665	"	not avail	"	not avail	"	not avail	"
UG (non-UC)		45	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
Graduate (UC)		28	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
Other		118	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
<b>Total FTE</b>		856	"	"	"	"	"	"	"
<b>Total UC FTE</b>		693	"	"	"	"	"	"	"

**Table 3**  
**Summer Session 2000 -- Preliminary Faculty and Student Data**

June 5, 2000

**(1) Faculty**

155 Faculty for Summer 2000 -- **59** (38%) are UCSD ladder rank; breakdown below:

<b>Title</b>	<b># Teaching</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>Average Salary/Crse</b>
Professor	30	51%	\$7,105
Associate Professor	12	20%	\$5,797
Assistant Professor	3	5%	\$4,602
Lecturers SOE	3	5%	\$7,383
VERIP/Emeritus	6	10%	\$7,398
Prof-Business & Mgmt	5	8%	\$7,620
<b>Total ladder rank</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>99%</b>	

There are 28 faculty who have a salary cap of \$7,500 (with some at \$7,700, which includes the \$200 bonus for teaching in the evening)

**(2) Students** (preliminary enrollment data as of 5/17/00)

<b>First Session</b>	<b># students</b>	<b>%</b>
taking 1 course	2,020	64%
taking 2 courses	1,126	35%
taking 3 courses	23	0.07%
taking 4 courses	4	0.01%
	<b>3173</b>	
<b>Second Session</b>	<b># students</b>	<b>%</b>
taking 1 course	1,515	72%
taking 2 courses	594	28%
taking 3 courses	5	0.02%
taking 4 courses	0	0.00%
	<b>2114</b>	
<b>Special Session</b>	<b># students</b>	<b>%</b>
taking 1 course	276	80%
taking 2 courses	34	10%
taking 3 courses	36	10%
	<b>346</b>	
<b>Total students</b>	<b>5633</b>	

**Table 4: Summer Session 1999 – UCSD / Systemwide Comparisons**Headcount Enrollments (all levels) -- UCSD ranked 3 of 8

Berkeley	11,950
LA	10,474
San Diego	7,287
Irvine	6,741
Davis	5,911
Santa Barbara	5,430
Riverside	2,826
Santa Cruz	<u>1,941</u>
	52,560

FTE Enrollments (all levels) – UCSD ranked 5 of 8

Berkeley	1,892
LA	1,724
Irvine	1,020
Santa Barbara	895
San Diego	856
Davis	809
Riverside	464
Santa Cruz	<u>357</u>
	8,018

UC Students as Percentage of Total -- UCSD ranked 6 of 8

Davis	94%
Irvine	89.5%
Santa Barbara	89.0%
Santa Cruz	85.2%
Riverside	82.5%
San Diego	81.0%
LA	74.8%
Berkeley	74.7%
ALL UC	81.7%

Cost of 1 course

UCSD	\$360
Irvine	\$405
Davis	\$422
Santa Cruz	\$446
Riverside	\$480
Santa Barbara	\$484
LA	\$652
Berkeley	\$655

2 courses/1 session

SC	\$626
SD	\$680
D	\$722
I	\$725
SB	\$796
R	\$920
B	\$985
LA	\$1044

2 courses over 2 sessions

SD	\$720
I	\$725
SC	\$801
D	\$844
R	\$940
B	\$985
LA	\$1044
SB	n/a

Summer Session--1999, continuedPercentage of Courses Taught by Regular Faculty – UCSD and LA ranked 1st

LA	30%
San Diego	30%
Riverside	25%
Irvine	16%
Davis	15%
Santa Barbara	14%
Berkeley	8%
Santa Cruz	3%
ALL UC	19%

---

**Summer Session 1998**Total # Courses Offered (all levels) – UCSD ranked 6 of 8

LA	528
Santa Barbara	426
Berkeley	424
Irvine	322
Santa Cruz	262
San Diego	230
Davis	225
Riverside	178

**Table 5: Summer Session Fees -- UC Campuses -- Summer 2000**

	Berkeley	Davis	Irvine	Los Angeles	Riverside	San Diego	Santa Barbara	Santa Cruz
Registration Fee	\$325 one time	\$128 each session	\$85 one time	\$300 one time	\$40-1 session \$60-2 session	\$40 each session	\$172 (1 6-wk sess)	\$175 each session
Course Fees	\$115/sem unit avg \$345/crse	\$80/unit avg \$320/crse	\$85/unit avg \$340/crse	\$100/unit avg \$400/crse	varies-- avg \$440/crse	\$80/unit avg \$320/crse	\$80/unit avg \$320/crse	\$180/course
Other	additional \$300 Reg fee--Intl*; lab fees some courses	n/a	lab fees some courses	additional \$300 Reg fee--Intl*	\$60/unit for 190 and 290 series courses	additional fees labs & special courses	\$35/\$50/\$65 appl fee (varies w/appl. date; \$50 regular fee)	\$98 ID card fee
Total Fees for 1 4-unit crse	\$670 (3 units) \$970 Intl	\$448	\$425	\$700 \$1000 Intl	\$480	\$360	\$542	\$453
Total Fees for 2 4-unit crses (1 session)	\$1015 (3 units) \$1315 Intl	\$768	\$765	\$1100 \$1400 Intl	\$920	\$680	\$862	\$633
Total Fees for 2 4-units crses (2 sessions)	\$1015 (3 units) \$1315 Intl	\$896	\$765	\$1100 \$1400 Intl	\$940	\$720	n/a (1 6-wk session)	\$808
One 4-unit course:	UCSD least expensive [range = \$360 (SD) to \$700 (LA)]							
Two 4-unit courses, 1 session:	UCSD second least expensive [range = \$633 (SC) to \$1100 (LA)]							
Two 4-unit courses, 2 sessions:	UCSD least expensive [range = \$720 (SD) to \$1100 (LA)]							

UCSD Fees, Fall Qtr 2000 = \$1283.50. Assuming full load = 15 units, and current Summer Session per unit fee of \$80:  $\$80 \times 15 \text{ units} = \$1200$ . Registration fee could increase up to \$83.50 and not exceed regular quarter cost. Summ 1999 headcount enroll = 7287. Project 25% increase for Summ 2000 = 9108:  $9108 \times \$83.50 = \$760,518$  additional revenue.

If UCSD Summ Reg fee increased to \$100, cost of 1 crse in 1 session = \$420 (would still be least expensive campus).

**Table 6: UCSD Summer Session 2000**  
**Summary of Variable Schedule Courses**

April 24, 2000

# Weeks Instruction	# Courses	% of variable schedule courses	% of total course offerings
2 wks	22	37%	8%
3 wks	14	24%	5%
4 wks	5	8%	2%
6 wks	10	17%	2%
8 wks	4	7%	1%
10 wks	2	3%	1%
11 wks	1	2%	0.4%
special--#wks TBD	1	2%	0.4%
<b>Total special format:</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>22%</b>
<b>Standard 5-wk crses:</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>n/a</b>	<b>78%</b>
<b>TOTAL CRSES</b>	<b>270</b>		

**Table 7: UCSD Summer Session Scholarship History**

February 22, 2000

	1987	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999
Sess 1 # awarded	23	29	32	32	24	16	29	26	28	29	54	42	38
Sess 1 \$ awarded	\$5,145	\$3,350	\$4,445	\$4,810	\$5,310	\$2,800	\$5,525	\$10,500	\$8,900	\$10,175	\$19,415	\$14,630	\$13,353
Sess 2 # awarded	0	15	16	18	15	12	19	20	26	34	39	37	31
Sess 2 \$ awarded	0	\$1,470	\$2,130	\$2,580	\$1,785	\$2,065	\$2,832	\$7,470	\$8,025	\$11,302	\$11,840	\$12,325	\$9,540
Sess 3 # awarded	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	8	6
Sess 3 \$ awarded	0	0	\$220	0	0	0	0	0	\$1,600	0	0	\$1,880	\$2,730
Total # awarded	23	44	49	50	39	28	48	46	56	63	93	87	75
Total \$ awarded	\$5,145	\$4,820	\$6,795	\$7,390	\$7,095	\$4,865	\$8,357	\$17,970	\$18,525	\$21,477	\$31,255	\$28,835	\$25,623