



UNIVERSITY  
OF  
CALIFORNIA

---

# 2016 Summer Session Pilot Program Outcomes

July 2017

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

---

**Contents**

**Summer Session Pilot Initiatives ..... 1**

**Analysis and Findings..... 1**

**Conclusions and Next Steps ..... 4**

**Appendix 1: Analysis of Summer 2016 Pilots ..... 5**

**Appendix 2: Marketing Images from UC Summer Session Pilot Websites..... 10**

**Appendix 3: UC Summer Session Websites..... 12**

## Summer Session Pilot Initiatives

---

As part of the Budget Framework Agreement between President Napolitano and Governor Brown and approved by the Regents, three University of California campuses each established and implemented a pilot initiative designed to expand enrollment in their 2016 Summer Sessions. Each of the pilot initiatives involved a pricing incentive:

- Berkeley offered an enhanced and expanded summer enrollment loan program available to all financially needy students, including middle class students. In addition, incoming freshmen were offered a tuition-free two-unit online course designed to help students find an appropriate major;
- Irvine established a summer fee cap whereby fees for current and incoming UC students were waived for additional units taken above eight units (“Pay for Only 8”); and
- San Diego offered low-cost summer housing rates for continuing students who enrolled in summer.

All three campuses implemented marketing plans to ensure the initiatives were widely known. In addition, all three summer session websites featured the new initiatives in various ways. The pilot initiatives operated during summer 2016.

## Analysis and Findings

---

To determine if the three pilot programs had an effect on undergraduate student enrollment, UCOP compared summer 2016 to summer 2015 and obtained data on the cost of implementing each pilot. Because the 2015 State Budget Act goal for at least additional 5,000 FTE in 2016-17 set 2014-15 as the base year, summer 2014 enrollment is also presented. The overall conclusions about the effects of the three pilot programs in 2016 would be the same if the summer 2014 enrollments were used. In both comparisons, the three pilot campuses outperformed the remaining six campuses. Compared to summer 2014, when Irvine had a fee cap, the increase in summer enrollment in 2016 for the three pilot campuses was small (+84); however, for the non-pilot campuses, it was negative (-123). Compared to summer 2015, when Irvine had no fee cap, the increase in summer enrollment in 2016 was much larger (+648) for the three pilot campuses, and for the non-pilot campuses, it was small (+106)

1. Collectively, the three pilot campuses were successful at generating a larger increase in UC full-time equivalent (FTE) summer enrollment than were the other six campuses not participating in the pilots. Table 1 on the next page shows the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) undergraduate enrollments generated at the three pilot campuses as well as the enrollments at the other UC campuses. Total UC undergraduate summer 2016 FTE was 744 or 5.1 percent greater than the enrollment for summer 2015. Most of the 744 increase was at the three campuses that participated in the Budget Framework Agreement pilot. Those three pilot campuses increased their summer FTE by 638 or 11 percent over

2015. That compares to a combined increase of only 106 FTE or 1.2 percent at the other six campuses that did not participate in the pilots. Summer enrollment at those campuses was essentially flat. The one exception among the non-pilot campuses was Santa Cruz which increased 75 FTE or 11.2 percent due in large part to a summer incentive program the campus put in place that gave discounts if students took at least 15 units.<sup>1</sup>

2. The results for the pilots varied substantially and only two of the three pilot campuses increased enrollment. Table 1 shows that of the 638 additional FTE generated on the pilot campuses, 80 percent was at Irvine and 20 percent was at San Diego. Berkeley's enrollment was basically flat.

Table 1

## UC Summer Session Enrollment

Campus	UC Undergraduate FTE			change from 2015
	2014	2015	2016	
<b>Berkeley</b>	2,243	2,238	2,232	(6)
<b>Irvine</b>	2,437	1,833	2,350	517
<b>San Diego</b>	1,698	1,753	1,880	127
<b>Pilots TOTAL</b>	<b>6,378</b>	<b>5,824</b>	<b>6,462</b>	<b>638</b>
Davis	1,997	1,964	1,974	10
Los Angeles	2,821	2,810	2,824	14
Merced	433	418	422	4
Riverside	1,211	1,173	1,160	(13)
Santa Barbara	1,780	1,668	1,684	16
Santa Cruz	689	669	744	75
<b>non-pilots TOTAL</b>	<b>8,931</b>	<b>8,702</b>	<b>8,808</b>	<b>106</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>15,309</b>	<b>14,526</b>	<b>15,270</b>	<b>744</b>
<b>Participating in Summer 2016 pilots</b>				

3. Irvine's direct financial incentive of waiving fees for units above a fee cap succeeded in generating a large increase in FTE. The only pilot that significantly increased enrollment due to the financial incentive offered was Irvine's pilot, which re-instituted a fee cap ("Pay for Only 8"). When Irvine eliminated the fee cap in summer 2015, enrollment fell by 604 FTE. Irvine's goal was to restore 400 of the lost FTE. In fact, the campus succeeded in adding 517 more FTE than in summer 2015.

<sup>1</sup> That discount, continuing into 2017, can be seen on this page <http://summer.ucsc.edu/fundamentals/fees-payment.html>

4. San Diego's pilot helped generate a substantial increase in FTE at San Diego, but the financial incentive of low-cost housing per se generated only a modest increase in enrollment. San Diego had the next largest FTE increase (127) among all of the UC campuses. However, only about 100 students actually benefited from living in housing at a reduced cost, and those students probably generated about 20 FTE. Thus, much of the increase at San Diego was due to other efforts. The campus stated that the significant increase in summer FTE was realized by integrating a number of student services (e.g., housing, financial aid, advising, etc.) into the marketing of summer session to current undergraduates.

5. Berkeley's loan and its no-tuition class for entering freshmen may have helped to stave off declines in enrollment, but these incentives did not result in overall enrollment increases. Berkeley did not show an increase in enrollment, but the campus believes the two components of the pilot program (the tuition-free 2-unit course and the enhanced middle class loans) offset what would otherwise have been an FTE decline in summer 2016 compared to summer 2015.

One hundred and forty-six students took advantage of the tuition waiver by enrolling in the 2-unit course. Although it was a numerical success, those 146 students only generated an increase of around 10 FTE due to the low unit-value of the course.

Compared to summer 2015, 132 more students were offered summer session loans; however, it turns out that only 16 more students actually received loans in summer 2016 compared to summer 2015. Many students never accepted or took all of the steps necessary to actually receive loan funds (e.g., completing the promissory note or participating in entrance counseling).

6. The summer session pilots benefited students across all income groups. Analysis of enrollment data at the three pilot campuses shows that students in all income ranges benefited from the pilot pricing incentives [data in Appendix Table 2]. In particular, the largest FTE increase was among low income students at Irvine. That is, of the approximately 500 FTE increase among continuing students, there was a 230 FTE increase among low income students.

In addition, San Diego increased headcount enrollment of low income continuing students by 60 over what would have been expected based on changes in the size of the undergraduate student body. Berkeley increased headcount enrollment of middle income continuing students by about 40 over what would have been expected, consistent with the pilot's focus on expanding loans to middle class students.

7. Although the Irvine program generated the greatest enrollment gains, it also had disproportionately higher costs than did the other pilot programs. The gains in FTE associated with the pilot programs correlate to the costs of implementing the program. Irvine's program waived \$7 million in summer session tuition for units above the 8-unit fee

cap. San Diego spent about \$400,000, mostly in housing discounts, and Berkeley's cost was the least, around \$205,000 (\$165,000 for waived fees and about \$45,000<sup>2</sup> for additional loans). Table 2 below shows the costs per pilot program. The Irvine pilot gained around four times more FTE than did the San Diego pilot, but it was 19 times more costly. However, the Irvine program also allowed the campus overall to meet its California resident enrollment growth target and thus avoid any loss of state enrollment funding.

**Table 2**  
2016 Summer Session Pilot Program Costs

Campus	Fees waived	Additional loan cost	Housing discounts	Marketing	Additional staff time
Berkeley	\$157,680	\$44,389	-	-	-
Irvine	\$7,068,816	-	-	\$40,000	-
San Diego	-	-	\$345,307	\$1,000	\$27,600

## Conclusions and Next Steps

---

The pilot programs were designed to examine how alternative pricing models affected summer enrollment. By itself, a relatively large financial incentive (such as a fee waiver) appears necessary to significantly increase summer FTE. The Irvine "Pay for 8" pilot encouraged more undergraduates to enroll in summer and to take more courses, but it was also an expensive program.

However, a smaller financial incentive combined with programmatic changes in how summer is marketed to students can also result in a significant increase in summer FTE. Although only a modest proportion of the FTE increase in San Diego's pilot was attributable to the direct financial incentive (reduced-cost housing), the campus attributes the greater FTE increases to the integration of a number of student services (e.g., housing, financial aid, advising, etc.) into the marketing of summer session to current undergraduates. This additional marketing and enhanced advising helped convey the benefits and opportunities of enrolling in summer compared to other options students may have had, such as working or returning home.

These results, were shared with all nine UC undergraduate summer sessions deans in January 2017 to allow all the campuses to learn from the results of the pilots and, if interested, to adopt similar measures. This final formal report will also be shared. All three campuses that participated in the pilots indicated that they planned to continue the pilot programs in summer 2017, and other campuses have planned other innovative approaches for summer 2017. The University intends to increase further California resident undergraduate FTE enrollment in summer 2017 compared to that achieved in summer 2016.

---

<sup>2</sup> Berkeley's pilot loan cost was modest due to the fact that only 16 more students *received* loans in 2016 compared to 2015 despite the fact that the pilot expansion of loan eligibility resulted in 132 more students being *offered* loans in 2016 compared to 2015.

## Appendix 1: Analysis of Summer 2016 Pilots

---

In summer 2016, three UC campuses (Berkeley, Irvine, and San Diego) piloted alternative pricing models to encourage *more* undergraduate students to take *more* courses. Each campus used a different incentive to encourage summer enrollments.

To determine if these pricing incentives had an effect on undergraduate student enrollment, summer 2016 FTE, headcount, and average credits attempted are compared to the summer 2015 data on these three campuses as well as the other six non-pilot UC campuses.

### Headcount Enrollment Compared to Expected Enrollment

As described in Table 1 on page 2, overall FTE increased at the three pilot campuses by 638 compared to only 106 at the six non-pilot campuses. FTE increases are a function of total headcount enrolled and the number of credits taken by students. In this section we will consider headcount enrollment not FTE enrollment and examine how increases relate to what might be expected based on undergraduate enrollment during the academic year preceding the summer.

Some of the change in enrollment is attributable to the size of the student body in the regular academic year prior to the summer session. That is, if undergraduate enrollments have changed during the academic year, the number of students expected to enroll in any particular summer should also change in a similar direction. To determine if greater **proportions** of students were enrolling in summer from previous years, summer enrollments are compared to the size of the previous spring undergraduate class in Appendix 1 Table 1 on the following page. Note that this table only looks at continuing UC undergraduates and not incoming freshmen and transfers.<sup>3</sup>

Specifically, the proportion of spring 2015 continuing students enrolled in summer 2015 was applied to the number of continuing students enrolled in spring 2016 to derive an “Expected Summer 2016 Enrollment.” The three pilot campuses exceeded the expected enrollment by 393. In contrast, the six non-pilot campuses collectively were 656 short of expectations. Irvine enrolled a larger proportion of its continuing undergraduate students than expected. It enrolled 343 more students or 1.4 percent more than expected given the spring 2016 population. San Diego and Berkeley enrolled just about the same percentage of continuing students as in the prior year—San Diego enrolled just 38 more and Berkeley enrolled just 6 more than expected.

---

<sup>3</sup> In fall 2016-17 there was a 7,400 increase system wide in new CA resident undergraduate headcount over fall 2015-16; however, less than 10 percent of new students historically enroll in summer courses. The majority of summer enrollments come from continuing students.

**Appendix 1 Table 1**

Differences in Summer 2016 UC enrollment compared to expected changes based on Spring 2015 UC enrollment (undergraduate headcount)

Campus	UC continuing students (headcount)							
	Spring 2015	Summer 2015	% enrolled in Summer 2015	Spring 2016	Summer 2016	% enrolled in Summer 2016	expected Summer 2016 enrollment	difference from expected enrollment
Berkeley	25,903	9,494	36.7%	26,094	9,570	36.7%	9,564	6
Irvine	23,046	9,376	40.7%	23,783	10,019	42.1%	9,676	343
San Diego	23,098	8,723	37.8%	24,660	9,351	37.9%	9,313	38
3 pilot campuses	72,047	27,593	38.3%	74,537	28,940	38.8%	28,547	393
6 non-pilot campuses	109,452	40,661	37.1%	110,883	40,537	36.6%	41,193	(656)
Total	181,499	68,254	37.6%	185,420	69,477	37.5%	69,729	(252)

**Headcount Enrollment by Income Compared to Expected Enrollment**

In an effort to encourage greater enrollments of middle income students, Berkeley's incentive focused on offering a loan to middle income students with family incomes greater than \$80,000 and less than \$150,000. Similarly, San Diego offered low-cost summer housing to students enrolling in summer. Appendix 1 Table 2 on the next page shows the change over expected summer enrollments by a student's family income.<sup>4</sup>

Irvine experienced greater than expected summer enrollments for students of all income backgrounds. San Diego enrolled more lower and middle income students than expected and Berkeley enrolled more middle income students than expected but enrolled fewer than expected lower and upper income students based on 2015 enrollment.

<sup>4</sup> Income data is based on the financial aid records of continuing students. Income data is not available for students who did not apply for financial aid. The proportion of students without income data ranges from 6 percent at Merced to 16 percent at Davis. For the three pilot campus, the percentages are 14 percent at Berkeley, 13 percent at Irvine, and 12 percent at San Diego.



**Appendix 1 Table 2**

Pilot campus differences in Summer 2016 UC enrollment compared to expected changes based on Spring 2015 UC enrollment by income level (undergraduate headcount)

	UC continuing students (headcount)			
	% enrolled in Summer 2015	% enrolled in Summer 2016	expected Summer 2016 enrollment	difference from expected enrollment
<b>BERKELEY</b>				
Lower Income	40%	40%	3,764	(20)
Middle Income	31%	32%	1,735	39
Upper Income	30%	30%	2,745	(26)
<b>IRVINE</b>				
Lower Income	35%	36%	4,576	76
Middle Income	40%	43%	1,945	154
Upper Income	43%	47%	1,963	203
<b>SAN DIEGO</b>				
Lower Income	37%	37%	3,815	61
Middle Income	35%	36%	1,939	25
Upper Income	35%	35%	2,469	(9)

Note: Excludes independent students and students not applying for financial aid.

## Average Number of Units Attempted By Income Compared to Prior Year

UC Irvine showed an increase in average units attempted in summer 2016 compared to summer 2015, whereas there was little or no change at the other two pilots and no overall change for the non-pilot campuses.<sup>5</sup> At Irvine, there was an increase on average of 2 more units attempted for lower income students, 2 more units for middle income students, and a little more than 1 more unit for upper income students (Appendix 1 Table 3 below). This is consistent with the Irvine pilot which waived fees for additional units.

**Appendix 1 Table 3**

Differences in average units attempted by income level for the pilot campuses compared to the non-pilot campuses

	Average Units Attempted							
	Lower Income		Middle Income		Upper Income		All Students	
	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016
Berkeley	10.2	10.1	8.6	8.8	8.2	8.1	9.4	9.6
Irvine	8.5	10.5	8.1	10.1	8.3	9.6	8.1	9.8
San Diego	8.5	8.4	8.3	8.2	8.2	8.4	8.3	8.3
3 pilot campuses	9.0	9.7	8.3	9.0	8.2	8.6	8.6	9.3
6 non-pilot campuses	9.6	9.5	8.7	8.8	8.5	8.6	9.1	9.1
Total	9.4	9.6	8.6	8.9	8.4	8.6	8.9	9.1

Note: Excludes EAP students, independent students, and students not applying for financial aid. Summer semester units at Berkeley and Merced are converted to quarter units by multiplying by 1.5.

<sup>5</sup> Among the non-pilot campuses, UC Santa Cruz was the only campus that showed an increase in average units attempted per student, consistent with their incentive that provided a discount if students enrolled for at least 15 summer units.

## Number of Units Completed and Percentage of Units Attempted That Are Completed

There was some concern expressed in advance that programs like the pilot at Irvine which would encourage students to sign up for more than 8 units would have increased the likelihood that students would not complete all the courses they began, particularly because there was no financial penalty for dropping a course.

However, the data on the Irvine pilot do not show that effect. In addition to an increase in the number of units attempted, Appendix 1 Table 4 shows that Irvine also had a healthy increase in the average units completed in summer 2016 compared to summer 2015. The average number of units completed at UC Irvine increased from 7.1 to 8.5.

Appendix 1 Table 4 also shows that the proportion of units completed at Irvine in summer 2016 compared to summer 2015 dipped only slightly to 87 percent from 88 percent. Thus, the additional units attempted resulted in nearly the same proportion of units completed for the Irvine pilot.

**Appendix 1 Table 4**

Average number of units attempted and completed at the pilot and non-pilot campuses compared to the prior year

	Avg. Units Attempted		Avg. Units Completed		Avg. Percentage Completed	
	2015	2016	2015	2016	2015	2016
Berkeley	9.4	9.6	8.5	8.4	91%	88%
Irvine	8.1	9.8	7.1	8.5	88%	87%
San Diego	8.3	8.3	7.7	7.7	93%	93%
3 pilot campuses	8.6	9.3	7.7	8.2	90%	88%
6 non-pilot campuses	9.1	9.1	8.4	8.4	92%	92%
Total	8.9	9.1	8.1	8.3	92%	91%

Note: Summer semester units at Berkeley and Merced are converted to quarter units by multiplying by 1.5.

## Appendix 2: Marketing Images from UC Summer Session 2016 Pilot Websites

### BERKELEY

The screenshot shows the Berkeley Summer Sessions website. At the top, the logo 'Berkeley Summer Sessions' is displayed in blue and orange. A search bar is located in the top right corner. Below the logo is a dark blue navigation bar with white text links: 'About', 'Summer Courses', 'International Students', 'Special Programs', 'Registration & Fees', 'Enrollment Changes', and 'Student Services'. The main content area has a breadcrumb trail: 'Home >> Summer Sessions Courses >> Summer Online Courses >> Letters & Science W1 - Exploring the Liberal Arts >> Letters & Science W1 for Newly Admitted Freshmen'. The course title 'Letters & Science W1 for Newly Admitted Freshmen' is prominently displayed. Below the title, there is a list of details:
 

- Instructor:** Alix Schwartz, Ph.D.
- CCN:** Section 001: 38902
- Session:** C (Eight-Week Session: June 20 - August 12)
- Units:** 2
- Location:** Online

 To the right of these details are links: 'Syllabus', 'Student Orientation Guide 2016', 'Who to Contact for Support Guide 2016', and 'Sample Guest Lecture Video: Ken Ueno, Music'. A bolded question asks: 'Are you excited to be coming to Berkeley, but not sure where or how to start exploring your academic options?'. Below this is a paragraph describing the course as an introduction to the intellectual landscape of the College of Letters & Science. Another section titled 'Get two units of tuition for free!' explains that newly admitted freshmen who complete the course with a 'Pass' grade receive a credit toward the cost of the course. At the bottom of the content area is a 'Register for LS W1' link. The footer features the Berkeley University of California logo on the left and a dark blue bar on the right containing links for 'SSALL', 'Contact Us', 'FAQ', 'Donate', social media icons for Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram, and a 'Summer Newsletter' button.

### \* Latest News



**Expanded Financial Aid options available!**

IRVINE



SAN DIEGO



### Appendix 3: UC Summer Session 2017 Websites

---

**More information about current summer sessions on the UC campuses:**

**Berkeley**                    <http://summer.berkeley.edu>

**Davis**                        <http://summer-sessions.ucdavis.edu>

**Irvine**                        <http://summer.uci.edu>

**Los Angeles**                <http://www.summer.ucla.edu>

**Merced**                      <http://summersession.ucmerced.edu>

**Riverside**                   <http://summer.ucr.edu>

**San Diego**                   <http://summer.ucsd.edu>

**Santa Barbara**             <http://summer.ucsb.edu>

**Santa Cruz**                 <http://summer.ucsc.edu>