IEI Recommendation Letter to Chancellor

Dear Chancellor Abrams,

The College submitted its 2006-07 review of the Instructional Enhancement Initiative (IEI) program to the Student Fee Advisory Committee on March 16, 2007 to meet an established, periodic review requirement. We recommend that you approve the three requests made regarding the Instructional Enhancement Initiative (IEI) as outlined in the review. The three requests are as follows: 1) Keep the IEI fee at its present rate of \$6.00 per unit 2) Redeploy \$150,000 within IEI funds over the next two years to support the Common Collaboration and Learning Environment (CCLE) 3) Increase faculty and student feedback through channels such as the Faculty Committee on Educational Technology (FCET). We support the IEI recommendation that an SFAC undergraduate member be placed on the FCET in order to give more students input on how IEI and other technological initiatives affect students. Our support of the second recommendation, the redeployment of funds to CCLE, is contingent on such a reallocation not adversely affecting other existing programs.

Outside of these three specific recommendations, we have several suggestions that would increase the effectiveness of IEI on campus. First, SFAC students have raised the issue of when the IEI fee is billed. The IEI fee appears almost mid-quarter and thus there is usually some confusion for students with regard to why they are receiving this charge after other fees and what it is for. Because students generally do not anticipate this later charge, they are not always prepared to take this fee into consideration and/or do not check their BAR accounts and are thus charged an additional late fee. We suggest that at the time when most fees are billed, at the beginning of the quarter, that a notice is placed on the student's BAR account and also on MyUCLA that advises students that the IEI fee has not been billed vet but will be posted at a later date, in order that students can be prepared for this charge. This will give students advance notice that the IEI fee will be charged at a later date, hopefully reducing some of the confusion over the charge. Another issue is that students appear unsure of what the IEI fee actually covers. Although there is already a web link provided for students to read more about IEI, we suggest that IEI be more proactive about educating the student body about what the fee goes towards.

We also recommend that IEI work as part of the campus technological community to be as environmentally friendly as possible. For example, future hardware could be purchased with issues of sustainability and energy efficiency in mind. We recommend, for instance, that all printers be bought with the feature of double-sided printing in order to lessen paper waste. We also suggest that IEI evaluate how often it replaces its equipment based on physical use and software requirements. Because of the increased amount of time that students spend with technology, we also recommend that all equipment be ergonomically friendly. Finally, we have been told that UCLA computers are often donated to local schools and encourage IEI to take initiative in making sure that this relationship continues.

We are excited to see how IEI has positively affected the campus and hope that IEI will be able to consistently follow through with the three year review period cycle that was decided upon in earlier years.

Best,

Julie Park, SFAC Chair