

**Questions posed by SFAC during the IEI Review and Answers given by IEI**

From: Hernandez, Nick [mailto:NickH@college.ucla.edu]  
Sent: Wednesday, May 09, 2007 5:52 PM  
To: Sherlyn Mossahebfar  
Cc: Davies, Glyn; Dahl, John V.; Alkin, Marilyn  
Subject: RE: IEI Update

Dear Sherlyn:

I've responded to most of the questions below (see italics). It might be useful to distribute this to your colleagues in advance of our meeting.

Regards,

Nick

-----Original Message-----

From: sherlyn3@ucla.edu [mailto:sherlyn3@ucla.edu  
<mailto:sherlyn3@ucla.edu> ]  
Sent: Tuesday, April 24, 2007 10:57 PM  
To: Hernandez, Nick  
Cc: Dahl, John V.; Alkin, Marilyn; Davies, Glyn  
Subject: RE: IEI Update

Dear Nick:

Thank you for completing the IEI review and submitting the copies to Chancellor's Office and SFAC. We have reviewed the information you have provided and have quite a few questions.

I am aware that you are going to be presenting to SFAC at our meeting on May 10, 2007, so please review and come prepared to the meeting to answer the following questions taht I have included in this email.

Thank you so much.

Respectfully,  
Sherlyn Mossahebfar

1. In Section 4, 'Recommendations and Issues,' you recommend in

item #2 to redeploy up to \$150,000 to support CCLE. Although you are taking it from a discretionary pool, will any area suffer from reallocating this money into CCLE?

The expectation is for the CCLE to help strengthen, not hinder, our goals with respect to educational technology. To this end, the funds should help us realize certain efficiencies and develop more standardization across different applications, particularly course management systems.

2. What portion of MyUCLA does the IEI cover?

IEI covers a small fraction of My.UCLA, about 10%. This is changing, though, and I anticipate that a greater percentage (an additional 5-10%) of My.UCLA will be supported by the IEI in the near term (see response to #3 below for more information).

3. Depending on what websites the student visits, different passwords might be required. What steps have been taken, and how much will it cost to make logging in a one step process?

This is tied to a campus-wide "seamless integration" project that's been in discussion for several months now. The idea behind this project is exactly what you described above; namely, to provide more seamlessness to our students and parents with regard to single log-in and other important functions that's currently dispersed among many different websites/portals. The project is still in its infancy, so I don't anticipate that we'll see any significant changes for another year or so. I should also note that this project is not being funded by the IEI, although since it relates back to My.UCLA, we expect there to be some redeployment of existing resources and/or additional IEI support to help us meet this important goal.

4. Referring to Section 3, 'Financial Statements,' please explain

the methodology for arriving at the \$6.00 IEI fee? In reviewing this current information, we also reviewed the same College Summary financial statements from 2003/04 under Section 5. In the latter case, we noted

that student credit hours were included in the schedule but did not see student credit hours listed in the current financial statements. We would appreciate if you would provide these numbers for the current financial statements too. In addition define student credit hours, reference the source that you use to obtain this information, and explain how they are used in the calculations/methodology if this is the case.

The \$6.00 per unit fee can be categorized in two parts: one, the \$4 base fee, which represents the support needs associated with the numerous course websites and computing facilities. Its derivation is the cost associated in maintaining these services. Note that about \$0.50 of the \$4 base is directed to the CLICC lab in support of its computing needs (same concept, i.e., the cost associated in maintaining the CLICC lab). The second part -- or the remaining \$2 -- was approved by the Chancellor to help us cope with recent budget cuts, as an offset to State cuts the College had to incur in instructional/educational technology.

I'll look into securing SCH information so that we may include it in future statements. In terms of what defines a SCH, it's simply the number of units as defined by course offerings and enrolled students. For example, a 4-unit class that has 10 students will generate 40 SCH, which in turn generates \$240 in IEI revenue (4 units x \$6 per unit x 10 students). The source of SCH information is the Registrar, the book of record in terms of student enrollments and course offerings. John Dahl can elaborate further on the role of the Registrar's Office if you need more information.

5. What computing facilities are supported by the IEI?

I will provide you with a more detail list at our meeting.

6. How many current career staff as well as student staff are covered by IEI fees? We are referencing items 2a, 2b, 3a, and 4a of the College Summary report in Section 3.

I will provide further details at our meeting.

7. We noted large increases in equipment expense from FY05/06 to FY06/07 on lines 2c, 3b, and 3d, and from FY06/07 to FY07/08 on line 4b.

Please elaborate on these increases and your equipment replacement philosophy and schedule. In your answer, please elaborate on the overall increase of 16% in expenditures between FY05/06 and FY06/07.

Our depreciation schedules vary from unit to unit. On average, most of the computing labs replace their workstations every 3 years, while other equipment like servers are replaced ever 3-5 years (it depends on the equipment). Again, these are averages. Note from the financial statements (3d) that 2002-03 was a particularly big year in terms of replacing our workstations (cost of \$1.2 million compared to an annual average cost of \$500k in the subsequent 3 years). In terms of software development (4b), the bulk of the increase from 06/7 to 07/8 reflects what we anticipate in terms of the CCLE, as well as other equipment/support needs related to My.UCLA.

8. Where would we find the evaluation form for the course websites and what are the responses that you have received in the past? Please provide a summary of responses from the evaluation.

The course evaluation form is the standard instructor evaluation form that's provided to each student at the end of each quarter. I don't recall if there are specific questions about the IEI in the evaluation, but I will check. There is also a senior survey that's done, where there are questions related to technology and instructional enhancement, although, again, I'm not sure if there are specific questions with regard to IEI.

Separate from this, there is the IEI complaint/feedback form which we included under section 5 of our submittal. This is also very informative, since the form deals specifically with the IEI. I should note that we do not receive many complaints over the course of the year (less than 20), and that the ones we do receive complain about faculty not utilizing the course websites. I would be happy to share some anecdotes at the meeting.

9. Is IEI included in financial aid?

I believe it is, although John Dahl or someone from his staff should confirm.

10. Are any students exempt from paying the IEI fee?

The IEI is charged ONLY to students enrolled in any College (and now Engineering) undergraduate course. Graduate courses are not assessed the fee, although graduate students enrolled in an undergraduate course are charged the fee. Again, the fee is dependent on the course offering and not the student. The only example where a student is not assessed the fee is if he/she drops the class before the cut-off date of 4th week (this is why we wait to process the charges after after 4th week, i.e., so that students who drop the class are not assessed the fee).

11. The Faculty Committee on Education Technology (FCET) reviewed

various aspects of the IEI and reported on its findings in a March 6, 2003 letter. Was there a follow up to their findings? Is this a standing committee? Should they be asked again for a similar review?

Let's talk further about this important issue at our meeting, as I would like some feedback from you and your colleagues to help inform the process on our end.

12. Can the different services such as moodle be aggregated, which could result in decreased fees?

I'm not sure I understand your question. Moodle is essentially a software program that the campus has decided to adopt for the CCLE. The very notion of the CCLE is predicated on consolidation/commonality for services that are either not currently offered OR that are offered but in a piecemeal fashion (and at a relatively high cost, in some cases). Keep in mind that the IEI does not currently support the CCLE, although the \$150k per above is seed funding to help explore/integrate some of the things currently done in course websites and My.UCLA within this new paradigm. Discussions are taking place at the campus level with regard to CCLE's funding stream.