Scheduling Task Force Information for today's Academic Senate Meeting

Pat Henrickson
Sent: Tuesday, February 20, 2018 9:14 AM
To: Nikki Dequin; Ozzy Zamora; Jane Maringer

Nikki, Jane and Ozzie:
Here is the information from a recent scheduling task force meeting. I would like to make this information available to the Academic Senate members as we begin our discussions to revise AS recommendations.

Scheduling Guidelines Group Notes from 2/14/18 -these are brainstorm only and will be refined in future meetings.
Issues and concerns presented from the group:

- Consistency
- Blocking
- Refer to Ed Master Plan-Sabrina will send relevant pages to group
- Senate recs-Pat will send to group
- Create canceling guidelines
- Balance areas needed for graduation
- Must keep courses for AST degrees and classes should not conflict
- Consider Guided Pathways
- Online exchange options
- Thoughtful start date that correlate, i.e. 8 week , publish and market late starts(post card, newspaper), put start dates on student schedule so they know
- User interface and how to use it-create mandatory tutorial at end of registration, confirmation of CCC apply when students receives an email-have tutorial guide them
- Consider materials needed for courses. Room scheduling needs to match course need. i.e. CD has heavy materials
- Consider virtual labs for non-science i.e. Bio 10, 15
- Consider hybrid for science
- Be careful of overlapping required courses
- Have counselors review the draft schedule EARLY in the process(Frist Draft)
- Consider a consistent schedule roll out date. i.e. 3rd week in April
- Continue keeping the continuity of summer and intersession classes(predictability for students)

We will be meeting in BU 134 on Wednesdays @ 8:30am. Due date for the scheduling guideline sub group is March 19- guidelines need to be submitted to EMT. Next week we will continue the brainstorm process and refer to the Senate recommendations and the EMP recommendations to guide the conversation.

FYI Notes from Sabrina covering the results of the survey:
2017.12.14 Enrollment Management Team SWOT Analysis
Current Method of Scheduling
Strengths:

- Lead scheduler
- Department chairs with experience contribute well to process
- Faculty that take student input

- "85% good"
  - Offering classes at variety of times and locations

  - Covering spectrum for GE

  - Plans in areas for certain areas / sequential degrees

  - Great faculty teaching the classes

- Improvement in listening to student input when considering GE

- Robust variety of scheduling types and periods

- Responsive to needs at sites

- Not much variation in the schedule from term to term

Weaknesses:
- Inconsistent method

- Late in development and publication

- We have a timeline but don't follow the timeline

- Number of deviations from the sequences and plans that are in place (adding & deleting)

- Thoughtful approach to cancellations
  - Is there a minimum, and if so, what is it?

- Inability to properly market classes

- Spaghetti method for late additions
  - Especially because of stability last year

- Lack of consultation of support services / student services

- Departmental variation in planning for alternative delivery methods

- Not possible to actually complete degrees that we have on the books

- Not much variation in the schedule from term to term

- Imbalance of what types of courses are offered on what days / needed classes conflict on a regular basis

- Inconsistent academic calendar / start dates

- High demand classes that fill even before priority 2 or 3… offer more sections? General students can't get a crack at it
  - Space constraints

- Limited cross-unit discussion

- Waitlists!

Opportunities

- Analysis of best practices for DE courses

- Creation of a systematic approach to cancellations and additions

- Articulation of a cohesive vision for overall enrollment and scheduling – what is it? Consensus that there hasn't been one articulated / lack of direction

- Tie in education master plan and identified needs – we have data on students, courses, and labor market outcomes. How are we considering them?

- Explicitly consider equity groups when creating schedule

- Guided pathways &…

- Move to multiple term scheduling

- Involve counseling upstream, not once schedule is "live"

- Analyze schedule systematically pre-production

- AB705

- Systematically match courses between Morgan Hill and Coyote Valley

- Online education initiative – plan, offer, statewide potential

- Look at scheduling differently given the interest in doing so at this time
    - Scheduling systems that allow that

- Weekend classes, but must have adequate weekend infrastructure to support instruction

- Related to image issue in "Threats," harnessing student stories of those who go elsewhere and come back due to missing our college and its smaller and more supportive environment / hands-on approach
    - But we don't market this! But we should. See "Threats."

- Waitlists!

Threats
- Students going elsewhere to get courses they can't get here

- If they transfer or finish elsewhere, all the work they did here doesn't count for us (outcomes issue)

- Students not completing their goals

- Distance education: students are savvy… they can go to the statewide exchange to get a class elsewhere

- Perception that enrollment management can eliminate certain "favorite" classes

- Failure to catch upstream limits opportunities for late additions

- Lack of infrastructure and preplanning for scheduling

- Services and safety

- at Coyote Valley in general

- On weekends, at all sites, extended testing, support, etc.

- Example: water was shut off because no one checked whether there were classes on the weekend…

- Same thing with IT upgrades – planned scheduling of system updates to not impact instruction

- Perception / concern among some that they will lose control over how their own schedules will look and be "forced" to teach at times /locations they don't want

- Losing students due to process and onboarding constraints / DE scheduling

- The Governor's 115th fully online college… impact on our enrollments?

- Perception of being "forced" to teach online

- Public perception – battling image of us being the "college of last resort" or the "default choice" or "high school 2.0" versus the "destination college" (like De Anza); may be slowly changing

- Consistent marketing message… not true now

- We can develop great plan, but then facilities don't allow it to be implemented due to space constraints

This information can be helpful when we begin the process of updating of Academic Senate guidelines. Our input is essential to the successful work of the Enrollment Management Team. At this point there are only 3 faculty on this task force.

Thanks,
Pat Henrickson
Enrollment Management Task force Member
Child Development and Educational Studies
Gavilan College