

Evaluation of Summer 1 and 2 Sessions

Dr. Jack Friedlander
Executive Vice President

9-14-15

As a condition of approving offering a second summer session in 2015, the College Planning Council (CPC) requested that a comprehensive evaluation be conducted of the two summer sessions. The purpose of this evaluation was to provide CPC with information it could use to inform its decision on whether or not to continue offering two summer sessions and, to identify changes that could be made to enhance the effectiveness of the way in which the two summer sessions are developed and implemented.

Methods for Conducting the Evaluation

This evaluation is based on the analyses of the following information: (1) data drawn from the college's Banner System and Tableau reports for students who took part in one or both summer sessions; (2) financial data provided by Business Services on the revenues and expenses attributed to offering a second summer session; (3) responses to a survey sent to all students who enrolled in one or both of the 2015 summer sessions; and (4) responses to a survey that was distributed to all faculty, classified staff, and managers. The final section of this evaluation lists recommendations based on the findings of this study for steps the college could take to enhance the effectiveness of offering two summer sessions, if the decision is made to do so.

1. What percentage of students in the spring semester enrolled in one or both of the 2015 summer sessions?

As shown in Table 1, 30.5% of the students attending the college in the 2015 Spring Semester enrolled in one or both of the two summer sessions. The comparable rate for spring 2014 to the 2014 summer session was 27%. It is instructive to note that there were 191 fewer students enrolled in the college in the 2015 Spring Semester compared to the number enrolled in the 2014 Spring Semester. This lowered the base of students who could have enrolled in one or both of the 2015 summer sessions.

Table 1**Spring to Summer Persistence Rates**

Spring to Summer Year	Enrolled Spring	Number Persisted	Percent Persisted
Spring 2013 -> Summer 2013	19,794	5,290	26.7%
Spring 2014 -> Summer 2014	19,661	5,302	27.0%
Spring 2015 -> Summer 1 or 2 2015	19,468	5,932	30.5%

2. How many students enrolled in at least one of the two summer sessions?

A total of 9,127 students enrolled in one or both of the two 2015 summer sessions which was 1,080 or 13.4% higher than the 8,047 students enrolled in the 2014 summer session.

Table 2

Question #2 (As of 8/27/15 for F15, 8/28/14 for F14)			
Enrolled Summer 2014	Also Enrolled Fall 2014	% Enrolled S14 and F14	Units Enrolled Fall 2014
8,047	5,643	70.1%	59,042
Enrolled Summer 1 or 2 2015	Also Enrolled Fall 2015	% Enrolled Su15 (1 or 2) and F15	Units Enrolled Fall 2015
9,141	6,158	67.4%	64,641

3. How many students enrolled in both Summer Session 1 and Summer Session 2?

A total of 1,915 or 36.5% of the students who participated in at least one of the 2015 summer sessions enrolled in both summer sessions.

Table 3

Students enrolled in both Summer 1 and Summer 2 2015		
Summer 1 Enrollment	Summer 2 Enrollment	Enrolled in Both Summer 1 and 2
5,238	6,025	2,160

4. How many FTES were produced from the two summer sessions for all students, for California resident students, and for out-of-state and international students for both summer sessions?

The college generated 340 more resident FTES from the two summer sessions offered in 2015 than in the 2014 Summer Session. In addition, there was an increase of 15 FTES in non-resident students and 25 FTES for international students.

Table 4

	Summer 2014 FTES	Summer 1 2015 FTES	Summer 2 2015 FTES	Summer 2015 I + 2 FTES	Summer 1 + 2 FTES as a Percentage of Summer 2014 FTES
Resident	1,080	659	761	1,420	132%
Out of State	56	32	39	71	127%
International	120	83	62	145	121%
TOTAL	1,256	774	862	1,636	130%

5. Did the college achieve its FTES targets for offering the two summer sessions?

The college achieved 87% of its targeted resident student FTES for the two summer sessions. The goal was to increase the FTES for the two 2015 summer sessions by 1.5 times the amount generated from the 2014 summer session. As shown in Table 5, there was a 200 shortfall in resident FTES than projected between the target resident FTES and what was achieved ($1620 - 1,420 = 200$ resident FTES).

The resident FTES was 9.8% (59 FTES) higher than projected for the first summer session. This enabled the college to meet its funded FTES base for 2014-15 plus capture 60 FTES in growth funding which has been added to the college's base funding for 2015-16. This also enabled the college to get off stability funding and to do so without having to borrow FTES from Summer Session 2.

The resident student FTES for the second summer session was 25.4% (259 FTES) lower than expected. A major factor contributing to not meeting the FTES target was not offering classes or a adequate number of sections students wanted to take to fulfill their lower division transfer requirements.

Table 5

August 25, 2015	CA Resident FTES			
Summer 2014 FTES	1,080			
Target: 150% of Summer 2014	1,620			
	Target Resident FTES	Actual Resident FTES	Over (Under) FTES	Over (Under) % of target
Summer 1	600	659	59	9.8%
Summer 2	1,020	761	-259	-25.4%
TOTAL	1,620	1,420	-200	-12.3%

6. **What was revenue vs. the expenses associated with adding a second summer session?** As noted in Table 6, the college received \$3,214,382 in FTES apportionment from the state as a result of applying the resident FTES from Summer Session 1 to meeting its state base funded FTES allocation plus 60 FTES in growth funding. Part of this revenue is from not having the college's base FTES apportionment funding reduced for 2015-16 as a result of needing to remain on stability funding by 25% of the difference between the college's base FTES funding for 2014-15 and the amount it generated last year.

If offering two summer sessions in 2016 is approved, the plan is to offer two noncredit as well as credit summer sessions since each are now on the same academic calendar. Adding a second noncredit summer session should help the college meet its future funded FTES base

Table 6

1 versus 2 Summer Sessions Variance of State Apportionment		
	2014-15 Final	
	FTES	Revenue
Fall, Spring, & Summer II Credit Resident FTES	12,910	\$60,365,869
Summer I Credit Resident FTES	619	\$2,894,382
Summer I Credit Non Resident FTES	40	\$320,000
Total Summer I Credit FTES	659	\$3,214,382
Total Credit FTES	13,569	\$63,580,251
What would have been lost without Additional Summer Session	659	\$3,214,382

Additional state revenue from the increase in FTES by offering a second summer session: Table 7 shows some of the items the state paid the colleges based on the number of FTES it produced in 2014-15 and the approximate amounts of additional income it received from the additional FTES resulting from offering a second summer session. As a result of offering a second summer session, the college received an additional \$748,318 in state funding for the programs noted in this chart.

Table 7

Additional Revenue sources based on FTES:	
Revenue Sources	Additional Revenue gained due to 2 Summers
Scheduled Maintenance	\$82,331
State Mandated Reimbursement - one time	\$45,193
State Mandated Reimbursement -on going	\$259,848
Student Success Support Program (SSSP)	\$159,141
Student Equity Program (SEP)	\$82,526
Lottery – unrestricted	\$92,260
Lottery – restricted	<u>\$27,019</u>
Total	<u>\$748,318</u>

7. What was the total amount of additional revenue received by the college in 2015-16 as a result of applying FTES from Summer Session 1 to the FTES it generated in 2014-15?

The total amount of additional revenue the college has to operate this year from applying the FTES from Summer Session 1 to the 2014-15 academic year is **\$3,962,700** (\$3,214,382 plus \$748, 318=\$3,962,700).

Additional Expenses from Offering a Second Summer Session: The additional expenses directly attributable from offering two summer sessions are in the areas of instructional costs, department chair stipends, and classified salaries. Given the challenge in gaining an accurate assessment of the additional classified hourly staff salary expenses that can be directly attributed to adding a second summer session, this analysis focused on the instructional costs from offering two summer sessions.,

As shown in Table 8, the additional instructional expenses (TLUs, increase in department chair stipends) resulting from offering an additional summer session, and associated payroll costs) from offering a second summer session compared to these same costs when one summer session was offered in 2014 was \$861,669.

Table 8

Summer Session Costs for 2014 Summer (one session):	\$2,344,674
Summer Session Costs for 2015 Summer (two sessions):	3,206,343
variance:	\$ 861,669

Even if the estimated addition in hourly classified staff salaries and benefits needed to support two summer sessions was \$50,000, the additional revenue from adding a second summer session far exceeds the expenses of doing so. A few departments requested additional permanent classified positions to support a second summer session. The costs of any new position that CPC and the administration would agree to fund to support a second summer session would not come close to off-setting the revenues derived from the two summer sessions.

8. Did summer session 1 cannibalize enrollments in summer session 2?

The analyses that were conducted to address this question are noted below.

Number of sections offered in Summer Session 2 compared to the number offered in the 2014 Summer Session. The college offered 180 fewer sections of courses in Summer Session 2 compared to the number offered in the 2014 Summer Session (478 vs, 298 sections). There were fewer sections or, in a few instances, no class sections offered at all, in many high demand subjects that students in general and Dual Enrollment students in particular enrolled in in past summer sessions. More specifically, fewer sections were offered in Summer Session 2 compared to the 2014 Summer session in such high demand areas as Art, Biology Medical Science, Biology, Communication, economics, English 110 and 111, History, HIT/CIM, Business Administration and Business Law, Math, and Political Science.

Due to factors related to not having a sufficient number of faculty, and, for a few departments such as Biology, laboratory assistants to staff lab sections of courses for both summer sessions, the college was not able to offer sufficient sections of courses that students have typically taken in past summer sessions (the courses are noted above in the response to Question 7 and in the summary of the responses to questions in the student survey which are reported later in this report).

Percentage of students attending the college in the 2014 Spring Semester who enrolled in the 2014 Summer Session compared to the percentage attending the college in the 2015 Spring Semester who enrolled in Summer Session 2. As shown in Table 9, excluding Dual Enrollment students, 27% of those attending the college in

the 2014 Spring Semester enrolled in the 2014 Summer Session compared to 30.5% of those attending the college in spring, 2015 that enrolled in Summer Session 2.

Table 9

Spring to Summer Persistence Rates

<u>Spring to Summer Year</u>	Enrolled Spring	Number Persisted	Percent Persisted
Spring 2014 -> Summer 2014	19,661	5,302	27.0%
Spring 2015 -> Summer 1 or 2 2015	19,468	5,932	30.5%

Number of Dual Enrollment Students Enrolled in Summer Session 2 compared to the 2014 Summer Session. Despite offering fewer sections in Summer Session 2 than in the 2014 Summer Session, close to the same number of Dual Enrollment students enrolled in Summer Session 2 as they did in the 2014 Summer Session (860 vs.842).

Table 10

**# of Dual Enrollment Students, Summer 2014 and Summer 1 / 2
2015**

Summer 2014	Summer 1 2015	Summer 2 2015
860	159	842

Student survey findings that pertain to whether offering two summer sessions cannibalized enrollments in the second summer session: When asked if the college did not offer Summer Session 1, would they have taken classes at another college, 29% of the students responding to the student survey conducted at the end of the two summer sessions said they would have enrolled in the same or similar courses if offered online at another college or university; 18.5% said they would have taken the same or a similar classes if offered in a face-to-face format at another college; and 75% said they would have waited to take the same or similar classes if offered by the college in its second summer session (students were allowed to check one of more of these responses).

These findings suggest that a sizable number of students who enrolled in Summer Session 1 would have waited to enroll in one a single summer session. On the other hand, a significant number of students enrolled in Summer Session 1 reported that they would have or considered taking their summer school classes elsewhere had it not been offered.

9. Did offering two summer sessions affect enrollments in the 2015 fall semester? No

To address this question, the following two analyses were conducted:

(1) comparisons were made between the percentages of students who enrolled in each of the 2015 summer sessions who continued taking classes at the college in the 2015 Fall Semester with the percentage of those who attended classes in the 2014 Summer Session and re-enrolled in classes at the college in the 2014 Fall Semester; and (2) an analysis to determine if the four percent or so decline in enrollments and unit counts as of the end of the second week of the 2015 Fall semester compared to what they were at this time in the 2014 Fall Semester could possibly be attributed to the offering of a second summer session in 2015.

As evidenced in Table 11, the percentage of students attending both of the 2015 summer sessions who enrolled in the 2015 Fall semester was significantly higher than the comparable comparison for the summer-fall rate for 2014 (85.8% vs.69.7%).

Table 11

Summer to Fall Persistence Rates, As of 9/10/15 for Fall 2015, 9/11/14 for Fall 2014

Enrolled Summer 14 8,047	Also Enrolled Fall 14 5,605	% Also Enrolled Fall 14 69.7%	Units Enrolled Fall 14 59,184
Enrolled Summer 1 or 2 15 9,143	Also Enrolled Fall 15 6,179	% Also Enrolled Fall 15 67.6%	Units Enrolled Fall 15 64,389
Enrolled Summer 1 and 2 15 2,169	Also Enrolled Fall 15 1,860	% Also Enrolled Fall 15 85.8%	Units Enrolled Fall 15 20,964

The second data analysis conducted to determine if offering a second summer session affected enrollments in the 2015 Fall Semester involved identifying where after the first two weeks of term the decline of 647 students (3.9%) decline in headcount and unit counts was taking place between the 2014 and the 2015 Fall Semesters.

As reported in Table 12, excluding Dual Enrollment students, there were 208 or 4.2% fewer first- time to college students 19 years of age or younger enrolled in the 2015 Fall Semester compared to the comparable number of students enrolled in the 2014

Fall semester. This decline in enrollments cannot be attributed to the offering of two summer sessions.

Moreover, excluding Dual Enrollment students, from the 2013 to the 2015 Fall Semesters, there has there has been a decline of 404 students 19 years of age or lower who entered the college as of the end of the second week of the term.

Table 12 – Location of High School of All Students Enrolled at SBCC Excluding Dual-Enrollment Students

High School	Fall 2013		Fall 2014		Fall 2015	
	Headcount	% Change	Headcount	% Change	Headcount	% Change
Bishop	33	-34.0%	11	-66.7%	7	-36.4%
Carpinteria	144	-0.7%	106	-26.4%	109	2.8%
Dos Pueblos	411	-11.6%	398	-3.2%	387	-2.8%
San Marcos	371	9.4%	338	-8.9%	325	-3.8%
Santa Barbara	399	-0.5%	370	-7.3%	349	-5.7%
Other Local						
HS	51	34.2%	52	2.0%	35	-32.7%
Other CA HS	2,886	3.8%	2,772	-4.0%	2,615	-5.7%
Out of State						
HS	467	12.3%	525	12.4%	522	-0.6%
International						
HS	427	9.2%	415	-2.8%	424	2.2%
Unknown HS	12	-42.9%	18	50.0%	24	33.3%
Total	5,201	3.1%	5,005	-3.8%	4,797	-4.2%

The data in the Table 13 shows that at the start of the third week of the fall semester, there were 880 (4.7) fewer students enrolled in the 2015 Fall semester compared to enrollments in the 2014 Fall Semester.

The largest declines in enrollment took place among out-of-area California residents (492 or 5.2%) and international students (177 or 7.3%). These declines in enrollments are more likely attributed to the decision by the college to no longer recruit out-of-area students. The decline international students can be attributed to the combination of the college's decision to raise international student tuition by close to 14% for the 2015-16 academic year, increasing the admissions requirements, making the application date earlier than in past years coupled with the strong dollar which further contributed to the cost of attending the college.

Table 13 – Including all student age groups by high school, excluding dual-enrollment

High School	Fall 2013		Fall 2014		Fall 2015	
	Headcount	% Change	Headcount	% Change	Headcount	% Change
Bishop	119	-5.6%	84	-29.4%	56	-33.3%
Carpinteria	464	0.2%	413	-11.0%	416	0.7%
Dos Pueblos	1,190	-4.3%	1,226	3.0%	1,158	-5.5%
San Marcos	1,157	1.0%	1,115	-3.6%	1,096	-1.7%
Santa Barbara	1,352	0.9%	1,280	-5.3%	1,247	-2.6%
Other Local HS	173	2.4%	199	1.1%	168	-15.6%
Other CA HS	9,298	2.8%	9,421	1.3%	8,929	-5.2%
Out of State HS	2,047	8.2%	2,139	4.5%	2,087	-2.4%
International HS	2,365	1.7%	2,426	2.6%	2,249	-7.3%
Unknown HS	353	-20.1%	316	-10.5%	333	5.4%
Total	18,518	1.8%	18,619	0.5%	17,739	-4.7%

Taken together, the evidence shown in these analyses does not indicate that the decline in the 2015 Fall Semester enrollments can be attributed to the college offering two summer sessions.

Differences in the course completion rates in Summer Session 1 and in Summer Session 2 compared to the rates in the 2014 and the 2013 Summer Sessions for all courses, for online classes, and for face-to-face classes?

As noted in Table 14, despite offering a greater percentage of class sections online (these classes typically have lower successful course completion rates than the same courses offered face-to-face), in each of the two 2015 Summer Sessions compared with the number offered in the 2014 Summer Session, the successful course completion rates were very similar for Summer Sessions 1 (77%) and 2 (79%) to those in the 2014 Summer Session (79%).

The course completion rates in classroom-based classes were higher in Summer Session 2 than they were in Summer Session 1 (86% vs. 82%) and in the 2014 Summer Session (86% vs. 83%).

The data in Table 15 shows that the successful class completion rates in online classes in Summer Session 1 (72%) and in Summer Session 2 (71%) were similar to those for students enrolled in online classes in the 2014 Summer Session (71%).

Table 14

Successful Course Completion Rates in All Classes			
Term	Total Grades	Count Successful	Percent Successful
Summer 2014	11,902	9,360	79%
Summer 1 2015	6,978	5,365	77%
Summer 2 2015	8,558	6,759	79%
Successful Course Completion Rates in Online Classes (Fully online or Hybrid)			
Term	Total Grades	Count Successful	Percent Successful
Summer 2014	4,035	2,831	70%
Summer 1 2015	2,979	2,141	72%
Summer 2 2015	3,066	2,180	71%
Successful Course Completion Rates in Face-to-Face Classes			
Term	Total Grades	Count Successful	Percent Successful
Summer 2014	7,867	6,529	83%
Summer 1 2015	3,999	3,224	81%
Summer 2 2015	5,492	4,579	83%

Table 15

Online Enrollment			
Term	Unduplicated Headcount	Enrolled in an online class	Percent online
Summer 2014	8,047	3,017	37%
Summer 1 2015	5,238	2,345	45%
Summer 2 2015	6,025	2,392	40%

Table 16 shows the comparison of course completion rates in Summer Session 1 and in Summer Session 2 for students enrolled in both summer sessions broken down by method of delivery.

Table 16

Students Enrolled in both Summer I and Summer 2 Sessions			
Course Completion Rates in All Classes			
Term	Total Grades	Count Successful	Percent Successful
Summer 1 2015	3,080	2,480	81%
Summer 2 2015	3,146	2,456	78%
Course Completion Rates in Online Classes (Fully online or Hybrid)			
Term	Total Grades	Count Successful	Percent Successful
Summer 1 2015	1,270	973	77%
Summer 2 2015	1,286	962	75%
Course Completion Rates in Face-to-Face Classes			
Term	Total Grades	Count Successful	Percent Successful
Summer 1 2015	1,810	1,507	83%
Summer 2 2015	1,860	1,494	80%

10. Approximately how many students who enrolled in Summer Session 1 may have taken summer session classes elsewhere or not if the college offered a single summer session in 2015?it had not been offered we did not offer the first summer session broken down by local and out-of-area California residents, non-resident, and international students by face-to-face and online classes.

To gain insights into addressing this question, a survey will be conducted of students who enrolled in summer session 1 broken down by face-to-face and distance education classes to determine the approximate number of these students who would have taken summer session classes elsewhere, the number who would have taken the same classes in summer session 2, and the number who would have not enrolled in summer session 1 or 2 classes if the college had not offered the first summer session. The survey has been distributed.

Student Survey

Methodology: At the completion of the second summer session, a survey was sent via Pipeline and personal email addresses to all students who enrolled in one or both of the two 2015 Summer Sessions. The survey consisted of multiple choice questions and written responses A total of 2,265 surveys were completed which is a 25% response rate. Student responses to the objective items are noted below in Tables 17-24.

Summary of the Findings from the Student Survey

Table 17

Did you attend Summer Session 1?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	59.7%	1352
No	40.3%	913
<i>answered question</i>		2265
<i>skipped question</i>		0

Table 18

How many classes did you take in Summer Session 1?					
Answer Options	None	One	Two	Three or more	Response Count
Online	234	468	121	13	836
Classroom	220	508	100	10	838
Combined Online/Classroom	402	92	10	0	504
<i>answered question</i>					
<i>skipped question</i>					

Table 19

What courses, if any, did you want to take in Summer Session 1 but could not because		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
They were not offered	61.9%	283
They were offered but full	19.5%	89
Other (please explain)	39.2%	179
<i>answered question</i>		457
<i>skipped question</i>		1808

Table 20

If the college did not offer Summer Session 1, would you have (check all that apply)		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Enrolled in the same or similar summer course(s) offered online somewhere else	28.6%	291
Enrolled in the same or similar summer course(s) offered on-campus somewhere else	18.4%	188
Waited for Summer Session 2 to take these classes, if offered.	78.0%	795
Other (please explain)		77
<i>answered question</i>		1019
<i>skipped question</i>		1246

Table 21

Are you attending Summer Session 2?		
Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Yes	74.6%	1585
No	25.4%	539
<i>answered question</i>		2124
<i>skipped question</i>		141

Table 22**How many classes are you taking in Summer Session 2?**

Answer Options	None	One	Two	Three or more	Response Count
Online	276	531	133	12	952
Classroom	223	704	169	26	1122
Combined Online/Classroom	445	50	15	4	514
<i>answered question</i>					

Table 23**What courses, if any, did you want to take in Summer Session 2 but could not because**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
They were not offered	60.4%	300
They were offered but full	23.1%	115
Other (please explain)	33.6%	167
<i>answered question</i>		497
<i>skipped question</i>		1768

Table 24**If you attended both Summer 1 and Summer 2, do you also plan to register for the upcoming Fall semester?**

Answer Options	Response Percent	Response Count
Not applicable - I attended Summer 1 or 2 but not both	39.5%	605
Yes	50.4%	773
No	6.8%	105
Not sure	3.3%	50
Comments		89
<i>answered question</i>		1533
<i>skipped question</i>		732

The written comments students made to several of the questions, were placed in categories and the number of comments made in each of these categories was tabulated. The following is a summary of the comments that were made in descending order of frequency. The number before item listed below is the frequency in which the comment was made.

Table 25

Broad Theme of Written Comments	Count	Percent
Two summer sessions is a good idea	228	27%
Add more classes/ schedule classes differently	139	16%
Improve support services/ hours (e.g., library, cafeteria, bookstore, financial aid)	89	10%
Expression of appreciation about course, instructor, or SBCC	85	10%
6 weeks is too short; offer 8, 10, or 12-week courses	72	8%
No Comment or Personal Comment/ Experience	66	8%
Complaint about course or instructor	49	6%
A break between summer sessions and/or between spring and summer	44	5%
Add more online classes	41	5%
Two summer sessions is a bad idea	31	4%
Classes were cancelled	24	3%
A better system for getting into the class; couldn't get the class I wanted	18	2%
Summer 1 overlapped with High School and UCSB spring term	8	1%
Offer a winter session	5	1%
Too many HS students in Summer classes	4	0.5%

Summary of the Responses to the Student Survey

The following is a summary of the objective and written comments to the student survey.

- Of those who responded to the survey, 72% of the students enrolled in one or more online class and 74% took one or more of their classes face-to-face.
- In response to the question of what courses, if any, students wanted to take in Summer Session 1 but were not able to do so, 62% said that the classes they wanted to take were not offered and an additional 19.5 % noted that the classes they wanted were offered but closed to additional enrollments.
- The classes students wanted to have offered or wanted more sections of were similar for both summer sessions. They included classes in such subjects as: HIT, biology, computer science, chemistry, physics, math, economics, history,

political science, business, communications, and Early Childhood Development.

- When asked if the college did not offer Summer Session 1, would they have taken classes at another college, 29% said they would have enrolled in the same or similar courses if offered online at another college or university; 18.5% said they would have taken the same or a similar classes if offered in a face-to-face format at another college; and 75% said they would have waited to take the same or similar classes if offered by the college in its second summer session (students were allowed to check one of more of these responses).
- With respect to Summer Session 2, 60% of the respondents reported the courses they wanted to take were not offered and 23% said the classes they were interested in taking were full.
- 84% of the students who enrolled in both summer sessions reported that they plan to register for the 2015 fall semester and an additional 5% were not sure.
- When asked to offer comments that would help the college better meet their summer session needs, a large number of the students expressed thanks to the college for offering two summer sessions. Many of the comments pertained to students experiences with their instructors (overwhelmingly positive with a few exceptions) and listing the courses they wish were offered.

One shortcoming of the student survey is that it did not capture information on the potential students who decided to not enroll in one or both summer sessions as a result of their not finding the classes they wanted to take. Having this information would have enabled the college to more accurately project the demand for classes to be offered in future summer sessions.

Faculty and Staff Survey

Methodology: A survey was sent via Pipeline to all managers, classified staff, and to all full-time and adjunct faculty members regardless of whether or not they taught classes in one or both of the two summer sessions. The survey consisted of a few demographic items and several open response questions.

Many of those who responded to the survey within a day from the time it was distributed commented that they needed more information to provide informed responses to several of the questions. Seeing these comments led to the decision to re-send the same survey to everyone who received the first version. The second survey contained the same questions as the first survey but provided a bit more information about the two summer sessions. Individuals who returned the first survey were informed that they did not need to resubmit their responses unless they would be different as a result of the additional information about the two summer sessions contained in the second version of the survey. In reading the responses to the surveys, it does not appear that many people answered the survey twice. Therefore, the following analyses of the responses were based on combining the data from each of the two surveys.

A total of 531 faculty and staff members responded to the survey. The responses to each of the questions in the survey are shown in the Table 26 is for all respondents and for members of each employee group. The raw data to the survey items can be accessed [here](#).

The data in Table 26 shows the number and percentage of the respondents in each employee category who stated they supported offering two summer sessions (Yes), did not favor offering two summer sessions (No), had no opinion, needed more information, or did not respond to the question.

Table 26 Faculty/Staff Responses to the Survey

What is your primary role?	Yes		No		No Opinion		Need More Info		No Response	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Academic Department Chair	7	44%	4	25%	1	6%	2	13%	2	13%
Classified Staff	26	16%	66	41%	15	9%	25	16%	29	18%
Faculty Full-time	62	39%	39	24%	13	8%	32	20%	14	9%
Faculty Part-time	74	56%	31	23%	10	8%	12	9%	6	5%
Management	15	35%	13	30%	3	7%	5	12%	7	16%
Other (please specify)	4	22%	5	28%	2	11%	2	11%	5	28%
Total	188	35%	158	30%	44	8%	78	15%	63	12%

The percentage of respondents by employee group who had a “Yes” or “No” position on whether or not they favored two summer sessions are reported in Table 27. This analysis revealed that 64% of the academic department chairs, 61% of the full-time faculty, 70% of the adjunct faculty, and 54% of the managers who responded to the survey were in support of offering two summer sessions while 72% of the classified staff were not in favor of doing so.

Table 27

	Recommend Yes	Recommend No	Total	% Yes	% No
Academic Department Chair	7	4	11	64%	36%
Classified	26	66	92	28%	72%
Faculty Full-Time	62	39	101	61%	39%
Faculty Part-Time	74	31	105	70%	30%
Management	15	13	28	54%	46%
Other	4	5	9	44%	56%
Total	188	158	346	54%	46%

The written comments regarding the offering of two summer sessions were categorized and then tabulated. If a person made several comments that corresponded to one or more of the categories, each comment was recorded separately for the corresponding response category. If a person made several comments that corresponded to one or more of the categories, each comment was recorded separately for the corresponding response category. The results of this analysis are reported in Table 28.

Table 28

Broad Theme of Reason for Recommendation	Dept Chair		Classified Staff		Faculty Full-Time		Faculty Part-Time		Management		Other	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
No Opinion / No Comment	0	0%	11	7%	14	9%	7	5%	2	5%	2	11%
More information / results of evaluation needed	0	0%	14	9%	14	9%	4	3%	4	9%	1	6%
There are significant problems that need to be addressed	1	6%	11	7%	18	11%	9	7%	6	14%	2	11%
Scheduling issues need to be addressed	3	19%	52	32%	37	23%	26	20%	6	14%	3	17%
Impact on support services staff and faculty is significant	5	31%	69	43%	36	23%	12	9%	16	37%	3	17%
Negative impact on students	1	6%	14	9%	19	12%	15	11%	1	2%	2	11%
Negative impact on enrollments	3	19%	10	6%	14	9%	21	16%	1	2%	1	6%
Good opportunity for students	6	38%	21	13%	47	29%	54	41%	9	21%	3	17%
Good opportunity for the college	3	19%	5	3%	8	5%	5	4%	10	23%	0	0%
Good opportunity for faculty	2	13%	0	0%	10	6%	18	14%	0	0%	0	0%
Longer break between summer session 1 and fall was good	0	0%	1	1%	10	6%	6	5%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	24		208		227		177		55		17	

The data presented in Table 29 shows the percentage of the written responses regarding their opinions about offering two summer sessions for each employee group. Table 30 shows the written responses made by faculty depending on whether or not they taught in one or both of the two summer sessions.

Table 29

	Yes		No		No Opinion		Need More Info		No Response	
Did you teach this summer?	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
Did not teach this summer	11	17%	25	38%	12	18%	12	18%	5	8%
Taught session 1 only	29	48%	14	23%	3	5%	8	13%	6	10%
Taught session 2 only	43	66%	12	18%	2	3%	5	8%	3	5%
Taught both sessions 1 and 2	55	57%	15	15%	6	6%	18	19%	3	3%
Other	6	25%	8	33%	1	4%	4	17%	5	21%
Total	144	46%	74	24%	24	8%	47	15%	22	7%

Table 30

	Did not teach		Session 1 only		Session 2 only		Both sessions		Other	
Broad Theme of Reason for Recommendation	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
No Opinion / No Comment	11	17%	4	7%	2	3%	4	4%	0	0%
More information / results of evaluation needed	5	8%	2	3%	0	0%	10	10%	2	8%
There are significant problems that need to be addressed	7	11%	1	2%	6	9%	12	12%	2	8%
Scheduling issues need to be addressed	17	26%	13	22%	11	17%	16	16%	9	38%
Impact on support services staff and faculty is significant	15	23%	10	17%	5	8%	18	19%	5	21%
Negative impact on students	5	8%	9	15%	5	8%	11	11%	5	21%
Negative impact on enrollments	14	22%	7	12%	5	8%	9	9%	3	13%
Good opportunity for students	8	12%	17	28%	36	55%	42	43%	5	21%
Good opportunity for the college	2	3%	4	7%	2	3%	8	8%	0	0%
Good opportunity for faculty	0	0%	6	10%	15	23%	8	8%	1	4%
The longer break between summer session I and fall was good	0	0%	10	17%	3	5%	3	3%	0	0%
Total	84		83		90		141		32	

Summary of major themes from the faculty/staff survey: In an effort to make the responses easier to interpret, the written responses were placed in categories and the number of comments in each category was tabulated separately for faculty, classified staff and managers. The following is a brief summary of the major themes that were identified from the written comments.

Among 531 responses, three dominant themes emerged. Of those who said “Yes” that they support offering two summer sessions again in 2016, 76% cited it being a good opportunity for students. Of those who said “No” to repeating two summer sessions, 66% stated that the impact on support services staff and faculty is significant, and 49% felt that scheduling issues need to be

addressed.

When analyzing results by employee category, a marked discrepancy in response type became clear. The majority of classified staff respondents (66%) said “No” that they do not agree with offering two summer sessions again, while a majority of faculty respondents (62% of full-time and 72% of part-time) said “Yes” in support of two summer sessions in 2016. The management group was almost evenly split, with 13 “No” responses and 15 “Yes” responses. The employee group that was the most in support of two summer sessions was faculty who taught classes in one or both of the two summer sessions.

Recommendations to consider if the decision is made to continue offering two summer sessions

The findings from this evaluation suggest the following steps be considered to enhance the effectiveness of future offerings of two summer sessions if the decision is made to do so. The recommendations are not listed in priority order.

Recommendation 1: A high percentage of the classified staff who responded to the Faculty/Staff Survey did not support the continuation of offering two summer sessions due to work load considerations. Managers of departments and units impacted by the offering of an additional summer session need to meet with the staff and faculty of the affected units to identify the challenges staff and Educational Support Division faculty had this past summer in accommodating the additional work associated with the offering of a second summer session. The purpose of these meetings is to identify steps that can be taken to address the work load concerns expressed by those in their areas.

Recommendation 2: Conduct a careful analysis of the enrollments in each of the courses offered in the first and the second 2015 summer sessions to identify the ones that should be scheduled in one or both of the 2016 summer sessions. The analysis should take into account the scheduling of the courses and number of sections students indicated they wish were offered this past summer.

Recommendation 3: A large number of students enrolled in online classes offered in the summer sessions. In many instances, sections of online courses were the first to close. Consideration should be given to schedule an adequate number of sections of courses offered online to correspond to student demand for these types of classes. With the start of the state’s listing and promoting its listing of all

online classes offered by California community colleges, it will make it easier for students to enroll in online classes offered by other community colleges if they cannot access these courses from the college.

Recommendation 4: In developing preliminary and comprehensive plans, where appropriate, counselors should include listing courses students need to complete in one or both of the summer sessions. This information could be used to identify the courses and estimated number of sections to offer in each of the two summer sessions. In addition, information could be collected from high school counselors or directly from high school students on the classes they would like to take if offered during the first and especially the second summer session.

Recommendation 5: One of the challenges in offering some of the core courses students wanted to take in each of the two summer sessions was finding faculty to teach these courses. Department chairs should begin the process of staffing their 2016 summer session classes in November if CPC recommends that the college continue offering two summer sessions. The hiring of six new full-time faculty positions should make it easier for departments receiving these positions to staff additional sections.

Recommendation 6: One of the reasons a few departments had for not scheduling courses in one of the two summer sessions is that they did not have sufficient classified staff to support the lab sections associated with the courses. Department chairs in consultation with their dean should begin identifying strategies that would enable the labs to be staffed.

Recommendation 7: In addition to targeting current students and high school students, the marketing campaign to promote the two summer sessions should focus on encouraging people in each of the following groups to participate in one or both summer session: Noncredit students (either to enroll in the noncredit or credit summer sessions); students who stopped attending the college in good standing prior to achieving their goals of certificate, degree and/or transfer; and students who stopped attending the college due to being placed on academic disqualification or where no making satisfactory progress toward their objective.