

Summer Analysis

Paul Jarrell, EVP Ed. Programs

8.31.16

Introduction

Historically, SBCC has offered a single six-week summer intersession in addition to a fall and spring primary term. This provided students three terms within which they could enroll in classes. Typically, fall semester would run from the last week in August to mid-December. After a long break, spring semester would begin after MLK day in mid-January and end around the end of the third week in May. The six-week summer intersession would begin around the end of the third week in June, after about a three to four week break.

Faced with declining enrollments, SBCC decided in the summer of 2015 to offer two six week intersessions. This would give students four terms within which they could enroll and it would provide SBCC with an opportunity to capture additional FTES (Full Time Equivalent Student) in an effort to avoid stability. During times of growth, many institutions have a winter intersession, or two summer intersessions.

Student Impact

Data sources:

Friedlander, 9.22.15

Reisz, SBCC IARP Office, 8.12.16

Jarrell, Ed Programs, High School Analysis, 8.27.16

Credit

SBCC offered 497 sections in Summer 2014, 747 sections in Summer 2015, and 653 sections in Summer 2016. During the summer intersessions of 2015 and 2016, an average of 9,423 students was enrolled (10,032 in 2015 and 8814 in 2016). Of these, an average of **2,027 enrolled in BOTH intersessions**. This is up from the 2014 summer intersession in which 8,052 students enrolled in a single summer intersession. Given the decline in enrollments we have seen over the past three years (14%), if we had offered a single session in 2016, it is estimated that we would have had about 6,900 enrollments. Thus, the two 2016 summer intersessions resulted in **an additional 1,900 enrollments**. Two summer intersessions seemed to have little impact on the number of students returning in the subsequent fall semester (2014 70.2%, 2015 67.5%). The 2.7% drop seen in 2015 could be due to increased completion of program/degrees, student "burn-out," or most likely, a drop in enrollment as seen in primary terms. (Reisz, Tables 1, 4)

It is interesting to note that students are **equally successful** in summer when there are two intersessions. Successful course completion in Summer 2015 was identical to Summer 2014. Students were 79% successful in both years (Friedlander, Table 14).

There had been concern expressed that the calendar shift would be detrimental to our local high school (HS) enrollment as it shifts the term available to them to later in the summer (after July 1). It was suggested that this may interfere with planned family vacations and result in less access for our local HS students. The opposite effect has been observed. Summer 2014 had 144 local HS students enrolled,

while Summer 2 2015 and 2016 had 153 and 170 local HS students respectively. Thus, the shift represented an **18% increase in local HS enrollment** (Jarrell, Table 10)

Noncredit

Similar trends were seen in noncredit offerings with a **37% increase in enrollments** with two summer intersessions (Reisz, Table 2, 3). A greater proportion of noncredit students enrolled in both intersessions in noncredit courses (33.8% vs. 21.5%). This was even **greater with noncredit ESL** (43.6% enrolled in both).

Outcome:

The shift in calendar to two summer intersessions increased access to students by offering more enrollment opportunities in both credit and noncredit programs. Over 2,000 credit students took advantage of this by taking classes in BOTH summer intersessions. Overall, this resulted in an estimated 1,900 additional enrollments over the number of students that might have enrolled in a single summer session in 2016. In particular, noncredit ESL students were more likely to enroll in both summer intersessions. Furthermore, the shift in calendar increased the access for local HS students by 18%.

The results of a student survey show that two summer sessions were valuable to students and allowed them to complete required courses, and to reach their educational goals more quickly. In addition, 35% of respondents indicated that had there not been a Summer Session 1, they would likely have searched for classes at a different college. In addition, 60% of respondents indicated a **week break between spring semester and Summer 1 would be preferred and/or beneficial**. An additional 30% indicated no preference. In addition, many students that did not take both sessions, indicated that they would have if this extra week break was in place.

Financial Implications

Data source:

Friedlander, 9.22.15

Jarrell, Ed Programs, Financial Analysis, 8.28.16

During summer intersessions, all faculty are paid as hourly instructors. Over the years, the average cost per TLU (Teaching Load Unit) has averaged about \$1790 (salary and benefits). This value can be used to represent the approximate cost to instruction for a given course. The cost for instruction has increased from \$2.5 million in 2014 to \$3.6 million in 2015, and \$3.2 million in 2016. The income generated as a direct result of this instruction can be determined by calculating the approximate apportionment per FTES earned. From Summer 2014, 2015, and 2016, FTES apportionment is approximated to be about \$6.4, \$8.4, and \$7.55 million respectively. This analysis is consistent with Dr. Jack Friedlander's (9.22.15) analysis. His analysis showed an increase in FTES revenue of \$2.04 million in Summer 2015 over Summer 2014. This is in line with that estimated by Dr. Paul Jarrell (8.28.16) of a \$2.03 million increase in Summer 2015 relative to Summer 2014.

Once TLU cost is removed from years 2014-2016, the net result is an **increase to the discretionary general fund of \$3.8, \$4.8, and \$4.3 million respectively**. (Jarrell, Table 11 8.26.16). While it is true that this analysis does not take into account all additional costs, many are fixed, and it is likely that the increase in discretionary funds more than covered any overtime and extra supply costs.

Conclusion and Recommendation

All the evidence points to **multiple benefits (student and financial)** to scheduling two summer intersessions. The second summer intersession has allowed for an additional 2,000 student enrollments, providing 2,000 more opportunities for students. The impact to students' success and progress is immeasurable. In addition, even after paying for faculty salaries and benefits, the dual summer intersessions resulted in an increase to the Unrestricted General Fund of over \$2 million each year. This calendar shift resulted in an 18% increase in enrollment by local HS students. A student survey indicated that the reason students enroll in summer is to complete required courses and to progress more rapidly toward their educational goal. Sixty percent of respondents indicated a week break would be preferable before the onset of two summer intersessions.

Many in the campus community had expressed concern that the double summer intersessions placed an unreasonable workload on classified staff. A survey of classified staff was conducted to determine if changes made since Summer 2015 have eased the workload for Summer 2016. Sixty-eight percent of respondents indicated that the extra six-week summer session impacted their workload. While some areas have implemented changes to address this increased workload, 47% indicated that it is difficult to complete their work during their regular work week, and 56% indicated that, with the added workload, it is also difficult to prepare for fall semester. Thirty six percent of respondents indicated that they feel they have inadequate staffing.

On August 26, 2016, I met with six laboratory technicians from the sciences to discuss the impacts. The technicians in Physics and Computer Science indicated that adding a second summer session did not significantly impact their workflow. Due to the lack of unscheduled lab time, lab technicians from Earth Sciences and Chemistry indicated that the addition of the second summer session made it difficult to perform routine tasks needed to refresh labs. They all noted that the increase in access for these in-demand classes was important, and were willing to consider changes in their workflow as well as investigate perhaps hiring skilled student workers to help during impacted times. The lab technicians also noted that having a week between the end of spring semester and the beginning of two summer intersessions would be beneficial.

In the absence of any compelling evidence against holding two summer intersessions, the Office of Educational Programs is recommending the continued practice of offering two, six-week summer intersessions, with a week break between the end of spring term and the beginning of Summer 1 intersession. In addition, it is recommended that the District engage in sincere dialog with the California School Employees Association (CSEA) to address classified workload issues associated with two summer intersessions.

How many students enrolled in both Summer sessions?Table 1. *Number of Students Enrolled in Both Summer Sessions*

Academic Term	Students Enrolled in				
	Session I or II	Session I	Session II	Session I & II	% in Session I & II
2016 Summer	8,814	5,571	5,129	1,886	21.4%
2015 Summer	10,032	5,236	6,964	2,168	21.6%
Average	9,423	5,404	6,047	2,027	21.5%

Table 2. *Number of Non-Credit (NC) Students Enrolled During Both Summer Sessions*

Academic Term	NC Students Enrolled in				
	Session I or II	Session I	Session II	Session I & II	% in Session I & II
2016 Summer	1,053	785	625	356	33.8%
2015 Summer	771*	NA	771	NA	NA

Note. * = count for Summer Session II; NA = Not available. Non-Credit course information for 2015 Summer Session I is not available in Banner.

Table 3. *Number of Non-Credit (NC) English as a Second Language (ESL) Students Enrolled During Both Summer Sessions*

Academic Term	NC ESL Students Enrolled in				
	Session I or II	Session I	Session II	Session I & II	% in Session I & II
2016 Summer	723	676	500	315	43.6%
2015 Summer	492*	NA	492	NA	NA

Note. * = count for Summer Session II; NA = Not available. Non-Credit course information for 2015 Summer Session I is not available in Banner.

Table 10. Summer enrollments by recent local high school graduates.

Term	# Local HS Grads Enrolled	# Local HS Grads - Previously Dual Enroll	% Local HS Grads Enrolled - Previously Dual Enroll
Summer 2013	189	149	78.8%
Summer 2014	144	113	78.5%
Summer I 2015	1	1	100.0%
Summer II 2015	153	119	77.8%
Summer I 2016	1	1	100.0%
Summer II 2016	170	135	79.4%

How many Summer students enrolled in the following Fall semester?Table 4. *Number of Summer Students Enrolled in the Following Fall Semester*

Academic Term	Total Students Enrolled	Summer Students Enrolled in Fall	Summer Students NOT Enrolled in Fall	% of Summer Students Enrolled in Fall
2016 Summers	8,814	NA	NA	NA
2015 Summers	10,032	6,767	3,265	67.5%
2014 Summer	8,052	5,653	2,399	70.2%
2013 Summer	8,105	5,616	2,489	69.3%
Average	8,751	6,012	2,718	69.0%

Note. NA = Not available. Fall 2016 student count at census will be available September 6th 2016.

from: Friedlander 9.22.15

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 11. Financial analysis of summer intersession.

Term	TLUs	FTES	FTES/TLU	TLU Expense	FTES Income	Discretionary Increase
Summer 2013	1378.89	1304.21	0.95	\$2,468,218.47	\$6,046,317.56	\$3,578,099.09
Summer 2014	1437.48	1363.00	0.95	\$2,573,085.62	\$6,373,388.00	\$3,800,302.38
<i>Summer I 2015</i>	<i>1008.69</i>	<i>880.00</i>	<i>0.87</i>	<i>\$1,805,547.94</i>	<i>\$4,114,880.00</i>	<i>\$2,309,332.06</i>
<i>Summer II 2015</i>	<i>1016.73</i>	<i>908.00</i>	<i>0.89</i>	<i>\$1,819,950.28</i>	<i>\$4,289,392.00</i>	<i>\$2,469,441.72</i>
Summer Total 2015	2025.42	1788.00	0.88	\$3,625,498.22	\$8,404,272.00	\$4,778,773.78
<i>Summer I 2016</i>	<i>796.08</i>	<i>772.00</i>	<i>0.97</i>	<i>\$1,424,974.25</i>	<i>\$3,646,928.00</i>	<i>\$2,221,953.75</i>
<i>Summer II 2016</i>	<i>1011.89</i>	<i>779.00</i>	<i>0.77</i>	<i>\$1,811,284.89</i>	<i>\$3,898,116.00</i>	<i>\$2,086,831.11</i>
Summer Total 2016	1807.97	1551.00	0.86	\$3,236,259.14	\$7,545,044.00	\$4,308,784.86