

## CALENDAR CHANGE FEEDBACK

Oppose	Support	Neutral	Comments
	X		I like the proposed changes and think we should put them in place as soon as possible
	X		I do very much like the idea of getting rid of intersession and having a longer summer that could be full term and two mini terms. I know this isn't one of the options but I would much rather go to an 18 week term with the last week set aside just for final exams. I think having more time for instruction would benefit our students and a week dedicated just for exams would eliminate some of the stress as well. Getting a whole week off for Thanksgiving is wonderful. We all need a break in Fall. An 18 week semester would allow more time for classroom instruction. I feel so rushed as it is in 16 weeks.
	X		As a long-term instructor in a skill-building program shortening the time between Fall and Spring will help students with skill-building and their retention of the material learned in Fall. Under the current system the break is long between Fall and Spring and again between Spring and Fall. This means that every semester we must spend significant time at the beginning of the semesters getting everyone back up to where they ended in the previous semester. It's frustrating for students because those who practiced and studied in between semesters don't want to have to re-visit the previous semester's skills and content, and it's both frustrating and deflating for students that did not practice in between semesters because they thought they learned so much, but ultimately time took its toll on their knowledge and skills. With that said, the 12 week summer with 6 week options might also be a time where courses that can help them solidify skills take place. I can envision some of the practical hands-on courses taking place during summers providing students the ability to keep their knowledge and skills in-tact but still providing them a version of a break/rest so that they can refresh and work on overcoming the inherent plateaus that exist in skill-building/training programs.

	X		<p>I am in favor of the proposed calendar. I think that it makes sense to work with summer and expand it to its fullest potential. Intersession can only garner so much FTES with its compressed timeline. Students cannot take more than 1 course, maybe 2 for Intersession, but for Summer, they could take 12 or more units with the calendar that is proposed. Our regular term is 16 weeks, so summer would function more like a quarter term, being 12 weeks. Other schools, such as Foothill CC operate on a quarter system, which is about 12 weeks per term. My only concern is for the spring HS graduates. First, with summer starting in May, HS students may not be able to take as many units as they would like to because they would be considered special admit students. Also, I am not sure if they could even be considered first time students should they only choose to enroll for the second 6-week term given that the official start date for Summer would still be in May. For admissions, residency and such, the official term start date is used. Also, there are additional regulations that govern special admit students in the Summer (5% per grade rule) and an overall restriction on what kind of courses they can take (no basic skills, limits on PE courses). This could potentially impact students who score into basic skills english/math and want to enroll in summer first to try to be ready for college level courses in the fall. An interesting legal opinion discusses special admit students: <a href="http://extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/Legal/Ops/04-13.doc">extranet.cccco.edu/Portals/1/Legal/Ops/04-13.doc</a>. In 2006, our Spring term started on 1-9-06 and ended 5-4-06. Summer did not begin until 6-12-06. This gap in our calendar was due to the fact that if we had started Summer in May (before the HS students graduated), the students would have been considered special admit students, been restricted to two courses, and not permitted to take basic skills. Also, the restrictions on PE enrollment would have posed a challenge for incoming athletes needing to take physical conditioning courses in the Summer to prepare for Fall sports. Aside from the concern for incoming high school students, I believe that the potential FTES gain from an expanded summer would be greatly beneficial to the campus. From a workload standpoint, we would have one less term, which would lead to a reduction in workload for many offices as we all have various mandated reports that happen during or at the end of each term (MIS, etc). My hope is that the potential issues with HS grads would not diminish the potential gain that an expanded Summer term could bring.</p>
	X		<p>As a faculty member at AVC for over 17 years I support President Knudson's proposal to eliminate intersession and extend summer. It provides a wonderful way to offer more courses in two shorter summer blocks or one full term. I have always found intersession to be too short and limiting. Thus I think it is worth a try.</p>
	X		<p>I believe the change is necessary. I hope it goes through.</p>
	X		<p>(16-16-12) format works much better for the Math Department, allowing 6-6 or 12-week terms in summer. I personally prefer 16-16-15 format with a 7-7-15 break down in summer.</p>
X			<p>As the Academic senate rep for adjunct faculty I have had the opportunity to discuss the calendar change with many of the adjunct faculty. The majority of the faculty I spoke to, about 70% were pleased with the present calendar schedule.</p>
	X		<p>The new calendar looks great; especially if it benefits our students.</p>
		X	<p>A proposed calendar will not impact Child Development Center. Our calendar is July 1 - June 30th and parents have to keep the same schedule (morning OR afternoon) for the entire year. They schedule classes during the time their child is here. They just keep the same schedule and enroll in classes during that time. It may impact the schedules of the students who work here; in summer they were more flexible with hours since they were not taking any classes. The new calendar may allow them to take classes and juggling their schedules will not be much different than what we do in fall and spring.</p>
	X		<p>I welcome the three semester schedule, since it allows students to take science labs in all three semesters, and if they take consecutive semesters, they can start in a summer and finish at the end of summer semester one year later. That is amazing for well prepared students.</p>

	X		<p>I, too, welcome the calendar change for similar reasons to the ones brought up. I have advocated for a longer summer session and the elimination of Intersession season since 2000. The 12 week semester will allow us to offer high-unit Stem lab courses which will expedite student completion. I don't mind if my name is attached to the comment. It is funny how the same arguments presented, loooooong time ago, against the change from 18 weeks to 17 and then later from 17 to 16, are resurfacing again. A lot of people are asking about numbers and data in proving the efficiency of the new calendar while they fail to offer any numbers or data in support of the current calendar. I do not profess to have answers about how it will affect counseling, grade submission, etc....but....the only numbers that matter in my area are the number of student contact hours. A four or five-unit science/engineering course requires 6 or 7 contact hours per week during a 16 week semester. That doubles to 12 or 14 hours during an 8-week period. For a 5-week period you would have to offer 20-22 hours per week. Clearly the 8-week and 5 week semesters are educationally unacceptable for offering such courses. We manage to offer a few heavy unit courses in 8 weeks but 12 weeks would reduce the daily load for a student significantly. This is why i am advocating for the 12 week session. Here are some more numbers....currently, besides the two 16 week semesters, students have two additional sessions for courses (intersession and summer). With the new proposal they will have three additional opportunities to complete their degree or program requirements. The current schedule aligns with the K-12 schedule whereas the new one will bring us closer to the rest of the higher education institutions around the country. I am sure we will encounter implementation obstacles that will need to be overcome, but...From any angle that i look at this, i see that the new calendar will allow us to keep doing what are currently doing, plus allow us the opportunity to expand our offerings. And that can only be a benefit for our students...</p>
	X		<p>I support the changes. This will work well for my program since I have classes with lecture/lab and I can offer classes in the summer and expedite student completion.</p>
X			<p>I would like to continue with the current calendar.</p>
X			<p>I am against the proposed calendar changes. Abolishment of Intersession has been tried previously on this campus, and on other campuses with very negative fiscal and student achievement effects. The proposed changes will delay student transfers by preventing students who need the one last class in order to transfer to four year institutions in the fall. Also, High School students will not be out of school before the summer session begins, and will therefore not be able to take any summer session classes before the Fall semester begins. Also, I wonder about the legality of faculty being asked directly about this issue, rather than through the AFT Union. With our current calendar, additional classes could be offered without the upheaval of implementing a new calendar. New classes require more faculty, more lab equipment and supplies, more lab tech help, and more classroom availability. Currently, these are insufficient for many classes that could be added with the current calendar. I can offer a few examples. Anatomy-probably 150 more students could be offered anatomy classes (the lab space and the students to fill the classes are available), but the funding for the necessary lab supplies have not been made available. Lab tech support for both the physical and biological sciences was insufficient this past summer, and is currently insufficient for biology. Transfer programs that have been developed or pending for the physical sciences and foreign languages desperately need additional faculty. I think that before we try to revise the calendar, that we are sure that we can sufficiently support additional classes by successfully maximizing use of the current calendar.</p>

			<p>1) The shortened winter break neither allows sufficient time for nor reorganizing of course materials, recovering from the semester, evaluating new materials, professional development projects. 2) It negatively impacts our income. We, as <u>adjunct faculty</u> qualify for unemployment benefits during off times. On average one can collect about 18 weeks of unemployment annually. In this schedule there are a total of 3 weeks off during the extended semester which now becomes longer, (Thanksgiving and Spring breaks). We are paid by the hour so we will not earn during these times, despite having to <u>contract</u> our time. Will we be compensated for the lapse times during the schedule? 2 (a). Additionally these breaks extend the length of the semester (one week in fall and 2 weeks in spring) and reduce our annual eligibility for unemployment by at least three weeks at a cost of many hundreds of dollars for part time instructors. 3) This concept extends the duration of the semesters without increasing compensation for instructors. 4) More consideration needs to be given to coordinating the schedule with the local schools as many of my students are parents with children in K-12.</p>
X			<p>My main concern is that such a short break between fall and spring does not allow much time to prepare (or to be rested/refreshed) for the upcoming term... both for students AND faculty.</p>
X			<p>The information packet that was sent out appears to be the same information used in the previous discussion and is still absent of a data-supported and compelling reason for making the change. As discussed in the paper included with the packet, which has an added hand-written note (not the author's) about the change supporting pathways, if designed correctly, guided pathways can be supported and effective in any model. Yet, with the exception of the AVC2CSU program, I am not aware of any concerted effort by AVC to establish guided pathways for students? I don't think we need to, or should, make a change without first making a concerted effort to develop guided pathways for our students in the current model. The winter intersession is not just about enrollment numbers (although the data shows a continued growth during the winter intersession), it is also about giving students opportunities in between full semesters, whether that be to correct issues, fulfill a prerequisite, or improve on a grade from the fall.</p> <p>Due to its length, and to facilitate easier reading of this response, I felt it would be helpful if I broke it into sections with headers. This will also make it easier for me to submit it to the calendar email: <b>Support Data</b> - The packet sent out by Ed does contain important data to support the current schedule. So, the suggestion, "... they fail to offer any numbers or data in support of the current calendar," does not hold true. There is data showing the winter intersession growing each year and a 38% growth in FTES from 2013 to 2017. Additionally, in his original memo, Mr. Knudson stated that the number of sections for intersession 2017 was increased, yet enrollment remained flat, and at the same time suggested that increased employment opportunities and reduced high school graduates contributed to a reduction in enrollment. In such an enrollment challenged environment, I would argue that a 3% winter intersession growth is more than flat and demonstrates that summer is not the only session to experience growth. Looking at the data provided in the discussion packet... from 2013 to 2017 winter intersession sections increased by 35% and summer intersession sections increased by 37%, while winter intersession FTES increased over the same period by 38%, the summer session FTES increased by 31%. This suggests that winter intersession is at least equal to summer in the bang-for-the-buck category if not greater. <b>Student Workload</b> - Your concern about student load is valid and noteworthy regarding a 4 or 5-unit course during a 5 or 8 week session, but it should also be a concern with a 12 week session. According to the contact hour numbers you gave, a 12-week session would require 9-11 hours, which is not much better than the 12-14 for an 8-week course. Another argument suggests that the new calendar would provide students with three options to take classes and move through the system quicker. We should realistically consider the workload of a student who takes full advantage of that argument and enrolls in a 12-week session and two 6-week sessions. Are there students who can manage that? Absolutely! However, I would argue (without data) that the majority of our students could not handle three compressed courses. As suggested, not all courses are designed to be compressed, nor should they be. So again, efficient and effective scheduling becomes paramount; something that can be achieved through guided pathways.</p>

		<p>Session Length and Schedule Alignment - In addition, one point about the length of time between sessions. It has been argued that Winter intersession causes students not to come back in the spring because it is too long of a break. If that argument were to hold true, then what of the student who has to take a summer job and does not attend summer school? The summer break would be even longer than the winter break; thus, logic would dictate that the potential for losing students due to a long break would increase. Yes, the current calendar aligns with the K-12 and it should, even more than it should with the higher education institutions. The students coming out of the K-12 system and into ours should be the focus more than moving students out of our institution and into the higher education system, and no, I am not suggesting we ignore the plight of transfer students. For those students who do transfer, the argument I hear coming from the Honors faculty is that the Winter Intersession plays a key role. An Opportunity - At this point, if anyone is still reading Lol!, I would like to introduce another element that could affect this discussion, one that I am passionate about, and that is our online offerings. While baby steps have been taken to solidify the quality of our online classes, if we as a college embrace the new technologies available to us, we could drastically increase the educational opportunities for those students who are taking advantage of the employment opportunities, and that is with a more robust online program. Think about it. Online learning will continue to increase, whether or not we want to participate, and with the availability of online classes throughout the state, we are potentially losing students to online programs at COC, Bakersfield, Cerro Coso, and who knows where else. Having obtained all of my degrees while working fulltime, I can speak to the advantages of learning anytime and anywhere. The online learning opportunities we have today were not available a long time ago, but they are now and should be used to their advantage.</p>
	X	<p>I welcome new calendar change to eliminate the winter intersession. I believe that overall students will benefit more from shorter semesters.</p>
	X	<p>I am speaking for my self and the AJ program as I see it. I have no problem with the proposed schedule personally. It would affect me only in the ability to take a longer vacation in the Summer. As possibly a voice for AJ students and for AJ instructors, The new schedule would allow the both of these groups to have a similar experience over the Summer, as they have during the regular semester. We don't schedule for the Winter Intersession as the classes are too short to grasp the material and process it. The current Summer session is not as bad, but still shorter.</p>
X		<p>I have several questions/concerns about the proposed changes to the calendar: First, is the calendar approved every two or three years? Second, the packet offered two sample calendars (Modesto and Columbia are from the same district, so they only count as one). How many community colleges follow the proposed calendar and how long have the schools had the calendar in place for data purposes? Third, from the Senate report that was attached, it didn't seem as if data supported the change. In fact, much of the report supported the current calendar, indicating many of our students benefit from Intersession. Concerns: My understanding of the desire of a calendar change is that AVC would be able to increase FTES and offer students more opportunities with a longer (or shorter, depending on 6 or 12 week classes) summer. This is combined with the Guided Pathways model, attempting to shuffle more students through more quickly. However, I didn't see convincing evidence that the 6/12 week summer classes are more beneficial for students. In fact, research indicated that if summer is divided into two sessions, that fewer faculty teach the second session, thereby limiting what classes are even offered to students. It is not that I am necessarily against the proposed change as much as I am not convinced it is needed. Intersession benefits faculty, so in that respect I prefer it--I am able to use Intersession to keep updated in my discipline, further my class prep, investigate new methods of teaching, and overall spend time on improving my teaching, and that is even if I am teaching a class. I teach two classes in the summer, and though I have some time to devote to preparation, I like having time in between the 16 week semesters. It keeps me energized, and that in turn makes me a more effective teacher. From all indications, most colleges are going away from the trimester model, and the proposed calendar change is reflective of that model with two 16 week semesters and a 12 week semester. I lean towards the current calendar over the proposed calendar.</p>

	X		<p>I am in favor of a change, however would like to see us use the YCCD model. Having a 15 week summer where three 5 week sessions, two 7 week sessions, or one 15 week session really allows for maximum flexibility in matching instruction lengths to course difficulty/time requirements and also allows multiple options for instructors to teach during the summer yet still have the much needed time off. Not having a spring break will take a while for people to get over but many instructors comment on the disruptions that it causes in student retention and overall continuity. There are two larger issues. The first is a perception that under the current proposal, only 6 week classes will be offered. More than a few are missing the fact that 12 week classes are also an option. The second and much larger issue is the need for more flexibility in scheduling. I know there is an idea that a classroom should be a classroom and not assigned to a department/division, but that removes much of the necessary flexibility in truly being able to utilize a modified summer schedule. Currently there are 1.5 people in charge of scheduling classrooms and the task is so overwhelming that the schedule is “rolled” from parallel semesters. That means the schedule is essentially static, giving no flexibility at all and any change is met with fierce opposition as it requires the one overworked person to try to make all of the pieces in the schedule fit again.</p>
	X		<p>I highly agree with the proposed calendar change because I feel it will be beneficial for the students in the Theatre Arts world. Intersession always is a struggle for the theatre class and would like to see that session go away. Also, with the proposed change it allows for a shift in pay schedule. It is very difficult for adjunct faculty that do not have an assignment during the intersession because we are left without a paycheck for an entire month which makes life very difficult if there is no other job. And, I'm hoping with an increased summer session, it will allow for more summer classes to open up in the theatre department.</p>
X			<p>I am in favor of retaining the current AVC calendar for reasons given below: 1) Some of our best university bound students have are able to take winter classes at AVC in time for transferring in the fall. Summer classes are too late for these students. I am polling my current students and thus far about 25% (most of my best students in the class) have taken winter classes at AVC in order to have enough units for transferring to a university. 2) According to a colleague who is currently teaching at El Camino College, Torrance, they tried the calendar schedule proposed for AVC for two years but have now returned to the original calendar with winter classes (as with the current AVC calendar). Apparently, eliminating the winter intersession did not generate the expected FTES for them. Additionally, most of the faculty and students were unhappy with that calendar for a number of reasons. 3) Many of the faculty have adjusted their schedules to include time meet FLEX obligations during the winter intersession. Some of us have active research and extracurricular programs that are ongoing during the winter intersession. Those programs would have to be scrapped in most cases. 4) Finally, it seems doubtful that High School graduates would be taking classes at AVC during the early summer session. This is apparently one of the problems that El Camino College had with the expanded summer.</p>
	X		<p>I am interested in the calendar change, but there seems to be data supporting both sides of the question, and so far I can't tell which numbers to give more credence. As an adjunct, I can't afford to take Intersession off to recharge, plan new curriculum, etc., so that incentive for keeping the current system does not exist for me. Based on my teaching experience, the 5 week Intersession is a real challenge for both students and instructors, however. It takes intense effort. By comparison, I like the idea of a 6 or 12 week term better simply because it would be longer. That said, many of our classes do work best as 16 week courses, especially for students who need more time to comprehend and process the material. 8 week sections work for some students but not for others. Some courses should probably not be offered in the shorter terms. I hope/expect the administration understands that not all classes could be compressed effectively.</p>
X			<p>I have not seen any evidence that would support a change in the calendar. I am not in favor of a change. I am willing to look at data. I would oppose a change at this point, since I see no convincing reason to change.</p>

		X	I wanted to also weigh in that we need more night classes on this campus, and with that, more resources for our working students. I really dislike how offices close right when our night students need to go to school, such as the Learning center. The campus feels a bit like a ghost town after 7 pm. I know this requires funding, but it would be an investment into our student population.
X			My opinion has not changed since we discussed about it before. Science labs are currently designed for 16 weeks - we cannot squeeze them into 12 weeks unless we change the entire curriculum. It does not make any sense when it is working perfectly now.
X			<p>I am opposed to the proposed change to the academic calendar. We did try this in 2005-2006, and it was a financial disaster. The school year finished on May 5th, and AVC was counting on a robust summer session. However, it did not materialize, since the high school students in the AV were not done with their academic year yet, and could not enroll in our classes. Instead of securing a significant increase in FTES, AVC suffered a big loss that year, because of the disastrous summer session. The following year, in 2006-2007, AVC went back to the original calendar with intersession. Other arguments against the proposed calendar are a lack of opportunity for students to work in December/January to make money. SOAR students' calendars do not align with the proposed calendar. Enrollment during intersession has increased in the past years and is still on the rise. Pasadena City College and El Camino have tried this and they went back to the original calendar with intersession. For PCC, the calendar change was disastrous, because the college lost a lot of students (and faculty) due to the change. If the goal is to get us out of stability in the next 2 years, a calendar change won't accomplish that. On the contrary, given the past experience in 2005 at AVC, it will have the opposite effect and we risk losing funding. Pasadena City College tried eliminating intersession and this is what happened, according to the PCC courier: "A winter intersession will be reinstated in the 2016-2017 academic calendar following the July decision by the Public Employment Relations Board that the district violated the law when eliminating the winter intersession in the 2012-2013 academic year. The July 30th PERB ruling stated that the district unilaterally implemented new terms and conditions of employment when adopting a new calendar in 2012-2013 academic year – which caused a loss of wages for faculty affected by the calendar change. The Board of Trustees accepted the ruling and chose not to submit any exceptions to the decision, which orders the district to reinstate winter by the 2016-2017 calendar year and compensate employees for “any losses suffered as a result of the change, including interest at the rate of 7 percent per year. The district is currently working with the Faculty Association to calculate the financial impact eliminating winter had on affected staff."</p> <p>Furthermore, eliminating the intersession in 2013 had a very negative impact on student enrollment. That combined with the reparation that the district is now forced to pay to faculty led to heavy costs to the district. In addition, it is stated in the article that "The poor communication and planning between shared governance—which includes staff, administrators, students and classified employees—has contributed to PCC being put on academic probation by the Accrediting Commission of Community Junior Colleges." I would not want AVC to go in that direction.</p>

Writing from the perspective of the arts, the shorter sessions (both 5 week intersession and 6 week summer) are inappropriate for AVC's time-intensive studio courses. So I am happy to support whichever model best supports students needing these shorter courses, whether that means eliminating or saving intersession. However I have deep concerns about the proposed sample calendar, specifically the compressed Winter recess between Fall and Spring semesters. I think this potentially jeopardizes all students and that a more effective calendar can be planned to incorporate the two 6 week summer sessions. The proposed sample calendar places a 3 week winter recess break between Fall and Spring semesters and a 3 week break between Summer and Fall semesters (not 2 weeks, as stated in the memo). What is the rationale for the lengthy breaks around the summer sessions? If intersession is to be eliminated, why not lengthen the Winter Break and condense the breaks around the Summer terms? My concern is this proposed calendar departs from the pattern of breaks established by other CC's, Calstates, and UC's. Bakersfield CC's schedule is provided as a model for a 12 week summer session. Yet Bakersfield CC offers a 5 week winter recess with two 1 week breaks book-ending their summer term. Even the Modesto college's winter recess (based on 16-16-15 system) averages at least 2 weeks longer than the breaks placed around summer. This average is followed by other colleges that offer two 6 week summer sessions (including CSUN and also UC's running on quarter systems). In its current state, I argue the proposed calendar undermines the importance of Fall and Spring semesters. I wrote down my reasons in detail below and divided my arguments into categories, for hopefully easier reading: Reasons for concern about the condensed Winter Recess and extended Summer breaks . . . **I can't find any other colleges that do this:** From the small pool of colleges I researched, Winter Recess breaks averaged at least 2 weeks longer than the breaks around summer sessions. 3 week winter recess breaks were rare. The only colleges I saw with a 3 week winter recess break were colleges on the quarter system or those with a 15 week summer session. These colleges had 1 week or even no breaks between the start and end of summer. These colleges with 3 week Winter breaks also all had a "finals week" which is typically when regular class meetings cease and are replaced by shorter single exam sessions. AVC does not have a finals weeks so classes meet in full during week 16, meaning students do not get any relief during the last week of the semester. Quite the opposite. **This jeopardizes students transitioning from Fall to Spring semesters and gives summer session disproportional priority:** I would argue that a reasonable break between Fall and Spring semesters is necessary to allow students to properly recover from full 16 week semester where they are taking multiple courses central to their degree. This is particularly important for students taking physically intensive classes, students with disabilities, or any students under undo emotional distress or hardship. My understanding is that summer is for supplementing and fast-tracking our degrees. These sessions are designed for students with the resources to pursue a highly intensive, expedited program. While this is beneficial, it should not come at the cost of harming preparation and recovery from our full 16-week Fall and Spring semesters. There are a few other reasons to prioritize education for our students during the Fall/Spring semesters. Not all courses fit successfully within a 12 week or 6 week session, so course offerings are limited. Many full-time faculty are off campus and thus not holding regular office hours. Fewer professors are thus available to assist students outside of class-time with preparing applications, letters of recommendation, and professional advancement. Additional educational spaces that run during the Fall and Spring, such as the Art Gallery, are closed. In short, the full resources of the college are not available to summer students.

		<p>There are a few other reasons why students would practically require a longer winter break. The winter holidays means that many regular businesses and resources are closed for days or even weeks. Students that use the breaks for professional development, research, or preparation of applications or portfolios (in the arts, this could include printing, digital services, library research) would benefit from extra time around the holidays. Does administration have the resources to turn over from Fall to Spring so quickly? If I am understanding the proposed calendar correctly, in 2020 the college will be open only one full business day in January before Spring classes begin. Are there any concerns about pressures or repercussions this will have on student services, facilities, the copying center, financial aid, etc? Why does the administration propose a 12 week summer term, as opposed to a 10 week or 8 week term? I'm wondering whether the extended summer breaks derive from a concern about summer burnout. I understand that the administration wishes to offer two 6 week summer terms, which will be especially useful to a handful of programs and courses. Is there a specific reason the college wishes to offer an additional 12 week term, other than it cleanly fits around the two 6 week sessions? CSUN offers two 6 week summer sessions and one 10 week session. This model seems to help students and professors who opt for the longer summer session to get an adequate break before Fall. Only those opting for a high pressure summer of back-to-back 6 week courses would experience the minimal breaks. If administration fears students will "disappear" during the intersession term, are there concerns that a 16 summer break will have the same effect? I have no evidence, just a thought.</p>
X		<p>As an accountant I can appreciate the number crunching being done, but I think it misses the point. The issue here is not squeezing FTE's out of the existing student population, but how do we increase our overall enrollment? With a decreasing population of students (items 5,6 and 7 from Mr. Knudson) and exponential increase in local competition (AVU, DeVry, SJVC, Alliant, Brandman, and Charter), we must market ourselves more aggressively to attract new students. We need to update our marketing materials and our approach by speaking regularly at the local high schools, and actively participating in the various community events during the year. We have some of the best faculty and should be telling parents why coming to AVC can benefit their children. As for encouraging students to complete their programs, not pushing them to take too many classes at once would be a start. I have married students with full time jobs and single moms with multiple children taking 4 classes a semester. This kind of scheduling is unsustainable and self-defeating. Graduating in 3 years with an A or B is far better than a C or D in 2, or dropping out altogether. I know for myself, as well as my colleagues, I spend 3-4 weeks of the summer and winter breaks prepping for the coming semester. Reviewing textbooks, creating my schedule and other documents, catching up on professional articles, and doing a variety of activities associated with being a better teacher. The proposed schedule eliminates that winter prep time.</p>

X

Intersession has proven to be crucial to the success of the **500 plus** students in the Honors program. It has been measurably beneficial to the Honors program, a program that helps the college retain and attract the most academically focused students in our valley. In terms of the program, January is a **major recruitment period**. During a time with more flexible schedules, I find students easier to reach and my schedule allows for more time to tend to the various tasks required for program success. For example, I send various marketing emails to current students about specific meeting dates to sell and promote the program. These emails result in increased student participation. Here is the break-down of the students recruited during the last 5 years (2013 was my first year): January 2013: 13 students recruited, January 2014: 43 students recruited, January 2015: 53 students recruited, January 2016: 60 students recruited, January 2017: 63 students recruited. Another issue to consider is the course offerings. There have been times when the enrollment numbers were low for an honors class and because of the January break, we were able to recruit and market the low enrollment classes. Here is a list of number classes that had low enrollment in early January and were able to exceed the minimum number requirement January 2013: 2 classes, January 2014: 5 classes, January 2015: 4 classes, January 2016: 6 classes, January 2017: 7 classes. All of the above classes exceeded minimum enrollment requirements. In fact, no honors class has been cancelled due to low enrollment in the last five years. Additionally, there are honor students who find out in the fall, usually from Susan Knapp, that they need two or three sequential classes to transfer. Intersession courses allow students to take a prerequisite course so that they can enroll in the second course for spring semester. Schools such as UCLA require students to complete all transfer requirements by the end of spring semester. Intersession has helped many students meet this requirement. Finally, I would like to add one other point about intersession. There are always students waiting to join the honors program in the spring semester; however, some are ineligible because they need to complete Math 70 and/or English 099/100A. However, students will lose the opportunity to take either class, and to hasten their entry to the honors program, if intersession disappears. In that case, students would have to wait until summer session to join the program, which presents a challenge since most honors faculty do not teach during the summer session.

X		<p>First, I would like to thank you for providing us with the opportunity and time to have a constructive discussion on this matter. At very least, these talks will allow faculty to look at our schedule and see how we can serve our students better. An assertion was made that we can offer more high unit science courses (with lab) during 12 weeks summer. Currently, we do offer high unit courses (Biol 201, 202 &amp; 204) during summer with retention and success rate in mid to high 80 percentiles. With our current calendar, additional classes could be offered without the upheaval of implementing a new calendar. New classes require more faculty, more lab equipment and supplies, more lab tech help, and more classroom availability. The opening of Palmdale Center (a great blessing) has allowed me to schedule more biology 101 class and we are working on offering more Biol 100 and 102 (need little more supplies) to support the LVN program. Furthermore, it is not practical to offer high unit science courses in 12 weeks from scheduling perspective. How can we break a 16 week class with lab into 12 weeks? We tried it in Palmdale this semester (Biol 101) and we had to offer 2 labs a week for the first six weeks and then one lab per week in the last six weeks (so lab sits empty in the 2nd half). Some might argue to increase the lab hours to 4 but this won't work. Let's say I cover Protista lab in 3 hours and spend the remaining hour on fungi but finish the fungi lab in next lab and start another one. This is not practical. All our Biology labs are based on Carnegie rules. Also, what to do with classes like Micro and Anatomy that have two labs per week. It is easier to break a lab from 16 weeks into 8 weeks by doubling labs during the 8 weeks (if the lab is offered once a week during sixteen week). If the lab meets twice a week, we can offer 4 labs a week in 8 weeks. I also called the BC Biology chair to inquire on how they schedule their 5 unit courses during the summer (since they have a 12 week summer) and the chair informed me that they do not. Finally, some might say that we can offer more Organic chemistry classes with expanded summer schedule. This does look like a good argument, however currently we only offer two Chem 210 and one Chem 220 in spring. Why not schedule more Chem 210 and 220 courses in during regular semester (fall and spring) in order to offer more options for students. Some adjuncts expressed concerns that switching to a new calendar means they won't be able to teach here anymore as the schedule will conflict with other colleges they teach at. Given our heavy reliance on adjuncts, this will be detrimental to our department. I know this is not a very strong argument, but as the Chair I wanted to be their voice. Finally, and not related to biology, it was argued that longer winter break causes some students not to comeback. However, wouldn't longer summer mean fewer students will return after 12 week hiatus? Having more data will be very helpful. It will be great to see hard data to support the change. For example, I am not sure when Bakersfield College switched to the proposed calendar system, but it will be great to have pre and post enrollment data. Also, would like to see student graduation rate and time to graduation numbers, along with their budget and number of new faculty hires and new buildings (as this data influences how many classes could be offered, etc). Not sure if we can get these data, but it will be very helpful. Thank you again for the opportunity and I am looking forward to further discussions on this matter. As I mentioned last time this topic came about, that longer summer won't help Biology, however, if majority of the school is for it, I will do my best to assist with the transition. After all, these discussions are not about faculty needs, or specific department's needs but the needs of the students. As it stands, I truly believe we can do more and offer more in biology (given proper resources) with the current calendar model.</p>
		<p>I did a great deal of research last time this issue arose. In fact I spoke to about ten people between Bakersfield, El Camino and PCC. It may interest you to know that both El Camino and PCC were on this proposed calendar for three years 2014, 2015, 2016. They abandoned it beginning this year July 1, 2017, and have brought back Winter intercession. I will supply data down the road on all three campuses. PCC was put on academic probation around this time, and I believe still are on probation, and I don't believe the calendar change made life any easier there. I look forward to doing due diligence with all of you, to explore which calendar best enhances our pedagogy and better serves the success of our many thousands of students.</p>
X		<p>It is comforting to see that someone from the Science Department is casting a "No" vote for a calendar change. Being able to expand the sciences classes that require lab (which are probably mostly lab) is the #1 argument for shifting to a new calendar, as more science classes offered would equate into further FTES. Dr. Nisani, a Biologist, refutes that argument. I think that says a lot.</p>

X			<p>I am teaching two 100 level nutrition classes at Palmdale (NF100 general nutrition and NF110 sports nutrition) and I have to chime in here. Teaching these 100 level classes in 12 weeks has been a challenge for both the students and for me. I am teaching the material at a faster rate and it is harder on the students, and their quiz grades are reflecting that. I am unable to spend the time as I do in the 16 week schedule and they have less time to learn the material. In 12 weeks the quizzes are more often, another stress factor for the students; they have less time to learn the material before the quizzes and they have less time to then apply the material to their two large assignments. The 12 week session has been an absolute disservice to them. I believe this has to be taken into consideration with our student population.</p>
X			<p>Intersession does not only benefit faculty. From a Counseling perspective, Intersession is a huge benefit to students because it is an opportunity to complete six units in five weeks. Many students who are nearing graduation take courses in Intersession in order to complete all graduation requirements by the end of Spring. For the students I am referring to, eliminating Intersession means needing to stay at AVC for an additional Fall. I am not "sure" of the benefit of a longer summer but I am sure of the benefit of the Intersession term. Intersession courses fill up very quickly, so expanding the course offerings and possibly the length of the term might be considered in order to increase FTES. Under the new calendar, what is the maximum number of units a student can complete in one full academic year? Under the current calendar a student can complete 53 units in one academic year.</p>
X			<p>I am an adjunct and have taught at a lot of universities with a lot of different schedules. I believe the intersession helps many students to stay on track for graduation, especially for those who cannot get the units they need. I believe adding an extra week to a term does not necessarily increase student learning and perhaps may increase burn out. I love the idea of different options for students and for faculty.</p>
X			<p>Would this make sense, if not giving up FPD: fifteen week semesters with the two extra weeks given over to summer (making a 15, 15, 14 model)? This looks to be the model that would align with the Cal States. In short, why not just do the same basic calendar model as the Cal States (which seem to be trying to align more closely with the community colleges).</p>
		X	<p>I don't mind a 12-week summer. However I don't want to be forced to compressed a 16-week class into a 6-week schedule. My concern is that once the 12-week summer schedule is in place, there'll be pressure to convert 3-LHE lecture courses into a 6-week course. In the subject I teach (Art History), 8-week is the limit into how much such a can be compressed while letting the students learn and absorb the materials. If the administration can guarantee a flexibility within the 12-week schedule (i.e. allowing 8-week class) then I may be open towards the new schedule. The hybrid semester mentioned by Scott Memmer above is attractive to me because it'll allow varying course duration within the semester.</p>

X		<p>From the knowledge I have for the nursing department I can say that the new calendar does not benefit our students. The break and intersession is extremely important in the nursing student's life for many different reasons. As many of our programs are in our college, the RN program is extremely demanding in every aspect. Many of our students use the break to precept, expand their knowledge, and become more competent in their performance. They learn to use their theory knowledge in a clinical setting with an RN who works at one of our local hospitals. As an instructor having nine to twelve students on the floor in clinic, it becomes very difficult to do one-on-one with our students. With precepting, the students receive that one-on-one experience with a knowledgeable RN. Other students use the time to work and save money. Again, it becomes very difficult to be a full-time RN student, parent, spouse, and work on top of everything. Unfortunately, some that do work during the program, are not successful. Other students use the time wisely to get ahead for the following semester. Furthermore, our LVNs use the break to do their transition class between the LVN and RN program. If this time is eliminated I do not know how the schedule will progress for the transition class, therefore reducing our numbers for the RN admissions. From my perspective the proposed calendar will cause much issue for the nursing program in many aspects. Perhaps asking the students opinion, as well as the faculty, may give us a bigger picture of what to expect if the proposed calendar passes.</p>
	X	<p>The proposed change could allow motivated students to complete their educational goals quicker. There are, however, students that need time between semesters to "recharge" and to take a break from college to return to the next semester well-rested and ready to engage in their studies. Many students also need a significant break to attend to personal and family issues or to use the summer and winter breaks to work seasonal jobs and increase their income. Having a break can allow students to work more hours and increase income, lessening financial strain that may be incurred during the regular semesters when the student may need to decrease available work hours to fit their school schedule. For students with disabilities, having longer breaks during summer/winter often helps to rebuild stamina needed to attend school and complete assignments. Shorter breaks might not accomplish this as effectively. I know that personally, as someone who worked full-time while attending college, I looked forward to time away from school during the summer and winter to be able to better attend to other areas of my life. Although I would sometimes take a summer course, the change in pace helped me be a more effective student, better able to focus on studies when I returned in the Fall because I felt well-rested and fulfilled.</p>
X		<p>I was opposed to the change in the past, and I am opposed to the change now, based on the same reasons stipulated by Scott Memmer, Kathryn Mitchell and Zia Nisani.</p>
	X	<p>I am for the calendar change and expressed my opinion on the calendar site. My main argument is that the new calendar allows the math department to offer pretty much all upper division courses during summer when many graduating students need them for their transfer. All we could offer in a 5-week intersession was basic skills courses. We can still offer them in two 6-week summer sessions along with a 12-week transfer courses.</p>
X		<p>From a counseling point of view, I see the elimination of intersession as detrimental to transfer students. Students must complete all courses for transfer by the spring term before they are to start university (in fall). The current calendar system allows for some "wiggle room," if a student needs to repeat a course, or lighten their fall/spring terms. It also allows more classes to be taken in a year. I just met with a student, who would be at AVC a whole year longer if I was not able to use the Intersessions for graduation/transfer planning. Obviously, we all want our students to be successful, but eliminating Intersession is not the answer. There is no reason why we can't make some minor tweaks to make summer more robust (more weeks), while preserving our Intersession term. This provides the maximum amount of opportunities to our students. We are a dedicated and creative bunch- Let's put our heads together and come up with a real solution, that provides the most options for our students.</p>

	X		I'm just wondering how will this affect the paid Holidays that we have now. Other than that, at first inspection, it seems to me that the new schedule would make our workflow and the scheduling of our programs simpler.
X			If the spring semester ends in May and high school students haven't graduated yet, how are we servicing the new generation of students who could come here? Having a child in high school right now, the consensus on this campus is AVC is a last resort and you are a failure if you don't go straight to a 4-year school. If that is already the mindset and then we change the calendar and those students graduating can't even get in because of the new calendar change, it makes no sense to try and build on the younger community to attend AVC.
X			The students in my program use intercession to graduate on time. Some either use it for a class they got a low grade in or one subject they can focus on for those weeks without the noise of a full semester class load. I've heard a few talk about lab classes when asked about the change and that just seems like a mess to attempt to change for those higher classes that need an allotted time for lab hours. I don't think the calendar change would benefit the students and they are why we are here, right?
			I am wondering about this fall break at Thanksgiving time. Would we get that off or would it be treated like another Spring Break and we keep working because the campus is open for business, I mean the campus is open.
			In some departments we're told not to take vacation 2 weeks before or 2 weeks after the beginning of a semester. If we go to 3 semesters, that excludes 12 weeks per year from the time we can take off. 12 weeks is 1/4 of the calendar year. How will these restrictions be addressed?
			Classified work load is an issue to be considered.
			My biggest question with the calendar change is how it affects our paid time off, if at all? The whole week of Thanksgiving as a holiday is great, but there are plenty of holidays that classified employee's don't get that students and faculty do (Spring break, etc). Would the campus be closed the week of Thanksgiving so everyone could enjoy it? Would this affect how much time off we get at Christmas (would it take away from that time)?
			The changes puts our calendar more Inline with many of the 4-year universities that students will be transferring to Intersession only allows students to take 1 class (2 if they are overly ambitious)
			The changes puts our calendar more online with many of the 4-year universities that students will be transferring to Intersession only allows students to take 1 class (2 if they are overly ambitious). The longer 12-week summer with the 2 shorter 6-week sessions will allow students more opportunities for taking classes. Not sure why they want to put an additional 8-week session in there, but whatever.
			I've heard people complaining that this will prevent local high school graduates from taking summer courses since they will not have graduated when summer semester starts. Big deal. For those fortunate enough to go directly to a 4-year university they have to wait until fall semester to start anyway. Summer's main priority should be retaining current students, not recruiting graduating HS seniors.

			If they add the fall break the week of Thanksgiving, will classified be given the week off also?
			Wouldn't there be a concern about the timing of graduating high school students not having the opportunity to attend the 12 week sessions; which will probably be the bulk of the class offerings? The courses would start before the high school students graduate. Although, 6 week late start courses will be added to the schedule, the class offerings will obviously be minimal and refined since there will already by 12-week course offerings and 1st session 6 week offerings. In essence, the schedule minimizes the selection of courses for incoming freshmen...less of a variety to choose from. How will this affect the numbers? It would be good to find out from other colleges (if any) on this schedule, if enrollment decreased or increased for summer. Since the goal is always enrollment growth, there needs to be research on if this proposed schedule is counter-productive to that goal.
X			<p>This is a NO vote on the calendar change. (1) No compelling information has been presented to show SPECIFIC advantages to the change, and further, no NEW information has been presented to show why this topic has come back from the dead. (2) As the faculty debate the issue in email, no fewer than 8 different models have come up (as of today). Whatever now happens going forward, some people will be unhappy. Was creating frustration and dissent the only point of this proposal? That does not seem like good leadership. I also wonder about my two-year schedule plan that I created for my chair; was all that work for nothing? True, there will be a town hall meeting next week, but that was announced very late in the game, and it won't take place until six days <i>after</i> these comments close. That is hardly demonstrating good faith or fair play. (3) Contrary to the implications of the proposed change, there is nothing inherently wrong with Intersession. Indeed, I have the highest retention, highest average scores of the year in my Intersession classes: students are focused and ready to work, perhaps because many are racing to wrap up specific goals in order to graduate in June. We do not know the full potential for intersession because it is not fully supported: if we opened up all the buildings and let the community know we're open for business and eager for students, almost certainly FTES would increase. (4) If we go to a "6-&amp;-6 schedule" in summer, it seems we could end up excluding developmental English, which in the past has not been done under such compression. If we end up having English 101 / English 102 on the 6 &amp; 6 plan and developmental as a mid-summer 8 week course, then that stigmatizes the developmental course (making it visibly different than other campus courses). It also harms developmental faculty, who cannot earn as much potential LHE as the 6 &amp; 6 instructors might be eligible for. (5) Further, to have 6-, 8-, and 12-week classes in summer uses rooms inefficiently and causes general confusion. In the early 1990s we had multiple start and stop dates in summer, and the reason we ended that is that students never could figure out when they were supposed to be present. We expect a clean, unified term --- or if not, then why not let all the terms start and stop randomly? (6) Intersession has additional value as a period for faculty "recharge," and, at least in my case, for academic research. It is false to state that same work could be done in summer: some facilities are closed, our colleagues elsewhere are dispersed, and airfare and hotel rates are often 100% or even 400% more expensive in summer than in January. Due to the way the budget years break mid-summer, there also is no staff development support for mid-summer research. (7) There was no data or compelling reason provided for this "top-down" change. That a school such as Bakersfield does something similar proves nothing; our needs and theirs do not overlap, and many more schools do NOT use the Bakersfield model than use it. Not to seem too blunt, but for those programs about which I have first-hand knowledge, when it comes to Bakersfield versus AVC, they should be copying us, not the other way around. (8) One objection to this no vote could be to say that I am a grumpy gus opposed to all change. Yet in my case, that's not true at all. When I was Composition Coordinator, I helped English receive a state-wide award for innovation and excellence. I was the first person on campus to offer writing instruction in conjunction with a computer lab and I have fully supported online teaching and the new English 100A course. I have taught at the UC and CSU levels and also been a visiting lecturer abroad. I would love to be shown a new and better way to run this campus. True innovation is vital. But merely changing things to change them or to show faculty who's the boss of things? I am sorry, that I cannot support. We already dealt with this issue. The calendar committee must (yet again) vote no to this poorly conceived and badly supported proposal.</p>

X		<p>Although I have not taught during intercession, I see the benefit in the offering of this program/term. It seems like an unintended consequence of eliminating intercession could be problematic to transfer students. Students must complete all courses for transfer by the spring term before they are to start university (in fall).</p>
X		<p>Thank you for providing me an opportunity to share my humble thoughts regarding the proposed calendar change from a 16-5-8-16 model to a 16-12-16 model. According to a memo dated October 17, 2017 from the Office of the President “The current academic calendar does not provide a continuous and contiguous schedule to encourage ongoing enrollment and completion...AVC increased the number of sections for intersession 2017, and enrollment remained flat from the previous years, however, summer session is the only session of the college to experience growth over the past two years.” <b>I understand, then, the purpose of the proposed change is to encourage increased enrollment.</b> I’d like to point out that a core commitment of the community college system is to “Foster the use of data, inquiry, and evidence.” Documentation I received from Patty McClure states that while summer session enrollment increased 6.4% from 2016-2017 <b>winter intersession enrollment experienced 3.6% growth.</b> This data contradicts the above conclusion that “summer session is the only session of the college to experience growth over the past two years. What are the growth projections for a switch to a 16-12-16 model, if even a calendar change can accomplish these goals? The President’s memo makes the case that flat enrollments are due to “the college having met the pent-up demand created during the forced workload reductions of the recession...” and therefore appears to indicate that our current calendar bears little to no connection to current enrollment patterns. It has been argued that the proposed calendar change will permit higher level course offerings. These intense courses certainly could not be responsibly taught during any of the 6-week sessions and so could only be taught during the 12-week session. However we currently offer high level courses during our 8-week summer. I taught MATH 250 and PHYS 110 courses this past summer during the 8-week session, and MATH 250 has not been available during summer the past five years or so due to no faculty being available to teach the course, suggesting there remains demand which can be met with our current calendar provided the resources exist. It is worth pointing out that a benefit of the current model is that winter intersession and summer session are offered successively whereas the 12-week summer session would run concurrently with the two 6-week sessions. How many students who enroll in the winter intersession also enroll during the summer session? If the proportion is significant then we could see a combined enrollment decrease. I cannot see enough students taking advantage of the full summer offerings to make up for the combined enrollment in the current winter and summer sessions. Students have communicated to me the difficulty of keeping up in PHYS 110 and MATH 150 during the summer session. Some students dropped one or more of the courses. I certainly cannot see large numbers of students persisting in a challenging 12-week course and a compressed 6-week course. Of the 114 community colleges, I am aware, from discussions with faculty, of only four that have adopted a similarly proposed calendar and these include Yosemite Community College, Bakersfield City College, El Camino Community College, and Pasadena City College. Of these four El Camino Community College and Pasadena City College abandoned these academic calendars and reverted to calendars containing a winter intersession, one argument being that high school students were unable to attend the first summer session. A similar consequence could be seen in the Antelope Valley where high schools finish in mid-June. Lastly, an over-reliance on data can be detrimental, as data is often incomplete and not easily interpreted. Experience and sound judgement remain valuable components in any decision-making process for there are observations that are difficult to quantify let alone measure.</p> <p>For example, the winter session remains a critical opportunity for faculty self-improvement, self-enrichment, a time to prepare and improve one’s craft, a time to recharge, all of which serve to enhance instruction. The large gap also serves the community at large. Older students and students with family responsibilities may use the time to earn additional income. Other students may find an internship or research opportunity available during the intersession which could provide experience and a competitive advantage when applying for educational programs at universities. Additional coursework may then be completed in summer. Eliminating the winter intersession would remove this valuable time and could make summer session an all-or-nothing experience. I believe adopting the proposed calendar will not improve enrollment and may prove disadvantageous to a not unsubstantial proportion of our students and future students if adopted.</p>

	X		Just wanted to say that the new proposed schedule you suggested is a great idea. The longer summer term would give potential CSUB AV students more opportunities to be prepared for transfer to us or other CSUs. Since CSUB has converted to semesters our start times are much closer, this new proposed schedule will better align our semester ending times as well. This will definitely help students as they transfer from AVC to CSUB AV. I wholeheartedly support the new proposed academic calendar for AVC.
	X		After reviewing the proposed schedule for Antelope Valley College, I am in favor of it. Interns are valued in the Assembly office and the majority come from local schools. Having a schedule for the college that mirrors the area high schools calendar would be appreciated in organizing our week.
	X		Just to follow up, I wanted to reiterate my support, and others on my campus including our head counselor, for the proposed change in AVC's academic schedule. Eliminating intersession would lessen student demands during this short period of time (high school courses always overlap during this time period) and significantly support our students' overall wellness. Also, I believe that expanding summer sessions promotes the opportunity for greater student success in coursework, especially in the math and sciences.
			I think the President should send out to all students a formal Survey Monkey survey that explains the proposed calendar. This survey should ask if the proposed calendar would better serve their needs. Individual student feedback is absolutely essential before considering any change in the calendar.
			I understand the reason for the proposal: the 5-week intersession during winter break is just too short. My suggestion: Start the fall semester after Labor Day and let it finish at the end of the third week of December (16 weeks). Winter intersession could begin the first week of January and run to the end of February, a full 8 weeks. Spring Semester could run from the first week of March until the last week of June (16 weeks). This will enable the Summer Session to begin the first week of July and run through the last complete week in August--a full 8 weeks. The advantage of this arrangement is that those who choose not to teach during the Winter and Summer intersessions would still have a ten-week break between teaching semesters. I find that this is what I need: a) to recover from the strain of teaching and grading papers during the preceding semester, b) to take care of home maintenance projects, and c) to pursue my own professional and intellectual projects (I'm preparing a series of personal essays--possibly for publication or a personal blog).