

Part 2 – Minimum Enrollment Number Options

Question 4 – Rank Proposed Minimum Enrollment Number Options

There have been three distinct proposals for how to establish minimum enrollment numbers for courses. Rank the options according to what you think is best: 1 = best option; 4 = least preferable option. The ranking numbers will appear once you start moving the options around.

[Background: Keep in mind that like our current process, the purpose of any minimum enrollment number is to establish a basic goal, while allowing some courses to run with fewer than the expected enrollment numbers. See proposed Board Policy for a wide range of standard exceptions: [Proposed BP 6.04 Class Cancellation Guidelines](#)]

Explanation of the three options:

- **One fixed number:** this corresponds to our past policy. Our current Board Policy sets twenty (20) students as the expected minimum enrollment number. Chancellor Moreno has stated that the Board Policy will revert back to twenty (20) students if we do not agree on a new Board Policy and Administrative Procedure this Fall.
- **Two fixed numbers:** this proposal establishes one enrollment minimum for courses that have a specific meeting time and a higher number for asynchronous courses. One proposal last year suggested 17 for courses that have a specific meeting time and 22 for asynchronous courses.
- **Fifty percent of class maximum:** this proposal establishes a course's minimum enrollment number as fifty percent of its class maximum.
 - In the short-term, this proposal would raise the minimum enrollment number for many course sections (any section that has a class maximum of forty or more students).
 - In the long-term, the number of courses with smaller enrollment minimums would depend on 1) how many course outlines are submitted to a college's curriculum committee that successfully justify a lower course maximum based on pedagogical reasons (for more on this step, see [Guidelines for Establishing Course Enrollment Maximums](#)) and 2) the number of these courses a Dean would agree to place in the class schedule for a particular semester.
- **Other:** [enter your alternative option]

[See next page for table of results →]

#	Field	1	2	3	4
1	One fixed number: this corresponds to our past policy. Our current Board Policy sets twenty (20) students as the expected minimum enrollment number. Chancellor Moreno has stated that the Board Policy will revert back to twenty (20) students if we do not agree on a new Board Policy and Administrative Procedure this Fall.	9% 20	18% 36	40% 84	48% 87
2	Two fixed numbers: this proposal establishes one enrollment minimum for courses that have a specific meeting time and a higher number for asynchronous courses. One proposal last year suggested 17 for courses that have a specific meeting time and 22 for asynchronous courses.	36% 79	40% 83	26% 54	13% 24
3	Fifty percent of class maximum: this proposal establishes a course's minimum enrollment number as fifty percent of its class maximum. In the short-term, this proposal would raise the minimum enrollment number for many course sections (any section that has a class maximum of forty or more students). In the long-term, the number of courses with smaller enrollment minimums would depend on 1) how many course outlines are submitted to a college's curriculum committee that successfully justify a lower course maximum based on pedagogical reasons, and 2) the number of these courses a Dean would agree to place in the class schedule for a particular semester. (For more on step 1, see Guidelines for Establishing Course Maximums.)	27% 60	35% 72	33% 68	24% 44
4	Other	28% 63	7% 14	1% 3	14% 26
		222	205	209	181

Table of Survey Results for Question 4:

- **First-place rank votes:**
 - Two fixed numbers option: 79 respondents (36%)
 - “Other” option: 63 respondents (28%)
 - Fifty percent option: 60 respondents (27%)
 - One fixed number option: 20 votes (9%)
- **Second-place rank votes:**
 - Two fixed numbers option: 83 respondents (40%)
 - Fifty percent option: 72 respondents (35%)
 - One fixed number option: 36 votes (18%)
 - “Other” option: 14 respondents (7%)
- **Third-place rank votes:**
 - One fixed number option: 84 respondents (40%)
 - Fifty percent option: 68 respondents (33%)
 - Two fixed numbers option: 54 respondents (26%)
 - “Other” option: 3 votes (1%)
- **Fourth-place rank votes:**
 - One fixed number option: 87 respondents (48%)
 - Fifty percent option: 44 respondents (24%)
 - Two fixed numbers option: 24 respondents (13%)
 - “Other” option: 26 votes (14%)

Open-Ended Feedback Entered for the “Other” Option for Question 4

Uncategorized “Other” Option Comments or Proposals Submitted for Question 4

- “A combination of diversity and classes needed to get students through.”
- “Many if not most students are no longer paying tuition for classes. As a result, a policy should be considered which works on a sliding scale. Minimum class enrollment should be aligned with overall student enrollment.”
- “Minimum should not exceed 20 in any case. Minimum set for 1 less than 50% unless this exceeds 20 (because classes are canceled early and enrollment still occurs) Dean has the right to make exceptions as needed to accommodate student needs.”
- “Grouping all courses under one policy is unfair to CTE courses and courses with lab where enrollment maximums are lower due to safety reasons. Some CTE classes only offer one section per semester. Enrollment minimums should be a percentage like 60% of the maximum enrollment. The default should be a minimum of 20 except when 60% is less than 20 such as a CTE class with a maximum of 24 where 60% of 24 would be 14.”
- “In my view, the core strength of community colleges is small class size, period. Tying class minimums and maximums, as suggested above (“50% of Class max.”) would have been fine with me, if it were (a) a simpler process without all the suggested curriculum changes, and (b) it was a range of, say {30-50% of the maximum}. If the Class-maximum guidelines can be fine-tuned, so that we do not have upto 50- and 70- students in classes, we will be in line with the fundamental principles of small-class-sizes for community colleges. With that as the basis, a 30-50% of class-max. range for arriving at class-minimums, would be a simple and effective way to bound the min-max range. I think having that single, 50% factor is a flaw in the 50% approach above. Another advantage would be that no curriculum changes are needed (except for the super-large classes) and we could state that the goal should be to center minimums around a single number (15 or a range 13-18). The reason I would rank this 2 on my list, would be if the discussion on maximums has already been accepted, in which case I would lean towards the “Two Fixed Numbers” as a practical approach.”
- “Standardization of class minimums for courses with multiple sections, perhaps using the “two fixed numbers” option seems reasonable; however, an exception should be made for courses for which only one class is offered. For these, I suggest a lower minimum, say 10 students. This would protect more specialized, major-focused, or advanced courses that the dean and faculty in a department deem to be worth supporting but that may not attract the enrolments of core curricular courses. Departments and divisions should have the latitude to protect from cancelation a limited number of these classes each semester in order to preserve the richness, depth, and diversity of our curriculum, especially with the streamlining of curriculum that is the trend. It seems clear to me that the cost of a few empty seats is far lower than it would be if we sacrificed the needs and educational ambitions of the students who have the opportunity to fill those seats.”

- “While the Fifty percent of class maximum proposal is most preferable of the 3 options given, I absolutely do NOT think we should be putting course maximums on CORs, especially with the very quickly coming Common Course Numbering which will further align course CORs across the District. My strong opinion on this originates from 10+ years serving on Curriculum Committee and also 20+ years of teaching a variety of 'program-driven specialty' courses. Many of these courses are taught in site-specific Lab spaces – each of these spaces is unique to the individual Colleges in our District, so the same class at one College in our District may have a possible maximum that is different than that at another College in our District due to the physical constraints of the space. I absolutely don't think this should be tied to how many course outlines are submitted to a college's curriculum committee, because this has factors that are outside of many faculty's control (such as which years they are scheduled for a Program Review) and is a workload issue, disadvantaging disciplines that have many courses (e.g. over 50-75) to have put through Curriculum Committee with class maximums on a COR.”
- “I like the class maximum idea, but I don't think it should be decided by the curriculum committee, as all faculty have their own ideas of how best to teach a class. I propose that departments/programs set their class sizes in consultation with their Deans based on their facilities (classrooms) and teaching goals. It would be nice as well to promote as a goal that all faculty in all departments try to make their classes as interactive as possible (aiming for the 30 or 35 class max goal). Online courses should be treated the same as face to face.”
- “Categorize classes based on the importance of teacher/student interaction. Highly interactive classes should have a lower student/teacher ratio than classes that require less interaction. For instance, writing classes are demanding for teachers since students need coaching and feedback to truly improve.”
- “When the minimum of 20 went into effect I was a dean. The way I handled the new minimum was if a faculty member had an average of 20 students in the courses they taught, I would let a class that did not meet the minimum to continue if it had at least 10 students.”
- “The one fixed number and the 50% are one-size-fits all proposals that completely ignore student-centered scheduling. NO (!!!) on those! (on the 50% short-term, no. The long-term PEDAGOGICAL limit is what we need to implement). The two-fixed number is at best a minimum effort at a compromise, that only considers modality, while completely ignoring types of delivery (lecture vs. lab, emphasis on group work, project-based learning etc.). The options presented ignore PEDAGOGY in the short term all together, which is shameful for an educational institution. Scheduling is much more nuanced than these simplistic options, and while I would like a bit more certainty in scheduling, including standardization of the timeline (I had a dean in the past who cancelled a class literally 2 hours AFTER its first meeting, with zero consultation from me), ultimately upper administration cannot treat all departments, or even all types of courses as one-

size-fits all. Until pedagogical considerations are brought to the forefront, the ultimate decision on retaining small-enrollment sections must still be kept with the dean and faculty, with reasonable consultation. The no-compromise default by the Chancellor and Board is draconian, ignores student needs, and will taint the reputation of SMCCCD, that will damage future enrollment, making problems even worse. There are other institutions who have created calculations that specifically emphasize PEDAGOGY above other enrollment considerations. The Chancellor and the Board should be made to study those first.”

- “Class maximums need to first be revised based on course type and modality, for example smaller labs, larger lecture halls, and hyflex/multimodal courses, and within a certain timeframe identify a specific percentage that makes sense to run the class - 50% of class maximum is not equitable for all courses.”
- “The two explanations about how the fifty-percent option would affect the minimum and maximum enrollment of classes are confusing. Perhaps an example could have made it clearer.”
- “The fifty percent rule seems random. Why 50%? Will the curriculum committees and faculty be allotted additional resources to establish, justify, and determine this new COR requirement? Also, it seems like this policy leaves a lot of discretion to the dean (“the number of these courses a dean would agree to place in the schedule . . .”).”
- “17 for all courses, with the specific time and no specific time (asynchronous). It is not clear why the modality should influence the decision. I am teaching the same course as a f2f, sync, and asynchronous modes. The materials, homework, lecture notes, concepts covered, and the number of assessments is the same in all modalities. Why, for example, my face-to-face class with 17 students will be kept, but the same online class will be cancelled? Does not make any sense.”
- “All of these sound bad to me. I don't understand the difference between face to face and asynchronous - I teach asynchronous and spend more time teaching than I did since I provide far more student feedback which usually means more than class time.”
- “As much as we wish this were NOT the case, our students do not complete their registration early. Every semester, for the last 30 years, we see a surge of students who are frantically trying to add required courses to their schedules. In the past, this behavior was strongly linked to the "pay to play" structure embraced by the District. Nowadays, I think it's partly about finances (for students coming from outside of SM county) and partly about students trying to figure out whether going to school now is right for them. I'm sure there are other contributing factors as well. When we cancel classes before the semester starts, we are ensuring that some of our most vulnerable populations do have access to courses. We also ensure that programs that are trying to grow will not be able to do so. When students realize that elective/higher level or new courses are likely to be canceled, they (logically) don't enroll as it's more important to have their schedule set and "locked in" than to live with that flux of a last-minute change in scheduling. Early

cancellation of classes also chills faculty's enthusiasm for trying new courses: why put a hundred hours into planning a course that is likely to be canceled before you even have a chance to build up a reputation and following for that course? For these and many other reasons, I think classes that have at least ten students enrolled should not be canceled until after the first week of classes. If we can afford to pay our current chancellor \$404,250 per year, we can afford to run "under enrolled" classes (that's 146% MORE than a faculty member with over 25-years' experience and a PhD will earn). Honestly, when I look at the chancellor's salary, I do wonder what on earth she even does that can justify being paid that much. [...]"

- “Sorry to sound snide, but since both policies set the minimum at 20 (which might be objectionable for in-class courses which due to Covid-19, inconvenience, etc. might find fewer takers, regardless of their programmatic importance, and relevance), why even ask the question? Administrative Fiat, is it not, anyway?”

Should Consider Different Factors and/or More Nuanced Factors and/or Program Specific Factors [At least some of these are addressed by the proposed BP 4000 (6.04).]

1. “Evaluation of how many sections of a class are scheduled in a given semester and whether the class has been offered in a previous semester/year. One blanket policy is not sufficient to address the differing needs of gen ed classes like lower level English and Math, and specialized courses that are specific to a discipline, like CTE classes in Medical Assisting, Fashion Design, Digital Art, and the like.”
2. “While I understand the role of costs and minimizing administrative frustration with scheduling, I do not think that the decisions should be focused mainly on those criteria. In the ongoing debates, it seems to me that the crucial factors of inconvenience to students looking for another course after cancellation of one they enrolled in, the lack of evidence that the majority do find another that fits their academic needs, and general absence of any study of these concerns is detrimental to both staff--esp. part timers who face an additional economic consequence of cancellation--and students who need to fill requirements in order to graduate, given their own limited resources, schedules, and other time factors.”
3. “Class minimums should be established based on nuanced factors that reflect equity, accessibility and critical pedagogy (as well as social justice, more indirectly but no less significantly). Certain courses that are unique, advanced, specialized, rarely offered or otherwise deserving of special consideration (put differently, NOT your run of the mill high volume high demand conventional transfer/graduation courses), should have lower minimum enrollments. So we can effectively respond to the educational demands and interests of learning communities, major requirements, and the broader community at large (retired, working, etc.)”

4. "There are some courses in the art department that need lower numbers for safety reasons. It is difficult to manage students using machinery and other tools when there are too many students."
5. "I'd love to see us take into consideration the number of courses being offered within a subject area. For example, if there are only 5 classes in the entire department and two low enrolled courses are the only in-person options and neither meet the minimum of 17, I think they should both be considered for staying open because they offer more flexibility for students (assuming they're different days/times and/or taught by different faculty)."
6. "I teach electives/GE courses not required for a specific major. These are the LAST classes that students sign up for, after they get their major or certificate classes. Please take into account how many Add Codes we give out after registration ends (this semester, 7 in Tap Dance, 11 in Social Dance, and 10 in Dance Appreciation). These classes need a longer timeline for meeting any class minimums."
7. "A combination of the 50% rule with some exceptions. None of these proposals mention Program Mapper and degree paths; this is the missing link that students and counselors need to be able to plan out degree/certificate progression. Classes that are part of someone's degree path with lots of prerequisites should not be cancelled unless the exceptions noted in the BP 6.04 are included."
8. "As a head of a single person dept. the overall LOAD of a dept should carry the day. Some classes routinely have high enrollment while other transfer/degree completion elective courses will be smaller. The higher enrolled courses balance out the overall dept #'s. We should be looking at the overall health of a dept and meet student degree and transfer needs. Courses that are offered in a regular rotation to promote degree completion and priority should be given flexibility on lighter enrollments. My dept has been hit hard by repeated cancellations by the Dean. I recently had a class of 24 students in a lab be cancelled because I could not read the adjunct applications due to vision impairment. I was left to do the hiring...The Dean cancelled that class without any alternatives for the students and they didn't notify me of this decision. . On the flip side, I have a course with 20 students on a wait list and the dean refuses to add a much needed section. The Dean/Admin policies and procedures are ANTI Students and conflict with our Mission and Values Statement."
9. "I support the updated BP 6.04 Guidelines for Class Cancellation. As the Program Lead for the fully online Baccalaureate Degree in Respiratory Care at Skyline, our program is structured using a carousel and flexible schedule (CFS) model. This allows students to take one or two courses at a time, providing flexibility as they work toward completing their BS degree. Consequently, our student numbers can vary significantly between courses—some may have higher enrollments, while others may be smaller. These numbers may shift each semester, with courses that are large one term becoming smaller the next, and vice versa. Our program recently received the approval of the substantive change, and the annual reporting by the Commission on Accreditation for Respiratory

Care (CoARC), entailing our updated PSLO and CFS model, confirming that we meet their rigorous standards. The CFS model officially launched this semester, and while we currently cap enrollment at 25 students per course, we are approved for a total of 70 students annually. Additionally, we face increased competition from other institutions that have recently launched their own BS degrees in Respiratory Care. Thus, placing a higher cap on the number of student enrollments per class in this specialized program could create a significant issue, potentially destabilizing the program. If the stability of our program relies solely on semester-by-semester enrollment, rather than viewing the long-term enrollment trends, we risk losing the program altogether. It is crucial to consider the bigger picture in maintaining the viability of this program.”

10. “Different programs should have different class maximum. Programs with traditionally lesser enrollment can have their classes in a category where a much lower number is settled upon. For example, Interior Design classes are in a robust program but do not have the enrollment numbers of chemistry or computer science. If 17/20 are used for ID classes then many classes will get canceled each semester leading to delays in graduating and for e students to go elsewhere. Different max for different classes/programs is best.”
11. For "Network Engineering" (NETX) at Skyline College specifically, we strongly recommend a maximum of 18 students. The rationale for this is explained below: Regarding class sizes, the major concern for the STEM Network Engineering (NETX) classes is that these have had to be historically smaller than that of many Skyline programs offered. Please note that the NETX classes are technical in nature and have a different focus from that of other Skyline curriculums. The current maximum physical capacity for teaching students in Building 19, Room 304 is 21. There are not enough seats to accommodate a larger number due to the configuration of the room and the equipment needed to be housed and utilized there. Additionally, there are safety concerns with any increase in the number of students. Students need to be able to physically interact with, disassemble, assemble, configure, inspect, and troubleshoot energized equipment. Ideally the best number of maximum students from an instruction perspective for the NETX classes is less than 21, strongly recommend 18. This improves the Instructor/Student ratio and allows for greater flexibility with classroom instruction and student experience in conducting physical hands-on labs.
12. For the "Network Engineering" (NETX) program at Skyline College, we recommend limiting class sizes to a maximum of 18 students. Below is the rationale for this recommendation: Historically, Network Engineering Technology (NETX - STEM) classes have needed to be smaller than many other programs at Skyline. This is due to the technical nature of the NETX curriculum, which differs from other offerings. The maximum capacity for instruction in Building 19, Room 304 is 21 students; however, the room's layout and necessary equipment do not allow for a larger class size. Moreover, increasing the number of students raises safety concerns, as students must physically interact with, disassemble, assemble, configure, inspect, and troubleshoot energized

equipment. From an instructional perspective, the ideal maximum class size for NETX is fewer than 21 students, with 18 being strongly recommended. This allows for a better instructor-student ratio and enhances flexibility in classroom instruction, resulting in a richer hands-on lab experience for students.

13. "As for the Network Engineering" (NETX) classes at Skyline College we strongly recommend a maximum of 18 students. The rationale for this is explained below: Regarding class sizes, the major concern for the STEM Network Engineering (NETX) classes is that these have had to be historically smaller than that of many Skyline programs offered. Please note that the NETX classes are technical in nature and have a different focus from that of other Skyline curriculums. The current maximum physical capacity for teaching students in Building 19, Room 304 is 21. There are not enough seats to accommodate a larger number due to the configuration of the room and the equipment needed to be housed and utilized there. Additionally, there are safety concerns with any increase in the number of students. Students need to be able to physically interact with, disassemble, assemble, configure, inspect, and troubleshoot energized equipment. Ideally the best number of maximum students from an instruction perspective for the NETX classes is less than 21, strongly recommend 18. This improves the Instructor/Student ratio and allows for greater flexibility with classroom instruction and student experience in conducting physical hands-on labs."
14. "A model that takes into account special considerations along with modality (model 2) and does not use a blanket number to determine if a class will run or be cut. Sometimes a program is getting back on its feet so a course needs to run even if there is low enrollment. And sometimes cutting courses that don't meet the minimum will have snowballing detrimental effects. For example, if English courses are cut, a student's academic progress is impeded and enrollments decrease. We need a model that offers a lot of flexibility and no repercussions for deans to run a low-enrolled class."
15. "Sequential classes that comprise a Certificate Program often have higher enrollment in the first class of a sequence and lower enrollments in subsequent classes due to having stricter prerequisite requirements and a more advanced curriculum. If only the first class of a Certificate Program sequence has sufficient enrollment to run while subsequent classes get cancelled due to low enrollment, this nullifies the entire Certificate Program. The first class of a Certificate Program can be subject to enrollment minimums like the ideas listed above. However I strongly believe that Dean and faculty should establish enrollment minimums for subsequent Certificate Program classes on a case-by-case basis to help ensure survival of the Certificate Program."

Special Consideration for New Courses

1. "There should be separate guidelines for NEW courses. These take a while to market, get on students' and counselors' radars, and articulate into degrees and programs. Specific suggestion: 1/2 of enrolment minimum for the first 3 semesters the new course is listed

2/3 of enrolment minimum for semesters 4-6 I am going through the process of listing and running a new course. It has been such a grind. It is critical that relevant, student-centered, high quality online courses get the best chance to ‘survive’.”

2. “New programs/courses should have a one-year reduced enrollment requirement of 15, with dean discretion to continue at 10. This would help mitigate the consistent lack of marketing support, the need to give new programs/courses runway.”

Special Consideration for On-Campus Classes

1. “The modality of the instruction should be factored in when identified the required minimum class size as well as the maximum.”
2. “There should be two fixed numbers. Courses with specific meeting times should be 10, not 17. If the district cares about community building, campus life, and all the other benefits that come from face-to-face courses, it should work to protect them, not dismantle them. Human relations are the foundation of this district, and face-to-face courses, its strongest and most important expression. Please preserve our face-to-face classes.”
3. “Reduce the number of online offerings in favor of a return to mostly in-person instruction. The college and district should stop competing with itself for enrollment by offering the majority of courses online. Even students who do not need the flexibility of online courses will gravitate toward that option because the courses are generally easier, and are more convenient than going to class and engaging in discussion. If there were fewer online offerings, students would have to attend more classes in person, which would stop the online courses from cannibalizing the in-person ones. This is not a new idea. Cabrillo College pivoted to mostly in-person courses when faced with a post-pandemic enrollment crisis: <https://www.opencampusmedia.org/2021/06/09/as-registration-lagsfurther-behind-cabrillo-college-pivots-to-a-mostly-in-person-fall/>
4. “Make the default assumption that F2F classes work best for the most students (show me the data that says otherwise) Make any exception to this rule, one that the faculty/dean need to make in an open meeting. Historic justifications should have some weight (e.g., working adults) other/ newer reasons should be looked at carefully, as the data shows that those in F2F classes learn more and face more rigorous course work (thus better prepared for their next step) Once this default is in place, enrollments in F2F should rise, as students will see a richer set of choices in one modality as compared to another.”

Blend of 50% of Maximum with a Fixed Number or Numbers

1. “Why not merge the two-number system and the relative enrollment system together? Courses with enrollment numbers fewer than X% the course maximum for Y modality will be canceled within Z timeframe.”
2. “A flat rate of 16, with cancellation at 50% of courses for which there is an alternative. Also, block scheduling MW so that there aren't half-hour time conflicts for students.”

3. “For classes of up to 35 students, a minimum fixed number of 10. For classes open to more than 35 students, 50% of class maximum.”
4. “Fifty percent of class maximum with an exception for courses that are the only section of that class on the schedule. Canceling a class is more problematic if there really is not other option, and this should be explicitly stated in the policy. One proposal: A class with no other sections should be allowed to run with 33% of the total enrollment (e.g. 10 students if the cap is 30).”
5. “Class Cancellation Policy Suggestion: *Courses with a Maximum Enrollment Under 40 Students: A minimum enrollment of 50% of the class maximum is required to proceed. *Courses with a Maximum Enrollment of 40 Students or More: A minimum enrollment of 20 students is required to proceed.”
6. “Have something like the above (50%) for most classes, but if it's a class with higher than 40, adjust it somehow. And leave room/flexibility for deans depending on the departments/courses students. I know in my department, ESL, the 20 student minimum nearly killed our program (not an exaggeration), putting in jeopardy the education of some of the most vulnerable in our community, adult immigrants in need of language skills for life, work, family, etc. In our classes, students often trickle in in the first few weeks of the semester; canceling classes too early rather than allowing time for them to fill, left many students with no classes to turn to. We saw our lowest level almost wiped out, and then as a result, this was happening at the level above it as well. Since the 10 student cap has been in place, we've been able to rebuild our program from the ground up. I fear that going back to this cut off will do what it was previously doing-- disenfranchising the most vulnerable in our community.”

Set the Class Minimum at a Lower Percent of Class Maximum

1. “Thirty percent of class maximum.”
2. “Fixed number of 25% of course max”

Set the Class Minimum at 15 students or Other Number Lower than 20

1. “Minimum class size of 15 with the Dean’s ability to allow smaller class sizes to run based on: 1- Students ability to graduate on time 2- Other available sections in the same modality 3- History of enrollment”
2. “Keep classes that have a minimum of 15. A lot of students wait until the first day to "try out classes" and then drop or want to add other classes. Don't cancel classes until the first week of classes.”
3. “I believe setting a minimum of 20 students is too high; perhaps 10 to 15 would be more reasonable. With decreasing birth rates, smaller classes allow teachers to provide better, customized instruction. Even if the class requires face-to-face interaction, I think it's beneficial to offer remote learning options so students can join remotely. Many of my students have jobs and cannot attend the in person class.”

4. "12 student minimum for synchronous classes. 17 student minimum for asynchronous classes."
5. Maintain fixed number that is lower than 20 but higher than 10 - maybe 15?
6. We should stay the course with a lower (12?) run number until we get a better handle on enrollment trends, and then create an open-minded plan on bolstering our ftf course numbers--late start classes, in-person/synchronous classes combo, etc.
7. One fixed number: minimum 15
8. Propose a minimum enrollment number of 15 instead of 20
9. For courses that are part of certificate or degree programs the number of students required are too high. 15 should be the minimum requirement of students.

Keep the Current Class Minimum of 10 students

1. "minimum enrollment 10 for all courses"
2. "The minimum enrollment should be kept at 10 students. It is important to provide a variety of classes for our students. Instead of penalizing and cutting classes due to minimum enrollment, we should find ways to market our colleges to increase our student population."
3. "The current (temporary) policy that sets 10 as the number for class minimum enrollment has been outstandingly successful in the English department. This policy has made possible the tremendous enrollment growth that some of us have known for years could happen. The policy of 10 as minimum number makes last-minute enrollment possible for more students. We have known for a long time that we were turning away a lot of students at the last minute. Class cancellations were not leaving enough room for the last minute arrivals. Finally these students who want to enroll at the beginning of the semester have classes that they can get. Few classes actually run with 10 students; most of the time, the low-enrolled classes get a pretty good number of last-minute enrollments. My own current classes have enrollments of 27, 26, and 22 (class cap is set at 26 for these classes). The one that's now at 22 was pretty low right up until the beginning of the semester. I'm glad I was able to accommodate the last-minute arrivals. This is a long way of saying that the "10-minimum" policy ends up being more efficient in terms of use of resources than one might at first expect.
4. "Minimum of 10 in a class"
5. "Minimum of 10"
6. "Make the class minimum 10 or 12. Pay for this by reducing non-instructional costs associated with special programs that are not focused on instruction. For example, smaller classes will retain students far better than all the new "retention specialists" we have hired. Plus, funding is no longer tied to enrollment for the most part so better strategic enrolment planning would be far more useful than cutting low enrolled classes after the fact. Cancelled classes alienate students and make innovation in instructional planning very difficult."

7. “Keep minimum for all classes at 10 so that our students can get the courses they need when they need them. Very important, the higher minimums result in deans cancelling classes that screw up student study schedules and often mess up required or recommended course sequencing. We lose students to other districts this way!!!!!! They are forced, or just get frustrated and decide to enroll online with any of California's other CCD's. And our enrollments spiral downwards --unnecessarily.”
8. “Each course is unique, keep it the way it is”
9. “Class minimum should stay at 10. If a class was put in the schedule and at least 10 students signed up for it, it should run that semester. Deans can always adjust what gets offered in the following semester based on enrollment. This means there is at most a 1 semester "lag" in the response to enrollment swings and students are less impacted. For instance, if we offer two sections of a course and one gets over 20 and the other 10, keep them both this semester. Next semester only offer one section and you'll hit the implied target of 20. Our policy should ultimately prioritize not cancelling classes that are put on the schedule to minimize impact to STUDENTS. Deans/admin will still have strategic control over attempting to hit the implied 20 minimum by adjusting future schedules without it being the explicit policy and potentially impacting 10-20 students per cancelled class when the financial gain is minimal relative to our total budget.”
10. “The truth is we have plenty of money to keep the class size at 10 students. We are slightly affected by having less students as we are on Community support. The money we get has gone up every year for the last many years. Our categorical spent money has been spent on staff/positions we should not fund in the first place. Then we are screwed into paying for them after the state gives us less money for the categorical programs. We really don't know what we are doing in the first place. Example: we hire 2 or 3 staff to work in marketing our college. Then we lose enrolment like crazy... : When I specifically asked "why do we need 2-3 people to work in our marketing department when our enrollment is dying?" THE ANSWER GIVEN TO ME WAS " COULD YOU IMAGINE HOW MUCH WORSE OUR ENROLLMENT WOULD BE IF WE DIDN'T HAVE OUR MARKETING DEPARTMENT" What a joke...we hire people we don't need in the first place, then we have to find money to keep them. Then we pretend to say it is all about our students... Then we hurt our students when we cancel their class, and they have to scrounge around looking for classes after the semester has started. I could say more but I'll let you all off on good behavior... :) [...]"

No Standard Minimum Enrollment Number

1. “I fail to see how enrollment minimums help establish good policy or help students learn considering the broad types of courses offered. I have many introductory courses that enjoy very high enrollments. By the 2nd year, my advanced courses are lucky to pull in more than 12 students. Still, those students need those courses to graduate and gain a certificate needed to transfer or get jobs in industry. If the issue is budgetary - set a base

enrollment necessary to maintain the course. With online courses being very cheap and on-campus courses based on resources required.”

2. “There should be no minimum.”
3. “No minimum cancellation, let classes run if students are enrolled”
4. “No minimum (or maybe 10 students) for courses required for Majors' sequences towards degree. 50% of class maximum for nonrequired courses/electives and general ed.”

There Should be No Standardization

1. “There is no standardization that can capture all of the varieties of types of courses and modalities we offer. I have had late start classes that didn't start until October cancelled in August for low enrollment. The whole point of a late start class is to allow for late enrollment. I think there should be a rubric to determine enrollment that takes into account start date, modality, if it's a graduation requirement, how often/recently a course has been offered if it's part of a graduation requirement or certificate/AA/AS/other program. We are harming students by cancelling courses that they need to graduate and succeed, and we are failing them when we cancel classes without a backup plan for them.”
2. “The above proposals are a "one size fits all approach." Some courses should run with lower enrollments --- i.e. classes or programs that serve specific marginalized student populations. In addition, research indicates that smaller class sizes benefit students. Yes, we should establish a bottom threshold, but class cancellations should be more fluid and should have faculty and dean discussion/approval.”
3. “Deans and faculty should work together on this issue, based on a situated understanding of each situation - the discipline, specific course, student needs, instructor approach, etc. I don't think any rigid set of rules will be useful. The "fixed number" creates numerous problems (including but not limited to the "synchronous vs. asynchronous" issue). The "half of course maximum" just begs the question of illogical course maximums - I looked at the chart used for determining course maximums, and based on the chart, many course maximums are way too high. Cancelling those courses if they don't meet half of those maximums just adds insult to injury. The proposal around "how many course outlines are submitted to a college's curriculum committee that successfully justify a lower course maximum based on pedagogical reasons" just seems like a way of deflecting the whole class-size (and cancellation) issue: the Curricunet system does not include a field where we specifically enter a justification for a lower course maximum, so how exactly would that work...? In my division, our dean understands and respects our various disciplines and works with us on course scheduling. I think we all trust her to oversee this process and determine if/when courses need to be cancelled. I'd rather work directly with her than have this one-size-fits-all rulebook.”
4. “The decision to cancel a class should be left up to the affected faculty member and the Dean. A standardized policy is unable to take into account the consequences of a class

cancellation. A class cancellation impacts students who will have to at least rewrite their schedules and at worst delay taking required classes. A class cancellation impacts the faculty who had prepared for the class. A class cancellation impacts the faculty members who are teaching other sections of the class who will now have to decide if they are going to overload their section or force students to delay their educational goals. A class cancellation impacts adjunct faculty who will lose a class to fill out a full-time faculty member's schedule. If a class is shown to be particularly small over a period of time, then we can assess the viability of the class for future schedules. Once a schedule has been set and published, those classes should go forward as planned. The least we can do is show our students who are setting up their lives around our published schedule some respect and not force undue hardship on them.”

5. “I mean, deciding on a case by case basis makes much more sense. Why have deans if the decisions are all automated?”