

Part 3 – General Feedback on Class Cancellation Guidelines

Q5 - If you would like to share an open-ended comment, question, or suggestion related to the class cancellation guidelines, then please enter it below.

Feedback Grouped by Trends/Categories:

Support for Updated BP 6.04

1. I just want to reiterate: I support the updated BP 6.04 Guidelines for Class Cancellation as it captures the stability of my program. 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.

Support for Proposed 50% procedure (AP 6.04.1)

1. I really disagree with a fixed number, such as 20, for cancelling classes and prefer a percent. 20 students in an English or ESL/ESOL class is very different from 20 students in a math or physics class with a larger class cap. In other words, students taking classes from departments with small class caps would suffer as fewer classes would be offered for them.
2. The district needs to stop viewing every class that is offered as equivalent to every other, and start taking into consideration whether a class is a "general interest" class like Math, English, and the like, or a specialized class that draws from a small percentage of the overall student population. Likewise, a course's position in the progression should also be

considered. More advanced courses enroll lower numbers due to attrition, and blanket run/cancel policy for classes like these disadvantages students. I am so exhausted from having to have the "can it run or not" conversation every semester, often far earlier than when our own internal research shows students register for classes. Having "targets" as the semester approaches is a good start, but it's not nearly flexible enough to accommodate courses that don't attract attention from the vast majority of the student population.

3. A set required enrollment number (like 20 students) would punish classes that typically need to have a smaller number of students, like an art class, and would give advantage to larger classes. A percentage would be fairer. Deans should also have some flexibility in keeping vs canceling classes because they know their departments.
4. The proposed policy of either sticking with 20 or changing to 17 and 22 is unrealistic for courses that are part of certificate and degree requirements. Having a set number doesn't take into account the differences between programs.

Support for a lower minimum number (i.e., 10)

1. Class cancellation is a tricky navigation. There are required courses that need to be taught, and there are rotating courses that do not get the marketing they need to fill. I believe all courses should have a minimum of 10 students enrolled to ensure a class will be taught. And Deans should wait to see if classes will fill before deciding to cancel them.
2. Either we are making education available for people or we are not. Cancelling viable classes (say, over 8 students) forces our students to just move to other California community colleges instead of SMCCD (almost all courses are available online through other colleges outside of our district).
3. This is a question - Are lab sections treated as a separate class or a section within a class? It would be helpful to define the term "class" as the lecture portion or the individual labs. When you talk about sections are you talking about individual CRN#'s because that would mean you are then talking about lab sections being treated as a "class" which I strongly oppose have a minimum of 20. My answers were based on the assumption that it is talking about the lecture and the labs are sections of that single class. There should also be a lower minimum (10) for classes ending a transfer sequence, especially if the class is at the end of an off sequence offering and is not offered elsewhere in the district.
4. Classes that are not always offered, but are necessary or at least important to students majoring in a field, should be offered if they have 8-10 students.
5. With a District Budget over \$500Mill, which is MUCH higher than if we were funded through state apportionment, "we can't afford small classes" is a BS argument. Additionally, our District has been out of compliance with the 50% Law for over a decade, currently at 40.71%. How can the district both comply with the 50% Law and help students? By offering more classes! Smaller class size is better for student retention and success, more classes translate in more options for students to take the classes they

need, when they need them and in their preferred modality. By spending more on instruction, the District will be doing the right thing for students while moving towards compliance with the 50% Law.

Support for two numbers for asynchronous & specific meeting time classes

1. I think we need to realize our students are moving more to an online format, and we have to adjust our in person classes to a smaller size because of this. Otherwise, the students lose out on the opportunity to meet face-to-face. There are many students who still value this modality and there are certain classes that only work in person, for example, physical education classes. I believe there needs to be an exception for the minimum enrollment for these classes. They are a basic need for everyone and canceling them would put our society in an extremely unhealthy state, affecting all of us!
2. 20 is too high to set the class minimum, especially for in-person classes. If we want students to come back to campus, we need to offer a wide range of in-person classes - and that includes at a variety of times, some of which will have lower enrollment.
3. Face-to-face courses are foundational to the strength of this district. Special measures should be taken to protect them. Otherwise, the SMCCD legacy will be in jeopardy.

Opposition to two numbers for asynch & specific meeting time classes

1. I disagree that Asynchronous classes should be held to a different enrollment standard than Synchronous classes. Although Synchronous classes can be more difficult to schedule for students, they are more desirable because they offer a better classroom experience. All else being equal, I believe a student would choose a synchronous class over an asynchronous one. I believe this preference for a synchronous classroom experience neutralizes any perceived advantage asynchronous classes have due to scheduling ease. In general, I believe enrollment minimums should be made on a per-class basis between the Dean and the faculty rather than having a blanket policy for all classes. Not all class subjects lend themselves to large class sizes, and generally the more specialized and advanced a subject is the more likely it will have lower enrollment. To cancel them for that reason would be a huge loss for the college and the students it serves.
2. I'm inclined to fundamentally reject the presumption, implied in one of these questions, that if we agree to a wide range of in person courses with lower enrollment requirements, the Deans will be forced to schedule a more limited and less diverse array of course offerings. In other words, "forced." I don't buy into that. We can and should (and of course we can afford to do it) have it both ways. They are not mutually exclusive, even though the survey question sets it up as such. We can and should have a variety of courses with lower min enrollments, justified as such, and be able to offer these courses, in the context of diverse and experimental course offerings. All we need do, is be brave enough, to tell the Deans to do it. They can do it. I know. Our Dean does it. Most don't. Some do. Let's do what's right. It's easier than we think.

3. I still don't understand the rationale for the 20 cut off since they didn't exist when I started in 2006. And I also don't understand the distinctions that are offered for online asynchronous versus other modalities. We don't make distinctions at my other campus because both modalities require the same effort - if not more for online, especially in order to promote retention. As it is in my discipline, the maximums are fairly arbitrary.
4. Online and in-person courses should not be treated differently from one another. They meet the same learning outcomes, whether in person or online. If students prefer an online version of a course, then maybe instead offer more online sections. When all classes were offered in person and day time slots were more popular than evening time slots back in the day, more daytime slots were added to accommodate student needs. Maybe since online courses are more popular, offer more online sections to help accommodate student needs. That would be the most student-centered thing to do.
5. The 20 minimum seems reasonable to me, honestly. In my view, the issue that really needs work is the process. A clear timeline and transparency around when faculty will be notified that a class will not run would be very helpful. This is particularly important for adjunct who are now health insurance through the district, since not having a class run can impact one's insurance. Also, these decisions are best made transparently, rather than relying on the whims of deans. The 50% policy would seem to create an incentive for admins to raise class sizes to unsustainable levels. I am strongly opposed to any proposal that has higher class sizes for asynchronous courses. Asynchronous courses (if taught properly, with appropriate faculty engagement) are much more work in terms of the grading and prep load, so any policy that treats these courses as though they were less work is unacceptable.
6. As an asych online instructor, I take strong objection to those classes needing higher enrollments. The amount of work that goes into meeting all the state and federal regulations, plus the rather invasive evaluations of online courses vs. face to face has created enough disparity.
7. Asynchronous classes should be valued the same as those with scheduled meeting times. They contribute significantly to the college's revenue and should be treated with the same respect as any other course. It's worth considering why the online learning community is sometimes met with criticism despite its clear success. The class cancellation criteria should be the same for all teaching formats
8. I think synchronous and asynchronous courses minimum requirements should be the same rather than differentiated. The amount of work implementing both modes should be the same since they are the same courses. What this is implying is that online teaching asynchronous is easier than synchronous. I have done both. It is not! I'm sure it depends on the subject matter but I don't think this is an assumption that should be made. If we differentiate between online courses then is there going to be differentiation between minimums with in-person vs online vs hybrid?

Suggestions for improved communication/collaboration between deans and faculty

1. Could the deans create a PowerPoint Presentation about the different classes and programs that they are trying to build so that the faculty can understand why some classes are not canceled even when they have lower enrollment.
2. Faculty who have had their classes canceled should be offered a late-start class if the department decides to add a late-start class after the start of the semester.
3. Students who are enrolled in a section of a GE class that is canceled should in the very least be tracked, identified, and given priority registration for that class in the next semester. Preferably, students who are enrolled in a section that is canceled should be guaranteed a seat in a different section of that course. Yes, this would be tricky, but it also indirectly incentivizes administrators to create a course offering that most likely meets student demand.
4. 1) Students should be polled on cancellations, and what they would like to see and the impact it has on them. 2) Students should be notified quickly and regularly about classes that still have spots open. Many times, students don't know which classes still have spots and how they relate to their goals. This leads to unnecessary class cancellations. So, as the semester approaches, the college(s) send out a weekly email alert to students indicating which classes have openings, how many spots are open, if they are UC/CSU transferable, etc. Individual counselors cannot reach enough students in time to do this on a weekly basis. 3) Late start classes. Due to registration problems and other situations, many students come into counseling requesting late start classes. These late start classes are very popular in general. 4) The college needs to be more uniform in being transparent and planful in indicating which classes will be offered which semester at least one year ahead of time. Students and counselors cannot plan correctly if they don't know when certain classes will be offered. This affects enrollment in classes. Each department should be required to submit a calendar like this: <https://www.deanza.edu/creativearts/course-rotation/dpds.html> and it should be widely visible and accessible to all
5. I think it important that the Dean have a key role (but not the only) in this guideline. S/he may know of extenuating circumstances that would allow overriding a fixed guideline. Let's keep it human and let's consider each "case" individually, fairly—without respect to personal friendships. On that note, we should provide recourse for a faculty member who would challenge a dean's decision on this point.
6. It's important to have a procedure in place that regulates how deans and VPs decide to cancel a course and does not leave out the voice of the faculty. I suggest 1) the dean writes cancellation proposal, 2) faculty replies to it, 3) a team or group of people review it to decide if a course will be canceled. We need something more humanized than a blanket policy without consideration of the consequences-- and deans don't know all the consequences.

Suggested changes to proposed 50% procedure (AP 6.04.1)

More time before semester before cancelling

1. Allow more time for students to add late.
2. Cancelling a class 2 days before starting time is inconvenient for students and faculty. The last day to cancel for the required number of students should be earlier than 2 days before start. Students will be surprised and why should an instructor prepare for a class that doesn't have the minimum number a week before class and so might be cancelled. All classes should be cancelled at least a week before the class if they could be cancelled. Right now I have a class with 19 students registered and 4 days remaining before the class. That could mean that it could be cancelled if students drop -- which they often do before the class -- however usually on the last day which wouldn't cause the class to be cancelled.
3. Cancelling classes for class size when there's always so much movement in the first few weeks of classes can hurt faculty. I almost always have late adds and if I was an impacted class that got cancelled for not having 1 or 2 students, I would be very upset.
4. It should definitely be discussed WELL AHEAD of a new term/semester with the faculty, and full time faculty should be given priority in choosing other courses to fill their teaching load -- even if other instructors might have to be bumped.
5. Need to give students time to find new sections, but balance it with some flexibility for deans with scheduling

Mixture of 50% and 20-minimum

1. 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.

Updated Language in Proposed Administrative Procedure

1. This sentence is unclear: "Faculty are notified of low-enrolled classes weeks prior to the start of class and collaborate to identify strategies to increase enrollment." How many weeks? The document should be specific so that faculty know when they will hear from their deans.
2. Include Program Mapper in these policies. Course sequences and planned offerings (rough draft) should be planned a couple years in advance.

Make it a Pilot

1. Pedagogy has taken a backseat to business needs. Whatever is ultimately adopted should be simple and have flexibility built into it. And most definitely, it must be treated as a

Pilot/Work-in-progress/a-one-or-two-year trial and should not be another structure that comes back to haunt us when enrollments are not in the upward trend they currently are in!

Improved Marketing to Fill Classes

1. What is the college doing to attract more students? If the students are unaware of a class, they may not be signing up. Students need to be informed about the awesome classes we offer.
2. As we address enrollment, kindly also address marketing, or the lack thereof.

Comments Potentially Addressed by Exceptions in Proposed BP 4000 (6.04)

1. *New courses also need flexibility in enrollment in order to grow. *Class cancellations, in my observation, have been used as a weapon to retaliate against instructors/ .
2. I am no expert on this subject. However, I do value the role the dean and the curriculum committees who understand how classes vary according to subject matter, timing and circumstance. There are always exceptions that apply so having options seem to be a more appropriate standard to follow. Everyone deserves the chance to dance.
3. There are many drawbacks to cancelling classes if they do not meet a substantial minimum enrollment (say 20 students); all drawbacks affect students negatively. This is especially so for night classes. If only two night classes are scheduled and the course is a prerequisite, and one is cancelled because it doesn't meet the enrollment minimum, students are set back a semester or more. Also, if a student's class is cancelled and they have already arranged with their employer to have that time period free - say they need to leave work early, the student is potentially out a portion of their income for no good reason. Flexibility in cancelling the classes must be available to the deans in order to accommodate the needs of community college students.
4. For classes needed to complete a degree in a timely way, there should be no minimums. I am thinking of a foursemester sequence that has the lowest enrollment in the 4th semester. If students need that course to complete a program, it needs to be offered in a regular, predictable way, and that pattern of offering should be widely published.
5. For new programs seeking to establish themselves should have a lower maximum. There is not much marketing support at times, and so it takes time to get the enrollments up.
6. I would like to continue to stress that transfer courses that often build of several pre-requisites (for example, several higher level STEM classes) and count towards a students ultimate major should have more flexibility in class size offerings as it could substantially impact a students ability to transfer on time.
7. I think we need flexibility and consideration for local (department) needs.
8. Cancelling classes at the last minute is incredibly disruptive for students, whose schedules are balanced on a knife's edge half the time. Considering the first week is a

game of musical chairs, too, it's really frustrating to cancel a class that's slightly under-enrolled, and which has few other sections on offer (or none) - only to field inquiries from students on Day 4 and 5 ("I was wondering if there was still a place in that class?") We've actually opened late-start sections quite frequently in our department, and routinely field 100+ students looking for sections in the first week. Cancelling classes before that process starts is not a great idea. (And it's very hard on instructors, too, especially adjuncts who might lose their contract.) Every division has a dean. Surely the role of the dean could include making decisions about which sections to run and which to close. We've developed a rationale for deans to prioritize. Why not let them make the call? Why try to standardize things? How much money will this save, really?

9. 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. In addition, if the course was required for a certificate program or major for an A.A. or A.S. degree, I would offer it every other semester
10. There needs to be a special provision for developmental courses that do not enroll high unless students find themselves in need of it after the start of the semester. By the time a student's language or computational skills are identified as too low for success, the course that could support them may already have been cancelled due to low enrollment 30 days prior to its start. Unless we make special provisions, these courses may never be offered.
11. Class cancellations should only be allowed if there are alternative options which allow a student to maintain their minimum time to degree. In other words, unique courses which are only offered as a single section in a semester such as many Career Education courses should not be cancelled unless enrollment drops to 10% of the course max.
12. Deans should have the flexibility to consider whether there are multiple sections of a given course or not before canceling, and whether the alternate sections are viable options for the "cut" students. Deans should also have the flexibility to run sections that are low-enrolled to allow program growth, diversification, and innovation.
13. Please be flexible with this, especially in departments with student populations that are particularly vulnerable. If we return to the 20-student minimum, we will likely see the same issues in ESL we saw in the year or two before the pandemic. High levels of class cancellations leave students with nowhere else to go and it makes CSM look like an unwelcoming institution rather than a pillar and essential member of the larger community.
14. Classes with cohort restrictions, program applications or historically late fill dates should not be cancelled before the first day of class. This is a problem that the automotive department at Skyline faces every semester and every semester it is a struggle with the Dean to let the classes fill before cancelling them. The daytime classes are cohort restricted and new students applying to the program can't register until they've been accepted to the full time program. Quite often we are still accepting students right up to

the start date. We are desperately trying to increase our enrollment and cancelling classes doesn't help! Also, our night classes are attended by working technicians and apprentices who are not regular college students. Application and acceptance to the college often delays registration for this group and classes that would otherwise be full are being cancelled out from under them. Please give us the chance to fill these classes that we KNOW will fill without cancelling weeks before the semester starts. A

15. It depends on which class the possible cancelation happens. If only one section of that particular class offered, cancellation may not be a good idea. If many sections of the same classes are offered, then students have another class to choose from.
16. Guidelines can not be a one size fits all. CTE and Lab classes often have lower maximums than a math or English lecture class. The policy needs some flexibility and room for variables for specific types of courses. Some CTE classes only offer 1 section per semester and canceling due to less than 20 can negatively impact the students pathway and the time it takes to complete their career.
17. There seem to be many exceptions to this rule that deserve attention. Single course offerings that would adversely affect students who can't travel elsewhere if the course isn't offered. Programs that are just getting started or require size limits based on facility accommodations (electronics labs, eg) deserve special consideration.
18. With physical education activity courses being removed as a requirement to attain an AA degree, these class sizes will continue to decrease. But should still be allowed to run due to the importance of physical activity correlated to academic success
19. Key points I would like to make associated with CTE programs that came to mind after reflecting on reading these proposals:
 1. Do these course minimums take into account new programs especially if they cannot advertise new certificates until state approval. Some programs end up in limbo for a year or sometimes two before certificates get state approvals which then impact course enrollments during that time. This then impacts the new certificate/s start for getting the program up and going to gain enrollments because when the approvals hit the semester may have already started and lost the window for advertising to gain fall enrollments and then wait until the following fall to really get the impact from advertising - means a year lag time. Enrollments are typically impacted.
 2. Do these take into account the ability for scheduling with nuances used to keeping lower enrolled courses due to departmental percentage of total enrollments where some classes will have full courses enrollments with waitlist while other classes may not have full enrollments until the first couple of weeks picking up students at the beginning of the semester? My program benefits from this greatly with some of the courses.
 3. What about the instructor LOAD - how does this play into the equation with enrollments and the 15 unit load per semester. This could end up creating a few nightmare scenarios for scheduling.
 4. [...copied to other location]
 5. Yes, there needs to be more structure but at the same time these requirements need to have nuances that take into account what's been brought to your attention. With a good Dean these scheduling determinations are not

abused. With new Deans or inexperienced Deans these numbers become "law" rather than guidelines. This is just as detrimental in a different way creating a different set of issues.

20. BP6.04 Part 3 as it is seems to be currently written has a clause for classes with fewer than 20 students. I'm not quite clear on why this was removed. There a classes that have a max of 20 due to the limit of resources in a classroom, or due to the need for individualized attention that is not possible with more. As it stands now, technically these classes need to have 100% enrollment in order not to be cut, unless the Dean exercises consideration in how these classes contribute to a department or degree.

Questions & Uncategorized Responses to Question 5

1. My Zoom synchronous class doubled in size this semester in comparison to the prior semesters (it is the same course). I have had to spend double the time for class preparation and grading as a result. These hours are not compensated since as an adjunct, I am only compensated for hours spent teaching and for office hours.
2. If any opinion on this issue is coming from outside our own community to inform policies like this one, it should not be allowed to have any influence UNLESS it is informed by peer-reviewed research and data.
3. Many, if not most students no longer pay for tuition. We should consider minimum class size aligning with overall district and individual college enrollment.
4. Has someone done the ROI to figure out what the absolute minimum enrollment number would need to be where a course that is enrolled with low numbers would still not adversely affect the bottom line (e.g. financials, liabilities, etc.) of the university? I imagine, for example, that a course with 10-12 students could still prove to be beneficial for improving graduation rates and easing some of the gridlock involved of some required classes for transfer becoming overly competitive to enroll into while still meeting the bottom line ROI needed by the university for it to make financial sense.
5. Glad this is being addressed, and that faculty have a strong voice in the outcome. Have students been included? they do not generally 'see' or experience the results of class sizes, but some would be thoughtful about it.
6. While we faculty might well understand the programmatic importance of some in-person, under-enrolled courses, our students might not, and no, I'm not sure how to resolve this problem, the more so as many student advisors will most probably not be "our discipline's" area experts. No insult implied as I am aware that the job of such advising is far from easy to accomplish with students who themselves are not overly aware, in many cases, of what their favored discipline might be.
7. In Senate meetings, we often hear griping about FTF who have tiny/4 person classes that don't get cancelled. While this may make sense for one class out of a FT semester (if there are no alternatives and there are 4 majors needing to graduate, for example), there is an underlying sentiment that some FT just teach a bunch of tiny classes because of

seniority. 1) Is this true? 2) Should class fill rates or overall faculty WSCH get mentioned on the Dean's evaluation of a FTF?

8. Thank you for the work you're doing for all of the faculty members!
9. College is way different post-pandemic. Online classes seem to be the most popular and our live classes have lower enrollment. Also, with our classes being free, I think a different economic model is in order in deciding class cancellations.
10. I also think that the college should take a hard look at the courses being offered and make sure they reflect students' wants and needs. There are more than a few in my division that have lower enrollment because few students are interested in them. The curriculum development and approval process is tedious, but updating course offerings in the short term would minimize discussions of course cancellations due to low enrollment in the long term.
11. What is the plan to deal with course cancellations in terms of fulfilling the load (5 classes) for full-time faculty? I believe we bump part-time faculty and then full time. This will destroy people's lives and cause a massive morale problem. It is too early to tell what enrollment will be in the future. We need to study possible combinations--more synchronous classes, late start classes, more asynchronous classes, etc., and come up with a plan.

Not-Applicable Comments

Comments related to class maximum rather than class cancellation

1. Discipline experts should be the primary decision makers regarding optimal class sizes. Our students these days need MORE support and one-on-one attention than ever. Large class sizes negatively impacts our most vulnerable students' ability to learn and progress through their programs. Stop pinching pennies. Give ALL employees health, vision, and dental benefits. If we can't afford it, then reduce the pay of our "executive" staff. Their high salaries don't retain them anyway. Let's pay fair, living wages to everyone and get people who are dedicated to students and education to take these jobs.
2. The minimums listed in your GUIDELINES FOR ESTABLISHING COURSE ENROLLMENT MAXIMUMS simply don't add up. For example, using the 35 student minimum, calculating the number of teaching hours I need per student - including my assessments and minimal student-to-student interactions for in-class activities - I have approximately 6 weeks of lecture to cover the 17 weeks of material mandated by my course CORs. Even the large minimums allowed for courses essentially for learning, sans instructor feedback, a standard set of rules (e.g., to qualify for a certification or license exam) don't make sense. At the very least, there is no way to check for cheating given 40 to 70 individual students. We need to consider, seriously, faculty input to establish any class minimum.

3. If we think our course maximums are too high, based on the chart used for determining this question, what do we do about it? I don't think anyone in my division has ever understood this. Can someone clarify?!?!
4. I see a big problem: many courses have different max class sizes in different disciplines I know for a fact that labs in chemistry, geo,physics, and astronomy have very different max class sizes. the same is true for lectures. it is also a fact that some faculty let many many more students enroll in their classes than what the limits are. the max class size numbers inherently linked to the min class size discussed this survey.
5. Art classes should have a maximum of 20, total including cross-listed students. If we have enough students that need classes, we should be opening up new sections, not stuffing 30 students into a class. Thank you.
6. Although I understand the desire to make class size maximums linked to the style in which a class is taught, to have class size maximums documented in a COR seems to be overly prescriptive. For example, I teach in the sciences. All my classes are interactive with group work and weekly assignments with writing that are best conducted with small class sizes. However, if another instructor were to teach my class, would they do it the same way? Should they have to? Based on what I see, each instructor decides for themselves, and, sadly, don't use the COR as their guide. Furthermore, if small class sizes are good for student learning (it is!) and intensive writing and guidance is good for students (I believe it is), then shouldn't all classes be smaller in size? The idea that we're teaching large lectures in any of our classes seems antithetical to supportive learning. Upping class sizes for online vs. FTF is assuming that online courses take less time, but well designed effective online courses take more time and should, in my opinion and as I teach them, have lower maximums. Finally, your proposed class maximums of 30 and 35 don't align with the size of my classroom (which is 32). I set my class maximums (with my Dean) based on my classroom and the type of course I teach (highly interactive and group-work based with writing every week). I'd like, therefore, for there to be a bit of flexibility in the final number chosen.

General support for standardization/revisions without specific guidance

1. Faculty, particularly, part-time faculty rely on the predictability of class assignments. Having a sound rationale for which classes go and which ones are canceled is essential for all faculty, department coordinators, and deans to plan regular and consistent course offerings. This is equally important for students, as they also depend on the predictability of courses required for their majors. We need efficient and predictable course cancellation policies.
2. As an adjunct professor, it's hard to continue teaching when you don't know whether your class will fill or not. It's also frustrating to do all the prep work, which you are not paid for, and then have a class cancelled. The university employee a strong number of

adjuncts. Enacting a policy that punishes adjuncts will only reduce the pool of talented teachers and leave the district with a shortage of instructors.

3. In the previous question - I raised the need to enrollment minimums and budgetary needs. I strongly believe in teaching courses that have need and enrollment. Still, it is best to have flexible systems that don't adhere to strict universal policies to establish each departments enrollment quotas. I don't see the need to teach a course that has so few students it should wait a semester to get higher enrollment. That said, I have courses that only run every other year, missing a quota and pushing to the next slot means a student waits 1 or 2-years until the next course is offered again
4. 20 is an arbitrary number. Why revert to something we know does NOT work and is NOT student-first friendly?

Not in favor of any standardized policy

1. 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.
2. I can see no value in the standardization of classes if it costs the college its ability to meet its mission statement by depriving faculty and deans of the ability to develop a program that serves all students and not just the majority of them. We are a wealthy district. We provide free college to students no matter their ability to pay. We create expensive new administrative positions that have little to do with educating our students. We pour money into sports programs and facilities to support them. Yet, we will be remiss if we don't recognize that not all students merely come here on the most direct way somewhere else and that we in our disciplines should have the academic freedom to offer the courses that they deem are important and appropriate to serve all of our students.
3. It is seriously challenging to offer a wider array of (history) courses if the emphasis is on maximizing transfer credits and cancelling low enrolled classes. Counselors heavily recommend Hist 201 and students prioritize enrollment in Hist 201. If our district funding is not tied to enrollment, why the preoccupation with cancelling "low enrolled" classes?

The course caps are made up - there is no consistent logic to what a "fully enrolled" class is. Setting a number for minimum enrollment feels equally arbitrary.

4. Classes should be offered regardless of enrollment numbers. Canceling or limiting classes based on low enrollment is a bureaucratic approach that undermines the mission of community colleges. As institutions dedicated to serving our community, our focus should be on meeting students' educational needs rather than cutting costs. Canceling courses forces students to seek alternatives in other districts, which can hinder their progress and limit access to education.
5. I think the whole idea of standardizing course enrollment minimums is too rigid for the reality of how course enrollments actually go. Enrollments are so fickle and mercurial, based on too many factors (everything from the economy, to instructor popularity, to course scheduling/time of day) ... I feel that the decision of when to cut a class should ultimately fall to the dean's discretion, which should be based on the individual circumstances of the class, the times, and dialogue with the instructor (many times the instructor has insights that the dean does not ... such as when there is expected to be a large number of people adding the course within the first week of class meetings).
6. A standardized minimum enrollment number does not take into account the range of students that attend Skyline and their varying needs. For example, 20 is an exceptionally high minimum enrollment number. It's the case that evening classes may not be able to meet this minimum. It does not make sense to disadvantage 13... 15... 17... 19... students due to the arbitrary minimum enrollment number.

Feedback Also Given in Question 4 "Other" Text

1. just left the comments on the previous one.
2. Everything I just sent in on my comments...
3. See my proposal response above, but reproduced below, with an additional message at the end: 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 SMCCD, 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. We worked on this subject for over a DECADE in Curriculum Committee, with upper administration completely ignoring that work every time, never looking at the PEDAGOGICAL options, and just treating both students and faculty as a table of numbers. Are we a welcoming institution if we keep cancelling much needed sections of classes?

4. See previous
5. just did
6. I mentioned my main concerns with cancellation policies in the preceding question. In my time at Skyline as an adjunct, my own questions have never been, to my knowledge, addressed or even seriously considered as appropriate concerns in the decision making process.
7. Please see my comment in "Other" from the previous question. Thanks.
8. I want to repeat the comment I posted in the previous window: 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".