

GAVILAN COLLEGE

Faculty Schedule Preference Survey Results

Surveys were distributed to all 199 faculty mailboxes with information about moving to a 16 week calendar followed by asking their calendar schedule. Objective responses from the 69 respondents follow. Responses represent the views of those who choose to return the survey and may or may not be representative of the entire faculty.

It appears most faculty favor switching to a 16 week calendar with more favoring implementation sooner rather than later. There appears to be a difference in preferences between full time and adjunct faculty with full time faculty being more likely to indicate they would like more information before deciding and adjunct faculty being more likely to prefer keeping the current 18 week calendar (Likelihood ratio (3) = 9.181, $p=0.027$). Open response comments are presented in Table 7 and have been summarized by the faculty members of the 16 week calendar task force (Table 6). Perceived benefits centered around improving the environment for students and faculty and being competitive with other colleges. Most concerns seemed oriented towards ensuring smooth implementation with a few specific comments about potential scheduling difficulties.

Prepared by Terrence Willett, Director of Research
Ken Miller, Business Instructor
December 7, 2004

Table 1. Calendar preference of faculty.

Preference	Count	Percent
18 week calendar	9	13%
16 week calendar in 2005	41	61%
16 week calendar in 2006	7	10%
I'd like more information before I decide	10	15%
Total	67	100%

Table 2. Cross tabulation of preference and faculty load.

		Full Time	Adjunct	Total
18 week calendar	Count	1	8	9
	% w/in load	3%	24%	13%
16 week calendar in 2005	Count	20	21	41
	% w/in load	61%	62%	61%
16 week calendar in 2006	Count	5	2	7
	% w/in load	15%	6%	10%
I'd like more information before I decide	Count	7	3	10
	% w/in load	21%	9%	15%
Total	Count	33	34	67
	% w/in load	100%	100%	100%

Table 3. Department of faculty respondents.

Department	Count	Percent
AH	4	6%
BUS/CSIS	6	9%
CD	2	3%
CGD	2	3%
Counseling	5	7%
DM	1	1%
DSPS	4	6%
English	6	9%
ESL	9	13%
Fine Arts	5	7%
Library	2	3%
Natural Science	10	15%
PE/Athletics	5	7%
Social Sciences	6	9%
Total	67	100%

Table 4. Load of faculty respondents.

Load	Count	Percent
Full Time	33	49%
Part Time	34	51%
Total	67	100%

Table 5. Teaching time of faculty respondents.

Time of Teaching	Count	Percent
Day Only	22	40%
Evening Only	12	22%
Both Day and Evening	21	38%
Total	55	100%

Note that at least two instructors indicated they teach online and were coded as teaching both day and evening.

Table 6. Summary of Faculty Comments on 16 Week Calendar.

Comment Theme	Count
Yes: 2005 Better for students &/ or faculty instruction	15
Yes: 2005 in line with other schools	15
Yes: 2005 FTE	11
Yes: 2005 Why wait	10
Worried about more time to implement and debug (2006)	8
Yes: 2006 too hasty, work out bugs	8
Better retention	7
Yes: 2005 like block schedule	6
Not better for students	4
Worried about basic skills , ESL pace	4
Delay decision until student survey	3
Worried about flexible schedule for some programs	3
Worried about lab structure	2
Better intercession options	1
More efficient building use	1
No reason to change	1
Worried about “dumbing” down content	1
Worried about evening schedule	1
Worried about Hollister night ESL	1
Worried about low afternoon attendance	1
Worried about STRS credit	1
Worried about text written for 18 weeks	1

Table 7. Open response comments by faculty.

Comments
1. The advantages of 16 week calendar probably out weigh the disadvantages of the 18 week calender.2. Implement in 2006 to save staff and students a less abrupt transition to block schedules with longer class periods and days. Give DSP&S time to experiment with new schedule options for providing support services.
All those classrooms lying in the afternoons is a waste of resources.
Already on this calendar, at Cabrillo college and it works well
As an adjunct honestly it would make little difference to me personally. I teach at another school on quarters and have also taught 6 week course. I think 18 week seems too long maybe because I went to UCD, I am used to more accelerated classes. I know an increase in FTES is important for the school and my keeping a job here. The advantages seems to outweigh.
August 15 is way too early to start classes, 16 week would also allow 1 week/ semester staff develop workshops and activities. This is sorely needed here at Gavilan. I have taught both 16& 18 and personally 16 weeks is much more productive for teacher an students.
Because based upon both considerations for the program I teach in, and the overall pros of the 16 week calendar, I don't feel there is sufficient need or benefit to change the current system.
Because I think this important issue is being decided in haste without allowing enough time for all aspects to be considered and with the making of assumptions that have not been followed through. I all angles are not properly evaluated or allowances made to customize programs to the new framework, enrollment will go down, and it will take much longer to recover.
Benefit for students i.e. Child care etc.
By starting changes in Fall 2005, we can work out the bugs by the time the new software is in place. Having a longer time to make decision about scheduling just puts the decision off longer. Lets do it now- Also longer class times in math one an advantage not disadvantage.
Change is good
Don't procrastinate.
Few students will attend 1-4 pm classes, if you add 10 minutes to a day class that's 30 min to an evening class. To an evening class, if class is already 6:00-9:50, how do you add 30 min? textbooks are written for 18 weeks- 18 chapters, Revising course curriculum is a huge task. Part time instructors must teach an 18 week semester receive credit for STRS. I see no advantage at all to a 16 week calendar.
Full speed a head. I my opinion, we are losing MANY students because we didn't have block schedules or 16 week calendars. The sooner, we move in this direction, the more competitive, also more a close complement to universities and k-12 school calendars.
I teach ESL and language learning need daily classes for exposure and practice. A block schedule would not work for these students.
I agree student retention is better with a 16 week schedule. Capture time growth similar schedule to area schools.

Comments
I am not sure which way to go because my students need to extended time to process information.
I am concerned about the success rate for basic skills, ESL, students with an accelerated pace. I also see the advantages of a 16 week calendar. I am undecided about my preference. Sorry.
I am uncertain as to what happen to lab periods. Labs are designed to hill a given amount of time. These do not lend themselves to being split up into 10 minutes sections, How then, can a lab schedule of 18weeks, with 18 separate exercises be feasibly condensed into 16 week?
I believe students would prefer longer classes, but on a minimum number of days. I do not teach that many classes. I mainly teach that have been I unit I Friday day and 2 Saturdays.
I don't see any reason for the delay of implementation of the 16 week calendar. I believe that 16 week semester will be beneficial for the students then will not to do it now? The delay could make the implementation work complicated though.
I don't think it's enough time to spend learning the more serious academic subjects. I know there are many pros to 16 week semester, but I think it's a dumbing down, for jar college.
I f we are going to move to a 16 week calendar, why wait.
I feel that the 18 week calendar is really dragging it begins too early in august. Since I also tech at San José city college, the 18 week curriculum makes it difficult for me to adjust lesson plans that I have had for the 16 week period to fit the longer semester.
I have taught at classes that have the 16 week calendar and I have found that it worked out great.
I have worked in 10 week "quarter", and actually preferred them, as both instructor and student. So, if we can't have quarters, at least, well go to the 16 week format.
I like longer classes evenings-my students do get breaks, fewer number of weeks. I have no sound academic resources, you're my own comfort with the shorter semester longer class periods would allow me to use videos for plays and stories more often.
I like teaching in block scheduling and having the extra time of is also nice.
I like the flexibility. Block scheduling is going to put too much on the students keeping it as is, please.
I like the idea of a 16 week calendar. Slightly longer class time, in order for student to possibly be able to apply facts learned in lecture to case scenarios.
I like the idea of adding time to each class session I think this makes us more focused and efficient. Starting the fall semester in September will be a huge improvement that may attract more students in the long run.
I prefer returning to school at the end of august/ beg of September rather than mid August when still summer. Most other colleges have 16 week semester and it works very well.
I prefer to have more concentrated hrs. of instruction, and longer breaks.
I prefer to teach shorter classes.
I teach ESL. I don't believe a more concentrated schedule is best for my students who need to extended semester to successfully practice would not be able to attend class if the class time was extended each day. As many of the students work immediately after class.

Comments
I think its better to do it, rather than dither about it for 2 yrs. Better timing for MIS better timing to boost F'TES.
I think that the cons outweigh the pros. In particular, I think my students lose if they have me in a class fewer days in the semester or if they have a longer school day.
I think the semester start so early in August is a disadvantage. For the 16 week schedule to work, attention must be paid to keeping computer labs, digital media, and TV studio open with plenty of hours to support student lab work. The campus goes dead too early in the afternoon. Faculty leaves, services shut down. Students have too little support. They need food, drink, open labs, and mentorship at this time. Maybe the 16 week calendar will help to increase the level of energy on campus, and help push toward a critical mass that will ignite the potential of Gavilan.
I think we need about a yr to get ready and work out clock time.
It's time to quit talking about it(8 yrs for counting)or do it. The sooner we implement it. The sooner we can learn how to make the proper adjustments to it.
I would rather take care of it before the new computer system comes in I believe most of the problems with 16 week block schedule can be solved relating quickly.
I'd like to know how this will affect evening ESL, classes in Hollister as the students schedule will students be able to come at 6:15 and that's difficult for some.
I'd like to see the data on the student surveys first. I'd like more specific info on how labs would be struttred. I'd like assurance that those basic skills courses that pedagogically need daily classes can keep them rather than following a block schedule. I like to see details of support services worked out. I'd like all faculty and staff to have time to prepare. Then if all is favorable, I like to implement the 16 week calendar in fall 2006 before MIS changes. If the above details or other concerns cannot be worked out we should stick w/ 18 week calendar and do further research.
I'm comfortable with 2005 or 2006, but to be able to independently analyzing block scheduling has a distinct advantage. All things equal, I'll select 2006.
It makes obvious sense.
It will attract students!.
I've always felt 18 weeks was too long and w/our students busy lives, work and family- they need more efficient consolidated schedule that they can take. This will enable them to take class 12 units on MW,TH, OR FRI, I've already started implementing block scheduling for the spring and for see no apparent problems with our discipline changing. Other community colleges are doing this and they may even be taking away our students because they begin 2 weeks later.
Later start, better student retention increase in FTE'S
More flexibility/ opportunity for students in both summer and winter. To also line up with most other comm. College schedules started early may cause us to loose some potential students.
My class works well in a 16 week frame work students asked also liked the idea of 16 weeks rather 18 weeks. Instructors I have talked with at Cabrillo prefer 16 weeks!.
Needs planning and publicity, 200 would give enough time

Comments
Starting August 16th is a real deterrent to obtaining enrollment as the "College of Choice". Students do not want to start before Labor Day and for that matter neither do faculty!
The 16 week calendar more closely resembles other campuses and local schools. Although it will shorten our time with basic skills students will be an overall draw to many students.
The advantage listed above as well as, the sooner the better.
The pros seem to outweigh the cons for the 16 week calendar. I think that it would help us compete for those students who currently commute outside Gavilan's district to other CC'S. I think that any students, given the choice, would opt for a 16 week semester. But also know that it was a bear to change to block scheduling for this semester so we should give ourselves until 2006 to develop the schedule only reason to do it earlier would be if that's better for m/s.
There seems to be no real question whether we will implement 16 week calendar regardless of survey outcomes. Beyond this, do think the pluses outweigh the negative. Walking out brings in block schedule seem prudent this 2006 verses 2005.
This college needs time to prepare technically and logistically. Experience planed by other colleges indicates that the most important is scheduling registration and technical support. If special programs i.e. nursing etc. are different scheduling than student services will need to follow to be conversable.
This schedule is in alignment with the other school where I teach. I find the 16 week calendar to be easier to keep students to the end.
This schedule more closely corresponds with the k-12 and the universities schedules.
This will allow various departments to adapt/ adjust classes and programs to deal with the 16 week schedule. It is also important to bring everyone along together the transition will be most effective if everyone is in agreement and working together for a common purpose.
To compete w/ other schools. Better plan for students and staff.
We can make it work well.
We need to be competitive with other colleges.
Will attract more students, less drive days(gas is expensive), parents have more time with their children over summer vacation.