I. **Call to Order**

Dr. Heidi Pasek called the meeting to order.

When NILOA Coach Natasha Jankowski was here yesterday, she left us with a message:

*You are exactly in the place you need to be. Proceed with confidence with what you're doing.*

When we look at the things we're doing with helping our students be successful, we need to keep this in mind.

II. **Report on NILOA Coach Visit – Mandy Wright, English faculty/Department Chair**

Dr. Natasha Jankowski, Director of NILOA (National Institute for Learning Outcomes Assessment) was on campus March 28, 2019. In the morning session she worked with CAAAC on the draft of the Strategic Plan. There is now a very solid draft of the Strategic Plan. She recommended that the Strategic Plan should not be so narrowly focused and should include less detailed metrics. She also helped differentiate between strategic and operational plans.
In the afternoon, Mandy Wright and Dr. Jankowski worked together on the assessment process. With her feedback, there will be significant changes to the process. The focus will be on student learning on an institutional level to demonstrate mission fulfillment, as opposed to the program and course level.

Dr. Jankowski looked at the overall process for assessment and felt it was too focused on reporting and not enough on the actual assessment process. There will be a follow-up call between Dr. Jankowski and Mandy in three weeks.

Dena commented that Dr. Jankowski recommending using “crosswalks” to create background information.

III. Budget – FY19 and FY20 – Carmen Roberts, Interim Financial Officer

FY2019
We are done collecting tuition revenue. Revenue shortfall is $299,000, helped by Benefis donation of $106,400.
Salary savings $268,000.
Net impact: $75,400 at this point.

FY2020
State allocation is a moving target as long as the legislature is in session. We are hoping to get about $88,000 operations funding increase (equivalent to a 3% tuition increase).
Pay Plan (50 cents/hour increase) will be effective January 1, 2020 has passed the legislature (each year of biennium). Will cost GFC MSU about $66k, funding $25,700.
Tuition and Other:
Overall revenue estimated $100,000 less than budgeted for last year

IV. Computer and Equipment Fee Timeline – Carmen Roberts – Interim Chief Financial Officer

Discussed planning fees vs. Perkins funding.
Still needs to go through a group of students for approval.

Discussed changing the timeline of the approval process.
Carmen Roberts suggested we might try a smaller “second opportunity” in the fall.

V. Perkins Grant Update – Jeri Pullum, Special Projects (Attachment)

Jeri Pullum discussed the internal Summary Request. The Perkins committee, consisting of Division Directors and Mary Kay Bonilla, approves how Perkins money is spent. The college receives an allocation of Perkins funds from the state and is required to spend that amount.

Deadlines:
4/12/19: Perkins committee finalizes budget
4/19/19: Budget to Dr. Wolff
5/3/19: Application to Dr. Wolff
5/24/19: Application due to OCHE

TILT (Transparency in Learning and Teaching) model: Troy Stoddard noted that TILT is a very effective way to make better assignment descriptions.

VI. Ad Hoc Report – Dr. Heidi Pasek, CAO

The Ad Hoc Report was submitted to NWCCU on March 1st and has been added to the website.
Note that it’s a report based on where we were at one point in time.

VII. **CPBAC Policy and Procedures – Dr. Heidi Pasek, CAO**

The Policy and Procedures have been updated. Please submit your comments to Heidi or Toni, so they can be incorporated and then sent on to Faculty Senate.

VIII. **Positions Update – Mary Kay Bonilla, Chief Students Affairs and Human Resources Officer**

- VCAF - No hire yet. There will be a meeting between Dr. Cruzado, Dr. Wolff, and Dr. Kegel next week
- Executive Director of Communications & Marketing position is under review
- Recruitment and Enrollment will be closing soon
- Instructional Designer; doing a fine tune to the job description, and opening will be advertised in the next couple of weeks
- Nursing director - Must work within the framework of Board of Nursing

IX. **Enrollment numbers as of census | 8-Week Advantage Survey Results - Eleazar Ortega, Institutional Researcher**

Eleazar discussed the enrollment numbers as of the census, which was released about a month ago. She also reported on the 8-Week Advantage Survey Results for both faculty and staff. Dr. Wolff has requested that this be sent out the end of this semester and the next two semesters as well.
Revenue

Revenue Shortfall = -$299,000
Benefis Donation for HS faculty salaries = $106,400

Net impact: $75,400

Cost Decreases

Estimated Salary Savings = $268,000
## Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budgeted</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summer Tuition</td>
<td>328,895</td>
<td>327,889</td>
<td>-1,006</td>
<td>-0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall Tuition</td>
<td>1,583,259</td>
<td>1,473,237</td>
<td>-110,022</td>
<td>-6.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Spring Tuition</td>
<td>1,537,214</td>
<td>1,390,684</td>
<td>-146,530</td>
<td>-9.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Tuition Revenue</td>
<td>3,449,368</td>
<td>3,191,810</td>
<td>-257,558</td>
<td>-7.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration Fee</td>
<td>94,470</td>
<td>83,010</td>
<td>-11,460</td>
<td>-12.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Fee</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>13,925</td>
<td>-11,075</td>
<td>-44.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Revenue</td>
<td>52,500</td>
<td>33,540</td>
<td>-18,960</td>
<td>-36.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue Shortfall</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,621,338</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,322,285</strong></td>
<td><strong>-299,053</strong></td>
<td><strong>-8.25%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Expenditures

As of 3/25/2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Budgeted</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Remaining</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Services</strong></td>
<td>9,301,092</td>
<td>6,335,074</td>
<td>2,966,018</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operating Expenses</strong></td>
<td>1,797,471</td>
<td>1,081,180</td>
<td>716,291</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>11,098,563</td>
<td>7,416,254</td>
<td>3,682,309</td>
<td>66.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

75% through the year

66.82% through budgeted expenditures
FY 2020 Operating Budget

Revenue Estimate

State Allocation
Operations Funding Increase: $88,000
Pay Plan Funding: $25,700
Total State support=$7,592,285

Tuition & Other
Tuition & Fees: $3,191,810
Transfers: $35,700
STIP/Other: $57,100
Total Tuition & Other=$3,400,854

Total Revenue Estimate=$10,993,139
Personnel Changes
Print Center Manager
Lifelong Learning Admin
CIT Faculty
Disability Services Asst.
VCAF
Help Desk Student Workers
Total Increase: $206,800

Operations Changes
Phone Charges
Workers Comp Premiums
Pay Plan
Total Increase: $134,200
FY 2020 Overall Outlook

Shortfall as submitted: $97,329
## Perkins 2019-20 Requests

### Administration

- Admin State Perkins Meeting: 386.20

### Academic Affairs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acad Anatomic Study Models for Academic Success Center</td>
<td>4,483.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acad AACC Workforce Dev conf, 2 people Jan,Feb</td>
<td>5,740.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acad NACTEI conf, Merja, May 2020</td>
<td>3,150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acad Learning Community Pro Development</td>
<td>8,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acad Transparency in Learning Pro Development</td>
<td>8,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acad ACT Workforce Summit, Oct. 28-30, 2 people</td>
<td>4,404.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acad ACT Work Ready Boot Camp, date TBA, Palermo, Merja</td>
<td>4,194.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### General Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen St CIT faculty</td>
<td>21,745.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen St Accounting conf, Dolan, Sept., May</td>
<td>616.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen St NACEP conf, Frost, Oct. 13-16</td>
<td>1,285.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen St ISTE20 Conf, Canine, June 28-Jul 1</td>
<td>843.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen St Computer NICE and CAE conf, 2 people Nov. 18-22</td>
<td>5,350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen St CIT CCNA, CCNP pro dev</td>
<td>3,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen St CIT Teaching Professor conf, Mee, Robinett, June</td>
<td>5,092.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen St CIT CISCO LIVE conf, 2 instructors</td>
<td>8,512.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen St CIT CyberPatriot Basic and Advanced Camps, Summer 2019</td>
<td>6,420.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen St CIT CyberSecurity Adjuncts</td>
<td>13,230.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen St MT Computer Science Summit, 2 people date/location unknown</td>
<td>818.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen St CIT Cyber Coach Mee</td>
<td>3,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen St CIT CyberSecurity Equipment</td>
<td>8,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen St CIT CISCO equipment</td>
<td>Moved to GFC MSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen St CIT WASTC conf, Mee, Winter 2020</td>
<td>2,080.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen St Chemistry Equipment</td>
<td>2,365.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen St Connections 101 with Adult Ed</td>
<td>24,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Health Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HS Dental Boot Camp - July 29-Aug. 2</td>
<td>5,650.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Dental Eaglesoft software training</td>
<td>2,390.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Nursing Boot Camp - Oct. 18-20</td>
<td>4,320.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS EMS Birthing Simulator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Nursing SimBaby manikin</td>
<td>52,878.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Nursing Storage cabinets</td>
<td>Move to GFC MSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Nursing Pediatric Manikin</td>
<td>Removed 3/2019 for lack of funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Memphis Nurse Ed Conf March 2020 2 people</td>
<td>4,990.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Nursing Nuts and Bolts conference, Aug. 8-11, 2 people</td>
<td>4,280.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Nursing NCLEX conference, Sept. 9</td>
<td>3,150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Nursing Chromebooks</td>
<td>10,275.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Resp AARC Congress, Bates, Nov. 9-12, New Orleans</td>
<td>2,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Resp Care Video Laryngoscope</td>
<td>2,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Resp Care CO₂ Pulse Ox Monitor</td>
<td>11,190.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Resp Care CPT vest</td>
<td>12,350.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Resp Care Sim hospital AV_Suction equipment</td>
<td>8,980.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS PTA American PT Association’s Combined Sections Meeting (CSM), Bechard, Jan 12-15</td>
<td>1,910.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS PTA Neurologic Specialist Certification</td>
<td>1,735.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS PTA Credentials Clinical Instructor, Hansel</td>
<td>3,040.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS DCHIMS conferences, Sher, fall, spring</td>
<td>240.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Dent Digital X-ray sensor</td>
<td>9,734.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS Biology models</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move to GFC MSU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trades</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades IDT Tooling</td>
<td>4,400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades CWI training/testing, Redding, Aug. 4-10</td>
<td>5,940.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades MT ACTE conf, Sims + 3 instructors, Oct.</td>
<td>800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades NCWE, 2 people, Oct. 7-10</td>
<td>4,870.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades Iron Worker Tooling</td>
<td>1,650.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades Women Apprenticeship/Trades Event</td>
<td>4,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades Welding Cold Cut Saw</td>
<td>9,695.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Operating</strong></td>
<td>321,481.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equipment Total</strong></td>
<td>89,917.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contracts Total</strong></td>
<td>21,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect 5% of Operating Minus Equipment &amp; Contracts</strong></td>
<td>10,503.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>331,984.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation</td>
<td>319,741.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>12,242.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUBJECT: Governance and Organization
POLICY: 104.1 College Planning, Budget and Analysis Committee (CPBAC)
RELATED PROCEDURE: 

Introduction and Purpose
Great Falls College MSU is committed to “… on-going, participatory planning that provides direction for the institution and leads to the achievement of intended outcomes of its programs and services, accomplishment of its core themes, and fulfillment of its mission (NWCCU, 2017).”

The CPBAC Charge
The CPBAC is charged with gathering and interpreting institutional data to evaluate performance and effectiveness at the institution, division and department levels. The CPBAC leads the development and aggregation of budget projections, strategic and annual (operational) plans and works with the college’s leadership to allocate resources strategically to improve overall institution effectiveness and achieve the priorities as set forth by the strategic plan.

Within this capacity, the CPBAC will strive to meet the following objectives:

1. Assess institutional effectiveness data on an annual basis and make recommendations to the membership and Executive Team for areas of opportunity or concern to be addressed;
2. Facilitate the development of annual budget projections;
3. Facilitate the development of annual division and department goals and objectives geared at addressing the areas of opportunity or concern;
4. In concert with the Executive Team, facilitate the strategic planning process of the College;
5. Collect, aggregate and evaluate annual budget projections and requests, as well as division/departmental goals and objectives, to assess the appropriateness and need of such;
6. Recommend to the Executive Team annual institutional budgets and work plans as identified in the division/department annual goals and objectives;
7. Consider requests for new allocation of fiscal, physical and human resources not falling within the annual budget, planning and analysis process and make recommendations to the Executive Team on the approval of such;
8. Educate the campus community on the budget and planning processes; and
9. Communicate processes and results of various CPBAC activities, meetings, and recommendations to all constituencies of the College.

The CPBAC policy and procedures are the responsibility of the CPBAC.
SUBJECT: Governance and Organization
PROCEDURE: 104.2 College Planning, Budget and Analysis Committee (CPBAC)
EFFECTIVE: February, 2019   REVISED:   REVIEWED:

The College Planning Budgeting and Assessment Committee (CPBAC) Membership
The CPBAC is comprised of representatives of all units of the College. By virtue of the positions within the College’s organizational hierarchy and structure, the majority of CPBAC’s membership is permanent. The Faculty Senate Chair and the Staff Senate Chair will participate by virtue of their appointment, and the Senates will make the appointment of the additional representatives.

The CAO and Budget and Purchasing Officer serve as co-chairs of the CPBAC. Standing membership is comprised of both voting and non-voting ex-officio members and includes the following:

Members (Voting)

1. Chief Student Affairs/Human Resources Officer
2. Chief Academic Officer
3. Budget and Purchasing Officer
4. Executive Director Marketing & Communications
5. Executive Assistant to CEO
6. Joint Directors Team
7. Student Government President or designee
8. Faculty Senate Chair or designee
9. Faculty at-large (2)
10. Classified Staff Senate Chair or designee
11. Classified at-large (2)

Ex-Officio Members (Non-Voting)

1. CEO/Dean
2. Institutional Research Analyst

Meetings
The CPBAC will meet monthly on the last Friday of every month. CPBAC business can be conducted via electronic mediums such as Video Conference or email in some instances. In accordance with open meeting laws and to honor transparency, the CPBAC meetings are open to the campus community and public.

CPBAC meetings and business will follow to Robert’s Rules of Order for voting. A quorum of no less than 2/3 of the voting membership must be present to act on any action item before CPBAC. Action items are those including, but not limited to significant resource allocations (e.g. annual budget), allocation of new resources, and/or institutional changes. A simple majority is required for passage of a motion. In some
instances of significant action (e.g. annual budget approval) action items may be moved to the Executive Team for final ratification.

Items for consideration of the CPBAC will be submitted through the assistant to the CAO by close of business one week prior to the scheduled meeting date. Once received, they will be listed on the agenda as an informational or action item.
Overview

• Fall 2018 Student Survey Results
  • Expectations and awareness
  • Intent to persist
  • What they liked
  • What they disliked

• Fall 2018 Faculty/Staff Survey Results
  • What they liked
  • What they disliked
  • Perception of student experiences

• Full reports of the results available online
Student Survey Respondents and Population

• Population
  • 1,057 fall 2018 students were enrolled in at least one 8-week course
  • 60% Continuing or readmitted students
  • 25% New students
  • 15% High School students (dual enrollment)

• Survey Respondents
  • 273 responses (26% response rate)
  • 60% Continuing or readmitted students
  • 21% New students
  • 14% High school students (dual enrollment)
  • 5% Unknown student type
• New or Transfer students were more likely to respond with extremely or somewhat clear (90%) compared to Continuing or Readmitted students (79%).

• Awareness: 89% learned of the blocks before fall 2018 semester began, 3% after fall 2018 began, 8% unknown.
Please mark all of the learning experiences you completed prior to the start of the semester:

Purchased textbooks

Yes: 89.7%
No: 10.3%

Logged in to D2L

Yes: 91.9%
No: 8.1%
New or Transfer students were more likely to indicate they would definitely or probably stay (66%)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Strongly or Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Strongly or Somewhat disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I was able to work at a job while taking classes.</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was able to focus on my class(es).</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was able to manage my homework.</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt prepared.</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What they Liked

221 responses (percentages are duplicated as one student’s comment could have more than one theme)

1) Shortened time to course completion (28%)
   “Classes were shorter.”

2) Being able to focus on fewer courses at a time (18%)
   “I can focus on 2 classes and finals instead of 4.”

3) Being able to take more courses (9%)
   “I’ve enjoyed the 8-week block as it has allowed me to take more Dual Credit courses while still in high school. Last year, I would have only been able to take Psychology or Sociology, but this year I could take both in the same semester.”

4) Shortened time to degree completion (7%)
   “It allows me to complete my degree in a shorter time than originally planned.”

5) Fast-paced nature of courses (6%)
   “It’s fast-paced and it doesn’t start to feel like it’s going on forever.”
What they Disliked

216 responses (percentages are duplicated as one student’s comment could have more than one theme)

1) Too fast-paced (32%)
   “Class is too short. Feels like everything is rushed…”

2) Heavy school workload (31%)
   “I can see it being a problem for some classes. The increased workload might be too much depending on the difficulty of the course.”

3) Lack of learning (18%)
   “Feels too rushed and not enough time to really learn the course materials.”

4) Time management issues (10%)
   “I have no time for anything else! I am drowning in homework. I work 8-10 hours a day, I do homework for 4 more, and somehow find time to cook and do laundry. I have no free time and I barely have time to spend with my wife.”
Faculty/Staff Fall 2018 Survey Respondents

• 58 responses
  • 16 faculty
  • 25 adjuncts
  • 17 staff

• 81% of respondents taught at least one 8-week course
• Staff were more likely to perceive student’s responses as very positively or positively (56%) compared to faculty (20%) or adjuncts (42%).
What they liked

37 responses

1) Shortened time to course completion (41%)
2) Being able to focus on fewer courses at a time (19%)
3) Increased student learning (19%)
4) Increased student engagement (16%)
5) More class time (11%)
6) Opportunity to improve courses (5%)
What did you like about the 8-Week Advantage?

“...Class over quicker and students felt accomplished quickly.”

“The ability for students to concentrate on only two or three classes at a time and really focus on those specific topics. The short term retention of information was good.”

“...students seemed to retain knowledge a bit better with the faster pace of the course- it appeared to me that less review was needed for the Final Exam than generally would occur in a more spread out 16-week course.”

“I liked that it kept the students engaged and there wasn’t a lot of time for any slack or boredom.”

“I liked the opportunity to look at my class through a new lens...It forced me to update some of my practices and forced me to do innovative things that realigned with my course outcomes...”
What they disliked

50 responses
1) Too fast-paced for students (20%)
2) Grading too frequent (18%)
3) Students falling behind and unable to catch up (16%)
4) Having to adjust the type and number of assignments given (16%)
5) Increased or unbalanced teaching/work load (12%)
6) Condensing lesson plans or subject matter (12%)
7) Too fast-paced for faculty/staff (10%)
8) Decreased student learning (10%)
What did you not like about the 8-Week Advantage?

“I did not like having to abbreviate so much information.”

“...it was sometimes hard to gauge how long students were spending each week on the material and how much homework should be assigned.”

“Grading had to be submitted very quickly, and I feel I probably left less feedback because I had such a short time to keep up on grading.”

“Some students get so far behind at the beginning, not realizing the critical nature of the pace of the course, then expect preferential treatment to catch up.”
View the Full Reports

• Student Survey Results
  https://public.tableau.com/shared/WNPWDD9TH?:display_count=yes

• Faculty/Staff Results
  https://public.tableau.com/views/FacultyandStaff8-WeekAdvantageSurveyResults-Presentation/Story1?:embed=y&:display_count=yes
Spring 2019 Enrollment

March 29, 2019
Presentation to CPBAC
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Headcount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2018 Census</td>
<td>1,002</td>
<td>1,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2019 Census</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>1,553</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spring FTE by Student Type


Legend:
- Blue: Spring 2018 FTE
- Orange: Spring 2019 FTE
Spring FTE by Division

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Division</th>
<th>Spring 17 FTE</th>
<th>Spring 18 FTE</th>
<th>Spring 19 FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Studies</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business &amp; Technology</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2018 EOT</td>
<td>1,001</td>
<td>1,656</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2019- as of 03-29-2019</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>1,547</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8-Week Advantage Survey Results
Student Survey Respondents and Population

- Population
  - 1,057 fall 2018 students were enrolled in at least one 8-week course

- Survey Respondents
  - 273 responses (26% response rate)
Student Survey

- **Expectations**: 81.6% of respondents said the expectations and structure of 8-week blocks was explained to them extremely clear or somewhat clear.

- **Awareness**: 88.6% said they knew about 8-week blocks before fall 2018 term began.

- **Influence to enroll**: 62.4% said they were not at all or not really influenced by the 8-week blocks when deciding to enroll in fall 2018.

- **Intent to persist**: 58.7% said they would definitely or probably stay at GFC
### Experiences with the 8-Week Blocks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly or Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Strongly or Somewhat disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I was able to work at a job while taking classes.</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was able to focus on my class(es).</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was able to manage my homework.</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt prepared.</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What did you like about the 8-Week Blocks?

221 responses (percentages are duplicated as one student’s comment could have more than one theme)

1) Shortened time to course completion (28%)
   “Classes were shorter.”

2) Being able to focus on fewer courses at a time (18%)
   “I can focus on 2 classes and finals instead of 4.”

3) Being able to take more courses (9%)
   “I’ve enjoyed the 8-week block as it has allowed me to take more Dual Credit courses while still in high school. Last year, I would have only been able to take Psychology or Sociology, but this year I could take both in the same semester.”

4) Shortened time to degree completion (7%)
   “It allows me to complete my degree in a shorter time than originally planned.”

5) Fast-paced nature of courses (6%)
   “It’s fast-paced and it doesn’t start to feel like it’s going on forever.”
What did you not like about the 8-Week Blocks?

216 responses (percentages are duplicated as one student’s comment could have more than one theme)

1) Too fast-paced (32%)
   “Class is too short. Feels like everything is rushed...”

2) Heavy school workload (31%)
   “I can see it being a problem for some classes. The increased workload might be too much depending on the difficulty of the course.”

3) Lack of learning (18%)
   “Feels too rushed and not enough time to really learn the course materials.”

4) Time management issues (10%)
   “I have no time for anything else! I am drowning in homework. I work 8-10 hours a day, I do homework for 4 more, and somehow find time to cook and do laundry. I have no free time and I barely have time to spend with my wife.”
58 responses
  - 16 faculty
  - 25 adjuncts
  - 17 staff

81% of respondents taught at least one 8-week course
Perception of Student Experience

From your perspective, how did most students respond to the 8-week schedule?

- Very Positively: 9.1%
- Positively: 30.9%
- Neutral: 38.2%
- Negatively: 20.0%
- Very Negatively: 1.8%

• Staff were more likely to perceive student’s responses as very positively or positively (56%) compared to faculty (20%) or adjuncts (42%).
What they liked

37 responses

1) Shortened time to course completion (41%)
   “...Class over quicker and students felt accomplished quickly.”

2) Being able to focus on fewer courses at a time (19%)
   “The ability for students to concentrate on only two or three classes at a time and really focus on those specific topics. The short term retention of information was good.”

3) Increased student learning (19%)
   “...Students seemed to retain knowledge a bit better with the faster pace of the course – it appeared to me that less review was needed for the Final Exam than generally would occur in a more spread out 16-week course.”
What they liked

37 responses

4) Increased student engagement (16%)
“"I liked that it kept students engaged and there wasn’t a lot of time for any slack or boredom.”"

5) Longer class time (11%)
“"I did like seeing students four days a week (3 credit class)...”"

6) Opportunity to improve courses (5%)
“"I liked the opportunity to look at my class through a new lens...It forced me to update some of my practices and forced me to do innovative things that realigned with my course outcomes...”"
What they disliked

50 responses

1) Too fast-paced for students (20%)
   “The time frame is very rushed. Students feel like we’re cramming material because we have to move so quickly...”

2) Grading too frequent (18%)
   “I can’t do as many assignments because I don’t have the time...to grade them all...”

3) Students falling behind and unable to catch up (16%)
   “...if a student was absent, the quick-paced schedule made it challenging to catch up...”

4) Having to adjust the type and number of assignments given (16%)
   “Too short to offer time for service learning assignments.”
What they disliked

50 responses
5) Increased or unbalanced teaching/work load (12%)
6) Condensing lesson plans or subject matter (12%)
7) Too fast-paced for faculty/staff (10%)
8) Decreased student learning (10%)