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Overview
City Colleges of Chicago’s new curriculum development process has been revised and Board-approved as the **Proposed Academic Curriculum Change (PACC)** process. This change is the first major change to this process in more than 40 years. The new process is inclusive of Curriculum Facilitators that were selected locally by the colleges.
The new process addresses colleges’ curriculum development needs and increase efficiency.

**PAC Process (proposed academic changes - *old*)**

- Separate review by faculty and administrators
- Lengthy, unclear internal review
- Ignores outside agencies (ICCB, IAI, program accrediting agencies)
- Paper-based and checkbox
- Multiple steps (at least 12)

**PACC (proposed academic curriculum changes - *new*)**

- Collaborative review by administrators and faculty together
- Clarity in expectations and shorter internal review
- Includes outside agencies from beginning
- Frontloaded expectations (Form 20 et al)
- Automated electronic delivery system and interactive capability – (Projected Sept launch)
- Curriculum development reduced to 3 steps
- 2 steps for internal reporting/roll-out, and then to external agencies
The PACC curriculum development concept has more than 75% fewer steps than the former process and features an integrated model, ensuring shared governance and objectivity.

1. **Conditional Recommendation**
   - Local President or Vice President (or designee), Academic Department/Discipline, and Curriculum Facilitator provide conditional recommendation to proceed with proposal. This is a college recommendation.

2. **Curriculum Workshop (2 parts)**
   - Content team led by local Curriculum Facilitator to facilitate research, vetting, and application of standards (ICCB and IAI). This is a college committee.
   - College Curriculum Committee of the Faculty Council to facilitate curriculum standards.

3. **Joint Curriculum Development Council**
   - Vice Presidents (or designees), all Curriculum Facilitators, and elected Committee A members, DO Academic Affairs. This is a district-wide committee.
## PACC Process (Phase 1): Academic Year 2013-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>PACC Process Deliverables For New Programs and Courses</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Curriculum Development:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Curriculum Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Automated master syllabus template</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Overhaul of the Curriculum Tab webpages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PACC Automated Process:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Submission form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Automated process workflow for new programs and courses*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Proposal Status Dashboard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rubric System:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Developed rubrics and scorecards for all steps of PACC process for a new program, course, and multiple courses associated with a program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PACC Dissemination:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Curriculum facilitator training materials for FDW and registration week</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### *PACC DASHBOARD (NEW)*

New curriculum submissions will be electronic via a dashboard resource that is being finalized. Powered by SharePoint, the dashboard will allow submission, continuous monitoring, and electronic signature. **NO MORE PAPER.**
# PACC Process (Phase 2): Academic Year 2014-2015

## PACC Process Deliverables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PACC:</th>
<th>Rubric System:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ➢ Automate approval process for existing programs and courses  
➢ Revise and update process workflow for programs/courses based on feedback | ➢ Develop rubrics and scorecards for existing programs and courses |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Curriculum Development:</th>
<th>PACC Dissemination:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ➢ Complete unfinished sections of the Curriculum Manual  
➢ Plan for updating documents (including external agencies’ timelines, program and course matrices, policy changes associated with curriculum, PACC approved curriculum in real time, semester by semester).  
➢ Develop automated templates for College and Instructor Syllabi  
➢ Revise and update Curriculum Tab webpages based on feedback | ➢ Transition from old process to new process requires training by Core Team (an ongoing over two semesters) faculty and administrators associated with curriculum.  
➢ Academic Affairs works with PACC Core Team, Curriculum Facilitators and Colleges to manually update catalog based on PACC proposal outcomes pending interactive catalog implementation.  
➢ Academic Affairs works with PACC Core Team on RFPs for automated catalog and seamless curriculum development system (Civitas, Curriculog, et.al.)  
➢ For external dissemination: PACC process conference presentations (e.g. HLC, Valencia, etc.) |
Each college has identified qualified faculty to be Curriculum Facilitators who will help colleges navigate the process through completion.

Curriculum Facilitators ...

- Help principal advocate lead new curriculum through the entire curriculum development process with the goal of attaining appropriate approval/accreditation from outside agencies (ICCB, IAI, DOE, et al).

- Assist the IAI curriculum articulation process.

- Assist Principal Advocate and College PACC Resource Team in the completion of the ICCB forms and tracking the results.

- Help conduct deep and extensive audits of the already articulated transfer courses.

- Collaborate and connect with faculty and administrators on the Discipline Committees, Teaching and Learning Committees, and Assessment Committees (and other relevant committees).
Training has begun to ensure consistency and compliance across all colleges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Development Week (FDW)</th>
<th>Registration Week (August 18-22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training: Curriculum Facilitators</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday Training (8-15-14)</td>
<td>Wednesday (20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR*: 9am-3pm</td>
<td>KK*: 9am-3pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L113 – located in the Learning Resource Center (LRC)</td>
<td>MX*: 9am-3pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MXC - MAIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Room(s) : 0538B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday (21)</td>
<td>Friday (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR*: 9am-3pm</td>
<td>TR Room: 2941</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Curriculum Tab
2) FC duties and responsibility
3) FC role in PACC submission
4) Scheduling meetings (at least three times a month)
5) Homework: curriculum personnel information list and tentative schedule for step 2B (submit last day of training)

**Focus on Courses**
1) Major and minor changes
2) Rubrics
3) SharePoint
   - PACC submission
   - Curriculum Tab

**Focus on Programs**
1) Major and minor changes
2) Rubrics
3) SharePoint
   - PACC submission
   - Curriculum Tab

*Computer Lab

**Note:** Workforce Development and DO AA will participate in this workshop

1) PACC Process Simulation
   - Programs
   - Courses
2) Collect curriculum personnel list and tentative schedules
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Tenure is one of four strategic points at which we can improve the quality of instruction at CCC

Creating Quality Instruction at CCC means...

1. Getting the best possible professors into the system
2. Granting tenure with a more rigorous, transparent process
3. Continually developing the professors we have in a high-quality, cost-effective manner
4. Ensuring the quality of tenured faculty through observations, self-assessments and committee review

Hiring
Tenure
Professional Development
Post-Tenure Evaluation
Background:
Surveys conducted during the spring of 2011 confirmed that there was considerable faculty concern regarding the tenure process

- Concerns raised by faculty:
  - the process was poorly defined and thus implemented inconsistently;
  - the goals of the process were unclear;
  - the requirements of the fifteen graduate credit hours and the tenure project were unreasonably burdensome;
  - the required tenure projects often became an empty exercise rather than a meaningful contribution to the department, college, or district;
  - the tenure candidate received little, if any, substantive feedback, guidance or mentorship; and
  - the overall process to grant or deny tenure lacked transparency.
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The new tenure process has four organizing principles.

- Outcomes-based and Growth-oriented
- Individualized
- Supported
- Transparent
The Talents of Teaching provide a standard set of competencies around which the tenure process is organized

- The Talents provide the basis for all faculty evaluation, including student evaluations, classroom observation forms and portfolio rubrics.
- In order to be granted tenure, faculty members must make an evidence-based argument for tenure, demonstrating competency in all five talents.
- The Talents, by defining faculty excellence, help frame professional development, scholarship and other aspects of quality instruction, aligning these with evaluation and tenure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Talents of Teaching</th>
<th>Reason for Talent</th>
<th>Result of Talent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Teaching and Learning</td>
<td>Improving instructional</td>
<td>Student Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Measuring Learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Diversity, Inclusion, Respect and Student Support</td>
<td>Meeting students’ needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Academic Citizenship, Shared Governance, and Leadership</td>
<td>Meeting institutional needs</td>
<td>Institutional Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Content Expertise and Lifelong Learning</td>
<td>Building stronger faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Tenure Process Overview – Semester Breakdown

### Year 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester 1</th>
<th>Semester 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic</td>
<td>Formative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Participate in TAP orientation (registration week)
2. Begin mentorship program
3. 2 mentor observations (informal)
4. 2 formal observations (dept. chair and administrator)
5. Attend department or other meetings
6. Portfolio submission
7. Departmental vote and president decision on contract renewal

### Semester 2

1. Participate in SSS (throughout semester)
2. 2 mentor observations
3. 2 formal observations (faculty members)
4. Develop Individualized Learning & Service Plan (ILSP)
5. Develop teaching and service philosophy
6. **Complete the Second Semester Review** (Interview with department chair and College Admin and approve ILSP)

### Year 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester 3</th>
<th>Semester 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focused Check-point</td>
<td>Formative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Participate in mentor program
2. Observe teaching in a faculty member’s classrooms
3. 2 formal observations (dept. chair, administrator)
4. Engage in professional development according to ILSP
5. Participate in department, campus, or district committee (ongoing through rest of process)
6. Portfolio submission
7. Departmental vote and president decision on contract renewal

### Semester 4

1. Participate in the mentor program
2. Observe teaching in a faculty member’s classrooms
3. 2 formal observations (faculty members)
4. Complete ILSP

### Year 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester 5</th>
<th>Semester 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Design argument for tenure and continued learning and service plan for portfolio
2. 2 formal observations (dept. chair and administrator)
3. Final Portfolio submission
4. Departmental vote and president decision on tenure contract

### Semester 5

1. Board resolution
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Data Sources

Evaluation includes a variety of sources and perspectives

Surveys
(4 qualitative surveys)

- Department Chair Survey
- Legacy Tenure Survey
  (faculty tenured under old system)
- Semester One Survey for new Tenure-Track Faculty
- Semester Two Survey for new Tenure-Track Survey

College Tenure Process Reports

- College Administrator Feedback Reports*

External Evaluator Report

- Recommendations from External Evaluator from Valencia College

*Submitted by 4 colleges
Scorecard Evaluation Scale

Overall implementation performance evaluated against the guiding principle objectives:

**Meeting Objectives**
Overall the objectives are being met at or above the expected performance level(s). Feedback across the various data sources is predominantly favorable.

**Needs Improvements**
Overall the objectives are being met at an adequate level, however, there were notable concerns expressed. Feedback across the various data sources is somewhat favorable, however, is not consistent in regards to meeting expectations/objectives.

**Not Meeting Objectives**
Overall there were a considerable amount of concerns consistently expressed across the various data sources. Continued improvement is required to meet expectations/objectives.
### Key Findings: Working Well

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value of TAP leaders and mentors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus on teaching and faculty self-improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process helped to identify areas for self-improvement, reflection and assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring, support and feedback among TAP leaders, mentors, departments and other candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops provide transparency and information about processes and requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom observations are helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readings, class activities and examples are meaningful exercises</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Findings: Needs Improvement

- Timelines are rigid. More flexibility in requirements would improve the process.
- TAP Leaders need more training.
- More training for Department Chairs and candidates is needed.
- TAP Leaders and Department Chairs are overwhelmed with the amount of work/paperwork.
- Better organization of the process and better definition of program responsibilities is needed.
- Better communication between TAP Leaders, Department Chairs, candidates and administration is needed.
- Seminars/ILSP should take place sooner.
Key Findings: Needs Improvement

- The content at meetings (group discussions, seminars, orientation, etc) are a little superficial. Focus more on quality versus quantity.
- Candidates should be grouped based on experience and discipline.
- Tenure Orientation Seminar needs more examples/expectations of binder.
- There needs to be more professionalism among TAP Leaders/Chairs/admin at SSR Meetings.
Website navigation needs to be improved to enhance the user’s experience and better leverage the information available to faculty.

There’s an absence of strong administrator presence and training of administrators.

There’s no plan to accommodate an increase in the number of tenure candidates, especially since TAP leaders/dept chairs expressed heavy workload as is.

Off-cycle hires complicate the tenure support process immeasurably and isolate the candidates who are not hired with the full cohort. Continuing this practice seriously degrades the opportunity for successful support of the program.
### Legacy Tenure Survey vs. Semester 1 Survey of New Tenure-Track Faculty

#### Q1

**Participating in the tenure process improved my teaching**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legacy Tenure</th>
<th>Semester 1</th>
<th>Semester 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**My time participating in the tenure process was well-spent/worthwhile**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legacy Tenure</th>
<th>Semester 1</th>
<th>Semester 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I’m confident in my understanding of the tenure process & what was expected of me**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legacy Tenure</th>
<th>Semester 1</th>
<th>Semester 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Answered: 32 Skipped: 0*
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City College’s Student Guided Pathways to Success, or Student GPS, is a comprehensive system of guided pathways and supports that inform some of our students’ most critical life decisions to ensure every student has a clear path to obtaining his or her college and career goals.

Student GPS links all of the resources of City Colleges (faculty, staff, programs, courses, technology, and services) into a personalized approach to help each student succeed in his or her college experience.
Students are creating personalized education plans based upon faculty-designed, semester-by-semester pathways

**WHY?** Building structured degree plans to graduation, students see completion as attainable and a valuable goal

- **More accurate:** By drawing from Student GPS maps as smart defaults, we ensure the full education plan is informed by faculty expertise.
- **More relevant:** Using the Student GPS maps to construct education plans, students plan according to transfer, career and personal goals.

### Higher Education Research**

- ✓ Students juggle families, jobs, school. The greatest help we can provide: predictability.
- ✓ 81 ch is the national average for associate’s degree attainment
- ✓ Unstructured complexity is most daunting for disadvantaged students

### Community Colleges like Us

Community Colleges that have made a similar push to great effect.

- **New York:** Queensborough, Kingsborough, Guttman
- **Orlando:** Valencia Community College
- **Charlotte, Kansas City, Phoenix,** others.

### CCC-specific evidence

Over 3,000 students last year had over 60+ ch, most of these above 75.

Students with education plans had fall-to-spring retention of at least 10 percentage points higher than those without.

Incoming students choose one of ten focus areas

- Advanced Manufacturing
- Business & Professional Services
- Construction Technology & Drafting
- Culinary Arts & Hospitality
- Education
- Healthcare
- Information Technology
- Liberal Arts
- Life & Physical Sciences
- Transportation, Distribution, & Logistics
They then have conversations with advisors, using new tools, to have better goal-setting and planning conversations.

**MAKE AN INFORMED CHOICE**

**A. Choose a focus area:** Choose from ten broad categories of CCC offerings (e.g., Healthcare, Liberal Arts) – consult with an advisor

**B. Get on a pathway:** Learn about common first-year courses in a focus area, career options and degree and certificate plans available

**COMMIT TO COMPLETE**

**C. Plan using a semester map:** chart your CCC map using a sample course sequence in a given pathway

**D. Complete an education plan:** Individualize the example plan to chart your own journey at CCC
We’re also encouraging eligible students to increase their full-time course load: Fifteen credit hours, not twelve.

**WHY?** 15 credit-hours means greater likelihood of completion.

- The longer it takes to graduate, the more life gets in the way.
- The more life gets in the way, the less likely graduation becomes.

For too many students, the end results are a few years of courses, no degrees.

### Higher Education Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-11.9</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-23.9</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-29.9</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30+</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

More students graduate when they complete 30+ ch in 1st year

### Community Colleges like Us

- Nationally, 29% of community college students are taking 30+ (<10% at CCC)
- Federal financial aid regulations now penalize students who take too long

### CCC-specific implications

- Without developmental education, a 12 credit-hours sequence requires six semesters to complete an AA or AS.
- We want to advise down from 15, not up from 12.

*We track progress of students enrolled for 15 credit-hours*
### Education plans: Quantity of plans as of early April, at the start of the Fall 2014 student registration period

#### All Registrants for Fall 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KK</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MX</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HW</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Registered by an advisor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KK</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MX</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HW</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Full-time students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KK</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MX</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HW</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### New students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KK</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MX</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HW</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Decision Support, 4/2/2014
**Education plans:** Quantity of plans as of August 18, halfway through peak registration at all Colleges

- **Ed Plan Prep Plan**
  - DA: 45% 3% 48%
  - KK: 34% 39% 5%
  - TR: 34% 37% 3%
  - OH: 32% 22% 54%
  - MX: 26% 28% 2%
  - WR: 25% 26% 1%
  - HW: 27% 45% 18%
  - DO: 28% 38% 10%

- **Registered by an advisor**
  - DA: 41%
  - KK: 31%
  - TR: 31%
  - OH: 30%
  - WR: 24%
  - MX: 23%
  - HW: 17%
  - DO: 26%

- **IPEDS 12 and 13**
  - DA: 81%
  - TR: 56%
  - KK: 53%
  - OH: 40%
  - WR: 32%
  - MX: 32%
  - HW: 31%
  - DO: 43%

- **New**
  - DA: 31%
  - TR: 26%
  - KK: 25%
  - OH: 25%
  - WR: 25%
  - MX: 22%
  - HW: 17%
  - DO: 22%

- **Source:** Decision Support, 8/18/2014

*Excludes BC’s, course-takers, 45+

*ID of person registering
Student in PSSA different from Student ID

*Of those who have re-registered so far
15-to-Finish: Of our full-time students, 23% are 15 ch+; 54% of our students are full-time status

- Source: Decision Support, 8/18/2014
### Future registration cycles: We will accommodate our students by scheduling the relevant courses they demand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester Maps</th>
<th>Course capacity reporting</th>
<th>Education Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • What courses are needed, as dictated by the semester maps  
• Which courses cross-cut multiple, popular semester maps | **Descriptive Data**  
• Daily Total Enrollment and % Capacity Met  
• One-year % change and total enrollment difference | • With all students on education plans, we know what courses they want to take, all the way until completion |

#### Data points provided

- **Descriptive Data**
  - Daily Total Enrollment and % Capacity Met
  - One-year % change and total enrollment difference

- **Actionable Data**
  - Projected Enrollment
  - # of sections needed

#### Implications for Scheduling Process

- Use course list and student declarations of program of study to gauge what to put on the schedule
- Leverage today, and much more so for Spring, to prepare schedules more in-line with projected demand
- Develop new, more agile scheduling to accommodate unexpected fluctuations
- Examine multiple semester registration for students who know exactly what they want / need to take
- Discern other factors to account for to be able to offer just the right number of sections