

COURSE SCHEDULING COMMITTEE MEETING
Meeting Minutes

October 1, 2018

I. Roll call

The following persons were present:

- Ken Baerenklau
- Elaine Wong
- Bracken Dailey
- Rylan Lipinski
- Alicia Arrizon
- Connie Nugent
- Kathy Redd
- Marko Princevac

The following persons were not present:

- Kurt Schwabe
- Louie Rodriguez

II. Review of pre-assignment agreements (program exceptions)

a) K. Baerenklau & B. Dailey met with 20-30 registrar staff- to discuss scheduling changes. It was suggested the pre-assignment agreements be considered a departmental exception (compared to a course exception). Suggested to CSC to combine all exceptions together for scheduling priority. CSC agreed this was a good idea.

b) All exceptions to be resubmitted and re-evaluated. K. Baerenklau to draft an announcement and online survey for intake.

c) Discussion of existing agreements...

1. Pre-assigned Rooms

a. Not an exhaustive list, departments sometimes schedule rooms for 3x times a week but use once in a while. List has not been updated in a while, list was developed over time & some agreements were verbal agreements. List needs to be updated.

2. Foreign Language Course Pre-Scheduling

a. 4 days a week- is there a reason why they choose those 8 classrooms?

- i. 35 % of classrooms will fit into the standard meeting pattern. Some agreements have been in place for over 10 years.
 - ii. More will fit if they don't care about specific days but rather just about 4x per week.
- 3. GSOE Pre-Scheduling
 - a. Evening classes- motivation: working educators pursuing degrees
 - b. Might they agree to meet a few times a week instead of three hours on one day, to fit into the standard schedule?
 - i. Concern-this may impact students, commuting more than one day can impact enrollment
 - ii. Others will be questioning why education receives exception and not others. (will be addressed case by case)
- 4. Graduate Seminar Pre-Scheduling
- 5. CHASS Connect Freshmen Course Pre-Scheduling
 - a. This year this will not be taking place, will take place next year. Not all freshmen take this course
 - b. Did not match the meeting pattern –MWF- twice a week
- 6. Learning Community “Bucket List” Pre-Scheduling
 - a. These are unique, many will get into the scaffolding, moving these late in the process has large negative ripple effects
- 7. Math Pre-Assignments
 - a. They like alternating days of lecture and discussion, high utilization of rooms
 - i. They schedule additional lectures in these rooms to once they are done with initial courses, will be reviewed
- 8. MSOL Pre- Scheduling
 - a. Challenge with this: equipment can be purchased for other rooms but maintenance and security are an issue
 - i. This will be reviewed in light of ITS input on technology
- 9. School of Business Pre-Scheduling

- a. (Tues, Thurs, Mon, & Wed- not a standard pattern) – original agreement if you can utilize the room (MWF) because they lecture Mon & Wed and discussion on Fri - It is now a standard meeting pattern.
- b. Faculty will look into the Faculty member's status who is teaching the course (ladder or non- ladder rank)

10. Physics Large Lecture Pre-Scheduling

- a. Only room in campus that can accommodate

11. HUB Scheduling Agreement

- a. The HUB requests room if available (WAT 1000) – not often

12. Faculty Special Need Pre-Scheduling

- a. Registrar does confirm with Human Resources Department

III. Evaluating pre-assignment requests

a) Criteria for evaluation

- i) Compelling justifications- type of instruction, ex. Online instruction, specific needs in lecture (unique spaces), outside speakers (advance scheduling)
- ii) It would be helpful to explain this to departments, so they understand the reasoning behind the decision

b) Process (including engagement with chairs and directors)

i) Suggested Qualtrics survey

- (1) Ask for people to provide the issue, provide reasoning behind why a specific room/time is needed, ask for alternatives considered, and explanation of desired alternative
- (2) Providing justification is important, it provides info for staff to give to other faculty
- (3) Faculty can explain why their class needs to be taught in a certain setting or way, but Dept. chair needs to be aware of requests made by faculty Chair should make the final decision because of implications for dept. compliance.

IV. Scaffolding

- a) Decisions due to Registrar by Feb. 1
 - i) Suggested the Associate Deans and Department Chairs to work together to ensure there is no overlap,
 - (1) Associate deans will need to commutate with dept. chairs to get all courses that need to be reevaluated

V. Take Away Points

- a) Figure out how to reach out to department chairs, and information that needs to be shared about pre-assignment agreements
- b) Meetings with Associate Deans will be set up to come up with document that will be sent out to department chairs regarding scaffolding
- c) Committee to draft Qualtrics survey questions for pre-assignment agreements

VI. Adjournment

Facilitator Name adjourned the meeting at 3:00 pm

Minutes submitted by: Michelle Jaramillo

Minutes approved by: Ken Baerenklau