

I. Contact information:

Kurt Schwabe, Associate Dean, School of Public Policy (951-827-2361 / kurt.schwabe@ucr.edu)

II. A written request containing the following information:

1. **Background information:** Briefly describe the scheduling challenge you are facing and any relevant context that will help the Course Scheduling Committee understand your situation. Include the number of affected students, special teaching needs, and other important considerations.

Response: The Master of Public Policy program is a two-year degree program that is geared for working professionals. Because we admit students that work full-time we offer our courses in the evening hours, starting after 5:00 pm, to allow the students time to get from work to campus. We currently have a total enrollment of approximately 40 students across the two cohorts (which we anticipate to increase in the future), of which approximately 1/3rd are working full-time. At present, our courses are not part of the priority run for scheduling. While this hasn't been a problem in prior terms, it will be problematic with the new scheduling timeframes set to go into effect this upcoming Fall 2019 term. With the new guidelines, courses that are taught once/week in a 3-hour block of time are slated to be taught on Friday's. With students in our program who work full-time, **requiring our MPP student take Friday classes would affect our ability to recruit and enroll highly qualified students** because courses these would no longer be taught in the evening hours and thus would pose a hardship on students to take every Friday off from work to attend class. Because of this, we will lose qualified students to other institutions.

2. **Options considered:** Describe the options you have considered to resolve this challenge, including the pros and cons and anticipated impacts of adopting each option.

Response: We have polled the faculty who teach our graduate-level courses regarding the new scheduling guidelines that will go into effect this Fall 2019. They agreed that due to the nature of the courses the MPP students are taking (graduate-level, seminar courses), **teaching the course in a two-day/week format would be counterproductive to the students learning**. The courses are designed to stimulate and promote class discussion and scheduling a course on a two-day/week format will interrupt the teaching and discussion.

3. **Your request:** Indicate which option presented in section 2 you are requesting and why.

Response: The SPP is **asking** for an accommodation for our graduate-level classes to be scheduled Monday – Thursday, and one day per week, and that they are scheduled during the priority scheduling run, as is done with GSOE so that we can be considered for a general assignment classroom for our courses. With the new scheduling guidelines that will become effective for Fall 2019, and because the majority of our courses are taught one-day/week, having our students take classes all day Friday is not be a feasible option, especially for those students who work full-time.

4. **Chair approval:** The chair/director(s) of the affected department/program(s) should briefly state whether they support this request and sign and date the document.

Response: I support this request.  1/3/19

Michelle Jaramillo

From: Alicia Arrizon <alicia@ucr.edu>
Sent: Thursday, January 17, 2019 4:49 PM
To: Ken Baerenklau
Cc: Bracken Janette Dailey
Subject: Fwd: Review of Proposed Scaffolding Matrix

FYI, Response from John Medearis, Chair of Political Science

----- Forwarded message -----

From: John Medearis <medearis@ucr.edu>
Date: Wed, Jan 16, 2019 at 10:24 AM
Subject: RE: Review of Proposed Scaffolding Matrix
To: Alicia Arrizon <alicia@ucr.edu>
Cc: Kiril Tomoff <kiril.tomoff@ucr.edu>, Sang-Hee Lee <sang-hee.lee@ucr.edu>

Dear Alicia,

Thanks for this chance to respond to the “scaffolding” proposal.

My overall concern about this is that “scaffolding” has the feel of a change that is being imposed on CHASS for the convenience of CNAS. My sense is that the predictability sought through scaffolding is especially important for majors in which building-block courses must be taken in a particular order. But this is not true of Political Science. (Our lower division courses can be taken in any order.) And I imagine it is also not true of most other social science and humanities majors.

That said, here are my concerns and questions about *this particular* “scaffolding proposal.”

Equity/inequity regarding 8 am classes. It appears to me that only four or five departments are being asked to schedule certain classes at 8 am – permanently. Is it necessary for any “scaffolded” courses to be scheduled at 8 am? Why can the burden not be spread more equitably among departments?

Equity/inequity regarding MWF v. TR. All of the Political Sciences proposed for “scaffolding” are assigned MWF schedules. Many other departments appear to be assigned both MWF and TR schedules. Can Political Science be given a combination of MWF and TR schedules?

W courses. The proposal appears to be locking us in to offering the W version of one lower division course, POSC 5, and the non-W version of POSC 10. We of course prefer to have flexibility as to whether we offer the W or the non-W version of our lower division courses. It seems to me a mistake to allow this “scaffolding” change to limit my department’s pedagogical freedom in this way.

Rotation. Instead of insisting that each of the “scaffolded” courses meet at the same time in perpetuity, would it be possible to assign a set of “scaffolded” times/schedules to the department, and allow us to rotate the courses through those times. That might alleviate some of the concerns about time of day and MWF v TR schedule.

Staffing of courses: unintended consequences and equity. Political Science is pretty good about having ladder faculty teach lower division courses – not all the time, but frequently. But if the scheduling of these courses becomes inflexible and undesirable, it could have the effect of making ladder faculty less willing to teach lower division courses.

And this concerns leads me to another concern. It is my general impression that in many departments, ladder faculty rarely teach lower division courses. I wonder to what degree such departments are shifting the costs of “scaffolding” on to lecturers – and perhaps to L(P)SOEs? This is potentially both unfair to the lecturers – and to departments that traditionally share the responsibility of lower division teaching more equitably.

Thanks again for the opportunity to provide this feedback.

Best,

John

John Medearis

Professor and Chair

Department of Political Science

University of California, Riverside

<http://politicalscience.ucr.edu/people/faculty/medearis/>

From: Alicia Arrizon <alicia@ucr.edu>

Sent: Thursday, December 13, 2018 4:41 PM

To: Andrea Smith <asmith@ucr.edu>; Andrew Winer <andrew.winer@ucr.edu>; Andrews Reath <reath@ucr.edu>; Augustine J Kposowa <augustine.kposowa@ucr.edu>; Christine Chiarello <christine.chiarello@ucr.edu>; David Lloyd

<dclloyd@ucr.edu>; Erika Suderburg <erika@ucr.edu>; Jacques Lezra <jacques.lezra@ucr.edu>; Jan Stets <Jan.stets@ucr.edu>; Jason D Weems <j.weems@ucr.edu>; Jeffrey Sacks <jeffsack@ucr.edu>; Joel Robert Smith <joel.smith@ucr.edu>; John N Medearis <john.medearis@ucr.edu>; Juliet M McMullin <juliet.mcmullin@ucr.edu>; Thomas Cogswell <cogswell@ucr.edu>; Leonora Saavedra <leonora.saavedra@ucr.edu>; Pashaura Singh <pashaura.singh@ucr.edu>; Rickerby M Hinds <rickerby.hinds@ucr.edu>; Sherine Hafez <sherine.hafez@ucr.edu>; Steven M Helfand <steven.helfand@ucr.edu>; Yunhee Min <yunhee.min@ucr.edu>
Cc: Sang-Hee Lee <sang-hee.lee@ucr.edu>; Kiril Tomoff <kiril@ucr.edu>; Milagros Pena <milagros.pena@ucr.edu>
Subject: Review of Proposed Scaffolding Matrix

Dear Department Chairs,

As you know, one of the improvements we are making to the scheduling process for Fall 2019 is a step we are calling “scaffolding”. This idea was originally suggested by department chairs whose students were impacted by the unexpected conflicts produced by the reshuffling of undergraduate courses when we last changed the campus scheduling policy in 2016.

Scaffolding gives 1st level scheduling priority to courses determined by the Provost and the Course Scheduling Committee to be of significant importance for student progress to degree across multiple majors. These courses are scheduled first, in standard meeting patterns, typically during prime hours, with the goal of avoiding conflicts with other scaffolded courses that would otherwise impact large numbers of students. Scaffolded courses rarely change meeting patterns from one year to the next, and those that do require approval by the Course Scheduling Committee. Scaffolded courses do not count against departmental prime time allocations due to the university service nature of these courses and because departments have relatively less control over when these courses are scheduled.

The main benefits of scaffolding were summarized by the Provost’s Course Scheduling Workgroup, which noted that “scaffolding creates a foundational framework of courses that are important across majors and thus to the university as a whole. These courses are scheduled first and deliberately arranged to avoid conflicts, thus placing an emphasis on student needs and progress to degree. This minimizes conflicts that would impact large numbers of students, and/or that could neither be foreseen nor resolved by a single department. It also allows for longer-term planning and greater predictability.”

Department chairs who attended their college "scheduling" chairs/directors meetings in fall 2018 were made aware of scaffolding and were told that they would have a chance to review and comment on the draft scaffolding matrix when it was ready. The proposed matrix is attached to this email. It was developed by the Registrar’s office in close consultation with your scheduling staff.

Please review the matrix and provide your comments by Friday January 18.

Enjoy your winter break!

Alicia Arrizón, Professor

Associate Dean of Student Academic Affairs in CHASS

Professor of Gender and Sexuality Studies

--

Alicia Arrizón, Professor
Associate Dean of Student Academic Affairs in CHASS
Professor of Gender and Sexuality Studies

Michelle Jaramillo

From: Richard Cardullo <cardullo@ucr.edu>
Sent: Thursday, January 17, 2019 4:39 PM
To: Ken Baerenklau
Cc: CNASDEAN; Studentdeancnas
Subject: Re: honors as 1st priority scaffolding
Attachments: image001.jpg

Dear Ken,

University Honors requests that 1st years Honors courses be put into the 1st priority scaffold in order to minimize conflicts with CNAS Learning communities for freshmen. These courses, which constitute a required series for these Honors students, includes:

- (1) Fall; HNPG 16, 17, or 18 (Ignition Seminars) - Counts for Breadth in Humanities, Social Sciences, or Interdisciplinary Studies
- (2) Winter; RLST 12H (Religious Myths and Rituals) - Counts towards the University Requirement for Ethnic Studies
- (3) Spring; HIST 10H/15H/20H (World History) - Counts towards the University Requirement for World History (Note: This will only be one of the three courses each Spring. For Spring 2019 this is 10H).

Rationale: This should minimize the number of occurrences when students have to choose between CNAS Learning Communities or University Honors.

Thanks!

Rich

On Thu, Jan 17, 2019 at 4:19 PM Ken Baerenklau <ken.baerenklau@ucr.edu <mailto:ken.baerenklau@ucr.edu> > wrote:

We'll keep an eye out for the request

From: CNASDEAN
Sent: Thursday, January 17, 2019 3:52 PM
To: Ken Baerenklau <ken.baerenklau@ucr.edu <mailto:ken.baerenklau@ucr.edu> >
Cc: Cardullo Richard <cardullo@ucr.edu <mailto:cardullo@ucr.edu> >; Studentdeancnas <studentdeancnas@ucr.edu <mailto:studentdeancnas@ucr.edu> >; CNASDEAN <cnasdean@ucr.edu <mailto:cnasdean@ucr.edu> >
Subject: honors as 1st priority scaffolding

Ken: Thank you (and Bracken) for coming to the CNAS C/D meeting again. I hope you found the discussion useful; I certainly appreciate learning more about scheduling.

CNAS just had a meeting with Rich to discuss the scheduling 'conflict' between honors and CNAS learning communities. Connie suggested that treating honors courses the same as CNAS learning communities (ie, 1st priority in the scaffold) would solve this issue - and this proposal seems to make perfect sense. Rich will be making the request to treat the first year honors courses as 1st priority, CNAS endorses that request.

Kathryn

Dr. Kathryn Uhrich
Dean, College of Natural & Agricultural Sciences Professor, Chemistry

Fellow of ACS, AIMBE, CRS and NAI
University of California, Riverside
Riverside, CA 92521

CNASdean@ucr.edu <mailto:CNASdean@ucr.edu>
(office) +1 951 827 3101

Executive Assistant: Rachel Alvarez
rachel.alvarez@ucr.edu <mailto:rachel.alvarez@ucr.edu>
(office) +1 951 827 4597

--

Richard A. Cardullo, PhD
Howard H Hays Jr. Chair, University Honors
Professor of Biology
University of California, Riverside 92521
Ph: 951-827-5782
<<http://honors.ucr.edu/>> <https://www.facebook.com/ucrhonors/?ref=br_rs>
<<https://www.instagram.com/ucrhonors/>> <https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCcaDsxSSCyARIW-AQ1k6_Jg>
<<https://twitter.com/UCRHonors>>