

Meeting Minutes

Committee:	Course Scheduling Committee (CSC)	Meeting Date:	July 1, 2019
-------------------	--------------------------------------	----------------------	--------------

Location:	Hinderaker 0154	Organizer:	Ken Baerenklau
------------------	-----------------	-------------------	----------------

ATTENDEES:

Members	Ken Baerenklau (Chair)	Associate Provost
	Bracken Dailey	Registrar
	Alicia Arrizon	Associate Dean
	Marko Princevac	Associate Dean
	Louie Rodriguez	Associate Dean
	Ryan Lipinski	Divisional Financial Administrative Officer
	Kathy Redd	Director & Student Services Advisor
	Connie Nugent	Divisional Dean

Did not attend:

	John Wills	Faculty
	Ivalina Kalcheva	Faculty
	Elaine Wong	Associate Dean
	Kurt Schwabe	Associate Dean

1. Preliminary senate response to exam scheduling memo

The Chair sent the memo to the Senate, as requested by the Senate. A Senate Representative asked for a form to be filled out with proposed language, so the bylaw may be revised. Because the CSC had not discussed proposed language, the chair suggested to the Committee to wait for the rest of the members to be present to have this discussion. The Chair proposed to table this topic until Fall 2019.

2. Departmental requests to be allocated open slots in the scaffolding matrix

Swapping W courses for non-W courses. Political Science raised this question, which was initially tabled. The problem that may arise with swapping W- classes for non-W classes is they are unlikely to meet the scaffolding requirements. Allowing swapping of such disparate courses will undermine the effectiveness of scaffolding and introduce new scheduling conflicts that were not addressed during the scaffolding step.

Swapping S courses. S courses are classes without discussion sections. Within CHASS, there are only two departments (Economics and Political Science) that offer these courses. Unlike W courses, the population of students served remains the same as a non-S course in the scaffolding matrix. However section sizes may smaller so room needs may be different.

Voting Results:

All present committee members approved the Chair's proposal to not allow the swapping of courses generally. However S-Courses may be swapped in the same meeting pattern but potentially not in the same room.

3. Clarify what scaffolding does and does not grant to the scaffolded course

Registrar Dailey gave examples: Can a scaffolded course bump a non-scaffolded course out of a room late in the scheduling process as enrollments evolve? Can a department decline a scaffolding slot and offer it to another department?

The committee discussed the implications of granting such broad priority to scaffolded courses and decentralizing decisions to departments about their scheduling. The committee felt this would undermine the effectiveness of scaffolding and would create problems both for non-scaffolded courses and for the scheduling process generally. No committee members expressed support for creating this kind of priority for scaffolded courses.

The Committee noted that current procedures allow departments to submit requested changes to scheduling of scaffolded courses early in the scheduling process. Members felt this is adequate and appropriate. Members felt departments should be prompted for this information, especially regarding anticipated enrollments. If departments have other requests, the form found on the CSC website should be completed and provided to the Committee.

4. Review/modify the special request process

The Registrar suggested that more structure in this process would be beneficial, to make the process more fair.

Currently, faculty are requesting specific rooms and/or attributes in the room. The Registrar reviews all requests. In many cases, the special request are not pedagogical; in some cases faculty are requesting rooms for personal preferences such as location. The Committee already guarantees such things through pre-assignment agreements but requests made by the Chair after pre-assignment are not guaranteed.

The committee felt that there is value in attempting to accommodate such requests rather than not receiving any such information and/or declining all requests. However, it would be very challenging to formalize this part of the current process. Members recognize that the current process is imperfect and can be influenced by squeaky wheels and felt it should be monitored going forward.

The Registrar will try running the optimizer first, and then review special requests (especially those that are for pedagogical reasons) and attempt to accommodate, only if they do not interfere with other courses.