

Meeting Minutes

Committee:	Course Scheduling Committee (CSC)	Meeting Date:	September 4, 2019
-------------------	--------------------------------------	----------------------	-------------------

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

ATTENDEES:

Members	Ken Baerenklau (Chair)	Associate Provost
	Bracken Dailey	Registrar
	Alicia Arrizon	Associate Dean
	Bob Ream	Associate Dean
	Ivalina Kalcheva	Faculty
	Kurt Schwabe	Associate Dean
	Kim Wolf	Student Affairs Assistant
	Kathy Redd	Director & Student Services Advisor
	Connie Nugent	Divisional Dean
	Kurt Schwabe	Associate Dean
	Rachel Wu	Faculty
	Thomas Kramer	Associate Dean

Did not attend:

	Marko Princevac	Associate Dean
--	-----------------	----------------

1. Discussion of pre-assignment request from POSC

See two attached supporting documents: “Resubmitted Winter 2020 POSC 170...” and “Classes for Winter Quarter”

Political Science submitted a pre-assignment request (POSC 170) to the committee for review. The Chair shared the request and the supporting documents with the committee. According to the request, the first hour of the class is devoted to an outside speaker and the speakers are available in the evening. Therefore, they are requesting pre-assignment priority to continue the three-hour time slot on Monday nights

Discussion:

A committee member verified that the Monday evening schedule was non-standard even prior to the new scheduling policy. Therefore, this course was being scheduled successfully but with low priority. Moreover, under the new policy, the time slot they are requesting (6:00 to 8:50 pm) would impact several other patterns and thus would create several inefficiencies in the scheduling matrix if prioritized.

The committee discussed possible solutions and reflected on possible pre-assignment categories this request might fit into. The Committee discussed possibly scheduling the course in a standard Monday-Wednesday evening pattern with two 90 minute meetings, or on Friday evening for 3 hours (also standard). The committee felt that the Monday-Wednesday option would be preferable and would meet the pedagogical needs of the class. Alternatively POSC can retain the status quo and maintain lower priority scheduling for the non-standard Monday evening time. Or they might find departmentally-controlled space for the Monday evening time.

VOTING RESULTS:

The request was declined. The chair will notify POSC and explain the decision.

2. Preliminary senate response to exam scheduling memo

The committee sent an exam-scheduling memo to the Senate in response to faculty feedback regarding the current three hour long exam periods. The current exam time contributes to the inability to provide a reading period for students prior to exams. Not all Committee members are present, so the Chair postponed the discussion. All committee members should be present to deliberate. This agenda item will be revisited at the next Course Scheduling Committee meeting.

3. Assessment of scheduling policy changes

a. What would the committee like to know about impacts of the scheduling policy changes?

The Registrar office is planning to retrieve and analyze data on how the new scheduling policy impacted various academic units. The data will be complete by the third week of October, discussion will most likely occur after October 18. The Registrar asked the committee for input on what kinds of questions they would like to analyze. Committee members provided the following as possible items to look at when pulling data.

1. Proportion of classes scheduled in and out of prime hours by department.

2. How many primary sections are scheduled during prime hours – by college, department, undergraduate vs graduate, breadth vs non? How many secondary sections were placed in general assignment rooms, in prime or non-prime time?
3. The number of courses taught online, that do not utilize classroom space.
4. The average utilization by classroom size range. Have we improved?
5. The remaining availability by classroom size range.
6. The number of requests to switch rooms after scheduling.
7. The number of courses scheduled in pre-assignment.
8. The number of courses scheduled in scaffolding.
9. The number of courses scheduled by the Registrar in non-general assignment rooms (e.g. HUB, UNEX, Pentland).
10. The distribution of meetings patterns used. Was there an increase in 2-day patterns used?
11. Unique/unexpected situations that have arisen.
12. How much time do students spend on campus each day?
13. Average number of enrolled units per student – did it increase?

Discussion:

Registrar plans to create a template and pull data quarterly, which then this committee will review. The idea is to provide information and data to departments and Chairs to understand campus scheduling, to help everyone understand the dynamics of scheduling and effects of the policy.

The committee is interested in asking the Department Chairs directly about their experiences, and any questions they would like to have answered. One member suggested a Qualtrics survey. The chair suggested the survey go out in Winter 2019, after the spring schedule of classes has been published. The committee agreed that this would be good timing, after three rounds of scheduling have been completed.

4. Priority scheduling discussion- expressed needs we may want to try to address through scheduling policy
 - a. Instructors with highly impacted schedules including senate leadership and faculty administrators
 - b. New courses with no enrollment history
 - c. Unique challenges at the department level (e.g. single parents assigned to evening time blocks)

Discussion:

Does the committee want to address these challenges, or does the committee think there are already enough/too many exceptions in place? Additional requests or exceptions are responsive to needs but create additional work for the Registrar office, complicate the scheduling process and have consequences for other courses. The committee could better understand common/critical challenges through the survey. The committee agrees the department chair should understand the needs of faculty and have some flexibility/authority to address them; enrollment managers and the Registrar office should not be making these decisions. The Chair is aware of the special circumstances, the history of courses, and can communicate to faculty their reasoning behind their decision. The chair can determine what is the best course of action for the instructors and the department in unique cases.