

June 8, 2012

Richard Hughey, VPDUE
Chancellor's Office

RE: Third Revision to Course Time Proposal of May 04, 2012

Dear Richard:

Attached are the responses from ten Senate committees that reviewed the third round of the *Class Times Proposal*. I transmit to you the comments in their entirety from the Committees on Academic Personnel (CAP), Affirmative Action and Diversity (CAAD), Admissions and Financial Aid (CAFA), Faculty Welfare (CFW), Educational Policy (CEP), Preparatory Education (CPE), Planning and Budget (CPB), Research (COR), Teaching (COT), and Graduate Council (GC).

The Senate appreciates the wide range of consulting by the VPDUE with faculty, students, department staff, including managers, divisional curriculum analysts, as well as transportation services and other units.

The Senate recommends that any altering of course time slots, whichever of the options is chosen, be implemented in a pilot period, with built-in review and monitoring.

Option 2 is favored by all committees except CFW and CAP. The changes resulting from this option would have the least impact on faculty and students. The plan, if implemented and determined to be problematic, can be easily reversed. CPE members also recommended the 5:00 – 6:10 p.m. time slot for small classes.

There were a few issues that concerned the reviewing committees, such as the late night ending of the last MW class. Faculty are generally concerned about safety, and about graduate students with young children (especially single parents). Members of CFW found the 8:30 – 10:15 p.m. time slot unacceptable for faculty or graduate students, especially those with children, to teach. Members of Graduate Council expressed concern that teaching skills and pedagogy may wane as the night gets later; other committees felt there may be attendance challenges with the MWF 5:00 -6:10 p.m. time slot; student representatives, however, did not view this as a problem for motivated students.

CAAD expressed its concerns that the costs of this option borne by the campus and the faculty, such as transportation (campus and public), instructional support services, and childcare, might outweigh the benefit. Additionally, several committees shared CAAD's concern that changes to the course time slots could have a disproportionately negative effect on lecturers, who are often assigned large courses with little control over their scheduling. Other committees noted that extending courses into the evening produces a collateral effect on the need for extending hours at the library, and in labs.

More general and broad-based concerns were expressed about Option 2. The possibility of increased course conflicts was raised for students with major objectives that require a specific sequence of courses (often with three interrelated courses taken in specific quarters); if the related departments were unable to schedule the courses accessibly, student progress would be impeded. On the programmatic side, this scheduling has become even more challenging given classroom size availability.

Although outside the bounds of the proposal, CEP discussed the possibility of scheduling courses on Saturday. Some departments already do so (e.g., in Art, which schedules some T/Th/Sat courses). Even with the obvious potential drawbacks, if a Saturday time slot allowed for additional offerings of heavily impacted courses, the advantages could, again, outweigh the costs. The committee tentatively endorsed offering once-a-week Saturday courses, for faculty who would like to try it.

Finally, CAP would like the class time schedule to reflect the norms around the UC system. From the perspective of the personnel process, members felt it important that UCSC faculty teach the same number of hours per unit as at other UC campuses. CAP defines this as a basic equity issue that should be a consideration in guiding course time slot planning.

Thank you for the opportunity to advise on this important matter.

Sincerely,



Susan Gillman, Chair
Academic Senate
Santa Cruz Division

Enclosures

cc: CP/EVC Galloway
Chair Takagi
Chair Lau
Chair Lodha
Chair Zurbriggen
Chair Smith
Chair Westerkamp
Chair Oliver
Chair Selden
Chair Schumm

May 24, 2012

Susan Gillman, Chair
Academic Senate

RE: Course Time Slot Proposal

Dear Susan,

The Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) discussed the Proposal to Increase the Number of Class Time Slots (1 May 2012). CAP's understanding is that the feedback from the original proposal to shorten the length of class time periods/contact hours (May, 2011) was mostly "neutral". The committee feels that this "neutral" support of the original proposal was not negative and should have been considered "support" of the overall proposal. As such, instead of a new, complex, and confusing proposal to increase the number of course time slots, CAP would rather see a coherent vision, keyed to aligning with practices at other campuses around the UC system, with shorter class time periods and more course slots.

Our view is that course time slots at UCSC should reflect norms around the system. From the perspective of personnel at UCSC, CAP members feel it important that UCSC faculty teach the same number of hours per unit as at other UC campuses. To the members of the committee, this is a basic equity issue that should be a consideration in guiding course time slot planning.

In the absence of a vision driven by alignment with other UCs, or other considerations (rather than just accommodating more students), CAP members saw none of the five proposed options as ideal. We felt several of the options were confusing to us and would be confusing to others, if implemented. CAP does not endorse any of the proposed course time slot suggestions and recommends alignment with the other UC campuses.

Sincerely,

lsl

Dana Takagi, Chair
Committee on Academic Personnel

cc: Susan Gillman, Chair, Academic Senate
Senate Chairs

May 31, 2012

Susan Gillman, Chair
Academic Senate

Re: VPDUE's Revised Class Slots Proposal

Dear Susan,

In its meeting of May 21, 2012, the Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (CAAD) discussed VPDUE Hughey's revised proposal to increase class time slots. While CAAD acknowledges that maintaining the current schedule may not be the most prudent approach, we have concerns about option 2 and are opposed to options 3, 4, and 5.

Option 2 is moderately tenable in that it would preserve some of the desirable MW 5:00-6:45 and 7:00-8:45 p.m. time slots and increase seating capacity, in the largest rooms, by adding a MWF 5:00-6:10 slot and shifting MW slots to 6:30-8:15 and 8:30-10:15 p.m. in those same rooms. CAAD's concerns about this option are the following:

1. The costs associated with this option—such as expanded public and campus transportation, classroom instructional support services, and child-care—will be borne by campus and faculty and may not outweigh its benefit.
2. This option will not be successful at increasing seating capacity if faculty from impacted departments are not willing to teach during the new time-slots. CAAD recommends surveying faculty in impacted departments to gather more information about their individual willingness to teach during such times (i.e., not a general survey as to whether they support the idea in principle). Additionally, several committee members voiced concern about the pedagogical effectiveness of teaching during late time slots.
3. These changes might have a disproportionately negative effect on lecturers who are often assigned large courses with little input as to their scheduling. Since lecturers might not be included in a potential survey of faculty willingness to teach in these later time slots (as recommended in #2 above), CAAD also strongly recommends consulting directly with lecturers through their union (AFT). Such consultation would also help clarify any contractual agreements that might limit the effectiveness of the proposed changes.
4. While CAAD admires the inclusion of a trial period in Winter 2013, it is concerned that there will not be enough time to assess the changes by gauging feedback from faculty, staff, and students before the planned full implementation in Spring 2013 since scheduling for large classrooms (and for the campus as a whole) occurs so far in advance; in addition, the committee pointed out that since Fall quarter is always the most difficult to schedule (according to VPDUE Hughey's memo), Winter 2013 might not provide the most accurate information for assessment.

Overall, CAAD is sympathetic to the need for increased classroom capacity, and we want to facilitate students graduating in four years whenever possible. We hope that any efforts to increase classroom capacity be undertaken with extremely careful planning to minimize costs, ensure the fewest disruptions to campus life/business, and to allow for a complete and thorough assessment.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kimberly Lau", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Kimberly Lau, Chair
Committee on Affirmative Action
and Diversity

May 18, 2012

Susan Gillman, Chair
Academic Senate

Re: VPDUE Revised Class Slots Proposal

Dear Susan,

The Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid (CAFA) has reviewed the revised proposal from the Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education to update the current class time slots to add additional slots as well as shift the current schedule. The CAFA membership is comfortable with going ahead with the implementation of the proposed changes and feels they are aligned with the EVC's stated goal of creating enhanced academic pathways to allow students to graduate in four years or less.

Additionally, it should be noted the CAFA student representative related that the student body is supportive of the proposed changes; really any changes, which would improve overall student access to courses.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "June A. Gordon".

June Gordon, Chair
Committee on Admissions & Financial Aid

June 1, 2012

Susan Gillman, Chair
Academic Senate

Re: Course Time Slot Proposal

Dear Susan:

The Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) has reviewed the Proposal to Increase the Number of Course Time Slots. CFW notes the need to increase flexibility in the number of class times and class rooms available and appreciates the opportunity to provide feedback on the proposed options.

On behalf of faculty welfare, CFW members unanimously agree that requesting faculty and/or graduate students to teach from 8:30 to 10:15PM at night is not acceptable. As such, the committee does not support classroom timeslot options two, three, or four as written. Further, option five, with rotating two day class options, is extremely confusing and could be vastly problematic if implemented. CFW would like to see at least two spots on Monday and Wednesdays that are one hour and forty-five minutes in length, preserved.

As the current schedule will add to increasing classroom impaction due to growing enrollments, the time slot options proposed may need to be redrafted and reconsidered. Removing the 8:30 to 10:15 PM course time slot in three of the options, for example, may generate more general support.

Sincerely,

lsl

Abel Rodriguez, Chair Pro Tem
Committee on Faculty Welfare

May 24, 2012

Susan Gillman, Chair
Academic Senate

RE: Revised Classroom Time Slot Proposal

Dear Susan,

CEP members discussed the revised course time proposal from Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education to modify the current class time slots to provide additional slots. The committee applauds the VPDUE's Office for the wide range of consulting that went on with departments, faculty, students, transportation services, and other units.

Members remain concerned about some issues including: student attention and attendance in Friday classes that end at 6:10 pm, late night safety when classes dismiss at 10:15 pm, whether ladder-rank faculty will agree to teach during these time slots, contract issues with lecturers (this seems like a change to their working conditions, which would require renegotiation). The committee also wondered whether it will possible to take advantage of additional large lecture time slots unless support for additional TAs is also provided.

In spite of these concerns, members were convinced that there is demand from departments for more large lecture room slots. The committee recommended moving forward with Option 2, the most conservative of the options. This option also preserves the popular MW 5:00-6:45 time slot for most classrooms. Once the change is implemented and assessed for the large classrooms, the campus could consider extending it to other classrooms, or implementing some of the other options outlined in the proposal.

We do note that a significant downside to Option 2 is that it creates overlapping classes within the (new) standard time blocks. Currently, some scheduled courses overlap, but only when one or both are scheduled outside of the standard time blocks. We do not think it is in students' best interests to be allowed to enroll in overlapping courses, and we will be following up this issue with the Registrar.

Although outside the bounds of the proposal, the committee also discussed the possibility of scheduling courses on Saturday. Apparently, there is nothing to prevent such courses being scheduled now and this is occasionally done (e.g., in Art, which schedules some T/Th/Sat courses). The committee noted that there are potentially many drawbacks to courses on Saturdays, for both faculty and students. There are also potential drawbacks to a course that meets for three or three and a half hours at one time. Except for seminars, this seems to be less than ideal pedagogically. However, the committee believes that if a Saturday time slot allowed for addition offerings of heavily impacted courses, this could be overall beneficial to students. Thus, the committee tentatively endorsed offering once-a-week Saturday courses, if faculty would like to try this.

Sincerely,

/s/

Eileen Zurbriggen, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy

cc: Senate Committee Analysts

May 25, 2012

Susan Gillman, Chair
Academic Senate

RE: Revised Classroom Time Slot Proposal

Dear Susan,

The Committee on Preparatory Education (CPE) felt this issue was not in our purview, but would like to share our thoughts as faculty members on the proposal from Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education to update the current class time slots with additional slots by shifting the current schedule. After a long robust discussion, we felt that:

- Option 1 is not a an option if we need more large lecture halls to meet class demand.
- While all agree Options 2, 3, 4, 5 are going in the right direction there are too many details missing for us to make a clear choice among them. All seem to have advantages and none seem obviously bad.
- Option 2 seems to have the fewest risks and might therefore be most amenable to running as a pilot.
- We discussed what we called an "option 2A" that would add a minority subset of medium and small rooms to the schedule that option 2 provides for large lecture halls. We thought this might offer significant flexibility without a large disruption, and also be suitable as a first step.
- Option 5 is the most desirable for faculty who would like to only teach twice a week, but over all is very complicated. In addition to the additional conflicts that will result from most of the new plans, and other obvious complications, we wanted in particular to remind the VPDUE and registrar to make sure that final exams aren't impacted. In particular, further pressure on the scheduling of final exams would mean that it will become difficult to schedule overflow rooms for large lectures, forcing students to take their exams in conditions that are both uncomfortable and difficult to proctor. It seems almost certain to us that finals week would have to be extended by one or more days under most of these plans, but particularly under option 5.

Sincerely,

/s/

David Smith, Chair
Committee on Preparatory Education

cc: Senate Committee Analysts

May 18, 2012

Susan Gillman, Chair
Academic Senate

Re: Revised VPDUE Class Slots Proposal

Dear Susan,

The Committee on Planning & Budget has reviewed the revised proposal from the Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education to update the current class time slots to add additional slots as well as shift the current schedule. While still reserved in our optimism, CPB is generally supportive of the proposed changes and feels they merit implementation given our classroom constraints. CPB strongly cautions that this implementation should be undertaken as a pilot experiment and feels that negative feedback or unforeseen issues should be considered for immediate remedy if possible, or be taken into account for the next year's schedule.

CPB members did note that many courses may experience attendance challenges particularly with the "Monday-Wednesday-Friday 5:00-6:10pm time slot", as this is already a rampant issue with the preceding time slot.

CPB also discussed the possibility that the now overlapping M-W-F and M-W time slots could cause an increase in the number of course conflicts which might prevent student progress. Many students have major objectives which require a specific sequence of courses (often with three interrelated courses taken in specific quarters), which might become an issue if the related departments are unable to schedule the courses accessibly. On the programmatic side, this scheduling has become even more challenging given classroom size availability.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Lynn Westerkamp".

Lynn Westerkamp, Chair
Committee on Planning and Budget

May 31, 2012

Susan Gillman, Chair
Academic Senate

Re: VPDUE Hughey's proposal (3/19/12 version) to increase time slots

Dear Susan,

COR has discussed the latest proposal for increasing the number of classroom timeslots. This issue significantly impacts faculty teaching and therefore the time they have for research. The committee was generally supportive of the proposal. At first, options 4 and 5 seemed too complicated, but would indeed lead to more options for graduate and upper level courses. COR therefore endorses option 5, to allow the most flexibility. Students and instructors will know their time slots, so there should be no confusion in terms of attendance. One unforeseen consequence is the creation of more scheduling conflicts. The registrar, divisional staff and departmental advisors would need to consider even more closely the common pathway that students follow in a given major.

COR felt strongly that student safety needs to be carefully considered. It was stated that the number of campus buses would be increased. A definite commitment of additional city buses, however, including the exact revised schedule, are needed since classes will be going to as late as 10:15 pm. This year, there have often been huge lineups at campus bus stops due to cutbacks in SCCRTC service. As mentioned, the creation of a mixed schedule on MWF would partially alleviate this problem. COR also recommends rolling back the free parking time to 5 pm on weekdays *for the sake of student safety*. Several years ago, the time of metered parking was moved to 8:30 pm as a money grab by the campus administration and TAPS. Free parking at 5 pm would allow students to park on campus before sunset, and more safely leave campus after the later time slots.

Overall, COR supports the proposal if student safety is considered, and suggests creating a graphic or timetable for visualizing the proposed changes.

Sincerely,



Scott Oliver
Chair, Committee on Research

cc: Senate Committee Chairs

June 1, 2012

Susan Gillman, Chair
Academic Senate

Re: VPDUE's Revised Class Slots Proposal

Dear Susan,

In reviewing VDPUE Hughey's Revised Class Slots Proposal, COT found the plan to be pedagogically beneficial to the campus as a whole. In fact, COT saw so many advantages to adding extra time slots to the regular Monday/Wednesday schedule, we wondered if a similar arrangement might not also be made to the Wednesday/Friday schedule. Members noted that while some conflicts may arise due to overlapping time slots, in general the positive consequence of a more robust distribution of class times should far outweigh any negative repercussions.

Adding class time slots would, however, entail two related problems. First, students are bound to impact campus resources such as the libraries and computing labs more heavily insofar as they will want to use such campus facilities to study later in the evening, especially on Mondays and Wednesdays (and potentially Fridays too). Secondly, Instructional Support Services would need to be increased to accommodate the lengthened duration of class hours. In the view of COT, full IT support should be available through the evening until the last class finishes.

Finally, given the specific expertise of Department Managers and Divisional Curriculum Analysts, members of COT were pleased to read that these staff members will have a chance to review the proposal.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/

Daniel L. Selden, Chair
Committee on Teaching

SANTA CRUZ: OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

May 22, 2012

Susan Gillman, Chair
Academic Senate

Re: VPDUE Revised Class Slots Proposal

Dear Susan,

In its meeting of May 17, 2012, the Graduate Council discussed the revised proposal to (slightly) restructure class times on our campus. Recognizing the need to alleviate scheduling pressure, and the necessity of enduring a degree of sacrifices that necessarily results from addressing the issue, members of the Council were generally supportive of the proposal. Members did express two concerns, however. First, there was concern that the 5:00-6:10 p.m. MWF could be very difficult for graduate students with small children, particularly those that are single parents. Several members of the Council noted that this is a graduate student demographic that is often overlooked in student affairs planning, and although a small segment of the graduate student body, the challenges they face in working toward their degrees is often markedly greater than that of other groups of students. Departments should keep this group in mind as they decide how to make use of the 5:00-6:10 p.m. time slot. Second, several members reported that they have trouble being at their best as evening wanes into night, and expressed concern that their pedagogical skills may not be in top form as the hour approaches 10:00 p.m.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Bruce Schumm".

Bruce Schumm, Chair
Graduate Council