

November 28, 2011

SUSAN GILLMAN
Academic Senate Chair

Dear Susan:

RE: Response to Senate Feedback on Course Time Proposal

I would like to thank the Senate for their analysis and discussion of the Course Time Proposal presented at the end of last year by the IVPDUE.

I agree with the opinion of most, if not all, of the Committees and the Executive Committee, that “the broad impact of proposed changes seems disproportionate to the acute but narrow problem that they are intended to address” (CPB; with similar comments from CEP, COR, COT), as well as the concerns that such a reduction, without a concomitant reduction in units, could degrade the quality of our educational experience (CAAD, CEP, CPB, CPE, COR, COT, COC).

Several committees asked for more information about classroom availability and conflicts. The Office of the Registrar has created a “Classrooms WebViewer”, <https://classrooms.ucsc.edu/classrooms/>. The “Location View” is the best resource for information about available classrooms, https://classrooms.ucsc.edu/wv3/wv3_servlet/urd/run/wv_space.Default

Many committees requested examination of other alternatives, and two provided specific alternatives that would add one more time slot each week, a 6.7% increase in capacity without changing class times, the earliest start time, or the latest end time:

- CPE: Change the two MW slots into three MWF slots, increasing the total number of slots 3-day slots from 6 to 9 and reducing 2-day slots from 9 to 7.
- CEP: Reduce passing time on MWF to 15 minutes, matching TTh, and move the two MW slots one hour later, also matching TTh, to create one additional MWF slot, maintaining 9 2-day slots and increasing 3-day slots from 6 to 7.

My initial thoughts are that the CEP alternative is more attractive, in that it does not include late-night classes on Friday, and also maintains the current number of twice-a-week slots, while increasing the number of three-times-a-week slots. Thus, it is a relatively modest change, though of course any change to our long-standing hours will create some initial confusion.

I do not believe that such an option would have a significant effect on total campus enrollments in student credit hours. However, this option would provide significant additional capacity and flexibility in course scheduling without waiting for a new building.

As the topic of classroom scheduling is fresh on everyone's minds, from this study and the CAB/SEC conversation on November 1, and because the alternative in CEP's response would not have the significant pedagogic issues of the prior proposal, I am hopeful that an appropriate combination of SEC and other interested committees may be able to provide some rapid feedback in time for the Fall 2012 call for large-lecture scheduling (http://reg.ucsc.edu/staff/2012_2013.htm). This call is presently scheduled for January 3, 2012, but in consultation with the Registrar, we have determined that we may shift the release of the call by one week. If possible, responses by January 8 would be most appreciated so there is time to discuss the results with the Vice Provosts, Vice Chancellors, and CP/EVC to potentially fully integrate any changes beginning with 2012-13 course scheduling.

Thank you again for the excellent feedback on this proposal. I am proud that our campus wishes to maintain the system's highest level of instructor contact hours per unit.

Sincerely,



Richard Hughey
Vice Provost and Dean
of Undergraduate Education

cc: CP/EVC Galloway
VPDGS Miller
VPAA Lee
Academic Senate Staff