

**ADHOC SCHEDULING MEETING ISSUES**  
**Faculty Senate Action Item: February 13, 2015**

Committee Chair: Dr. Mary Krome

Committee Members: Dr. Susan Cooper, Dr. Elizabeth Elliott, Dr. Thomas Felke, Dr. Penny Finley  
Ian Campbell, Nicholas Gallo, and Steve Rokusek

**PROPOSED FACULTY STATEMENT**  
**REGARDING COURSE SCHEDULING**

We, the faculty, proudly affirm our dedication to the university and our responsibility for academic integrity of our programs. We recognize that the needs of a growing institution require change. We see involvement in recent scheduling decisions as part of the shared governance process that enables us to focus on our role in curriculum design and delivery as we continue to grow. There has been concern that recent scheduling decisions may be impacting the quality of our education programs and emphasize that both content and delivery are integrals part of maintaining and improving the learning environment for our students; an environment that enables our programs to achieve their learning outcomes and ensures that students complete their degree requirements in the six year time period required under performance-based funding initiatives.

We recognize the legitimate need to fill classrooms to justify new capital improvements such as buildings for classrooms, faculty offices, and support services for students. Regardless of the impact such initiatives have on course scheduling, there is a perception among faculty that we have had little input how these decisions are implemented. We seek to remedy this perception. We propose some common agreement within and across colleges as to how scheduling decisions should be planned and implemented, especially at the college and department levels.

1. The faculty affirm our responsibility for the content and delivery of the curriculum which includes determining how to deliver a quality education in our area of expertise. As such, faculty should be involved in the planning, refinement, and implementation of these schedules at the College and Department levels.
2. We affirm that individual faculty assignments, as part of our responsibility for the content and delivery of our curriculum, should not be arbitrarily assigned by college or department administration. Faculty schedules, both in terms of course assignments and times offered, should continue to follow the process set forth in the collective bargaining agreement.
3. Since the University administration has not mandated specific teaching times for faculty, departments, or colleges, we propose that each faculty member determine the best type of schedule (MWF, TR, one day a week) for courses in their area of expertise. We further propose that the college and department administration work with the faculty to plan and implement a curriculum schedule that 1) meets the needs of their students, 2) accommodates the research and service requirements of faculty, 3) fulfills the

learning requirements in our programs, 4) satisfies the enrollment concerns of the colleges, and 5) falls within the general framework of the University's available time slots.

4. To maintain academic integrity in our programs, special consideration should be given to offering upper level and special courses at times other than MWF since classroom instruction typically requires a learning activities that supplements or replaces lectures. There are also implications in these courses on students' ability to fulfill their optional research opportunities, internships and service learning requirements.
5. Monetary and practical issues of the support staff need to be considered. Adequate coverage and costs of support functions such as the library, computer help desk, academic technology, writing center, adaptive testing services, lab time, childcare and other relevant support services should be considered.
6. Prior to major scheduling changes, we propose that:
  - a. Faculty, collectively and individually, should evaluate the implications in light of program integrity and their research and service obligations to the university.
  - b. Student representation should evaluate the implications on optional research opportunities, internships, and service learning requirements, among other things.
  - c. Support staff and administration should evaluate the monetary and practical issues associated with such changes.