

ADHOC SCHEDULING MEETINGISSUES
Faculty Senate Discussion: 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 PROPOSED BREAK IN CLASS SCHEDULING

The ad hoc scheduling team met several times in the past few months to address the concerns of faculty related to two proposed drafts of scheduling changes resulting from the parking issues at the university. These scheduling changes include the following:

1. A break in classes around 5 p.m. due to parking issues at the university
2. Moving class start times to 7:00 – 7:30 depending on the proposed version

The committee recognizes the following:

1. There is a legitimate need to fill classrooms to justify the need for new capital improvements to accommodate additional classrooms, faculty offices and expansion of support services for students.
2. Given that faculty is responsible to the university for curriculum design and delivery in their areas of expertise, the faculty is best equipped to determine if a course should be offered on a one day, two day or three day a week schedule so as to deliver a quality education. We recognize this responsibility is constrained by the availability of classroom space.
3. The intent and implementation of both the spring, 2015 and proposed fall, 2016 schedule changes has been interpreted differently by each college. Discussions with the university administration have clarified that there is no mandate for specific course schedules. The university administration recognizes that specific course schedules are an essential part of course delivery are the responsibility of faculty.

The committee supports the 7:30 a.m. start time. The committee does not support a schedule that adds a break in classes around 5 p.m. for the following reasons:

1. Using scheduling changes as a way to solve a parking will not lead increased usage of classrooms and thus is not likely improve our justification for capital improvements. While we recognize the traffic issues, we suggest that there are other ways to address these issues
2. The ability of the scheduler to work with varied schedules should not be determined by a parking/traffic issue. Since faculty are responsible for the content and delivery of the curriculum, the varied schedules should be worked out with faculty who are experts delivering the course content so that student learning objectives and program objectives are met.
3. The time slot blocked out to clear up traffic times is the time period in which student enrollment is high. This could adversely impact the six year degree completion that is part of FGCU's performance based funding and enrollment from this student population. Example:
 - a. Offering a 5:00 p.m. class two days a week and a 6:30 p.m. class one day a week means that students who work full time can take three classes after work two days a week. Some of them take a 3:30 p.m. class two days a week for a full time load. This schedule along with summer classes is what enables part time students to finish in five years.

- b. The proposed staggered time for three hour blocks does not give part time students the ability to take more than one class in an evening, which means they can only take two classes in two nights, thereby lengthening the five years to six or seven years
4. The varied times in the break and in the start times of classes can be very confusing to students.

We suggest that before these changes and other scheduling changes are made, we evaluate the impact of these changes on the following:

1. The feasibility and potential monetary implications of insuring that the library, computer help desk, academic technology, food services, writing center, adaptive services, canvas support, lab time, day care and other relevant support administrative services are adequately covered during the early morning and late evening classes.
2. Data on the implications on course enrollment that address differences in enrollment in early morning MWF, TR, late evening MWF, TR, one day Friday and Saturday classes. Some colleges see lower enrollment in early morning and MWF classes. Other colleges may see increases in enrollment.
3. Data on the implications to the quality of our programs across the university. Some colleges are already seeing the impact of scheduling on class exercises, exams that impact the quality of the delivery of the curriculum based MWF schedules and are concerned that this proposed schedule may change will exacerbate this further.
4. Data on the implications to students. Scheduling requirements, especially at the 300 and 400 level need to consider optional research, internship, and service learning requirements that are an important component of the university's mission and that ensure students are able to graduate in six years.
5. Data on implications on faculty in terms of available time for research and service requirements to the university.