

Amended April 27, 2011

The thirty-fourth meeting of the Committee of Six for the academic year 2010-2011 was called to order by President Marx in his office at 3:30 P.M. on Monday, April 18, 2011. Present were Professors Basu, Ciepiela, Loinaz, Rockwell, and Umphrey, Dean Call, President Marx, and Assistant Dean Tobin, Recorder. Professor Saxton was absent.

The Committee reviewed the final minutes of its March 28 and April 4 meetings and voted to approve them.

Under “Announcements from the President,” President Marx informed the members that he had not had at hand the College’s policy (which can be found at <https://www.amherst.edu/offices/it/about/policies/acceptable>) regarding the privacy of emails when responding to a question posed at the April 5 Faculty Meeting as to whether the administration planned to make a statement regarding recent attempts to obtain the emails of a Wisconsin professor through the open records law. The President noted that the College’s policy is consistent with those of peer institutions and said that its purpose is not to allow investigations into the scholarly work of faculty or political views and actions, which would threaten academic freedom, but to comply with requests for information under certain articulated conditions. If the Committee wants more information about this matter, Paul Murphy, Legal and Administrative Counsel, would be happy to meet with the members to answer questions, President Marx said.

Continuing with his remarks, President Marx asked the members whether the Committee of Six ought to bring forward a proposal that all tenured faculty members should be required to evaluate their teaching in all of their courses each year by means of their choice, with the results belonging to them. The Committee on Education Policy (CEP) has agreed to consider in fall 2011 whether to develop such a proposal, according to the committee’s chair, Professor Lyle McGeoch. Professor Umphrey, while praising the progress that has been made in recent years on this issue and noting the likelihood that such a motion would be brought forward in the near future, expressed the view that it would be best during this period of presidential transition not to require a proposal in the fall. She commented that the incoming president may have other agenda items he or she wishes to prioritize in the first months on campus. Professor Basu, noting the importance of this issue, suggested that a first step might be to assess the Faculty’s views on the requirement for teaching evaluations for senior faculty, which was approved by the Faculty in May 2007. Professor Basu suggested that the Dean’s office and/or the CEP write to department chairs in the fall to ask them to poll colleagues about whether they have found the new system to be informative and/or discuss this issue at a Faculty Meeting. She favors gathering data to inform any future deliberations and/or proposals, she said. Dean Call responded that he would be pleased to assist with the organization of such an evaluation. As a matter of faculty governance, Professor Ciepiela raised the issue of whether it would be appropriate to evaluate this new policy regarding teaching evaluations on a schedule that would be inconsistent with the one that the faculty had approved. She noted that the Faculty had voted to evaluate the new policy six years after its implementation. In a related matter, President Marx informed the members that a group of students had met with him recently to express their concern about this issue. Professor Basu suggested that the students be invited to share their views with the Committee of Six and the CEP.

Under “Announcements from the Dean,” Dean Call informed the members that, in accordance with the charge to the Copyright, Reserves, and Coursepack Task Force, the task force report will be sent first to the Committee on Priorities and Resources (CPR). It is likely

Amended April 27, 2011

that the Committee of Six will consider the report in the fall. The Committee then turned briefly to personnel matters.

Under “Questions from Committee Members,” Professor Loinaz asked if there was support available for tenured colleagues who might want to develop online teaching evaluations for their courses. The Dean said that many Academic Department Coordinators can provide such assistance and/or that the Department of Information Technology could also provide support, if needed. Professor Loinaz suggested that having a link to sample online evaluation forms from faculty course pages might be helpful for tenured colleagues who are considering formats for soliciting feedback on their teaching. Professor Basu suggested that the forms that are posted on the Teaching and Advising Program (TAP) web site should be updated. Particularly valuable as models, she said, are forms that the Amherst faculty and Harvard’s Derek Bok Center for Teaching and Learning have used.

Conversation returned to the issue of class scheduling, and the members discussed the possibility of bringing forward additional motions beyond the CEP’s proposal for a circumscribed expansion of evening courses and a loosening of some previously imposed constraints, and the committee’s proposed changes in the times at which courses of different lengths could be offered. The CEP has proposed that timeslots on Tuesday and Thursday afternoons be adjusted to create a new 80-minute slot at 1:00 and new possibilities for scheduling longer classes on Tuesday and Thursday mornings and on Fridays). (See the [CEP’s report on class scheduling](#) for specific motions.)

In its consideration of this issue, the Committee focused on thinking about possible solutions that could enhance students’ access to the curriculum and ease pressures on classroom spaces. The members discussed how to address challenges surrounding the need for a greater number of eighty-minute timeslots; the current situation of too few courses being taught before 10:00 A.M. and on Fridays; and an inefficient use of classroom space. The members noted that creating an additional evening timeslot(s) would help free up time during the day for classes and would offer students additional options and suggested that, perhaps, an evening timeslot could be created on Mondays. President Marx wondered whether consideration should be given to creating evening timeslots on all weekday evenings, leaving it up to students to make choices from among a range of options for curricular and co-curricular offerings. The Committee favored creating an evening timeslot for one day of the week to minimize conflict with arts performances, which, under such a plan, would have one “dark” evening, a schedule that is common at other schools. The members also favored the creation of an additional eighty-minute timeslot on Tuesdays/Thursdays, as proposed by the CEP, while noting that longer classes that started at 2:30 P.M. might push into late-evening early-afternoon time periods that have traditionally been reserved for athletics. Under such a plan, students could make choices as to whether to take classes during such a slot or whether to take classes at other times that would not interfere with early evening activities including athletics, it was noted. Professor Basu wondered whether having more Amherst classes in the evenings would negatively affect the ability of Five-College students to enroll in Amherst classes. The Dean said that it is his understanding, from conversations with other Five-College Deans, that adding more evening courses at Amherst would most likely enhance the accessibility of Amherst classes to Five-College students. The members also discussed the possibility of recasting the schedule using ninety-minute timeslots—increasing flexibility, with the result that classes could more easily be offered for fifty, eighty, or ninety minutes within a series of longer blocks. Distributing large, popular classes throughout the

Amended April 27, 2011

day, including in the morning, would be helpful in using classrooms of different sizes most efficiently it was noted.

The members discussed whether there might be ways of using the class schedule to shape students' choices when enrolling in courses. Proposals included requiring all students to take some classes in the early-morning and on Fridays or requiring first-year students to do so. It was noted that, if students were required to take classes in the morning and/or on Fridays, it would be necessary for more courses to be offered at these times. Several members commented that the prospect of low enrollments have been the most significant barriers for them when they have considered teaching in the morning, and it was agreed that, if there were more student demand for courses in the morning (either because required courses were offered in the morning or as a result of requiring students to take some courses in the morning), more faculty would likely be willing to teach courses in the morning. Professor Umphrey noted that some colleagues with children might find it difficult to teach in the morning because of family obligations. President Marx commented that the College would incorporate consideration of needs in this area into its review of questions surrounding opportunities that should be offered to the community for daycare.

Continuing the conversation, Professor Basu suggested that departments could be urged to schedule required courses across timeslots; electives, on the other hand, could be scheduled in overlapping slots or within one or two slots, thereby limiting overlaps among required courses for a major within a department. The Committee also discussed the possibility of increasing the number of timeslots for seminars by allowing seminars to be taught on Fridays, as well as Wednesdays, and/or in the evenings, with an anticipated result being that students' access to these classes would be enhanced and the pressure for small classrooms for these courses would be eased. The Committee also discussed the possibility of offering First-Year Seminars in more than one timeslot, perhaps in morning slots (e.g., dividing First-Year Seminars among Monday/Wednesday 8:30 A.M., Wednesday/Friday 8:30 A.M., and Monday/Friday 8:30 A.M. slots, thereby requiring only two-thirds the number of classrooms on each day for First-Year Seminars and ensuring that each first-year student has at least one class out of the way before 10 A.M. every day). If this approach were taken, it would be important for other courses that first-year students typically take to be scheduled so as not to conflict with the seminars, it was agreed. Dean Call noted that scheduling First-Year Seminars in the morning would affect the schedule for other courses (particularly in multiple levels within languages, mathematics, and the sciences) for first-year students. Professor Umphrey expressed some concern that it might be difficult for faculty with young children to participate in the First-Year Seminar Program if the seminars were taught in the early-morning, while commenting that if it were possible to schedule courses at 9:00 A.M., it would be quite desirable for parents to teach at that time. The members also discussed the possibility of scheduling First-Year Seminars once a week for two-and-a-half hours, but Professors Basu, Ciepiela, and Umphrey said that they were disinclined toward adopting such a schedule, noting that first-year students, in particular, benefit from more frequent class meetings and opportunities for classroom interaction with their professors.

Professor Ciepiela asked whether the decision to implement some of the changes under discussion might be largely administrative. Professor Umphrey commented that the decision to change the schedule for First-Year Seminars, for example, seemed to be a purely administrative matter that would not require a faculty vote. The Committee agreed that, while some decisions about scheduling would be administrative ones, any proposals that resulted in changing or adding

Amended April 27, 2011

timeslots for class meetings would require a vote of the Faculty. Since the academic year is drawing to a close, the members wondered whether it might be best to bring the CEP's motions before the Faculty at this time and to charge the administration with developing additional scheduling proposals to bring to the Faculty. President Marx suggested that, if such an approach were taken, it would be important for the administration to be given parameters. For example, based on the discussion so far, the administration could be asked to develop proposals that would include a strategy for spreading classes with a history of having large enrollments across timeslots and/or that would result in all students, or perhaps just first-year students, taking classes on Friday mornings.

Professor Ciepiela stated that she preferred the measures being discussed, and the measures proposed by the CEP, to requiring departments not to reuse a timeslot until all had been used, a policy for which exceptions would have to be made when there were pedagogical reasons for departments offering multiple courses in the same timeslot. The members agreed that it would be informative to confer with the CEP about its rationale for considering but not recommending some ideas and, more generally, about whether the committee had considered some of the ideas that the Committee had been discussing. In addition, the Committee agreed to consider making additional proposals, if necessary.

The members spent the remainder of the meeting considering nominations for faculty committees.

The meeting adjourned at 6:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Gregory S. Call  
Dean of the Faculty

March 13, 2011

The Committee of Six  
Amherst College

Dear Colleagues:

I write on behalf of the Committee on Educational Policy on the issue of class scheduling. In April 2010, the Committee of Six created the Class Scheduling Task Force, and charged it “to explore mechanisms to increase Amherst students’ access to the full breadth of the College’s curriculum.” The task force was charged with “drawing up proposals, including new scheduling options, for consideration by the Faculty,” and with reporting their findings and proposals to the CEP. The full charge to the task force is included in its November 2010 report, which is appended. The CEP appreciates the thorough study conducted by the task force and the comprehensive report that it produced on a difficult issue.

It is clear that student access to the College’s course offerings is limited by our current unbalanced distribution of courses within the week. Beyond opening opportunities for students, there would be a second advantage to spreading our courses more evenly across the week: the possibility of minimizing the need for additional classrooms to support an expanding curriculum. The 2006 CAP report called for the introduction of 18 FTEs, which (barring changes in how classes are distributed across the week) will mean demand for classrooms will exceed supply at peak times.

The main problems with the current schedule are:

- There is too much clustering of courses in the middle part of the day, from 10:00 to 3:30, with a brief lull at noon.
- There are too few timeslots available for courses that are 80 minutes or longer.
- There are too few courses taught before 10:00 and on Fridays.
- Departments have too little information on how different timeslots are being used.

Our *Motion 1*, which appears below, proposes some changes in the times at which courses of different lengths can be offered. The slots on Tuesday and Thursday afternoons are adjusted to create a new 80-minute slot at 1:00, and new possibilities are created for scheduling longer classes on Tuesday and Thursday mornings and on Fridays.

We believe that better sharing of information on scheduling is vital and can go a long way to improving the use of underused slots. As described later in this letter, departments and faculty now have access to software that provides detailed information on course schedules over a number of semesters, including the preliminary schedules for future semesters. There should be two benefits: the ability to adjust schedules before they are finalized, and better understanding of the long-term trends.

It would be possible for the College to adopt policies that could dramatically improve our distribution of courses, including requiring that departments not reuse a slot until all have been used; requiring that departments move classes to Friday; expanding the teaching day by introducing evening classes; and requiring that more classes be taught in the late afternoon. However, we believe that there is no crisis that would justify adoption of measures that would significantly change the rules by which departments schedule courses or the hours at which courses can be taught. We instead urge departments in the strongest possible terms to take account of course clustering and the need to reduce conflicts for students.

We do hope that departments will avoid unnecessary reuse of timeslots and will make better use of Fridays. (The new slots that we propose in the morning and on Fridays should facilitate this.) We hope that voluntary steps will suffice, and we are unsure how a reasonable mandate could be constructed. There are often good reasons for scheduling multiple courses at the same hour. (For example, in some disciplines different levels of introductory courses are taught at the same hour. This causes no conflicts for students and permits shifts of students between levels, even after add/drop.) We do not believe that our course distribution problem is so severe that a mandate is necessary.

We also do not believe that the College should move in a significant way to introduce evening classes. Only the shift of numerous classes to the evening would affect the daytime scheduling problem, and this would unacceptably limit the academic options for students who participate in the performing arts. Evenings are used in other important ways, too, such as for lectures, departmental film screenings, and study sessions. On the other hand, we do not think that the exclusion of evening classes should be absolute, and we offer a carefully circumscribed expansion of evening courses in the proposals in our *Motion 2*. The goal is to give departments slightly more flexibility in scheduling their courses.

It would also be problematic to significantly expand teaching in the late afternoon. This part of the day is already heavily used, not just for athletics but also for departmental colloquia and events.

The Education and Athletics Committee wrote to the CEP twice (in 2008 and 2009) with requests concerning afternoon scheduling. The 2009 letter, which is attached, was passed on to the task force but received no formal response from the CEP. We would like to respond to their proposals now.

The first proposal is that weekday afternoons from 4:30 to 7:30 be kept as free as possible from required academic activity, and the second is that afternoon courses longer than 2 ½ hours begin at 1:30, not 2:00. The CEP believes that while these are reasonable requests, scheduling pressures make it impossible to institutionalize the informal division between the class day and the athletic day that occurs at 4:30 or 5:00. There will always be conflicts of all kinds present in the College schedule, and we think it would a mistake to reduce the length of the class day at a time when there are too many conflicts at peak times.

The scheduling proposals in *Motion 1* maintain the status quo on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday: courses of any length may begin at 2:00. In most cases, but not all, three-hour classes that begin at 2:00 are labs that have alternative meeting times.

Our proposal for Tuesday and Thursday interacts with athletics in a more difficult manner. To be a useful addition to the day, the new 80-minute slot at 1:00 should not be required

to overlap with courses that begin at 1:30 or 2:00. The majority of the CEP supports permitting courses of two hours or longer to begin at either 1:00 or 2:30, a proposal that is included in *Motion 1*. The difficulty, of course, is that 2 ½- and 3-hour classes could extend to 5:00 or 5:30 respectively. We anticipate that this is a question that the Faculty will want to discuss carefully.

To reiterate, we think that while the College has a scheduling problem, it is not a crisis. We believe that the mandates listed above are unnecessary at this time. If availability of classrooms becomes an issue, the College can reconsider ways of ensuring that all classes can be taught.

The CEP recommends that the Faculty approve the following two motions:

*Motion 1:* The Faculty approves the following times for courses:

**1. Monday - Wednesday - Friday:**

- 50-minute classes may be scheduled on the hour, at 9:00, 10:00, 11:00, 12:00, 1:00, 2:00, and 3:00. (A 9:00 class may start anytime between 8:30 and 9:00.)
- 80-minute classes may be scheduled at 8:30, 12:00, and 2:00, on Monday-Wednesday, Wednesday-Friday, and Monday-Friday. (A 12:00 class can start anytime between 12:00 and 12:30. A 2:00 class may start anytime between 2:00 and 3:00.)
- Longer classes of up to 110 minutes may be scheduled at 8:00 or at 2:00 or 2:30.
- Classes of two hours may be scheduled at 2:00 or 2:30.
- Laboratories, studios, and class meetings of longer than two hours may be scheduled at 2:00.
- On Fridays, any class longer than 80 minutes can begin as early as noon.

**2. Tuesday - Thursday:**

- 50-minute classes may be scheduled as follows:
  - 9:00, 10:00, 11:30, 1:30, 2:30, and 3:30.
  - The following alternative start times are acceptable: a 9:00 course may start at any time between 8:30 and 9:00; a 11:30 course may start between 11:30 and 12:00; and a 1:30 course may start between 1:00 and 1:30.
- 80-minute classes may be scheduled as follows:
  - 8:30, 10:00, 11:30, 1:00, 2:30
- Classes and laboratories of more than 80 minutes may be scheduled as follows:
  - Starting at 8:00 or later, and finishing by 11:20.
  - 2-hour meetings may start at 2:30.
  - Meetings longer than two hours may start at 1:00 or 2:30.

**3. The new schedule of 50-minute and 80-minute slots will begin in 2012-13. The new longer morning and Friday slots are available in 2011-12.**

4. Classes may be scheduled at times other than those provided above by permission of the Dean of the Faculty.

Discussion:

The motion above is a variation of one brought forth by the task force. We are enthusiastic, in particular, about the proposal to create a new 80-minute time slot at 1:00 on Tuesdays and Thursdays, sliding the slot currently at 2:00 to 2:30. We also support another of their recommendations, opening slots for long classes on Tuesday and Thursday mornings.

The motion does not include the task force recommendation to move the 50-minute slots on Monday, Wednesday, and Friday afternoons later by 30 minutes. Although shifting these slots later would resolve a three-way conflict in the middle of the day, where the 80-minute slot conflicts with both noon and 1:00 pm 50-minute classes, it would exacerbate conflicts with labs and athletics, and we are unconvinced that there would be enough benefit to make the shift worthwhile.

We agree with the task force that the College should abandon the currently authorized evening course slots for 80-minute courses (at 7:30 MW) and for multi-sectioned labs (at 7:00 MWTh). The 80-minute slots are never used, and multi-sectioned labs can be scheduled easily with permission of the Dean.

*Motion 2:* The Faculty endorses the following recommendations on course scheduling:

1. The Dean of the Faculty should apply the following guidelines when considering requests for courses at non-standard times:
  - The Dean should consider whether the course time creates new scheduling conflicts for students and whether alternatives to that course are available. (Classes that meet at least two times a week create new conflicts if the requested meeting times are split across distinct time slots, for example a class that meets Monday and Thursday morning or a class that splits between standard and nonstandard times.) Requests that create significant scheduling problems, and for which no alternative sections exist, should be turned down.
  - As much as possible, classes should avoid unnecessary conflicts with courses in regular blocks.
  - Classes scheduled to meet after 4:30 should, in general, be second (or higher) sections of multi-section courses, so that students have alternatives within the standard schedule.
  - Departments may be permitted to offer occasional electives in the evening, even if the same courses are not taught during regular hours. Departments should take care that they have sufficient elective offerings during regular hours to ensure that evening courses are not required for completion of the department's major. If a course is taught in the evening, the next offering of the same course should be during regular hours.
2. Departments have the authority to schedule classes into any regular slots, subject to



the availability of classrooms. They should strive to use the possible course times as fully as possible. In general, they should avoid reusing slots until they have used all the available slots for classes of that particular length. When possible, they should schedule large-enrollment courses (over 80 students) at non-peak times. Departments that use fourth hours should avoid scheduling them at peak times. Classes that meet five days a week should avoid using two blocks of peak times.

3. If the Registrar discovers that there are too many classes and not enough classrooms in a given time slot, he or she should consider the best way to match room capacities, configurations (lecture versus seminar), and technologies to class requirements. Priority may be given to classes scheduled within the standard schedule over classes scheduled at nonstandard times. If necessary the Registrar may contact departments to suggest alternative times and/or alternative rooms for individual courses.

4. The Registrar should report to the Faculty annually about course scheduling, assessing the College's efforts to balance its schedule and providing information about peak and non-peak times.

5. Instructors should give advance notice when a course has required events and meetings outside scheduled times, such as evening exams, film screenings, and field trips. If possible, notice should appear in the course description (e.g., "This course requires occasional attendance on Wednesday evenings."), but in any event should be announced on the first day of class.

### Sharing of Scheduling Information

The task force identified the lack of information about course scheduling to be an impediment to reducing the clustering problem, and we agree. We believe that there is substantial goodwill among the faculty on this question and that improved communication can make voluntary solutions possible.

A graphical computer program that displays courses, times, and enrollments for each semester since Spring 2010, is available at:

<https://www.amherst.edu/people/facstaff/lamcgeoch/scheduler>

The data for Fall 2011 is preliminary, with course enrollments based on either "target enrollments," submitted by departments, or on enrollment limits. Our hope is that, in future semesters, we can distribute preliminary data early enough that departments can adapt their own schedules to take advantage of low-enrollment slots in the overall schedule. We expect that the historical information on schedules, together with the opportunity to adjust schedules, will be useful in reducing clustering in future years.

### Summary

The College has a class scheduling problem, but not a crisis. We can do a better job ensuring that student academic choices are not unnecessarily limited because too many courses are taught in a few slots. The addition of a new 80-minute course slot and new options for longer

classes should help us improve the distribution of courses. The ability to offer occasional evening courses should give departments new flexibility and provide a small amount of relief in the daytime schedule, without greatly disrupting other evening activities.

The CEP believes that these relatively minor changes to our policies, together with voluntary efforts based on improved information, can greatly reduce the scheduling problem. The Committee will continue to monitor this issue in coming years and is hopeful that the College can achieve a better distribution of classes without needing to make any dramatic changes in its approach to scheduling.

Best regards,

Lyle A. McGeoch, for the Committee on Educational Policy:

Anthony Bishop  
Gregory S. Call  
Javier Corrales  
Heidi Gilpin  
Pranay Kirpalani '12

Rose Lenehan '11  
Rick Lopez  
Lyle A. McGeoch, Chair  
Andreas Shepard '11

Appendices:

1. New Course Grid (CEP Proposal)
2. Current Course Grid
3. Report of the Task Scheduling Task Force
4. Schedule A (Task Force Proposal)
5. Prose Version of Task Force Scheduling Proposal
6. November 2009 Letter from the Committee on Education and Athletics

# New Course Grid (CEP Proposal)

	MWF	MWF	MWF		TuTh	TuTh	TuTh
08:00 AM				08:00 AM			
08:30 AM				08:30 AM			
09:00 AM	50 min	80 min	2hr	09:00 AM	50 min	80 min	2hr
09:30 AM	50 min			09:30 AM	50 min		2hr
10:00 AM	50 min			10:00 AM	50 min	80 min	
10:30 AM				10:30 AM			
11:00 AM	50 min			11:00 AM			
11:30 AM	50 min			11:30 AM	50 min	80 min	
12:00 PM	50 min	80 min		12:00 PM	50 min		
12:30 PM			Friday ONLY	12:30 PM			
01:00 PM	50 min			01:00 PM		80 min	2hr
01:30 PM				01:30 PM	50 min		2hr
02:00 PM	50 min	80 min	2hr	02:00 PM	50 min	80 min	2hr
02:30 PM	50 min			02:30 PM	50 min	80 min	2hr
03:00 PM	50 min	80 min		03:00 PM	50 min		2hr
03:30 PM				03:30 PM		80 min	
04:00 PM			2hr	04:00 PM	50 min		2hr
04:30 PM			2.5hr	04:30 PM			2.5hr
05:00 PM				05:00 PM			2.5hr
05:30 PM			<b>KEY</b>	05:30 PM			
06:00 PM			3hr	06:00 PM			
06:30 PM			2.5hr	06:30 PM			
07:00 PM			2hr	07:00 PM			
07:30 PM			>= 2hr	07:30 PM			
08:00 PM			80 min	08:00 PM			
08:30 PM			50 min	08:30 PM			
09:00 PM				09:00 PM			
09:30 PM				09:30 PM			
10:00 PM				10:00 PM			

# Current Course Grid

	MWF	MWF	MWF		TuTh	TuTh	TuTh
08:00 AM				08:00 AM			
08:30 AM				08:30 AM			
09:00 AM				09:00 AM			
09:30 AM				09:30 AM			
10:00 AM				10:00 AM			
10:30 AM				10:30 AM			
11:00 AM				11:00 AM			
11:30 AM				11:30 AM			
12:00 PM				12:00 PM			
12:30 PM				12:30 PM			
01:00 PM				01:00 PM			
01:30 PM				01:30 PM			
02:00 PM				02:00 PM			
02:30 PM				02:30 PM			
03:00 PM				03:00 PM			
03:30 PM				03:30 PM			
04:00 PM				04:00 PM			
04:30 PM				04:30 PM			
05:00 PM				05:00 PM			
05:30 PM				05:30 PM			
06:00 PM				06:00 PM			
06:30 PM				06:30 PM			
07:00 PM				07:00 PM			
07:30 PM				07:30 PM			
08:00 PM				08:00 PM			
08:30 PM				08:30 PM			
09:00 PM				09:00 PM			
09:30 PM				09:30 PM			
10:00 PM				10:00 PM			

# Report of the Class Scheduling Task Force

November 20, 2010

**Kathleen Goff**

**Rose Lenehan '11**

**Catherine McGeoch**

**Catherine Sanderson**

## ***Introduction***

The Class Scheduling Task Force received its charge in April of 2010, and met regularly during the spring of 2010 and the fall of 2010. Our charge was as follows:

**The Committee of Six charges the Class Scheduling Task Force to explore mechanisms to increase Amherst students' access to the full breadth of the College's curriculum. The Committee of Six charges the task force with drawing up proposals, including new scheduling options, for consideration by the Faculty. The Committee asks that the task force consult broadly with the campus community, including the chairs of all academic departments, other members of the Faculty, students, members of the administration, Information Technology and Registrar's staff, and those who oversee and schedule co-curricular activities. The Committee of Six asks that the task force report its findings and proposals to the Committee on Educational Policy by November 1, 2010 and with the goal that proposals be brought to the Faculty for consideration at a Faculty Meeting no later than February 2011.**

To understand the issues involved and identify problems, we gathered information from various sources, including the following:

- Examined schedules and scheduling guidelines from several other schools including the 5-Colleges.
- Distributed a survey in May of 2010 to all students about scheduling issues and potential solutions.
- Analyzed scheduling and enrollment data from recent semesters.
- Held two open meetings with faculty to discuss scheduling issues and potential solutions.
- Met individually with departments and campus groups with particular scheduling concerns (including Art and the History of Art, Asian Languages and Civilizations, German, Music, Theater and Dance, the Science Steering Committee, and the Education and Athletics Committee).

- Reviewed information on classrooms and classroom utilization from the Shepley-Bullfinch Space Use Framework Study, dated April 2010.
- Met with the student senate.
- Met with administrators.

These meetings and discussions revealed various problems and concerns about the current schedule. These concerns included all of the following:

- Courses are unevenly distributed among course slots, reducing options for students.
- Many courses overlap two or more slots, which exacerbates conflicts for students. In some cases these overlaps are allowed by the current schedule of time blocks; in some cases overlaps arise due to courses taught at nonstandard times.
- Concerns were expressed at the number of courses and course-related activities (e.g., exams, screenings, and field trips) that are scheduled in times traditionally reserved for extra-curricular activities, including athletics (4:30 to 7:00 pm and weekends) and rehearsals and performances (after 7 pm and weekend evenings).
- Room use at peak times currently exhausts campus resources. If the College grows, or if classrooms are taken off line for maintenance or construction, this will become a crisis.
- Five College Deans would like to know if courses could be scheduled to facilitate Five-College exchanges.

We discussed the advantages and disadvantages of various solutions intended to resolve these problems. Our discussions included the following general areas:

- Making changes to the current class schedule to remove conflicts and to open up new time slots
- Expanding the current 8:30 am-4:30 pm footprint for class times (start classes at 8 am, and/or continue until 5 pm or later).
- Developing new class scheduling guidelines. Ideas included stricter enforcement of rules regarding nonstandard times, and strategies for encouraging departments to avoid bunching classes in peak times.
- Improving the flow of information about class scheduling, to departments from the registrar, from departments to the registrar, and among departments.
- Improving classroom usage (making our room use more efficient), and increasing the availability and usability of classrooms at the College.

## **A. Proposals**

Based on our extensive discussions with students and colleagues, as well as our review of course scheduling patterns over several years, we have a number of proposals to recommend to the faculty for adoption.

- 1) ***We recommend that a two-year trial period be established for the new schedule and policies we propose. At the end of that time an assessment should be made whether student access to the full breadth of the College curriculum has improved sufficiently.***

While we are optimistic that our proposals will improve availability of courses to students overall, there is no way to predict how new patterns of course schedules will develop in response to new time blocks and policies. If problems persist, it may be necessary to adopt additional policies that we outline in Section B of this report.

- 2) ***We recommend that the faculty adopt the new class time grid referred to in Appendix A as Schedule A.***

Schedule A (and its prose description *New Scheduling Guidelines*) makes a few changes to the current schedule, as follows:

- a) The 50-minute MWF classes are shifted by 30 minutes in afternoons. This eliminates a 3-way time conflict (with the very popular 12:30-2:00 time slot) that is allowed in the current grid.
- b) An additional 80-minute (2 times a week) class block is added TuTh 1-2:20. This addresses an observation in the Shepley-Bullfinch report, supported by our own analysis, that the number of 80-minute slots available is too low compared to the number of 80-minute classes offered.
- c) Classes, seminars, studios, and laboratories of more than 90 minutes may start at staggered times, beginning at 1:30 instead of 2:00 (finishing by 4:30). Additional time slots for these meetings are opened on Tuesday and Thursday mornings, Friday mornings, and earlier on Friday afternoons. Under the current schedule, all such classes begin at 2:00, which places significant constraints on departments with large proportions of studios, seminars, and labs. Despite the potential to increase conflicts at one peak time (TuTh 10 to 11:20), we believe that opening these additional slots will have little effect on the larger picture because the total number of these types of classes is relatively small.
- d) Evening time slots are no longer considered part of the standard schedule. We do not propose to eliminate these time slots; rather, we propose that evening and afternoon times be made available for course scheduling under certain restrictions outlined in Proposal 3.
- e) As part of the new schedule, we recommend that some classes be allowed to "slide" their starting times forward or backward, as long as no new time conflicts are introduced. For example a 12:30 MWF class could begin at 12:00 or even at 12:15. Sliding class times may be used to allow set up/tear down times for faculty members who must bring technical equipment or demonstration materials to class; to reduce the lunch-time rush at Valentine; or to allow a department to make a course more accessible to 5-College students. These alternative times are listed in the New Scheduling Guidelines.

- 3) ***We recommend that when a request to schedule a course at a non-standard time is made, the Dean of Faculty should consider whether that course time creates new scheduling conflicts for***

*students, and whether alternatives to that course are available. (Note that classes that meet at least two times a week do create new conflicts if the requested meeting times are split across distinct time slots (for example a class that meets Monday and Thursday morning, or a class that splits between standard and nonstandard times)). Requests that create significant scheduling problems (and for which no alternative sections exists) should be turned down.*

Creative scheduling is sometimes necessary to meet exigent circumstances: we believe the Dean should continue the current practice of allowing departments to schedule courses at nonstandard times (on request). However, we propose the following guidelines and restrictions.

- a) As much as possible, classes scheduled within the 8:30 to 4:30 footprint should avoid unnecessary conflicts with existing class blocks.
  - b) Classes scheduled to meet after 4:30 should be second (or higher) sections of multi-section courses, so that students have alternatives within the standard schedule.
- 4) *We recommend that the following steps be used to improve the flow of scheduling information at the College.*
- a) Every class that does not have an enrollment limit should have a **target size**, which represents the Department's best guess about the maximum expected enrollment for the class. The Registrar will use this information when assigning rooms to classes at the time of preregistration. This information will be provided when departments submit class schedules to the Registrar for the upcoming year.
  - b) The Registrar should regularly report to departments which times are to be considered "peak times" and "underused times" in the schedule.
  - c) Faculty members should give advance notice when a course has required events and meetings outside scheduled times, such as evening exams, film screenings, and field trips. Ideally this kind of notice should appear in the course description during pre-registration (e.g., "This course requires occasional evening attendance."), but should certainly be announced on the first day of class.
  - d) During the week before when class schedules are submitted to the Registrar, departments are encouraged to make their preliminary schedules available to one another (perhaps via a website or by email to interested department chairs) and to check for conflicts -- for example, between large introductory courses, courses that are similar and so expect to attract the same group of students, or courses that are required for significant numbers of double-majors). The IT department should be asked to facilitate the development of such a system.
- 5) *We recommend that the Faculty endorse the following guidelines for departments to use when setting class schedules. In all cases, exceptions may be allowed for reasons of pedagogy or to coordinate with other departments or academic programs.*
- a) A department should not re-use a time slot until all time slots have been used once.
  - b) Whenever possible, large-enrollment courses (over 80) should be scheduled at non-peak times.
  - c) Departments that schedule fourth hours should avoid scheduling the fourth hour at peak times. Classes that meet 5 days a week should avoid using two blocks of peak times.



- 6) *In cases where the Registrar discovers that there are too many classes and not enough classrooms for a given time slot, she considers the best way to match room capacities, configurations (lecture versus seminar), and technologies, to class requirements. Priority may be given to classes scheduled within the standard schedule over classes scheduled at nonstandard times. If necessary the Registrar may contact departments to suggest alternative times, and/or alternative rooms, for individual courses.*

This recommendation simply codifies current practice, which allows the Registrar to cope with scheduling and space problems when necessary.

## **B. Additional Measures**

Reasonable people can disagree – on the effect of a given policy, on how much change is needed, and on how to balance competing priorities. In this section we provide a list of additional measures that we do not (unanimously) support, and some recommendations that do not rise to the level of formal proposals. Our intention is to provide a useful framework for discussion, should the CEP or the Faculty wish to make adjustments to the policies we have proposed.

- 1) We do not recommend more dramatic schedule changes, such as expanding the standard academic day past 4:30 pm. The obvious advantage of expansion is that more course options are opened to students. The disadvantage is that expansion would interfere with students' (and faculty members') ability to participate in various academic and extracurricular activities, including department seminars, invited speakers, College-wide events, athletic practices, and music/theater rehearsals. A sizable proportion of Amherst students are involved in such activities.

We are persuaded that it is not reasonable to ask coaches of team sports to plan practices with positions missing, or directors to plan rehearsals with particular students missing. Nor is it reasonable to ask a student to choose between two majors (many students who major in music and/or theater and dance are double majors) or to forgo participation in varsity sports in some semesters. The athletic facilities and coaches, as well as rehearsal spaces and directors, are fully occupied Monday through Friday (and weekends), and these groups cannot "double up" on some days in order to avoid conflicts with classes on other days.

For these reasons we believe that afternoons and evenings should be available for class scheduling on a restricted basis. The Faculty may wish to discuss proposals for increasing (or reducing) the number and/or type of courses taught in afternoons and evenings. Here are three possible paths.

- a) Expand the standard schedule (time slots available without restrictions) to include some combination or subset of the times listed below.
- i) Classes may be taught on Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday from 4:30 to 6:30 pm.
  - ii) Classes may be taught on Sunday, Monday, Wednesday, or Thursday from 7:30 to 10:30 pm.
- b) Reduce (or expand) the restrictions on courses taught in afternoon or evening slots, by changing the Guidelines for the Dean in Proposal 3. For example, allow a course to be taught in

afternoons or evenings if it is one of several electives offered by a department in the semester (not just a second section). Or, restrict afternoon and evening classes to particular time slots or days of the week.

- c) Add restrictions on the use of these times for course-related activities such as exams, review sessions, screenings, and field trips (perhaps by targeting particular days).
- 2) The Faculty may wish to discuss additional mechanisms or incentives to ensure that departments do a better job of spreading courses across the schedule. The following observations led us to not make such recommendations.
- Counts of classes per time slot suggest that schedules are not dangerously out of balance at present. (We do note that student enrollments per time slot show much greater imbalances.)
  - Many departments and individual faculty members have expressed eagerness to schedule their courses in under-used time slots, but they need better information about which times would be suitable.
  - Many departments must schedule certain combinations of courses at the same time, or at particular hours of the day, to meet pedagogical constraints and to co-ordinate with other departments and programs.

For these reasons, we do not think stricter rules are necessary; and many departments would ignore such rules for good pedagogical reasons. However, should the College wish to pursue additional measures along these lines, the following ideas seem to be the most viable:

- a) Define a "special" time slot to be the first meeting time of the day (before 10:00), or the last meeting time of the day (after 1:30, or later, depending on class length). Departments offering fewer than 8 sections in a semester should schedule at least 1 section in a special time slot; departments offering 8 to 12 sections should schedule at least 2 sections in special time slots; departments offering more than 12 sections in a given semester should schedule at least 3 sections in special time slots. (Adapted from guidelines at Bowdoin.)
- b) Establish a quota system for proportions of classes that must be scheduled at under-used times; or that must be scheduled without repeating time slots. (Adapted from guidelines at Williams.)
- c) Authorize the Registrar to consider how well departments follow scheduling guidelines – for example, how many times a department has already used a given time slot – to establish priority when assigning rooms to classes. (Adapted from guidelines at UMass.)
- d) Assign "costs" to time slots (peak times cost more, under-used times cost less) and grant each department an appropriate number of "credits" to purchase time slots. (Adapted from guidelines at Oberlin.)

We have no recommendations for achieving better balance in student enrollments, except to open new time slots as outlined in Proposals 2 and 3.

- 3) We have no particular recommendations for facilitating 5-College exchanges, except to note that sliding course times may be used to shift particular courses by 15 or 30 minutes to accommodate travel times for 5-College students. We have examined the schedules for UMass and Hampshire College (the two institutions with smallest travel time from Amherst College) to understand how

their class times might interact with our proposed schedule. In particular we looked for courses that an Amherst student could take at another campus that would overlap with just *two*, but not *three*, Amherst class blocks. They are as follows:

- The UMass MWF schedule consists of 50-minute slots throughout the day, with 15-minute gaps between classes, so class times shift away from the hour. Allowing 20 minutes for travel time, an AC student could take a UMass course at the following times: 8:00 am, 11:15 am, 12:20 pm and 4:40 pm.
- The UMass TuTh schedule consists of 80-minute slots throughout the day, again with 15-minute gaps. An Amherst student could take a UMass course at the following times: 8:00 am and 4:00 pm.
- The Hampshire MWF schedule consists of 80-minute blocks throughout the day (until 10 pm) with a break for lunch. Assuming a 15-minute travel time each way, each class requires 110 minutes, which must necessarily overlap three AC class blocks. However, Amherst students can take courses at 4:00 pm, 5:30 pm, and 7:00 pm.
- The Hampshire TuTh schedule consists of 80-minute blocks with a shorter lunch break. An Amherst student could take courses at 12:30, 5:00, and 7:00 pm.

It should not be too difficult to perform a similar analysis for other schools and to make this information available to interested students.

- 4) In the course of our discussions, it has become clear that problems with classroom quality and availability sometimes impose significant constraints on departments' abilities to achieve their curricular and pedagogical goals. We make no formal recommendations because classroom issues are outside the charge given to our committee. However we believe these issues need to be addressed by the College in the near future, and encourage the administration, CEP, and Committee of Six to set up mechanisms by which such discussions can occur. Here are some observations and suggestions.
- a) Many classrooms are overcrowded, poorly equipped, or otherwise unattractive to use. A person or committee should be appointed to receive complaints about classrooms and to work to resolve problems. Individual faculty members and departments should be polled to learn what problems exist. The general goal should be to widen the *multi-purpose* usability of each classroom.
  - b) There is a significant mismatch between the distribution of class sizes taught and the distribution of room capacities available on campus. In particular there is an immediate need for at least 10 more classrooms sized for classes of 20 or fewer students.
  - c) The Shepley-Bullfinch long-term target of 60 percent utilization of rooms specifies 48 total general-use classrooms (the number we have). However they note that our *current* 50 percent utilization rate requires 58 classrooms, 10 more than we have. We believe their target is over-optimistic given that rooms and class formats are not interchangeable; also, some of their recommendations for achieving such a target are simply not practical.
  - d) We understand that the new science center may be able to alleviate some classroom pressures by providing more "right-sized" classrooms. However it is expected that the total number of classrooms available on campus will be reduced (by about 4 to 6) during that project, and the

total number of seats will not increase from present numbers when construction is completed. Assuming that the College continues with its planned growth in student and faculty counts, the current difficult situation regarding contention for classroom space will soon become a crisis.

- e) It will be necessary to find new classroom spaces to meet the looming crisis. Solutions may include repurposing rooms that are not currently being used as classrooms; making "department-owned" classroom spaces available to the Registrar for general use, making meeting rooms available for classes for a portion of the day or week; or installing temporary classroom structures.
- 5) Finally, we have noticed that the Registrar is in an impossible situation regarding the preregistration system and the current time-line for scheduling classes and rooms. She is asked to assign classes to rooms without sufficient information about enrollments, and then asked to find new rooms to accommodate large enrollment swings during the drop-add period. It is illegal (against fire code) to schedule a class into a room that is too small to contain it. Given the current insufficiency of classrooms at the College, and the increasing number of requests for rooms with specialized equipment, there is no margin for error in the current process --- yet errors in estimating class sizes are inevitable. We recommend that the CEP work with the Registrar to develop more effective strategies regarding preregistration, time-line, and room scheduling.

# Schedule A (Task Force Proposal)

	MWF	MWF	MWF		TuTh	TuTh	TuTh
08:00 AM			Friday ONLY	08:00 AM			
08:30 AM			Friday ONLY	08:30 AM			
09:00 AM	50 min	80 min	Friday ONLY	09:00 AM	50 min	80 min	3hr
09:30 AM	50 min			09:30 AM	50 min		3hr
10:00 AM	50 min			10:00 AM	50 min	80 min	3hr
10:30 AM				10:30 AM			2.5hr
11:00 AM	50 min			11:00 AM			2.5hr
11:30 AM	50 min			11:30 AM	50 min	80 min	
12:00 PM		80 min		12:00 PM	50 min		
12:30 PM	50 min		Friday ONLY	12:30 PM			
01:00 PM	50 min		Friday ONLY	01:00 PM		80 min	2.5hr
01:30 PM	50 min		2.5hr	01:30 PM	50 min		2.5hr
02:00 PM			2hr	02:00 PM			2hr
02:30 PM	50 min	80 min	2hr	02:30 PM	50 min	80 min	2hr
03:00 PM				03:00 PM			
03:30 PM	50 min			03:30 PM	50 min	80 min	
04:00 PM				04:00 PM			
04:30 PM				04:30 PM			
05:00 PM				05:00 PM			
05:30 PM			<b>KEY</b>	05:30 PM			
06:00 PM			3hr	06:00 PM			
06:30 PM			2.5hr	06:30 PM			
07:00 PM			2hr	07:00 PM			
07:30 PM			>= 2hr	07:30 PM			
08:00 PM			80 min	08:00 PM			
08:30 PM			50 min	08:30 PM			
09:00 PM				09:00 PM			
09:30 PM				09:30 PM			
10:00 PM				10:00 PM			

# Amherst College

## New Procedures for Scheduling Courses (Task Force Proposal)

### 1. Monday - Wednesday - Friday:

- 50 minute classes may be scheduled as follows:  
9:00, 10:00, 11:00, 12:30, 1:30, 2:30, and 3:30.  
The following alternative start times are acceptable: The 9:00 course may start any time between 8:30 and 9:00; the 12:30 course may start any time between 12:00 and 12:30.
- 80 minute classes may be scheduled at 8:30, 12:00, and 2:30, on Monday-Wednesday, Wednesday-Friday, and Monday-Friday.  
The 2:30 course may start any time between 2:30 and 3:00.
- 110 minute studios and laboratories may be scheduled in any combination of two of the following times: 2:30 Monday, Wednesday, Friday, and 8:00 AM Friday only.
- Laboratories, studios, and class meetings of 2 hours or longer may be scheduled in afternoons, to finish by 4:30:
  - 2 hour meetings start at 2:30 MWF
  - 2.5 hour meetings start at 2:00 MWF
  - 3 hour meetings start at 1:30 MWF
  - On Fridays only, any of these classes may start at an earlier time, but no earlier than 12:30.

### 2. Tuesday - Thursday:

- 50 minute classes may be scheduled as follows:
  - 9:00, 10:00, 11:30, 1:30, 2:30, and 3:30.
  - The following alternative start times are acceptable: The 9:00 course may start at any time between 8:30 and 9:00; the 11:30 course may start between 11:30 and 12:00; and the 1:30 course may start between 1:00 and 1:30.
- 80 minute classes may be scheduled as follows:
  - 8:30, 10:00, 11:30, 1:00, 2:30
- Classes and laboratories of 90 minutes or more may be scheduled as follows:
  - To start at 8:30 or later, and finish by 11:20.
  - To finish by 4:30:
    - 2 hour meetings start at 2:30
    - 2.5 hour meetings start between 1:30 and 2:00
    - 3 hour meetings start between 1:00 and 1:30

3. Classes may be scheduled at times other than those provided above by permission of the Dean of Faculty.

# Amherst College

## New Procedures for Scheduling Courses (Task Force Proposal)

### 1. Monday - Wednesday - Friday:

- 50 minute classes may be scheduled as follows:  
9:00, 10:00, 11:00, 12:30, 1:30, 2:30, and 3:30.  
The following alternative start times are acceptable: The 9:00 course may start any time between 8:30 and 9:00; the 12:30 course may start any time between 12:00 and 12:30.
- 80 minute classes may be scheduled at 8:30, 12:00, and 2:30, on Monday-Wednesday, Wednesday-Friday, and Monday-Friday.  
The 2:30 course may start any time between 2:30 and 3:00.
- 110 minute studios and laboratories may be scheduled in any combination of two of the following times: 2:30 Monday, Wednesday, Friday, and 8:00 AM Friday only.
- Laboratories, studios, and class meetings of 2 hours or longer may be scheduled in afternoons, to finish by 4:30:
  - 2 hour meetings start at 2:30 MWF
  - 2.5 hour meetings start at 2:00 MWF
  - 3 hour meetings start at 1:30 MWF
  - On Fridays only, any of these classes may start at an earlier time, but no earlier than 12:30.

### 2. Tuesday - Thursday:

- 50 minute classes may be scheduled as follows:
  - 9:00, 10:00, 11:30, 1:30, 2:30, and 3:30.
  - The following alternative start times are acceptable: The 9:00 course may start at any time between 8:30 and 9:00; the 11:30 course may start between 11:30 and 12:00; and the 1:30 course may start between 1:00 and 1:30.
- 80 minute classes may be scheduled as follows:
  - 8:30, 10:00, 11:30, 1:00, 2:30
- Classes and laboratories of 90 minutes or more may be scheduled as follows:
  - To start at 8:30 or later, and finish by 11:20.
  - To finish by 4:30:
    - 2 hour meetings start at 2:30
    - 2.5 hour meetings start between 1:30 and 2:00
    - 3 hour meetings start between 1:00 and 1:30

3. Classes may be scheduled at times other than those provided above by permission of the Dean of Faculty.



AMHERST COLLEGE  
Department of Religion

November 19, 2009

Dear Colleagues on the Committee on Educational Policy,

In May of 2008, the Education and Athletics Committee submitted to the CEP a proposal regarding the scheduling of academic commitments at the College (attached). Our understanding is that due to the chaotic circumstances surrounding the economic crisis that began at the start of the 2008-09 academic year, the CEP has not yet had the opportunity to respond to the proposal; we also understand that the CEP is due in the near future to take up the issue of the scheduling of academic commitments in a broader fashion. So we want to take advantage of the present moment to revisit the Committee's earlier proposal.

In 2008, the EAC's recommendation was that **the CEP take steps to keep weekday afternoons from 4:30 to 7:30 PM as free as possible from required academic activity**. This would effectively reserve the late-afternoon time slot for athletics and other co-curricular/extracurricular activities, and allow enough time for students to eat dinner and return to academics by 7:30 PM.

On reviewing current patterns in the scheduling of courses, we now wish to add a more specific proposal to the general recommendation of 2008: that **afternoon seminars that run longer than 150 minutes begin at 1:30 PM rather than at 2:00 PM**. This proposal remains in service of the project of reserving the late afternoon for extra-curricular and co-curricular activities, but takes into account the fact that there are significant differences between the way scheduling works with respect to science labs on the one hand and other types of courses on the other.

During the current semester (Fall 2009) 48 out of a total of approximately 610 regularly scheduled course meetings run into the 4:30-7:30 PM time slot. Of these 30 are science lab meetings (LAB), 15 are lecture/discussion meetings (L/D), and two are honors tutorials (TUT). The figures for the Spring of 2010 are similar (see attached lists of courses).

In view of these results, it might seem that addressing the scheduling of science labs would be more pressing than addressing the scheduling of lecture/discussion classes. But in fact, there are options for ameliorating conflicts between athletic commitments and science labs within the current scheduling regimen. Most large science courses offer multiple labs, and some science departments have in recent years taken care to ensure that some lab meetings will be available to students who have nonacademic commitments in the late afternoon. We therefore think that the best plan of action regarding conflicts between science labs and athletic commitments is to work with the heads of science departments to ensure that some lab meetings



will fall outside the 4:30-7:30 PM window for as many courses as possible, rather than to legislate a move of lab meeting times *en masse*.

This option is not available for courses that meet only one or twice per week in the same time slot. Of the lecture/discussion meetings that run into the 4:30-7:30 PM window during the current semester, ten are three-hour seminars that begin at 2:00 PM and meet once per week, four are late-afternoon classes in the performing arts that meet twice per week, and one is a humanities course that meets for 80 minutes in the late afternoon twice per week. To the extent that these results are representative of general scheduling patterns at Amherst, moving the start of three-hour seminars ahead would eliminate most of the current cases where non-science courses extend past 4:30 PM.

We understand that moving the seminar slot ahead would produce a new set of difficulties involving conflicts with early afternoon courses. We also understand that our proposal does not eliminate all potential for scheduling conflicts between athletic and academic commitments, and note in particular that we do not recommend that the option for instructors to schedule courses at times of their discretion, with the permission of the Dean of the Faculty, be eliminated. But we continue to believe that there would be significant value in the adoption of a scheduling policy intended to minimize conflicts between academics and athletics, and it seems to us that the proposal described above will have a significant positive impact at a relatively low cost.

Sincerely,

The Education and Athletics Committee

Suzanne R. Coffey, Physical Education and Athletics  
Andrew Dole, Religion, Chair  
Krystyn Elek, Class of 2010  
Donald Faulstick, Physical Education and Athletics  
Benjamin Garmezy, Class of 2011  
Carol Knerr, Physical Education and Athletics  
Ben Lieber, Dean of Students (*ex officio*)  
Christopher Linsmayer, Class of 2011  
Barry O'Connell, English  
Geoffrey Woglom, Economics