

Amended April 28, 2011

The thirty-fifth 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 25, 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 April 11 meeting and voted to approve them. The members turned briefly to a personnel matter. The Dean next reviewed with the Committee responses to invitations to Faculty to serve on faculty committees.

The Committee returned to personnel matters. Following those discussions, the members reviewed proposals for new courses and voted five in favor and zero opposed to forward them to the Faculty.

Conversation turned to the issue of class scheduling, and the members returned to their consideration of the possibility of bringing forward additional motions beyond the Committee on Educational Policy (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 eighty-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](#) (appended via link) for specific motions.)

The members reviewed the possible solutions to problems with class scheduling that they had developed at their last meeting, with the goal of enhancing students' access to the curriculum and easing pressures on classroom spaces. The members agreed that implementing some of their ideas would require a vote of the Faculty, while others could be considered by faculty committees and/or the administration and possibly implemented, when faculty votes were not required. Professor Rockwell noted that, before asking the Faculty to vote to implement some of the ideas—for example, requiring all students to take some classes in the morning or requiring first-year students to take classes on Fridays, he imagines that the Faculty would want to have data on the effects of taking such significant steps, before making a decision. Professor Rockwell suggested that, for some proposals, it would be necessary, in his view, to gather these data and to explore these ideas in greater detail, perhaps in the fall.

The members agreed on the value of making as much progress on the class scheduling front as is possible, while allowing enough time for evaluating proposals, as needed. The Committee decided to forward [motion one](#) (appended via link), which had been developed and forwarded by the CEP, to the Faculty, which will have the effect, among other things, of creating an additional eighty-minute timeslot on Tuesdays/Thursdays. In addition, most members agreed that it would be helpful to create an additional evening timeslot(s) to help free up time during the day for classes and offer students additional options. The Committee discussed the possibilities for days of the week to which an evening time slot could be added and that would interfere least with curricular and co-curricular activities, particularly the arts. The members felt that Sunday and Monday were the best possibilities, and, after discussion, agreed to put forward a motion, now called [motion two](#) (appended via link) that an additional timeslot be added on Mondays from 7 P.M. to 9:30 P.M. Sunday evenings, the members felt, were used by many faculty and students to prepare for classes and would be a less desirable time for class meetings as a result. No matter when evening timeslots were added, 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 evening activities. Professor Umphrey expressed some concern that adding an evening timeslot could have a negative effect on students' ability to participate in artistic practices and performances.

Amended April 28, 2011

Continuing the conversation, the members agreed that the First-Year Seminar Committee, in collaboration with the CEP and the administration, should be asked to explore a proposal to offer 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 ensuring that each first-year student has at least one class out of the way before 10 A.M. every day). The members reiterated that, if this approach were taken, it would be important for other courses that first-year students typically take (particularly in multiple levels within languages, mathematics, and the sciences) to be scheduled by departments so as not to conflict with the seminars. Distributing the seminars over more slots would be helpful in terms of easing the pressure on the small classrooms that are needed for First-Year Seminars, Dean Call noted, since only two-thirds the number of classrooms on each day would be required for First-Year Seminars.

The members next reviewed the substance that the CEP had put forward as motion two and agreed to retain the language as written, but to re-order the information and to divide it into [three motions](#) (appended via link). Professor Ciepiela suggested that some of the information included in these motion(s) appears not to require legislative action and to be largely instructive. The Dean said that it is his understanding that the CEP believes that there is value to having the Faculty endorse this set of recommendations, which will serve to advise the Dean, departments, and the Registrar, and that doing so would give additional weight to these directives.

Since the academic year is drawing to a close, the members agreed that it would be preferable to charge relevant faculty committees and the administration with developing scheduling proposals beyond these motions, which could be brought to the Faculty, when a vote to implement them would be necessary, presumably in the next academic year. In the context of the Faculty's consideration at the May 3 Faculty Meeting of the motions that the Committee had decided to place on the agenda, President Marx wondered whether it would be informative for the Dean to review other ideas that the Committee had discussed about class scheduling, and which might be researched and/or brought forward to the Faculty in the future. The Dean agreed to offer some remarks at the Faculty Meeting on this subject, and the Committee agreed to append via link its [list of proposals](#) to the minutes of today's meeting.

The Committee then voted on the substance of each motion and on whether to forward them to the Faculty. With the exception of the Committee's motion two, the votes were recorded as five in favor and zero opposed on substance, and five in favor and zero opposed to forward them to the Faculty. For the Committee's motion two, the vote on substance was recorded as four in favor, zero opposed, and one abstention (Professor Umphrey). The vote to forward motion two to the Faculty was five in favor and zero opposed. The members next voted on forwarding the Faculty Meeting Agenda for the meeting of May 3 to the Faculty. The vote was five in favor and zero opposed.

Discussion turned to the question of whether to continue the Mellon Senior Thesis Prize, which was created in 2009-2010 with a modest amount of funding that the College had received for one year only from the Mellon Foundation to encourage student research. To inform the conversation, the Committee had been provided with testimony from Gina Rodriguez '11, the first (and only) recipient of the prize, and Professor Frank, who advised her as part of the award, about their experience working together. Both Ms. Rodriguez and Professor Frank saw great value in the award, it was agreed. Upon the creation of the award, it had been decided that it would be awarded to a graduating senior (ultimately Ms. Rodriguez) who had completed an honors thesis that had been judged by his or her major department to be of exceptionally high quality. The winner would receive a \$2,000 stipend and \$1,500 toward living expenses in the summer after graduation, to enable him or her to spend the summer at Amherst doing work to

Amended April 28, 2011

turn the thesis into a publication, under the supervision of a faculty advisor. As part of the award, the advisor (ultimately Professor Frank) would be offered \$500, either as a grant toward research expenses or as an honorarium. Each department had been offered the opportunity to nominate one of its theses to be considered for the prize, and the winning thesis had been selected by the Committee of Six on the grounds of intellectual quality, originality, and potential for publication.

Professor Rockwell began the conversation about whether to continue the award by saying that he would not be in favor of doing so, expressing the view that, only rarely are theses of a quality and/or in a state or readiness that would make it possible for them to be revised over a summer and be fit for publication. In addition, he noted the difficulty of selecting one thesis from among the many that would be submitted, as comparisons and judgments can be challenging because of the range of subject matter and approaches. Professor Ciepiela questioned whether theses represented the best format to be considering, particularly in the humanities, if the purpose would be to encourage students to revise a piece of academic work over the summer after they graduate, with the goal of publishing it. She suggested that, in the humanities, it would be preferable for a student to focus on an outstanding seminar paper or essay that he or she had written, which might later be published as a journal article, for example. The members agreed that there would be field-specific differences in terms of the format of a student project that might be publishable after a summer spent working toward this goal. Professor Basu said that she would support a prize that would encourage faculty/student research collaborations, building on the College's initiatives in this area, over a summer after graduation. She noted that such an endeavor might result in a joint publication by the faculty member and student. The prospect of such a publication might serve as more of an incentive than a modest honorarium for a faculty member to serve as an advisor. Professor Loinaz expressed support for providing funding for seniors to pursue post-baccalaureate research with a faculty mentor. It was agreed that, if this prize continues, it should be awarded to a student who would build on a project that had already been undertaken, rather than pursuing a new project. The Dean, who said that he sees great value in student-faculty research collaborations of this sort, said that he could provide funding (a \$2,000 stipend and \$1,500 toward living expenses in the summer after graduation for the student to remain at Amherst for the summer and a \$500 grant toward research expenses or as a stipend for the faculty advisor) for up to three Post-Baccalaureate Summer Research Fellowships. It was decided that the Dean would solicit nominations of students for the fellowships from the Faculty, and that each department could nominate no more than one student. In addition to a letter of recommendation (which would describe the strengths of the student's project and speak to its potential for publication) from the faculty member who would serve as the student's advisor, the proposal to the Dean would include the paper, essay, or thesis on which the student planned to focus and the student's transcript. At the Committee's suggestion, the Dean agreed to ask the Faculty Research Awards Committee if its members would select the recipients of the fellowship.

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	2hr	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			KEY	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				12:00 PM	50 min		
12:30 PM	50 min	80 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	80 min	2.5hr
02:00 PM			2hr	02:00 PM	50 min		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			KEY	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

Motion 1

The Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) and the Committee of Six recommend that the Faculty approve the following motion:

The Faculty approves the following times for courses:

1. Monday - Wednesday - Friday:

- o 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.)
- o 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.)
- o Longer classes of up to 110 minutes may be scheduled at 8:00 or at 2:00 or 2:30.
- o Classes of two hours may be scheduled at 2:00 or 2:30.
- o Laboratories, studios, and class meetings of longer than two hours may be scheduled at 2:00.
- o On Fridays, any class longer than 80 minutes can begin as early as noon.

2. Tuesday - Thursday:

- o 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.
- o 80-minute classes may be scheduled as follows:
 - 8:30, 10:00, 11:30, 1:00, 2:30
- o 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.

Motion 1, cont.

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.

(On April 25, 2011, the Committee of Six voted 5 yes, 0 no, on content;
5 yes, 0 no to forward to the Faculty)

Motion 2

The Committee of Six recommends that the Faculty approve the following motion:

The Faculty approves the addition of a timeslot for classes on Mondays from 7 P.M. to 9:30 P.M.

(On April 25, 2011, the Committee of Six voted 4 yes, 0 no, 1 abstention on content;
5 yes, 0 no to forward to the Faculty)

Motion 3

The CEP and the Committee of Six recommend that the Faculty endorse the following recommendations on course scheduling:

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.

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.

(On April 25, 2011, the Committee of Six voted 5 yes, 0 no on content;
(5 yes, 0 no to forward to the Faculty)

Motion 4

The CEP and the Committee of Six recommend that the Faculty endorse the following recommendations on course scheduling:

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.

(On April 25, 2011, the Committee of Six voted 5 yes, 0 no on content;
5 yes, 0 no to forward to the Faculty)

Motion 5

The CEP and the Committee of Six recommend that the Faculty endorse the following recommendations on course scheduling:

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.

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.

(On April 25, 2011, the Committee of Six voted 5 yes, 0 no on content;
5 yes, 0 no to forward to the Faculty)

**The Committee of Six's Ideas that
Could Enhance Students' Access to the Curriculum
and Ease Pressures on Classroom Spaces**

- Create an additional evening timeslot(s) on Monday evening that would help free up time during the day for classes and would offer students additional options
(Motion Two, Faculty Meeting Agenda of May 3, 2011)
- Recast 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.
(Research options with the CEP. If desired, the CEP would bring a proposal forward for a faculty vote)
- Distribute large, popular classes throughout the day, including in the morning
(Using new software on class scheduling, encourage departments and ask the Registrar to monitor results)
- Require all students to take some classes in the morning
(Implementation would require a vote of the Faculty)
- Require all students to take classes on Fridays
(Implementation would require a vote of the Faculty)
- Require first-year students to take early-morning classes
(Implementation would require a vote of the Faculty)
- Encourage departments 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 the courses that students could take that are at the same level within a department.
(Encourage departments to do so, and ask the Registrar to monitor the results.)
- Increase the number of timeslots for once-a-week seminars by allowing seminars to be taught on Fridays, as well as Wednesdays, and/or in the evenings, with an anticipated result being that the pressure for small classrooms for these courses would be eased.
(Motion One addresses this issue in part. If the motion is passed, the Registrar would be asked to monitor results)
- Offer First-Year Seminars in more than one timeslot, perhaps in morning slots (e.g., divide FYS among MW 8:30, WF 8:30, and MF 8:30 slots, thereby requiring only 2/3 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 am every day).
(Ask the First-Year Seminar Committee to consider this idea)

- Spread classes with a history of having large enrollments across timeslots
(Using new software on class scheduling, encourage departments and ask the Registrar to monitor results)
- Require departments not to reuse a timeslot until all have been used, while recognizing that exceptions would have to be made when there were pedagogical reasons for departments offering multiple courses in the same timeslot.
(Research options with the CEP. If desired, the CEP would bring a proposal forward for a faculty vote)