Attached are the responses from the ten Senate committees that reviewed the December 17, 2015 *Class Times Proposal*. I transmit to you the comments in their entirety from the Committees on Academic Personnel (CAP), Affirmative Action and Diversity (CAAD), Admissions and Financial Aid (CAFA), Faculty Welfare (CFW), Educational Policy (CEP), Preparatory Education (CPE), Planning and Budget (CPB), Research (COR), Teaching (COT), and Graduate Council (GC). These responses specific to purview are fully communicated, in the hope that they can be remediated to the extent possible should the time slots change.

The Senate has been concerned regarding the very short time-frame for this review, and wonders if any other constituents have been consulted, most critically lecturers and students. Of paramount concern, on the current review schedule, the Senate is unable to meet as a body to consider the proposed changes before large lectures begin scheduling on February 4, 2016. We officially request that this meeting on February 4, 2016 be rescheduled to allow for the Senate to meet and discuss the proposal on February 12, 2016. If the Senate spends copious time on relatively small matters and then allows substantial changes to take place without notice or discussion, the faculty can over time lose faith in the consultative process.

The committee noted that UCSC does not offer campus child care services nor does it provide child care subsidies to help pay for these services off campus. The late class times combined with the absence of support for faculty with young children creates a climate that is not family friendly. Members also raised concerns about safety for students and faculty who will now be making their way to and from class later in the evening. The likelihood of injury to students and faculty due to having to navigate ever darker walkways are real and avoidable. If classes are to end later steps must be taken to ensure campus safety.

The later hours will also increase safety concerns, particularly if students have to endure long waits at bus stops. Campus police may well need to increase their rounds, and the campus may need to reinstitute the late-night checks it used to perform on cars and buses entering the campus. These two measures, along with increased campus shuttles, could prove expensive.
We have concerns over how these class time slots will be assigned and what considerations will be given in the allocation of slots. If done on a voluntary basis we are concerned that once the earlier more desirable time slots are filled by senior faculty, junior faculty and lecturers will feel pressured, if not be obliged, to “volunteer” for the later slots. For those with young children or with caretaker responsibilities this would prove difficult.

Summary and Conclusion
In summary, the Senate recommends that, in addition to implementing 1.a) and 1.b), a single additional teaching slot be introduced on MWF 4:00-5:05. We also reiterate that campus should strive to make fuller use of the currently existing late slots on MW (new time: 7:10-8:45 p.m.) and TTh (new time: 7-8:35 p.m.). The need to introduce a MW 9:00-10:35 p.m. and a TTh 8:50-10:25 p.m. time slot can be reevaluated annually, as their implementation would be relatively straightforward once the other changes have been put in place. At present, the added benefits of the late slots are highly unlikely to outweigh the significant costs, noted above.

On balance, the Senate is not supportive of the change in the final examination block which reduces from exam time from 3 to 2 hours though we would support expanding the examination days from 4 to 5. We also support an “opt-out” system in which instructors are asked to notify the campus if they will not be using the classroom for final examinations. We do not support an "opt in" requirement for securing a final exam slot.

We appreciate the need to address the planned enrollment increases for 2016-17 and beyond. The Senate hopes any class time changes will be only the first of multiple stages of logistical and enrollment management strategies that will best enable our academic programs and varied support structures to best guarantee student success and timely advancement toward degree.

Sincerely,

Don Brenneis, Chair
Academic Senate
Santa Cruz Division

Enclosures

cc: CP/EVC Galloway
    Chair Dean
    Chair Hu
    Chair Greenberg
    Chair Zachos
    Chair Tamkun
    Chair Elkaim
    Chair Rodriguez
    Chair Whittaker
    Chair Scott
    Chair Smith
Don Brenneis, Chair
Senate Office

RE: Standard Time Slots for General Assignment Classrooms and Finals

Dear Don:

CEP members discussed the revised course time proposal from Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education to reduce class meeting times and align the current class time slots to the UC standard. The committee agrees on the importance of this issue and generally supports increasing the number of time slots to accommodate more offerings of courses. Our campus does have a history of teaching longer courses due to our 5 unit courses. Perhaps UCSC should consider reducing course credits for and offering some elective courses just once a week?

We are concerned about a few aspects of the proposal, including the late night ending of the last classes on Monday through Thursday. Members found the MW 9:00 – 10:35 p.m. time slot unacceptable for faculty or graduate students, especially those with children, and the TuTh 8:50 - 10:25pm slot is only marginally better. The primary concern is that campus does not provide a childcare facility on campus for instructors that may teach these courses. Other members and student representatives expressed concerns about late night transport for students who live off campus and related safety issues. There should be consultation with Santa Cruz Metro Transit and additional UCSC shuttle buses to accommodate these later classes. This is especially important if there are any late night, large (300+) lectures. A single lecture can easily fill more than a single bus and the frequency of buses at this hour is greatly diminished. During the day, the frequency of the busses addresses this problem.

Student representatives pointed out that the passing time between classes is difficult now. While it is true that the current schedule only allows 15 minutes between classes on TuTh, this would extend the same challenges to the MW and MWF classes. This often results in classes starting late and additional loss of lecture time. Members agreed that this would be especially difficult for students that require transportation accommodations due to disability. There should be additional resources for students that require these accommodations.

The committee discussed other possible options such as weekend and early morning instruction. Saturday instruction may not be possible for some students who work. In addition, certain religious denominations may have problems if courses are scheduled for Saturday (or Sunday). Weekend and early morning instruction may also have daycare issues for single parent instructors or graduate students similar to the late night courses.

Both committee members and student representatives were generally supportive of the change in the final examination block which reduces from exam time from 3 to 2 hours and expands the examination days from 4 to 5.

Sincerely,
SANTA CRUZ: OFFICE OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

John Tamkun, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy

cc:  CAAD Chair Greenberg
     CAP Chair Dean
     CAFA Chair Hu
     CFW Chair Zachos
     CPB Chair Rodriguez
     CPE Chair Elkaim
     COR Chair Whittaker
     COT Chair Scott
     GC Chair Smith
RE: VPDUE Proposal: Time Slots for General Assignment Classrooms and Finals

Dear Don,

The Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) discussed Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education (VPDUE) Hughey’s proposal for Class Times and Final Exam Block Reductions at its meeting of January 14, 2016. Before moving to our response, we would like to remark on the desirability of this matter being brought up for a discussion, and possibly a vote, at the next Academic Senate meeting. If the Senate spends a lot of time on relatively small matters and then allows substantial changes to take place without notice or discussion, the faculty can over time lose faith in the consultative process.

The proposal divides its recommendations into two items. We would like to further subdivide each of these items into its constituent elements in order to respond more effectively:

1. a) a reduction in class meeting time by 5 minutes for courses that meet three times a week, and 10 minutes for those that meet twice a week, for a total reduction of 15 minutes a week for MWF classes and 20 minutes for MW and TTh time blocks.
1. b) a reduction in transit times for MW/F courses from the current 20 to 15 minutes.
1. c) the addition of three new time slots for instruction. The completely new (not just rescheduled) slots are as follows:
   1) MWF 4-5:05 p.m.
   2) MW 9-10:35 p.m.
   3) TTh 8:50-10:25 p.m.

2. a) a reduction in the time block for final examinations from 3 to 2 hours
2. b) an increase in the number of days set aside for final examinations from 4 to 5 days.
2. c) the introduction of an “opt-in” system for final examinations.

We appreciate and are concerned about the pressure on classroom space -- especially for high-enrollment courses -- that is driving these proposals. We realize that with anticipated increase in numbers of students mandated by the Office of the President, these pressures are only likely to worsen. So all our deliberations were conducted with these needs in mind. As befits our committee’s charge, we focused primarily on the resource implications of these proposals.

1.a) and 1.b): We support these changes. The proposal for a reduction in class times by 5 or 10 minutes per class, depending on the numbers of days of instruction, and the reduction in transit times on MWF from 20 to 15 minutes seem to us to have only very limited resource implications, taken in and of themselves. As discussed in the proposal, the reduction in class times would align UCSC practices in terms of class contact hours per credit with those of other UC campuses. Furthermore, current campus practice is to allow for 15 minutes of transit time on TTh, so we do
not foresee major complications with extending this practice to MWF. If any, the main effect of these changes might be that campus shuttles will need to be run slightly more frequently during class-change times (which could be compensated for by running them slightly less frequently at other times).

1.c): If the changes in 1.a) and 1.b) are implemented, we see no problem with the introduction of an additional time slot on MWF 4-5:05.

However, during our discussions it quickly became apparent to us that running courses much later into the night than is currently the case -- until 10:35 p.m. on MW (versus 8:45 p.m. at present) and until 10:25 p.m. on TTh (versus 9:45 p.m. at present) raises a series of challenges and potential additional costs for the campus. Not only would campus shuttles need to be run more frequently and until later in the evening, but the campus would also probably need to negotiate more late-evening city bus runs to the campus with the Santa Cruz Metropolitan Transit District. Currently, the number of buses per hour falls off significantly at later hours. This is a concern because it could make it difficult for students to get home -- many of them have still further journeys to make once they arrive at the Transit Center downtown, especially now with students living ever farther afield because of housing shortages and increased rents in the immediate Santa Cruz area. Not all students can afford cars. So we cannot plan late-evening course times on the assumption that students can park close to their classrooms.

The later hours will also increase safety concerns, particularly if students have to endure long waits at bus stops. Campus police may well need to increase their rounds, and the campus may need to reinstitute the late-night checks it used to perform on cars and buses entering the campus. These two measures, along with increased campus shuttles, could prove expensive.

As the previous Senate response to the 2012 proposal for changing class times pointed out, later classes will also extend the hours in which Instructional Technology support is needed. Especially if we schedule large-enrollment courses in these late hours, faculty will need emergency help available if sudden problems with classroom technology emerge.

To again revert to the 2012 Senate response, these new, later hours could conceivably trigger contract negotiations with represented employees (Lecturers and Teaching Assistants), who are also the ones most likely to find themselves assigned these late-evening time slots. The extension of the total workday that is being proposed could well be construed as constituting a significant change in terms and conditions of employment.

Finally, the addition of these new, later class times could work against the considerable (and wise) investment the campus is currently making in student success. The students most likely to have 8 a.m. required courses -- namely new entering students -- are also the ones most likely to be slotted into late-evening sections. Having an instructional day that is extended to 14.5 hours could pose an additional challenge to this vulnerable population as it attempts to adjust to life on a college campus.

CPB became less convinced of the utility of adding late-night time slots for courses after we carefully checked over current and past Schedules of Classes. Our research (which focused on
lectures and did not include laboratories) shows that the latest of the currently available time slots (TTh 8-9:45 p.m.) is only minimally utilized. This quarter, there is only one small class (23 students) offered during this time block. Going back to 2012, there have never been more than at most 4 courses per quarter offered during this time slot. (See attached). Out of a total of 24 courses over 11 quarters, only 6 have had more than 100 students, and only 2 more than 200. The MW 8-9:45 pm slot is also underutilized, although not as much so as the TTh 8-9:45 p.m time. CPB believes that before we move to implement two additional late time slots on MW and TTh, we should first make full use of the current late-evening slots. This would be facilitated by the implementation of 1.a) and 1.b), which would make the seventh TTh slot more desirable by moving it earlier, from TTh 8-9:45 p.m. to TTh 7:00-8:35 p.m.

In summary, we recommend that, in addition to implementing 1.a) and 1.b), a single additional teaching slot be introduced on MWF 4:00-5:05. We also reiterate that campus should strive to make fuller use of the currently existing late slots on MW (new time: 7:10-8:45 p.m.) and TTh (new time: 7-8:35 p.m.). The need to introduce a MW 9:00-10:35 p.m. and a TTh 8:50-10:25 p.m. time slot can be reevaluated annually, as their implementation would be relatively straightforward once the other changes have been put in place. At present, the added benefits of the late slots are highly unlikely to outweigh the significant costs.

2. b) CPB supports the increase in the days scheduled for final examinations from four to five, as proposed. Indeed, the UCSC campus long had a five-day final exam schedule.

2.c) We also support an “opt-out” system in which instructors are asked to notify the campus if they will not be using the classroom for final examinations. We do not support an "opt in" requirement for securing a final exam slot. We can easily see faculty members overlooking this requirement and losing their exam space, which could be a pretty severe blow to someone teaching a large class. If the campus were to go to an "opt in" process, the Registrar would need to email faculty clearly and repeatedly requesting that faculty reserve their rooms, and with clearly stated deadlines (in the subject line of the email) for doing so. Also, unlike teaching time preferences (which need to be provided many months in advance), the deadlines for “opt-in” should be set well after the quarter has started to accommodate necessary last-minute changes, e.g. a course where the end-of-quarter requirement is shifted from a final paper to a final examination because of unexpectedly high enrollments and/or inadequate TA support.

2. a) We do not support the decrease in scheduled time for final examinations from 3 to 2 hours. First, it is not necessary because a five-day finals schedule could accommodate a total 4 additional slots for final exams, which would be enough even if the campus proceeded, against our recommendations, to add the two late-evening slots on MW and TTh. Secondly, all faculty currently have the freedom to offer shorter final examinations should they wish to do so. Thirdly, increased student numbers and worsening student/faculty student/TA ratios have led many programs that typically rely heavily on papers for assessing student performance and evaluating learning outcomes to shift instead to essay final exams. Since students write at such variable speeds, three-hour time slots remain desirable or even necessary for such courses. As for accommodating students with disabilities: faculty learn early in the quarter if they have students needing more time to take an exam and can plan accordingly.
In sum, CPB supports many of the recommendations of the VPDUE’s report -- the shortening of class and transit times, the addition of the MWF 4-5:05 time slot, the scheduling of final examinations over five rather than four days -- but has serious reservations about or opposes others. We do not feel that it is yet time to add late-evening time slots on MW and TTh, though that might become necessary at some point in the future, and we do not see a strong rationale for shortening final exam time blocks while we can imagine arguments against doing so.

We would also like to weigh in with a final observation: the fact that the campus finds itself confronted with this difficult set of choices as it deals with increased student numbers reflects a failure of long-term capital planning. The need for a new classroom building, and especially for more large-enrollment classrooms, has been clear for over a decade, yet as far as we are aware such a structure has never reached the top of the campus list of building priorities.

Our thanks to the VPDUE for providing such a thoughtful set of proposals that are, from what we can discern from past documents, much clearer and more streamlined than the earlier 2012 recommendations. This made it much easier for us to respond to them as a committee. We are also grateful for his willingness to boldly tackle this complex set of issues.

Sincerely,

Abel Rodriguez, Chair
Committee on Planning and Budget

Enc: Appendix A: Courses TTH 8-9:45pm Schedule of Classes W2016-F2012
Appendix B Courses In Each Time Block: Schedule of Classes W2016

cc: CAP Chair Dean
CAFA Chair Hu
CAAD Chair Greenberg
CFW Chair Zachos
GC Chair Smith
COR Chair Whittaker
COT Chair Scott
CPE Chair Elkaim
CEP Chair Tamkun
APPENDIX A to CPB Response to Class Time Change Proposal

USAGE OF TTh 8-9:45 P.M.
TIME SLOT
Winter 2016 back to Fall 2012

Prepared January 15, 2016

Winter 2016
1 course
23 students -- CROWN 80A

Fall 2015
2 courses
298 students -- AMS 7
11 students -- WRIT 169

Spring 2015
2 courses
7 students -- HISC 139B
21 students -- WRIT 2

Winter 2015
3 courses
153 students -- CMPE 110
16 students -- CROWN 80A
21 students -- WRIT 2

Fall 2014
4 courses
131 students -- CMPE 110
141 students -- MATH 3
18 students -- WRIT 23
26 students -- WRIT 169

Spring 2014
4 courses
83 students -- CRES 10
22 students -- WRIT 2
15 students -- WRIT 2
25 students -- WRIT 2

Winter 2014
1 course
22 students -- WRIT 2
Fall 2013
2 courses
  313 students -- LALS 1
  19 students -- WRIT 169

Spring 2013
2 (listed as 3) courses
  144 students -- AMS 10/10A  (meet in same room at same time)
  14 students -- WRIT 2

Winter 2013
3 courses
  79 students -- AMS 79
  20 students -- CROWN 80F
  25 students -- LTMO 190N

Fall 2012
0 courses listed
APPENDIX B to CPB Response to Class Time Change Proposal

WITH NUMBERS OF COURSES IN EACH SLOT
Winter 2016
Prepared Jan. 18, 2016
(N.B.: Student enrollment nos. can vary slightly day by day)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Slot</th>
<th>Courses Total</th>
<th>Students Range</th>
<th>MW/F Total Slots</th>
<th>Time Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MWF 8:00-9:10 a.m.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2 - 275+</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8 a.m. to 8:45 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - 200-274</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 150-199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - 100-149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW/F totals:</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>339 classes total</td>
<td>339 / 8 = 42.4 avg courses per slot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWF 9:30-10:40 a.m.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2 - 275+</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 200-274</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 150-199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 - 100-149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWF 11:00-12:10 p.m.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3 - 275+</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 200-274</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - 150-199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 100-149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWF 12:30-1:40 p.m.</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2 - 275+</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - 200-274</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 150-199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 - 100-149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWF 2:30-3:40 p.m.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2 - 275+</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 - 200-274</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 - 150-199</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 - 100-149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MWF 3:30-4:40 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
43 classes total
2 -- 275+ students
2 -- 200-274 students
3 -- 150-199 students
3 -- 100-149 students

MW 5-6:45 p.m.
47 classes total
2 -- 275+ students
1 -- 200-274 students
0 -- 150-199 students
5 -- 100-149 students

MW 7-8:45 p.m.
13 classes total
0 -- 275+ students
2 -- ca. 200 students
1 -- 150 students
1 -- 98 students

There is currently no MW 9-10:45 slot

TTh 8-9:45 a.m.
42 classes total
1 -- 275+ students
1 -- 200-274 students
3 -- 150-199 students
5 -- 100-149 students

TTh totals: 7 time slots
8 a.m. to 9:45 p.m.
387 courses total
387 / 7 = 55.3 courses avg

TTh 10-11:45 a.m.
92 classes total
3 -- 275+ students
2 -- 200-274 students
3 -- 150-199 students
3 -- 100-149 students

TTh 12-1:45 p.m.
84 classes total
4 -- 275+ students (one in Music Center 101)
2 -- 200-274 students
1 -- 150-199 students
6 -- 100-149 students
TTh 2-3:45 p.m.
    72 classes total
    4 -- 275+ students
    2 -- 200-274 students
    2 -- 150-199 students
    5 -- 100-149

TTh 4-5:45 p.m.
    68 classes total
    1 – 275+ students
    1 -- 200-274 students
    3 -- 150-199 students
    4 -- 100-149 students

TTh 6-7:45 p.m.
    24 classes total
    1 -- 275+ students
    0 -- 200-274 students
    0 -- 150-199 students
    4 -- 100-149 students

TTh 8-9:45 p.m.
    1 class total
    with 23 students (Crown 80A)

CURRENT FINAL EXAM TIME SLOTS: 4 days of exams, 4 each day = 16

8-11 a.m.
12-3 p.m.
4-7 p.m.
7:30-10:30 p.m. (14.5 hours of exams each day)

Current exam slot needs: 15 + 1 (for unconventional classes) = 16

PROPOSED FINAL EXAM TIME SLOTS: 5 days of exams, 4 each day = 20

Same schedule as above

Exam slot needs under the new proposal: 18 + 1 (for unconventional classes) = 19
Re: Changing Standard Time Slots for Classrooms and Finals

Dear Don,

The Committee on Teaching (COT) had a lively discussion about VPDUE Hughey’s proposed changes to standard time slots and finals. In this discussion a clear message emerged that classroom capacity, while a pressing reality, is poor motivation for enacting such changes without wider consultation with instructors and students regarding the impact of such changes. We delineate our concerns and offer suggestions below:

1. Extending the instructional day until 10:35pm
A number of concerns were voiced by committee members, including our undergraduate student representative, that ranged from instructional impact to safety. Pedagogically, teaching a class that begins after 8:30 will likely impact student learning, attendance, and the quality and dynamic of the class. Scheduling classes this late in the evening could also be seen as a lack of compassion for families and single parents whose daycare would not cover evening hours. Such a change might have a disproportionately negative effect on lecturers who often have little input into their scheduling and will bear the brunt of this change.

Furthermore, COT is concerned about student safety, particularly for students tempted to walk home alone this late at night. We would like to learn if there will be additional bus services for transportation or escort services available for these students. Other resource issues were also raised, including the need for IT support for these classes.

The COT would like the VPDUE to seriously consider Saturday classes as an alternative to meet the immediate need to increase classroom capacity. In addition, we suggest a survey of faculty and students to determine their willingness to teach and/or consider taking late night or Saturday classes, and creation of an incentive to attract faculty to teach at these times.

2. Reducing the amount of time spent in class and passing time between classes.
The reduction of contact minutes per unit to align with system-wide standards seems reasonable, and the feeling of the committee was that most instructors could adjust their teaching to fit this norm. However, the committee questioned why there are no MW time slots before 5:00pm and wondered about the possibility of offering such WF classes. We assume that the VPDUE considered scheduling changes such as these in creating his proposal.
The reduction of passing time to fifteen minutes on all days raised concern with the growth of tardiness given the current passing time, particularly with reduced overall contact time. We encourage the increase of buses to transport students more efficiently, the reinstatement of buses through the core of campus and increased facilitation of traffic and pedestrian interface at intersections. It was also noted that there would be decreased time available to fix IT issues between classes if or when they occur.

3. Changes to the final exam schedule.
We note that the change from a three-hour time period to two hours for final exams can potentially increase the numbers of examinations students are taking on any particular day. While students with three exams scheduled for the same day are able to shift their exams with the permission of their instructors, this change is likely to increase number of students who need such accommodations, placing an additional burden on faculty to coordinate exam scheduling with these students.

We agree that increasing the scheduled final exam days will help alleviate issues of overcrowding, and note that increasing the window to 6 days would provide even more flexibility while still allowing three hour time slots. Again, we note that Saturday could be included in this schedule. We also discussed the value of obtaining information from faculty at the beginning of each quarter regarding their plan to use the classroom space allocated for final exams. A simple survey would allow administration to know whether an instructor was planning to give an in-class exam or would be requiring a final paper, take-home exam, or another alternative that could release their class space to another user. Regardless, the COT emphasizes that finals given after 8:00 pm are problematic.

Thank you for this opportunity to respond to the proposed changes in scheduling. We consider this proposal, particularly the extension of time slots, as a stop-gap measure, implemented as a temporary solution to larger structural issues. We would like more faculty input and discussion before any such proposal becomes permanent.

Sincerely,

Judith A. Scott, Chair
Committee on Teaching

cc: CAP Chair Dean
    CAAD Chair Greenberg
    CAFA Chair Hu
    CFW Chair Zachos
    CEP Chair Tamkun
    CPE Chair Elkaim
    COR Chair Whittaker
    GC Chair Smith
Don Brenneis, Chair
Academic Senate

RE: Standard Time Slots for General Assignment Classrooms and Finals

Dear Don,

At its meeting of January 14, 2016, Graduate Council reviewed Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education (VPDUE) Hughey’s proposal on changes to standard classroom time slots, passing times, and final exam block time.

The Council recognizes that the expected large increase in the size of the undergraduate class in the coming academic year necessitates solutions to address classroom capacity issues our campus faces. The Council also recognizes that some elements of the proposal aim to address the issue of instructor contact time per course unit. The Council, however, also expressed concerns about the proposal, particularly around issues of pedagogy, student safety, and the potential negative impact on graduate students.

Members raised extensive concerns about graduate student safety and the potential impact on graduate students of extending classroom time to 10:35 at night. Graduate students typically have little to no choice about the scheduling of section times, and the Council is concerned that graduate student-led sections may be disproportionately scheduled for these later time slots. This raises additional concerns about graduate student safety, which are compounded by transportation issues with bus transportation in particular being extremely limited after 10:35. Late evening classes would also present equity issues for students with children and family responsibilities. The Council discussed that perhaps an earlier daily start time may present a more workable solution than a later end time in terms of safety, but might still disproportionately impact students (and faculty) with children and families.

The Council also expressed some concern about the impact of reduced classroom contact time and final exam time on pedagogy and student success. The proposal to reduce class times to be more in-line with UC averages is not in itself unreasonable, but it should only be considered with full deliberation of the instructional costs and benefits, including possible impacts on student success. Similarly, reducing the final exam time may be appropriate for some courses, but not others, and may disadvantage students who may need additional support and/or cannot finish their exams quickly.

Finally, Council concurs with the potential utility of moving from a 4-day to a 5-day examination schedule, and using the Curriculum Management system to allow instructors to ‘opt in’ for scheduling a final exam so as to more effectively utilize available class rooms.

In sum, the Council recognizes the gravity of classroom capacity challenges on our campus and the need for solutions to this issue in the very near term. Nonetheless, we are concerned that the pressing nature of these challenges may not allow for sufficient deliberations of the costs and
benefits to graduate students and the campus as a whole. Thus, if these changes are enacted, we implore the campus administration to attend closely to their potential deleterious effects and take proactive and ongoing steps to mitigate them.

Sincerely,

Donald Smith, Chair
Graduate Council

cc: CAP Chair Dean
    CAFA Chair Hu
    CAAD Chair Greenberg
    CFW Chair Zachos
    CPB Chair Rodriguez
    COR Chair Whittaker
    COT Chair Scott
    CPE Chair Elkaim
    CEP Chair Tamkun
Don Brenneis, Chair
Academic Senate

Re: Proposed Standard Time Slots for Classrooms and Finals

Dear Don,

In its meeting of January 13, 2016 CAFA reviewed VPDUE Hughey’s proposal to increase class time slots, reduce class times, and reduce the final exam block. The committee is cognizant of the need to open up space for additional class time slots and observes that contact time is an area where adjustments might be made. While CAFA discerns the urgency of the situation, the reduction in contact hours and the later class time slots raise concerns.

Reducing contact hours is an option that CAFA views with apprehensive resignation. Committee members recognize this need to act, and that options must be explored to open up instructional space to accommodate the increasing numbers of students expected in the next few years as a result of system wide enrollment growth mandates. There is a need for space, but the committee is concerned that the student experience at UCSC will suffer as a result of this proposal.

CAFA has reservations regarding the scope of class times proposed by VPDUE Hughey. According to the proposal, standard instruction would range from 8:00 a.m. to 10:35 p.m. M-TH. Members are concerned about how the later class times will impact faculty, lecturers, and students with young children. The committee noted that UCSC does not offer campus child care services nor does it provide child care subsidies to help pay for these services off campus. The late class times combined with the absence of support for faculty with young children creates a climate that is not family friendly.

Members also raised concerns about safety for students and faculty who will now be making their way to and from class later in the evening. The likelihood of injury to students and faculty due to having to navigate ever darker walkways are real and avoidable. If classes are to end later steps must be taken to ensure campus safety.

The committee also considered the proposal to reduce the final exam block from three hours to two hours. The committee expressed that a reduction in the final exam block would disadvantage some students who need the extra time to complete the exam, and that the campus as a whole may see an increase in requests for DRC accommodations, which would also impact the graduate students who proctor these exams. The committee supports the proposal for “opt-in” final exam scheduling.
CAFA recognizes and appreciates the facility related limitations facing the campus and understands the need to create instructional space. The committee is concerned about the potential negative impacts to students and faculty, particularly around equity, safety and the overall impact on student experience. We would like to emphasize that these impacts are to be felt across classes of all sizes on campus even though the underlying cause involves only the largest classes and classrooms. These potential negative impacts should be fully evaluated before adding late evening classes and reducing the final exam block.

Sincerely,

Minghui Hu, Chair
Committee on Admissions and Financial Aid

Cc: CAAD Chair Greenberg
    CAP Chair Dean
    CEP Chair Tamkun
    CFW Chair Zachos
    COR Chair Whittaker
    COT Chair Scott
    CPB Chair Rodriguez
    CPE Chair Elkaim
    GC Chair Smith
Re: Standard Time Slots for General Assignment Classrooms and Finals

Dear Don,

During its meeting of January 14, 2016, the Committee on Academic Personnel (CAP) reviewed Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education (VPDUE) Richard Hughey’s proposal for standard time slots for classrooms and finals. In his letter to the Senate of December 17, 2015, VPDUE Hughey requests input on the following two items:

1. Reduction of class meeting time to UC standard, reduction of passing time, and a 20% increase in time slots, with standard instruction ranging from 8:00 a.m. to 10:35 p.m.
2. Reduction of standard final examination block to 2 hours, and increase in offering days.

CAP does not oppose either of the VPDUE’s proposals on the basis of their likely impact on the personnel process. We do, however, have some reservations regarding various aspects of the proposals, which are discussed below.

As indicated in CAP’s response to a proposal made to increase the number of Class Time Slots in May, 2012, CAP members find it important that UCSC faculty teach approximately the same number of hours per unit as faculty at other UC campuses. CAP thinks it appropriate that UCSC’s class time schedule reflects the norms around the UC system.

As individual faculty, CAP members were not sanguine about the late teaching slots for Monday-Wednesday and Tuesday-Thursday classes, citing safety concerns and work-life balance. Additionally, and importantly, 8:50–10:25 p.m. and 9–10:35 p.m. are not optimal times for learning (or instructing), and so we suspect that student evaluations will be less positive for courses taught in those time blocks. We trust that future CAPs will take this into consideration when evaluating teaching, just as CAP currently understands that many students find 8 a.m. courses undesirable.

CAP also recognizes that the decrease in class time, both per class period and over the course of the term, will necessarily compel faculty to rework their daily and quarterly plans, as well as the goals for the course as a whole. For sequential courses, or courses that are prerequisites for other courses, significant work may be required by faculty. CAP recognizes that the impact will not be the same on every faculty member and so, should this plan be carried out, those faculty who have to devote considerable time to revising their courses will need to be encouraged to include a brief account of the additional labor.
required in their personnel actions. CAP will then take this into account when evaluating teaching contributions.

With regard to the second item, CAP sees no problems with the 5-day finals week insofar as the personnel process is concerned. We also see no problems with regard to the proposed reduction of standard final examination blocks from 3 to 2 hours. CAP favors the opt-in system as described in the VPDUE’s letter.

Sincerely,

Carolyn Dean, Chair
Committee on Academic Personnel

cc: Miriam Greenberg, Chair, CAAD
    Minghui Hu, Chair, CAFA
    James Zachos, Chair, CFW
    John Tamkun, Chair, CEP
    Gabriel Elkaim, Chair, CPE
    Abel Rodriguez, Chair CPB
    Steve Whittaker, Chair, COR
    Judith Scott, Chair, COT
    Don Smith, Chair, GC
Don Brenneis, Chair  
Academic Senate  

Re: Standard Time Slots for General Assignment Classrooms and Finals  

Dear Don,  

At its meeting of January 21, 2016, the Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) reviewed the Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education’s (VPDUE) proposal for reducing class time to the UC standard with instruction ranging from 8:00 to 10:35 pm and reducing the final examination block to 2 hours and increasing the number of exam days.  

Of all the options presented, CFW is least supportive of extending instruction late into the evenings as proposed (i.e., to 10:35). Concerns were raised regarding faculty (& student) welfare, equity and labor issues, safety, and lack of adequate infrastructure for holding late classes. The overall effectiveness of courses so late in the day was also questioned as many students would be also taking morning classes. The committee noted that this does represent a change of labor conditions, and that to our knowledge no other UC campus requires faculty to teach after 9:50 pm. CFW is additionally concerned by possible inequity of burden, with junior faculty and lecturers or TA’s potentially being slotted to teach in less attractive time slots. This would be particularly stressful for faculty with young children. The committee also discussed whether additional infrastructure would be provided to support late night classes. In particular, additional shuttle and bus services would be needed. Safety at night might be an issue as well. The committee also recommends that the expenses associated with these added services not be neglected before making a final decision.  

The committee was supportive of increasing the number of time slots by decreasing average class meeting times to the UC standard, as well as reducing time allocated between classes. However, with reduced between class time, additional infrastructure might be required to help students move between classes more quickly. The committee also recommends consideration of additional options such as the option of once a week 3 unit courses.  

With regards to reducing the standard final examination block to 2 hours and increasing exam offering days, several members noted that some departments/courses require longer exam hours due to the content and structure of exams. Also, reductions in exam time might disadvantage students whose performances tend to degrade under tighter time constraints. CFW supports extending number of final exam days to five with appropriate adjustments to deadlines.
CFW is cognizant of the fact that current classroom space needs to be more efficiently utilized to accommodate the sudden expansion of students expected in fall 2016, and to alleviate current overcrowding. The committee offers its feedback on the proposed options, but sees all of the potential options as short term solutions for a growing crisis. As student enrollment continues to rise, CFW expects that the campus and administration will develop a long term plan to expand classroom and student space, without further diminishing effective course scheduling. The committee looks forward to continued collaboration with the administration to address this critical issue.

Sincerely,

/s/
James Zachos, Chair
Committee on Faculty Welfare

cc: Carolyn Dean, Chair, CAP
Miriam Greenberg, Chair, CAAD
Minghui Hu, Chair, CAFA
John Tamkun, Chair, CEP
Gabriel Elkaim, Chair, CPE
Abel Rodriguez, Chair, CPB
Steve Whittaker, Chair, COR
Judith Scott, Chair, COT
Don Smith, Chair, GC
Re: Changing Time Slots for Classrooms and Finals

Don Brenneis, Chair
Academic Senate

Re: Changing Time Slots for Classrooms and Finals

Dear Don,

The Committee on Research (COR) has reviewed the proposal to reduce the time for classes, passing between classes, adding evening classes and examination days. While appreciating that we need to adjust to a higher number of incoming students, COR urges that we ensure these adjustments do not lead to a lower quality of education for all students. Also, the reduction of class time slots by 15 to 20 minutes a week will create a burden for instructors as course lecture, materials, and examinations will all need to be redesigned and as it stands, there currently does not seem to be enough contact time to teach students.

The committee discussed at length the potential detriments of adding late night classes both because of reduced student engagement and impact on instructors and TAs. There were also concerns that this would undoubtedly affect a higher proportion of TAs or lecturers. Also, late evening classes pose a concern for student safety and must be addressed with transportation options.

If this proposal were implemented, it would be helpful to mitigate potential long days for students attending or faculty teaching the late Monday & Wednesday time slot and then having to attend or teach early Tuesday & Thursday. We approve of proposals to add additional final examination days as long as grade submission is rescheduled accordingly.

On exploring current class usage, COR wonders if the current evening class slots are fully utilized. We note that several late evening slots are currently empty for large classes, which also might imply that plans to add yet later slots are unlikely to succeed. We also suggest re-evaluating the possibility of early morning classes (7 or 7:30am following Riverside precedent) as this could have fewer repercussions for students and faculty. And finally, if the justification to change the current standard time slot is based on the contact time with student per unit, COR would be interested in learning if the units are comparable across UC campuses or if there are other metrics that may be more reasonable to compare.

COR would also like to know about long-term plans for addressing what may be a recurrent problem. Are there plans to construct new large classrooms, if our student numbers continue to increase, e.g. with the drive to recruit more international students?

Sincerely,

/s/

Steve Whittaker, Chair
Committee on Research
cc: CAP Chair Dean
CAAD Chair Greenberg
CAFA Chair Hu
CFW Chair Zachos
CEP Chair Tamkun
CPE Chair Elkaim
COT Chair Scott
GC Chair Smith
Don Brenneis, Chair
Senate Office

RE: Standard Time Slots for General Assignment Classrooms and Finals

Dear Don:

CPE members discussed the revised course time proposal from Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education to reduce class meeting times and align the current class time slots to the UC standard. There is also a request to reduce the finals schedule from three hours to two hours. The proposal requests reducing Monday, Wednesday, Friday (MWF) class slots by 5 minutes per day and for Tuesday, Thursday (TTh) class slots by 10 minutes per day. The time between classes would be 15 minutes everyday, reduced from 20 minutes on MWF to the current 15 minutes established for TTh classes. Members agreed that no one would want to teach the late MW time slot from 9-10:35 p.m., it has many negative implications and concerns as to safety on campus, transportation, instructors with children and partners, and work life balance issues. Currently, the late night course sections have a low attendance rate.

CPE Members observed that many classrooms are not at capacity during the class offerings since the current requirement is that all enrolled students must fit into the classroom -- when in fact most of the time a subset of the students show up (except during exams). Members are concerned that the courses scheduled at these less desirable times will have negative impacts on students who are already struggling to succeed in their courses.

Committee members prefer not to cut back on teaching instruction time but instead change how we offer courses during the week. Members are concerned in keeping the integrity and rigor of our courses over cutting contact time. There are 49 instruction days per quarter; distributed among the two-day a week and three-day per week classes. If 5 minutes per day is reduced from the MWF time slot, this amounts to reduction of 7% of class time and/or materials for instruction. For the MW/TTH course offerings, reducing the class time by 10 minutes per week would be 9.5% less class time and/or materials for instruction. Reducing this amount of material in the curriculum will require carefully reworking the class (which is a very large investment of instructor time), or more likely Instructors will simply truncate their classes or run over and students may lose information that is needed for the rigor of the course material.

Members agreed pedagogically this would be a disaster, most classrooms are only at capacity during exams.

CPE believes there are far better alternatives than the proposed solution that still address the growing needs of the campus. A simple solution would be to book the rooms for median/average attendance rather than peak; and have overflow rooms with lectures recorded and rebroadcast to the overflow rooms; thus students can watch remotely, taking in person quizzes and exams in sections. An overflow room could be booked for large lecture courses of this type. Students have
a choice to attend in person or watch remotely, which is what students currently do. This is a low cost alternative, students find seats in the lecture room on a first come first serve basis and allows student a choice. This would require no changes in current scheduling (or small tweaks as required).

As another alternative, CPE proposes moving away from a MWF weekly offering entirely to three weekly classroom offerings of two day a week; MW, TTH, Friday/Saturday, Friday/Sunday or even Saturday/Sunday. This schedule would offer more overflow rooms, especially for exams (and would increase the classroom space by 50%). Most faculty and students prefer a two day a week course instruction. Many faculty would prefer to teach on Saturday over teaching late at night, and several would volunteer to take these times. Offering classes two days a week opens up additional sections for course offerings. Members preferred changing to a two day a week course offering schedule to preserve instruction time and keeping passing time at the 15 minute limit.

A density plot of student attendance, classroom occupancy, and capacity as it varies throughout the year would be instructive; CPE was unaware if such data had been gathered. Several fixes might accommodate both current schedule and physical classrooms if such data can be analyzed.

Final Examination Length and Schedule:
Committee members were generally unsupportive of the change in the final examination block which reduces exam time from 3 to 2 hours and expands the examination days from 4 to 5. Again as a reduction of 33% of the time/material to be covered on the final exam necessarily reduces the rigor and breadth of the subject matter. The two hour blocks would also result in more students with multiple exams per day, thus increasing the requirement to reschedule exams.

In conclusion, CPE feels that this proposal would reduce the academic rigor; impose additional workload demands on the faculty to reduce course content in a coherent way; increase stress among the students and faculty; and that the marginal students would most likely be relegated to the poor time slots very late at night and early in the morning.

UC Santa Cruz is a reputational economic good--that is, our ability to attract good students is based on the reputation of the students we have graduated, albeit with a time lag of 5-10 years. Maintaining the highest quality of education we can deliver is paramount to keeping UCSC successful in its mission. CPE worries that decreasing our educational rigor will decrease the value of the UCSC education, and that by the time the damage is done, it will be far too late to undue it. In short, CPE sees this proposal as “penny wise, pound foolish” and hopes that other alternatives (several proposed above) will be considered.

Sincerely,

/s
Gabriel Elkaim, Chair
Committee on Preparatory Education

cc: CAAD Chair Greenberg
    CAP Chair Dean
    CAFA Chair Hu
    CEP Chair Tamkun
    CFW Chair Zachos
    CPB Chair Rodriguez
    COR Chair Whittaker
    COT Chair Scott
    GC Chair Smith
Don Brenneis, Chair
Academic Senate

Re: Proposed Standard Time Slots for Classrooms and Finals

Dear Don,

In its meeting of January 11, 2016, the Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (CAAD) discussed VPDUE Hughey's proposal to increase class time slots and the finals block. While CAAD agrees in principle that more must be done to allocate time and classrooms given the expected increase in student enrollment at UCSC, we have concerns about how equitable this policy will be toward junior faculty members, lecturers, and those who have family and or caretaker responsibilities.

The proposal includes an extension of the standard instructional day on Monday and Wednesday from 8:45 p.m. to 10:35 p.m. and from 9:45 p.m. 10:25 p.m. on Tuesday and Thursday, which effectively extends the workday by an hour and forty five minutes on MW and by forty minutes on TTH.

We have concerns over how these class time slots will be assigned and what considerations will be given in the allocation of slots. If done on a voluntary basis we are concerned that once the earlier more desirable time slots are filled by senior faculty, junior faculty and lecturers will feel pressured, if not be obliged, to “volunteer” for the later slots. For those with young children or with caretaker responsibilities this would prove difficult.

The committee notes that UCSC does not currently offer child care related services that would be essential to providing the needed on campus support to faculty and lecturers with children should this proposal go forward. This deficiency has required faculty to seek these services at off campus facilities that are open during regular business hours. The increase in the length of an instructional day could lead to an inestimable burden of additional costs associated with increased use of child care services that would not be borne by faculty without children. In equal measure, those with caretaker responsibilities may have to arrange for supplemental support of loved ones at additional expense. While CAAD understands the inevitable need for increasing instructional space, we hope that this is not done to the detriment of families and dependents who rely on faculty members for their support and care.

The proposal to extend the instructional day to after 10:00 p.m., raises a host of other issues which were touched upon in our May 21, 2012 response to a similar
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Proposal from VPDUE Hughey. At that time the committee was concerned with the costs related to transportation, classroom instructional support services, and pedagogical effectiveness of teaching during late time slots. We renew those concerns here in addition to concerns regarding the safety of faculty and students who will now be on campus longer and later into the evening.

CAAD made specific recommendations in the 2012 letter that included a survey of faculty in impacted departments to determine their ability and willingness to teach during the proposed times, and a consultation with lecturers through their union, as they are often assigned large courses with little input as to their scheduling. We understand the immediacy of the problem at hand, however, had these recommendations been followed and questions asked at that time, some of our current concerns may have been addressed.¹

We agree that more has to be done to allocate time and classrooms to accommodate the sizable incoming frosh class. CAAD must stress nonetheless, that in light of the concerns voiced above, any allocations must be executed in a manner that will not have a disparate impact on junior faculty and lecturers generally, and more specifically, on those who may have family and/or caretaker responsibilities.

Sincerely,

/s/
Miriam Greenberg, Chair
Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity

Enc: CAAD to AS Chair Gillman Re: Revised Class Slots May 31, 2012

Cc: CAFA Chair Hu
    CAP Chair Dean
    CEP Chair Tamkun
    CFW Chair Zachos
    CPB Chair Rodriguez
    GC Chair Smith
    COR Chair Whittaker
    COT Chair Scott

¹ To the best of CAAD’s knowledge, the VPDUE never responded, formally or informally, to our earlier concerns.
May 31, 2012

Susan Gillman, Chair
Academic Senate

Re: VPDUE’s Revised Class Slots Proposal

Dear Susan,

In its meeting of May 21, 2012, the Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity (CAAD) discussed VPDUE Hughey’s revised proposal to increase class time slots. While CAAD acknowledges that maintaining the current schedule may not be the most prudent approach, we have concerns about option 2 and are opposed to options 3, 4, and 5.

Option 2 is moderately tenable in that it would preserve some of the desirable MW 5:00-6:45 and 7:00-8:45 p.m. time slots and increase seating capacity, in the largest rooms, by adding a MWF 5:00-6:10 slot and shifting MW slots to 6:30-8:15 and 8:30-10:15 p.m. in those same rooms. CAAD’s concerns about this option are the following:

1. The costs associated with this option—such as expanded public and campus transportation, classroom instructional support services, and child-care—will be borne by campus and faculty and may not outweigh its benefit.

2. This option will not be successful at increasing seating capacity if faculty from impacted departments are not willing to teach during the new time-slots. CAAD recommends surveying faculty in impacted departments to gather more information about their individual willingness to teach during such times (i.e., not a general survey as to whether they support the idea in principle). Additionally, several committee members voiced concern about the pedagogical effectiveness of teaching during late time slots.

3. These changes might have a disproportionately negative effect on lecturers who are often assigned large courses with little input as to their scheduling. Since lecturers might not be included in a potential survey of faculty willingness to teach in these later time slots (as recommended in #2 above), CAAD also strongly recommends consulting directly with lecturers through their union (AFT). Such consultation would also help clarify any contractual agreements that might limit the effectiveness of the proposed changes.

4. While CAAD admires the inclusion of a trial period in Winter 2013, it is concerned that there will not be enough time to assess the changes by gauging feedback from faculty, staff, and students before the planned full implementation in Spring 2013 since scheduling for large classrooms (and for the campus as a whole) occurs so far in advance; in addition, the committee pointed out that since Fall quarter is always the most difficult to schedule (according to VPDUE Hughey’s memo), Winter 2013 might not provide the most accurate information for assessment.
Overall, CAAD is sympathetic to the need for increased classroom capacity, and we want to facilitate students graduating in four years whenever possible. We hope that any efforts to increase classroom capacity be undertaken with extremely careful planning to minimize costs, ensure the fewest disruptions to campus life/business, and to allow for a complete and thorough assessment.

Sincerely,

Kimberly Lau, Chair
Committee on Affirmative Action and Diversity