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Agenda, goals and objectives

- Review of where we left off
- Three models and their variants
- Validation on capacity
- Unique features of models
- Discussion
- Poll / vote
Review of where we left off
Steps we agreed on

- Send, post, provide the presentation and the 3 models discussed in January to the campus for the senators to use in college meetings
  - Done!
- Bring back to senate variations discussed on 3 models
  - Today
- Provide data on capacity validation
  - Today
Guiding principles

- **Student success**: Scheduling pattern is flexible for students to complete degree or complete minor
- **Pedagogical excellence**: Provide opportunities for faculty to deliver courses that optimize student learning
- **Operational effectiveness**: Support efficient schedule of available facilities

Provide our students with the best academic experience
Implementation principles

- **5x3 model**: Accommodate dominant 3-SCH courses, 3 hours/week
- **Consistent start times**: Classes must start at beginning of an approved time-block
- **Balanced offerings**: Reasonable balance of course offerings M-F and through each day
- **Studios and labs**: Can be scheduled for longer blocks of time
- **Flexibility**: Allow scheduling of courses outside the norm with approval process through the Council of Scheduling Officers and provost
- **Responsibility**: College leadership have responsibility for developing schedule that complies with framework and parameters
The three models and variants
Common elements of 3 models

- Accommodate 3X-hour meetings times per week
- Support pedagogy that may benefit from longer meeting times
- Non-3X weekly contact hours possible but may block courses offered during standard times
- Labs and studios will be accommodated
- Evenings: 75 min blocks beginning at 5 PM; no classes Friday evening
Model “A”

- **Framework**
  - M-W-F (9 standard blocks)
    - 50-min blocks 8 AM through 5 PM (*1-hour block*)
  - T-R (6 standard blocks)
    - 75-min blocks 8 AM through 4:45 PM (*1.5-hour block*)
- 15 standard blocks; i.e., a classroom can accommodate 15 courses
Model “B”

- **Framework**
  - MW, WF, FM, TR 75-min patterns
  - 75-min (1.5-hour) blocks 8 AM through 5 PM
    - Of every 5 courses one will need to meet in 2 different rooms

- 15 standard blocks; i.e., each pair of classrooms can accommodate 30 courses
Model “C”

- Combination of “A” and “B”
- Framework
  - TR 8 AM – 5 PM 1.5-hour blocks
  - MWF
    - 8 AM– 2 PM 1-hour blocks
    - 2 PM– 5 PM 1.5-hour blocks
- 14 standard blocks; i.e., a classroom can accommodate 14 courses
Validation of capacity
Simple calculations

1. **Credit hours**: Credit hours are remaining the same at roughly 15 CH

2. **Slots**:
   a) Students will take 25% more courses (5 instead of 4)
   b) But class periods will decrease 25% in length (from 2 hours to 1.5 hours)
## Capacity in quarters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Explanation / source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General purpose (GP) rooms</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2011 FTE</td>
<td>13,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day + evening sections</td>
<td>3,237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average courses per student / term</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average class size</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 AM – 5 PM sections offered</td>
<td>2,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sections offered in GP rooms</td>
<td>1,181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of sections offered in GP rooms</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day FTE</td>
<td>11,516</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Explanation / source:
- Registrar
- Current curricula

### Calculations:
- \((13,551 \times 4) / 3,237\) for average courses per student / term.
- \((2,742 \times 16.8) / 4\) for Day FTE.
## Capacity in semesters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Explanation / source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average class size</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>11,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day sections needed in GP and non-GP rooms</td>
<td>3,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. number of courses delivered by any model per semester</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. number of sections we can deliver in 108 GP rooms</td>
<td>1,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% sections offered in GP rooms</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. number of sections we can offer</td>
<td>3,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num. sections we can offer 108 GP rooms using Model A or B</td>
<td>3,767</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Distinguishing features of models
Model A Unique Features

- Used by most 5x3 universities across U.S.
- Used by all Rochester-based universities; this will facilitate the academic common market.
- Has the least number of 75 min blocks
- Can accommodate a variety of course blocks
- Offers both 50 min and 75 min courses to accommodate variety of pedagogies
- Some courses may need to be developed both in 50 min and 75 min format
- Offers best chance to avoid conflicts for students
- Offers compact scheduling options for students
Model B Unique Features

• Uniform time-blocks
• One course format for most courses
• Favors pedagogy based on longer time-blocks
• Difficult coordination of scheduling of courses
• Challenge to build compact schedules for students
• Science courses would have to change their pedagogical framework
Model C Unique Features

• Offers more 75-min courses than “A” but less than “B”
• Offers fewer 50-min courses than “A” but more than “B”
• Science courses would need to alter pedagogical approach
• Activity hour, seminars, and meetings on Friday afternoon
### Scorecard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimizing student scheduling conflicts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity time (for meetings / events)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fit with science course delivery formats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compatibility with other universities (Rochester area academic marketplace)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical flexibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility to accommodate multiple block scheduling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uniform course format</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of building university-wide course schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficient use of facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion
Conclusion

- No model is perfect
- We’ll need to accommodate exceptions regardless of model choice
- A scheduling model is an essential tool in support of our commitment to offer our students the best academic experience
Straw poll
Voting results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model A</th>
<th>Model B</th>
<th>Model C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shift lowest 1<sup>st</sup> place votes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model A</th>
<th>Model B</th>
<th>Model C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt; choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>