

## DRAFT

Date: xxxxx

To: Joan Lorden, Vice Chancellor and Provost  
Academic Affairs

From: Richard Leeman, President  
University Faculty Council

Re: Implementation of MWF Schedule

After an iterative process of gathering written feedback and discussion in Faculty Council and the Faculty Executive Committee, the faculty makes the following recommendations regarding implementation of MWF scheduling:

- 1. Individual units should be provided the greatest possible flexibility in implementing and prioritizing MWF assignments.** Universally, department representatives reported a wide range of variation regarding the use of labs, hybrids, adjunct instruction, clinicals, internships, practica, etc. Units need to be able to schedule courses that may meet for three hours on a MWF basis in order to meet enrollment demands (e.g., science labs—which work best in a concentrated three hour block of time). Many other examples of similar courses were provided. For example, the Belk College of Business offers three hour graduate classes to working professionals. The 5:30pm start time is too early for many of their students, and the 7:00pm start time for a three hour night class is too late. The faculty assume that units will make good faith efforts to “stay within” the standard time blocks to the greatest extent possible so that the students registered in their courses are not unduly prevented from taking other courses in the nearest abutting time block. However, faculty are in strong concurrence that there cannot be a “one size fits all” policy at the university level that prescribes how large classes, hybrids, etc. are allocated across the week, nor that all classes in a block are the standard 50 or 75 minutes in duration.
- 2. Faculty agree that, broadly speaking, there may be some benefit to emphasizing the scheduling of lower-division, freshmen-oriented classes to a MWF schedule, but it is clear that there are important structural limitations that prevent codifying such an “emphasis” into a uniform policy.** First, many of the lower division classes are large-lecture classes, and there are a limited number of large classrooms available on campus. By necessity, many large lecture classes must be scheduled in the late MW and T/R two day a week time slots. There are simply not enough large lecture classrooms to accommodate all the large lower-division classes in the MWF time slots. Second, some units report that their upper division classes will work better in the MWF 50 minute time periods, which means that their staffing of lower divisions classes will be placed into the MW late afternoon and T/R two day a week time periods. Again, these kinds of departmental needs speak to the desirability of maintaining unit flexibility.
- 3. As outlined in greater detail below, considerable effort will be needed in order to make the necessary curriculum revisions to hybrid classes, lab sections and other classes such as 4 credit hour classes.** In order to make these revisions quickly and effectively, curriculum development support grants should be provided. A number of programs note, too, that due to classroom space shortage, moving these hybrid sections back to 100% classroom is not an option. Despite the additional time slot the MWF schedule will provide, UNC Charlotte is now

dependent upon the utilization of hybrid and online classes in order to provide students with the requisite seats in classes. Faculty do not want to see instructional quality suffer as we make this substantive shift back to 50 minute class periods for some of our sections.

4. **Commuter parking permits should include a three-day option (MWF) at the same cost as the Two Day Permit (T/R), so that adjunct faculty are not penalized for teaching in the MWF configuration.** Alternatively, all adjunct faculty could be charged a lower parking rate regardless of permit type (evening, two day, etc.) to provide some economic relief for their already modest remuneration.
5. **Faculty would like to have clear guidance as to whether Academic Affairs will continue to require that 40% of classes be out-of-prime-time and 20% offered on Fridays, or if the assumption is that the new scheduling will automatically meet those scheduling goals.**

Almost universally, faculty continued to express serious misgivings about the new MWF scheduling, and were puzzled by and skeptical of the claim that there is “no pedagogical reason for supporting a 75 minute class period schedule.” Many of the common concerns were:

1. **Seventy-five minute class periods provide a far more efficient use of pedagogical time for most of the classes we teach.** Specifically:
  - a. Seventy-five minute classes are more conducive to active-learning strategies. Fifty minutes is rarely sufficient to provide the necessary context, work students through the experience, and then debrief. Even high schools use longer class period blocks in order to engage the material more deeply. It is troubling to see the old model of fifty minute class periods being held onto at the college level.
  - b. Seventy-five minute periods are more conducive to examinations. Fifty minutes is a short period of time for an in-depth examination. Seventy-five minutes is also more conducive to utilizing short quizzes or exercises that can then be folded into a substantive lecture/discussion in the remaining portion of the class period.
  - c. Fifty minute class periods cannot accommodate computer-based exams (e.g., coding exams). Time is required to set up the lab and collect electronic files. For instance, we might need to block Internet access or create a common log in account for the exam. This can be done in 75 minute class periods, but is impractical for 50 minute periods.
  - d. For instructors and departments who teach lower-division classes with multiple sections, having some class periods of 50 minutes and some of 75 minutes will create substantial obstacles for synchronizing and coordinating their lectures and labs.
  - e. Across the course of a semester, class periods of fifty minutes lose substantially more productive time to the “set up” and “take down” segments of a class.
  - f. Three day a week, 50 minute class periods can be accommodated in the current time schedule for those classes that would be better served by that configuration.
2. **The ability to offer hybrid, or blended classes, will be negatively impacted by the reduction of available 75 minute time slots.** Hybrid, or blended, classes, are currently configured as 50% online, which requires a 75 minute period for classroom interaction. Moving to the MWF 50 minute configuration will have one of three negative impacts in regard to hybrids: (1) preference hybrid classes for the two day a week time slots while skewing the MWF time slots towards classes taught 100% in the classroom; (2) require substantial curriculum revision as hybrids

move to either 33% online (100 minutes, 2 days in classroom) or 66% online (50 minutes, one day in classroom); or (3) 75 minute classroom periods for hybrids scheduled on M,W, or F will cross time blocks, and prevent students from taking other courses due to time conflicts. Faculty from across units wish to underscore the amount of time and energy that is required to prepare effective online instruction, whether in a 100% online course or a hybrid. The amount of effort that will be involved in re-structuring current classes should not be underestimated. The proposed MWF schedule will involve substantial disruption in curriculum planning and delivery.

3. **Three day a week class scheduling will have a negative impact on research and scholarly productivity of faculty as well as graduate and undergraduate students.** Many research activities, such as lab work or meeting with external constituents integral to our research activities, require substantial blocks of time, in some cases entire days. Reduced flexibility in the weekly schedule will negatively impact the ability to find those blocks of time. Reduced flexibility will also make it more difficult for programs to recruit top quality research faculty.
4. **Students will be disadvantaged by the changed schedule.** When students cannot consolidate their standard classes, as they can through the M/W T/R standard 75 minute time periods, it will be more difficult for students to preserve blocks of time within their weekly schedule. This problem will disadvantage students in several ways: (1) make it more difficult to schedule off-campus clinical, internship, and practica experiences; (2) make it more difficult to accommodate extra-curricular learning through lab work, studio experience, etc.; (3) make it more difficult to consolidate their work schedules, thus creating the need to be at their job for additional work-days in order to accumulate the same number of hours; and (4) impose additional commuting time and expenses, often on our students who can least afford either of those.
5. **There are better alternatives available.**
  - a. Campus traffic congestion could be eased by moving the MWF starting times to match what is proposed for T/R classes; i.e., starting at 8:30am and finishing the “day” classes at 5:15pm.
  - b. If an additional “time slot” is needed in order to provide sufficient classroom space, the university could consider allowing classes to start in a 7:00am-8:15am time block. This would actually create two additional time periods for scheduling classes (M/W/F and T/R), and may also help serve our non-traditional students who would benefit from attending class in the early morning and then going to work.

Finally we note that not every faculty member agrees with every point that has been made above. These are, however, points of widespread concern that were made by a number of faculty and units, both through discussion in meetings and in written feedback.

## APPENDIX 1: Faculty Feedback Regarding Proposed Schedule Change

Regarding MWF class schedule, physics department unanimously opposes this change. All faculties prefer 1:15 lectures because it is easier to schedule an in-class test, save transportation time, and have more flexibility in arranging different components in lectures. Another thing is it will become difficult to synchronize lower-level class with multiple sessions if some are 3 lectures a week and some are 2 per week.

---

2. Freshman engagement with the campus may be increased by a five-day/week presence. Should lower division courses that serve primarily entering freshmen be prioritized for MWF scheduling?

Time is always lost in the beginning and end of class (commute time, checking rolls, announcements, etc.) . Breaking up classes waste more logistical time.

5. Would faculty support giving preference for two-day classes be assigned to part-time instructors to alleviate the need for part-time faculty to be present on campus three days a week?

Yes, but see #2. Even high school students are using block schedules. No college classes should be less than about 90 mins. per class

---

1. Serious concerns about shorter session of class period:

- Shorter session is not efficient
- Some faculty have long group projects that need longer class periods
- Mid-terms are typically done in class, the shorter class time would result in shorter exams with less strenuous material.
- Some courses interact significantly with the industry and shorter, more frequent class periods would affect our ability to take students to industry sponsored conferences and trips.

2. To some students (especially juniors and seniors), no class on Friday provides would be beneficial

- Many of our students have internships and use Friday as a full work day. These internships are very important to our students and their development as well as to their employers.

---

· Will MWF courses be prioritized for freshman? We are concerned because transfer students or working students (a majority of our population in languages) will be disadvantaged because it will limit accessibility to their courses. We believe this may affect retention. Restriction-free time slot assignment is highly desirable in languages; we would rather not have entire blocks of the day limited only to freshmen or any type of class/course.

· Are (4 credit) critical language courses that will require a curricular overhaul to adapt to the new schedule, or courses that offer a new delivery format of an existing Hybrid-only course be prioritized on Curriculog? (THIS IS CRUCIAL BECAUSE WE WOULD HAVE TO BEGIN IMMEDIATELY.)

· Which of the following options to our four credit courses be permissible (or, better yet, institutionally supported with stipends) under the new schedule?

Ideas that involve meeting 3 days a week

1) TTh (75x2) + F or M (50)-- This MIGHT be possible (we need to ask). However, it is UNLIKELY because by having a class on Friday, we end up making that room unusable at that time on Mondays and Wednesdays. However, 4-credit classes are the exception to the rule, so perhaps there is enough wiggle room in the schedule for 4-credit classes (since there are so few of them).

2) TTh (75x2) + a 1 credit lab (50) that meets on M or F (or W). This idea seemed very popular with everyone. However, scheduling the 1 hour lab may be challenging. One person suggested that the labs could all meet in one of the 3 rooms for which our department has control over scheduling. Additionally, this problem presents another challenge in that we would need to begin making course change proposals through Curriculog **immediately**.

3) MWF (100x3) - For this to work, classes would need to finish 1 month early. On the one hand, it looks good because we are not making classrooms unusable on Mondays and Wednesdays (since we are using all 3 days). However, on the other hand, all three classrooms become unusable from November onward.

4) Convert 1201~3202 into 3 credits instead of 4. This requires **Curriculog** work as well

-->A) Decrease the amount of content taught --> this is undesirable since prestigious universities already have 5 contact hours and not 4. We would also need to create additional classes to supplement the major because of the decrease in credits.

-->B) Break 1201 and 1202 into 3 classes (1201, 1202, and 1203). Each class would be 3 credits, so first year would be a total of 9 credits instead of 8. Because this would create a graduation delay, you would need to offer either 1201+1202 or 1202+1203 as "fast-track" courses. In other words, students could finish 1201 the first half of the semester and then do 1202 the second half of the semester. Scheduling 6 (2x3credits) credits would be very easy: MWF(50x3) +TTh (75x2) OR MWF (100x3). For this approach to scheduling to work perfectly (for Japanese, at least) we would need to offer 2nd year and 3rd year courses in the same way. However, since 1201 and 1202 have the most sections, and 2nd and 3rd year have very few, it may be easier to get special permission to do something unique with 2nd and 3rd year.

5) MWF (50x3) or TTh (75x2) + 50min Online. We would need to be creative to figure out how to use this 50min most effectively, but this is the easiest option scheduling-wise.

#### Ideas that involve meeting 4 (or more) days a week

6) MWF (50x3) + T or Th (50) and finish the class early or start late on T or TR -->

7) TTh (75x2) + M, W, or F (50) --> Any additional day (M, W, F) makes a room unusable for the rest of the week as if this class were two classes.

8) MWF (50x3) + additional 50 mins on MW or F --> Same as above because it makes other rooms unusable.

Finally, can we use the rooms we control to accommodate our 4-credit classes? Although we have too many sections for this to be a viable option, these rooms could play a role as part of the 1-credit lab option (above).

"As an urban institution, our academic mission serves working adults in Charlotte, and it can often be difficult for diverse non-traditional students to get release time from employers for 2 days a week to attend a class, much less 3 days a week, ...so MW classes may better serve the diverse mission of an urban institution."

---

I fear that it will be much harder in the future to recruit faculty members to serve as "representatives" of the faculty in the future.

The "need to use the classroom space on Fridays," strikes me as a vague canard to rationalize this policy. If students are currently being taught efficiently and faculty are currently "meeting" effectively, where is this supposed "need"?

The Chancellor, I know, is concerned that the campus does not "show" well on Fridays. Perhaps not... and so the Chancellor should show the campus on other days. But more to the point, the "public" never understands how busy faculty lives are well beyond the classroom, and the Chancellor, rather than advocate for the hard work of his faculty, is playing right into that misunderstanding. So, rather than undermine our work, perhaps the Chancellor should consider "showing" the hundreds of meetings (on Fridays as well as other days) that demonstrate the FULL dimension of faculty work, energy, and dedication. The disregard for that dimension of our professional lives is deeply troubling!

Finally, it may be pure cynicism on my part, but I cannot help but think that pressure both from PaTS and Chartwell's are behind this policy as well. I say that having had long talks with Auxiliary Services admins in the past!

---

We offer some graduate courses that are 3 hours long for working professionals at night at main campus. We are concerned that a start time of 7PM would make for too long a day, while a start time of 5:30PM does not allow (with Charlotte traffic) enough time for working professionals to get to campus. Will there be some flexibility in scheduling night classes for graduate students? Right now, we typically start main campus 3-hour night classes at 6:30PM or 6PM.

---

- Why the university isn't using Friday for once-a-week classes or the meeting time for hybrid classes, I do not know. It seems that approach would serve both continuing and non-traditional students better than requiring more commuting.
- I'd like to see what all departments/majors on campus have done to include Fridays in their class scheduling. I know that our department has taken measure to include classes/labs on Fridays, but what about the other departments? Instead of asking everyone on campus to switch to a MWF (when it's obvious folks on Tues and Thurs are still able to teach the content in 1hr 15 min), we ask each department/major to send a list of all their course offerings on Fridays and then require all majors/departments not utilizing Fridays to abide by the university expectation? I would imagine there are several majors simply not utilizing classes on Fridays.
- I asked my students and they dread the idea of a MWF schedule. 1) Many of them think it's a waste of time to drive to campus for just one 50-minute class. They'd rather pack a lot of

classes into 4 days rather than spreading them out in 5 days; 2) Many of our students work to support themselves. Many need the full day on Friday to make their ends meet. Moving to a MWF schedule will make that very difficult. For faculty, I personally think it's better too to have our old system where faculty can teach on MW or TTh without having to come to campus for an extra day. For research faculty, having the whole Friday is very helpful to get writing and research work/meetings done.

- I think 75-minute active learning classrooms are critical. Active Learning is an initiative within the university so we should support its development.
- If faculty are going to have to do a MWF schedule, that means that many of them (adjuncts and non) will be driving to campus more often and/or have to pay for parking more often. As faculty receive NO help with parking, the campus should be prepared to offer any support at all given the expectations of more on-campus presence. This could mean a sliding scale of parking passes, and/or consideration for the level of cost an adjunct takes on with a 600\$ parking pass and \$3500/class. Unless the Adjunct is confirmed for 3-4 classes per semester, it is difficult for them to meet this cost, as it is for many tenured faculty, but likely more-so.
  - As someone who needs the longer periods for some classes but could see shorter periods for others, I think faculty themselves can realize which classes would benefit from the shorter or longer sessions. General guidelines could complicate matters.

--Freshman engagement with the campus may be increased by a five-day/week presence. Should lower division courses that serve primarily entering freshmen be prioritized for MWF scheduling?

- Probably, especially because freshmen are more likely to live on campus.
- I would say yes to that question since more engagement for Freshmen according to student development theories means better retention over time and (hopefully) quicker/firmer major selection because of clearer self-understanding.
- I really think most of the M/W/F courses should initially be designated for freshman classes, including classes with labs, to get our students back in the habit of attending the University five days a week. I think there is going to be a fair amount of blowback from upper-class students and it would be smarter to phase this in over a few years so that students adjust without taking it out on faculty. I had two classes that met W/F mornings, and the animosity on Fridays in the classroom was almost unbearable!
- I think lower-level classes should be the ones on the three-day schedule. I feel short on time in both of my 3000-level classes on a TuTh schedule. Also, we want our juniors and seniors to have more open schedules for internships. I would prefer for the university to do MW, MF, and WF classes as opposed to three-day classes, but I think that's already a done deal.
- I definitely think first-year students should be on campus as much as possible.

---

6. I am concerned about the impact of this decision on commuting students, which comprise the majority (I think) of our student body, and certainly on those (again a majority) who work full time.

7. I had to teach 4-4 for three years as a lecturer at ECU. In that position, I *strongly* preferred MWF because it was the only way to avoid going in 3 times a week. I don't know what the implications of that are.

8. I am concerned that the push for MWF is intersecting with this incessant push for more late afternoon and evening classes. Presumably this is because nobody would show up for a F class in the late afternoon. But the university's push for classes at weird hours is family unfriendly at best. Don't take that from me. Carla Fehr who came here as an ADVANCE speaker was horrified when I told her about the strong push for evening classes, and the fact that if you can't teach evenings in a lot of programs, you can't teach graduate students. The current plan means that people will be having to teach on Fridays when they can't teach evenings, too.

---

There are a myriad of reasons why 50-minute classes would not work, particularly in the Department of Kinesiology. It is not logical nor feasible to make unnecessary schedule changes simply due to traffic congestion, which can be resolved by other mechanisms. Here are some of my viewpoints:

- We teach 2-hour exercise physiology/testing labs one day a week, with a 1.25 hour lecture on Mondays. We cannot divide the weekly labs over three 50-minute classes, as the lab experiments must be completed in the 2 hour period due to their nature. We can't stop an experiment on Monday and pick it up on Wednesday.
- The same reasoning holds true for the anatomy and physiology labs--you cannot pull a dead cat out in 3 different sessions for dissection due to logistics. Once the students get the cats out and opened up, the shortened time will severely restrict their comprehension of the continuous "inner workings" of the cat (or any other animal or cadaver).
- The change in scheduling would markedly reduce available classroom space in the Belk Gym, where most of our classes are held. It would be a logistics nightmare for the administrative director to try and work around three 50 minute classes weekly, changing from what is currently scheduled. We would need to other buildings, which would be inconvenient for the student and cause a campus-wide scheduling nightmare if all other departments move to 50-minute classes.
- This change is not driven by pedagogy--this should be the main focus for any changes. This change would not be best for the students.
- All undergrads perform one semester of internship and the grads perform 3 semesters of internship. This change would severely impact their internship schedules, where they need to spend entire days (or long periods of time) at a given internship site due to their weekly schedules. In essence, we would be taking away their internships and this is simply not an option.
- Much research is conducted over here on Fridays due to the availability of the students. There is a strong need for a class-free Friday to conduct research, hold department or other meetings, meet with TAs and GAs, and a number of other important functions.
- There would be an economic impact on part-time faculty who must now pay to park 3x/week
- There would be a significant impact on students who work, complicating their ability to maintain outside employment.
- There would be an impact on staff – some departments have staff who only work 4 days/week.
- When we had MWF classes before many students failed courses because of rigid attendance policies and they would not/could not come to Friday classes. Thus, this has been tried before and it failed (not only for the above reason, of course).
- 75 minute classes 2x/wk allow for more in-depth exposure to content. As I stated before, 2-hour labs cannot be split up over 3 days. This is simply not possible or feasible.
- 50 minute classes are maybe only 35 minutes once you account for "settling" in and "packing up."



- Would this change affect all levels (i.e. 1000 level thru 4000 level courses and presumably graduate courses) as well? Given the push for non-prime time scheduling, hasn't this helped to alleviate some of the issues? Committee should look at that data.

---

### Faculty Question Regarding Implementation

1. Freshman engagement with the campus may be increased by a five-day/week presence. Should lower division courses that serve primarily entering freshmen be prioritized for MWF scheduling?

There is no single best way to teach a class. In looking at class levels, it is possible that the shorter class times may benefit the freshman and sophomore students but it will need to be looked at closely. It is a different story for the upper level (3000 and 4000 level courses). Three 50 min classes provide less "effective" class time than two longer classes per week. In engineering, it is hard to cover in-depth concepts or group efforts (group solving, group project presentations and discussions) in a 50 min class. Some faculty prefer to teach a 4000+ level class once a week (3 hour time with an adequate break at the half-time). The needs of the faculty and the Department should govern scheduling. No guidelines are needed. Please let the units determine how best to juggle the struggles they will have as a result of the change.

\*\*\*We understand that this schedule change is going to happen but we strongly request that the option to have MW 75 minute class period still exist on a case by case basis if that is the best we can do so we can continue to utilize the open Friday slot for review/recitation periods that significantly help our students and their success in our core courses. If we don't have this option, it will significantly impact student success in these critical engineering courses. This is our most important concern.

2. Hybrid courses have been developed in many instances with one in-class meeting and one online class meeting each week. How should we pair hybrid courses allowing for two courses to make use of the same classroom on different days during the week? Should hybrid courses be given preference in room scheduling on Tuesdays and Thursdays and after 2 p.m. on Mondays and Wednesdays?

Hybrid classes can be effective, but again there is no need to prioritize these types of classes over twice a week in person classes. The scheduling of Hybrid class should be left to the department to balance the department and course needs.

3. Should there be a consideration of scheduling priority based on class size to accommodate the limited number of large classrooms available during peak times?

There is likely a shortage of large classrooms especially as this University continues to grow. Some prioritization of large classes can occur within reason as long as location-based priority is maintained so that a faculty teaching a large class gets priority for that nearby large classroom. Currently, all our classes are taught in either Duke or EPIC. It is preferred that we stay within our home buildings since many of our faculty use active learning techniques in the classroom which often require the use of equipment and visual aids brought to class or used in other rooms within our buildings. Also, our students take heavy course loads and many of our core classes line up right after each other. Logistically, it is difficult for our students to be forced to go back and forth across campus. A potential loss of community in our unit, the logistical challenge of being forced somewhere else based only on class size, and the physical challenges on faculty that need to be close their resources are reasons why location-based priority should be maintained.

4. Would faculty support giving preference for two-day classes be assigned to part-time instructors to alleviate the need for part-time faculty to be present on campus three days a week?

Permanent faculty have heavy research, teaching, and service loads that are difficult to balance and the 3 day a week teaching schedule is going to negatively impact many of them. We should not give special preferences to part time instructors. Again, the University should let units decide what is best.

5. Overall, should there be a centralized, university-wide policy for this, or would you prefer if it was determined by departments separately?

This would be hard to manage, and will likely have unintended consequences. Leave it to Departments to work out what's best for their faculty and students.

\*\*\*Our second most important concern: Please let the Departments determine what is best for their unit given the schedule restraints and the challenges it will impose on them.

---

I like the idea of the MWF class primarily for the benefit it would hold for large classes (like LBST courses) where the Friday class is a break out session of 20-25 students. Of course, this structure would require a TA (or that would be a preference) but doing so would also "use up" classrooms on Fridays (i.e. since a 70 person LBST course would require 3 classrooms on the Friday) which seems to be part of the justification for this change. I'm not sure if this is helpful, and you have likely already thought of it, but I thought I would pass it along just in case.

1. I think the freshman engagement point is important - not because of boosterism issues (rah rah Niners and all), but rather to build their skill at the importance of *showing up regularly* for class. Of course, the less incoming classes resemble typical 18-year-old freshmen, the less important this point may be.
  2. There is a tension between claiming that more classes increase engagement and then trying to figure out how to have a hybrid course, unless we think hybrid courses do the same work as f2f courses in that regard.
  3. It seems like question 4 is self-answering in that you can only have so many large courses given a set number of rooms, and given our large-course congestion, I'm not sure that there's any priority-setting to do?
  4. I'd certainly support prioritizing not expecting part-timers to teach 3x/week if they don't want to.
- 

1. There does not seem to be general consensus on the benefits of shorter, more frequent classes or longer less frequent meetings. In some areas of study, faculty find that shorter more frequent class meetings are more effective. Those employing active learning techniques may need longer periods to provide time for group work or discussion. Do we need to provide guidelines about scheduling priorities for these different approaches?

This would differ vastly -- according to the teaching style of the faculty member and the content area.

---

2. There does not seem to be general consensus on the benefits of shorter, mor...

---

Yes, I think guidelines would be useful.

---

Yes.

---

Yes, each course will work differently. I don't believe most classes will be better with shorter, more frequent mee

---

yes

Yes.

3. Freshman engagement with the campus may be increased by a five-day/week pre...

As someone who doesn't teach lower division courses, I'm not sure if I can really speak to this. If MWF courses can be detrimental (at least for the courses I teach) as I use a combination of lecture, discussion, in-class activities, and p

Yes

I would not know enough about this because of the diversity and uniqueness of first-year students.

yes

Yes! One of the reasons for this is more engagement, that is the group to be targeted. Also, upper level class stu

If the goal is to increase freshman engagement, then they should be targeted through lower division courses.

4. Hybrid courses have been developed in many instances with one in-class meet...

Again, I don't teach hybrid courses, so I can't really speak to this, but it does seem to make sense to have hybrid c

Yes

I don't see a reason hybrid courses need to have preference.

complications with final exams, etc. Should be paired at department level if needed to happen. Yes. What also al

No sure-

Hybrid courses could also be three days a week with two sessions online, and one session in person.

5. Should there be a consideration of scheduling priority based on class size...

Although logistics are less flexible, I think consideration for the quality of the course and student outcomes shoul

Yes

Yes, because we have limited resources.

No.

Yes

No comment

6. Would faculty support giving preference for two-day classes be assigned to...

While I empathize with the difficulty associated with traveling to campus multiple days a week, I would like to no  
faculty to effectively fulfill their other responsibilities (i.e., research, service). Therefore, I do not support giving p

No

This argument does not make any sense. Faculty have all different situations and different work styles. I do not see

---

No. Everyone has other scheduling issues. For example, faculty required to do research teaching 2 days a week have

---

No, due to research pressures.

---

There shouldn't be differences between faculty based on their position on how the courses are scheduled. The goal

DRAFT