TO: Committee on Strategic Planning and Priorities

FROM: Committee on Strategic Planning and Priorities

RE: Class Scheduling Grid

DATE: September 12, 2013

**Background:**

The current scheduling grid was designed to support the curricular transformation and was adopted for the 2004-2005 academic year. In October 2007, The Committee on Academic Programs was charged with reviewing the class scheduling grid. CAP formed an ad hoc committee to work on this charge and submitted a final recommendation to the Provost’s Office in June 2009. The final recommendation was, however, never accepted. Additionally, since the 2007 CAP review of the grid, enrollments at The College have increased by 10%.

**Charge:**

CSPP requests that CSPP examine the class scheduling grid to assess the design and operational use of the class scheduling grid and to make recommendations as appropriate.

Among the sets of questions that might be usefully considered are:

1. Does the College’s current class scheduling grid support the transformed curriculum? Does the scheduling grid facilitate the optional scheduling of a fourth hour for classes at the discretion of the instructor?
2. Are needs of graduate classes accommodated? What are the differences between day and evening classes? Note: There are faculty who want to begin teaching the 5:30 grid hour at 5:00, which is acceptable at the graduate level but not at the undergraduate level where it would conflict with a scheduled fourth hour.
3. Does the grid support the needs of each individual school? Are scheduling patterns different amongst schools? What are the implications of scheduling off the grid? What guidelines should be used for decision-making regarding off-grid scheduling?
4. How does the scheduling grid impact the dining services and the flow of students through dining venues.
5. Does the grid support the needs of affected clients: students, staff, and faculty?
6. Does the grid lead to the efficient utilization of classroom space and resources?

**TCNJ Planning Processes**

Step One: Identifying and reporting the planning issue.

When CSPP identifies or receives information of a planning issue, it will post notice of impending action on the issue on the Planning Website (www.tcnj.edu/~CPP). The notice should contain a description of the goals and expected results of the planning process, identify the planning body involved, offer a provisional timeline for the final plan and describe how interested parties can offer preliminary input. In all cases, preliminary input can be sent via email or campus mail to the chair of the relevant Planning Council (or to the co-chairs of CSPP if CSPP is taking the lead role on the issue).

Step two: Preparing a preliminary plan.

The Planning Council (or CSPP) assesses the issue brought forth, surveys preliminary public input and collects other data as needed. The Planning Council (or CSPP) may request quantitative data from the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. Using all available information, the Planning Council (or CSPP) will revise the relevant plan to address the underlying problem identified in the previous stage. The plan should include a means of assessing the proposed change, as well as a timeline for assessment. The planning unit should be cognizant of how such changes will affect other units’ plans

Step three: Soliciting public input.

Once the Planning Council (or CSPP) has a revised plan, it must offer it for public input. A draft of the revised plan will be posted on the Planning Website ([www.tcnj.edu~CPP](http://www.tcnj.edu~CPP)) and a campus-wide email should notify all students, staff and faculty about such a posting. The Planning Council (or CSPP) can invite testimony during its regularly-scheduled meetings. In addition, the Planning Council (or CSPP) will make every effort to identify affected parties and by email solicit the view of their representative. For issues that garner campus-wide attention or significant controversy, the Planning Council (or CSPP) will have a campus-wide forum at a time or times that allow substantial public access.

It is important to give every stakeholder enough time to consider the proposed changes and form an opinion on them. From the time of posting the preliminary plan on the Planning Website and the emailed notification of such posting, stakeholders must have at least ten working academic days before the closure of the input process or the holding of an open forum. Longer periods may be considered for more controversial or far-reaching changes. The adoption of substantial planning changes during the summer is discouraged and Planning Councils should consider awaiting public input until the academic community reconvenes. The guiding principal is to err towards generosity in opportunities for public input to ensure a well-informed and legitimate process.

Step four: Creating a final plan.

When, in the best judgment of the Planning Council, the campus community has had ample opportunity to respond to the preliminary plan, the council will prepare a final plan and send it to CSPP. The plan should be accompanied by a memo that summarizes the input received from the college community and explains how the plan was revised in light of the input.

CSPP reviews the final plan to make sure it followed the process above and that the plan is consistent with other strategic plans on campus and with the College’s Mission. If CSPP feels that additional and substantial revisions are necessary, it posts these on the Planning Website, informs the campus community and begins a process of public input. If CSPP is satisfied with the substance and process of the final plan, it sends it to the President for consideration.