Calendar Implementation Taskforce (CIT)
May 11, 2020 Meeting

This meeting was recorded and can be viewed here.

Jeff Popke said that the Alternative Calendar Committee (ACC) (the Chancellor’s Calendar Committee) will meet again on Wednesday. He set as a goal to come out of the meeting with a set of concrete recommendations and suggested they begin working on things that could be agreed upon and can go forward to the ACC at the Wednesday meeting. He explained that he is part of a faculty subgroup and they are supposed to come up with set of recommendations by May 18th, 1 week from today. If CIT does not meet another time this week, then this is the last time to provide recommendations.

Jeff Popke said the full ACC will see the recommendations on May 23rd and then the ACC will issue a report. The real deadline for having calendar and course schedule established is 1st of June because orientation sessions begin on June 8th. Recommendations on the 22nd or 23rd are supposed to feed into that. Mary Farwell or Chris Buddo, the other two members of the faculty subgroup of the ACC, who are also present at this meeting may have a better idea about that.

Chris Buddo said the way Jeff Popke explained it is the way he understands it. The faculty subgroup is tasked with providing their recommendations by May 18th so on May 23rd everything can be put into place.

Angela Anderson said she had to leave for other meetings soon and encouraged everyone in the group to send questions. She said she would review the notes or video recording of the meeting to catch up. She said she and Grant Hayes met with the Interim Chancellor on Friday to talk about exceptions and a process for obtaining approvals. She explained that each course in Banner has a field called “schedule type” and that field provides the different categories of courses. She considered which of those categories would be suitable for exception and thought the following types should be considered: student teaching, practicum, clinical, internship/field experience, cooperative education, recital performance or ensemble. That automatically addresses a large number of ECU’s courses and automatically takes them out of the block scheduling process.

Angela Anderson explained that they also presented a proposal for how exceptions may be requested. They understand that not every course or every program will work in 8-week blocks. Her office has been working to create a DocuSign document that starts with department chair, routes to the appropriate dean for approval, then to the Provost for approval before it comes to Registrar’s Office to be updated in the schedule. For example, if you wanted to exclude one course from the 8-week block schedule, the department would go to the chair, then upon approval it would be entered in the DocuSign form, and, it would automatically route to the next step (the dean) for approval. If there is a question along the way about the justification for the exception or there is a problem, it would have to be sent back and start over again at the department chair. For complete programs there would be a separate form. Instead of doing one form for each course, can have all courses for a program listed on the one program form and the Registrar’s Office will have what it needs to change those courses in the system.

Angela Anderson said that the DocuSign forms will be rolled out tomorrow. The forms need to be to the Provost for consideration by May 26th, and he will have 3 days to turn it around on May 29th. By June 1-June 5, the Registrar’s Office would have schedules updated. She offered to provide all of that information to the committee, because she understood that it was a lot to take in all at once.

Crystal Chambers asked for the rationale for not excluding distance education (DE) courses automatically because there are no financial benefits to making them go to the 8-week block schedule.

Angela Anderson said we have other courses that are not suited to be 15-week and have some moving to DE for health reasons.

Crystal Chambers said if the course is already being delivered DE, even if some courses are being adjusted for other reasons, she thinks it would be much cleaner to leave existing DE courses on the 15-week schedule.
Angela Anderson said that could certainly be a recommendation out of this group. She said Interim Chancellor Mitchelson and Grant Hayes were interested in what this group had to recommend.

Crystal Chambers said thesis and dissertation courses are another course type that should be excluded. Placing a dissertation course in one block but not the other block would hide faculty work. Those need to be done across the board.

Donna Roberson noted that this plan largely seems to be centered on undergraduate education, and graduate education comes with a different set of problems. The masters in nursing is all DE except nursing anesthesia, and they are figuring out what they are going to do. For programs already appropriately reimbursed to the university and already set up as DE, why should they go to 8 weeks when they are already DE, and why should they have to request an exception when there is no impact? Also, Angela Anderson said these requests would go to the Provost. For the Health Sciences division, would they go to Mark Stacy instead of Grant Hayes?

Angela Anderson said she assumes that Grant and Mark Stacy are having conversations about the approval of these requests. This came up very quickly, so that detail was not worked out that same day.

Donna Roberson reiterated that she would urge them to accept something that is already in DE format.

Marianne Montgomery said that she thinks they are talking about exempting DE programs, not individual DE courses. She expressed thanks Angela Anderson for what is being done already.

Elizabeth Swaggerty said that it is going to require a lot of work to submit these requests. Given that their program is already a DE program on an 8-week schedule, is there a way to reverse for select programs any blanket decisions about DE programs being automatically converted to a 15-week schedule?

Angela Anderson said that as they are looking to migrate from a full semester to the partial terms, so there is a way to leave those programs on their same timeline. They will literally have to go through a spreadsheet of programs or courses line by line to do it.

Jason Yao said he thinks he understands the process, but when there is mention that people will need to provide some kind of information to justify the request, do we have any guidelines to guide the faculty on whether or not the courses would be considered? He has been collecting input from faculty within the College of Engineering and Technology, and some of them have good reasons for wanting to stay on a 15-week schedule, and some are just resistant to change. There needs to be something to help the unit heads say no to some people. Do you want to limit the percent of course numbers in a unit that would be eligible for exception?

Angela Anderson said she and Grant Hayes did have a conversation about limiting the number of exceptions to the unit. They didn’t feel like they wanted to put that number out there. Some units are better in 8 weeks and some are not, so they don’t want to post an exception rate. The reason why they decided to start the form with the chair rather than the faculty member is to make sure those conversations happen between chairs and the faculty before something is sent on for approval.

Marianne Montgomery asked if exceptions become widespread, how do we manage student course load? It seems desirable for undergraduates to be on the same calendar as much as possible. It seems like it would cause a lot of confusion for students to have a number of courses on the 8-week schedule and some on the 15-week schedule as well. As units we need to be mindful not to request a lot of ad hoc exceptions.

Puri Martinez said one of the things that might be useful for CIT is if Angela Anderson is willing to provide a document with all these things, maybe the group can see the document and send her comments and critiques to the document so she can revise it. That might help?
Angela Anderson said she could send the document later in the afternoon or place it in the Teams files section for this group or send it through Rachel or Jeff.

Leigh Cellucci asked Angela if she would have a sense of where each division needed to direct their forms to by tomorrow when the forms would be sent out (Mark Stacy, Grant Hayes, or both), and when the DE decision would be made. She would like to make a plea for some of their undergraduate programs that had students in full-time jobs, who would struggle if the program moved to an 8-week block schedule.

Angela Anderson said the form itself is being routed automatically, and she would touch base with Grant Hayes and make sure he has discussed it with Mark Stacy. The DocuSign forms were created to be distributed through each college.

Mark McCarthy noted that the College of Business already had their Accounting classes set up in our own little block and wondered if they would need to do anything to make sure they did not get changed.

Angela Anderson said the Registrar’s Office is not touching those.

Crystal Chambers asked whether department chairs filling out the forms would be able to list multiple courses within the department, or would they need to submit a form for each course?

Angela Anderson said there are two forms: one to request individual courses, and one to request all the courses within a program.

Paul Lindauer noted that in the School of Dental Medicine, 18% of curriculum is didactic and the rest is simulation in labs or hands-on patient care. Lots of these things aren’t really going to work for Dental Medicine. They are still trying to figure out how to bring students and patients into clinic. He is sure his dean has talked with Stacy about these issues.

Angela Anderson said the Registrar’s Office are already excluding Dental Medicine courses from the algorithm that will migrate the 15-week courses into the 8-week blocks.

Jason Yao asked whether the chair or unit heads will receive guidelines for how they make the decision about whether a course will be exempted or not, since that initial choice will be made by dept chair. Will they receive anything from anyone or not?

Angela Anderson is hoping deans will do that. She said that will be the topic at the Dean’s council tomorrow morning. Deans will need to share that information to department chairs prior to when they receive these forms.

Rachel Roper said there is already an exception for MD students, but her faculty want them for PhD students who are working on research grants and projects full time. They would like all programs in Brody exempted.

Angela Anderson said she will mention that to Interim Chancellor Mitchelson and see what he says. Angela Anderson needed to leave the meeting at this point.

Jeff Popke said the group can continue to consider those questions for now, and he thinks this group should play a role in providing some guidance. The deans will talk about it tomorrow but it is within the group’s purview to think about the types of exceptions that should and should not be granted. That said, given that the due date for that isn’t for another week, he suggested that the group focus on the courses that will not be granted an exception and spend time doing that for now.

Jeff Popke had a discussion with Mary Farwell and Chris Buddo in the ACC subgroup, and he said it seems like they need to agree on a set of assumptions before they can move on to see what a schedule might look like and any hurdles to overcome. Marianne Montgomery’s document laid out some of these assumptions, so he thinks it is best to proceed by going through them and figuring out whether they need to be adjusted. The easiest one has to do with what they think is an appropriate workload that faculty should not be expected to teach more than 2 courses in a block, which was
cashed out as 8 credit hours because some faculty have 4-credit courses or have a 3-credit course plus a lab. Students would take no more than three courses in a block. A typical load would be 5 courses, distributed as 3 courses in one block and 2 in another.

Elizabeth Swaggerty said that in her program area they drafted some possible schedules using the 8-week models. There are some situations in her program because they have such variety. What happens if a faculty member is teaching two courses in block one and one full-term course? How would that be considered? It works out neatly if you have faculty only teaching in 8-week blocks, but that is rarely working that way in her unit.

Crystal Chambers pointed out that is like the summer where some faculty have one 11-week course, then one course in summer 1 and one course in summer 2. If someone is teaching one course in the 15-week duration, then it seems like they can only have one course in each of the 8-week blocks.

Marianne Montgomery said that even if someone has one course extending over the 15-weeks, the 8-credit limit on their workload would still hold. They would still not exceed 8 credits. The 15-week would count for both blocks. She wondered if the 9 hours for students should actually be 11, given the same logic with the labs and faculty having 8 credits instead of 6?

Puri Martinez said she thinks 11 credit hours is a lot for a student in one 8-week block.

Marianne Montgomery agreed, but said she is just thinking as an advisor. If a student is taking three courses, and two of them are lab courses, would they want to say they can’t do that?

Crystal Chambers said it would be helpful to get a faculty member who teaches lab courses to chime in on that. Even if students in the past have taken two labs in one semester, they may not necessarily want to do it now, in one 8-week block.

Jean-Luc Scemama acknowledged that there are some students who are able to take three labs in a semester, but that is rare. Most limit themselves to no more than two, so they could assume that would be no more than 1 lab course in each block. So 9 or 10 credits would fit. He suggested that they settle on 10 and have something in place to make an exception. There are some students for whom this will be their last semester and they will want to finish on time and need to be accommodated.

Jeff Popke agreed that 10 will be the max, and if a student and their advisor thinks that does not make sense for their schedule and circumstances, then those students can go through a process to request more.

Stacey Altman asked a question about meeting process: does Jeff want the members to indicate their affirmation in the chat and to only say something when they do not agree?

Jeff Popke agreed that the chat is helpful in that regard and asked for members to affirm in chat and speak up when disagree. He turned to the next question: large lecture courses. He said that is a conversation that goes with which model the CIT chooses and how to handle room assignments. He said they all probably agree that very large classes shouldn’t meet face to face. In ACC, a number that was kicked around was that any class with more than 100 might be transferred to DE format. Any comments?

Crystal Chambers had a question about that. Are there concerns about SACS requirements for courses delivered DE and whether they have gone through the appropriate approval process?

Jean-Luc Scemama asked some members of UCC about this and Cyndi Bellacero (the SACS Liaison for ECU). If it is for the fall and not going to be a permanent thing, they are fine with that. If it is going to persist longer than that, they would need some approvals.
Jeff Popke said he will check with Cyndi, but he thinks that SACS does not need to be informed if there is no change in learning outcomes unless the change in that course means that overall 50% of that program goes DE, in which case that needs system level approval. If the impact of changing that large-enrollment course to DE would take the program over that threshold and they do not have prior approval, then that might be a problem.

Alethia Cook said she thought Dean Danell (Dean of Harriot College of Arts and Sciences) said that the cap wasn’t 100, but something like 70.

Marianne Montgomery said she was not sure, but she thinks settling on that cap is something decided by the Facilities workgroup.

Rachel Roper noted in chat that 70 would be safer.

Puri Martinez pointed out that the guidelines put out by the guidelines Jeff Popke circulated from the American College Health Association (ACHA) says no more than 30 in a classroom. Wouldn’t higher caps go against that?

Marianne Montgomery said she thinks that consideration is in the Facilities workgroup charge, and this group should not spend time on it.

Crystal Chambers noted that recommendation about capacity has to be made in relation to space and the ACHA recommendations make no comment to that. Higher caps might be fine in larger spaces.

Alethia Cook said CIT does not have any way of knowing whether there will be 30 minutes between classes, etc. She checked with Edu Leorri, who is on that workgroup, and nothing had been settled about that.

Leigh Cellucci said she is actually on cleaning task force. They recommended 30 minutes but were told that was not a realistic expectation. They were told that faculty and students would be asked to wipe down their own stations. They are looking to the people in the classroom to do it. They are doing some cleaning, but they are looking at faculty and students to take responsibility for cleaning between classes.

Puri Martinez said she had seen that same recommendation here and other institutions too.

Rachel Roper said that having faculty and students clean their stations is good, and we should be opening the doors during the class changes too.

Leigh Cellucci said that recommendation had been made and her group was told absolutely not. They are not to be opened at any time other than the student exit or entry. The cleaning group wanted them open a few minutes before and after class changes and were told that would not pass.

Rachel Roper said she has seen that recommendation. Students and faculty shouldn’t be touching the door anyway—it should be propped open.

Leigh Cellucci said she will bring that up again.

Jeff Popke said they should proceed with the assumption there will be more than 10 minutes between class periods, but whether it will be faculty and students cleaning rather than janitorial staff is an unsettled question.

Jeni Parker asked if the units will pay for cleaning supplies, or the university? As many studios and other areas as the School of Theatre and Dance has, it will take a tremendous amount of supplies to clean, and if budgets are cut, she can see that being a struggle for units to cover.

Leigh Cellucci said that Friday afternoon the cleaning group made their recommendations, and that is when the person who decided about the fire doors told them they could not keep them open. She said they will ask about that again. The
other information they learned at that time was that faculty and students are going to have to take responsibility for cleaning their spaces, but no one actually said who was paying for cleaning supplies. That group mostly learned what was going to be approved as a recommendation and what wouldn’t be.

Jeff Popke said there has been a mention of masks, and Interim Chancellor Mitchelson has said units would not be expected to pay for that. He said cleaning supplies would most likely be treated the same way.

Jason Yao said asking faculty and students to clean up their own space is a good idea, and he thinks asking faculty to add this item to the syllabus so the students are all getting the same information for all courses from faculty would be the best way to proceed.

Jeff Popke said these are things that other people are likely to have to weigh in on. They already talked about ACHA not recommending more than 30 participants in a space. He suggested that CIT consider the two basic models and see if the group can come to an agreement on an approach that makes sense from a calendar and course scheduling perspective. The two models are:

1. Marianne Montgomery model (the all-hybrid model). Face-to-face hybrid model, in which courses meet either two or three days a week. The tricky thing is that rooms pretty much all have to change unless current enrollment is under the number we deem to be the maximum occupancy. 50% seems to be the maximum occupancy (and it might be less than that). If current enrollments are above 50% then they would have to be rescheduled. All of the existing times can be migrated to one or the other block so fewer students will have to be re-registered in that model. But the Facilities group will have to do more work to find more venues, especially large venues.

2. Other model assumes face to face and the only advantage to that second model (by Catherine Rigsby) is that it could allow a situation for a class to be divided into two groups, where one half attends a set of lectures some of the days, and the other half attends lectures the other days (rotating). That model does not work with a hybrid model. According to SACS that model doesn’t work. If we are going to count it as face to face, then we need students to get more face to face hours. Because only half of the students are showing up for any given class, then it is less disruptive for facilities. But pretty much every student will need to be re-registered.

Jeff Popke asks: is one of these models clearly superior and we can abandon the other and move on?

Puri Martine said she really likes Marianne’s model. The only thing she worries about is that she did a little study on what would happen in her department with this model with the schedule they have currently, and there will be a great number of students that are currently enrolled with schedules that will have to be dumped. The department would have an imbalance; all their classics classes will be in one block and not in the other. That might not allow for offering of courses in both blocks. She understands that to some extent, some dumping of schedules will happen. She would like to see if, despite the fact that everything is on a very tight deadline, there will be a chance to study the implications for a few select programs to see if the dumping will be so complex that it is not feasible to use the model or if it is only some programs and adjustments can happen on a case-to-case basis. This model will work very well for departments with many sections of the same courses, and graduate students who can move around. In her department the problems they will have is that the way their schedule was created, a lot of the fixed term faculty would be assigned 3 courses in 1 block and 1 to another. Her department does not have the flexibility to switch the schedules. She likes the model, but wants think about some of the implications.

Marianne Montgomery said the significant difficulty will be for fixed term faculty. People who teach 4 courses a semester are more likely to end up with workloads that are inappropriately balanced. In a department where fixed term faculty are fairly specialized, that is definitely a drawback. She envisions there will be a similar problem in her department and admits that she does not know what to do about it.

Timm Hackett asked to speak on two points. He notes that he is a fixed term faculty member and that along with those implications for this whole process of going from 16 to 8 weeks, there is the fear of maybe having to go online for the second block. The hybrid model, especially with the transition to Canvas this semester, at least guarantees some sort of online presence in every class. Over spring break and in the bonus week in spring break, everyone was scrambling to get
even some gradebooks or syllabi online. One of the big benefits of the hybrid model, besides keeping everyone’s schedule as close to normal as possible is that there is an online presence and if there is a second wave, all the classes are there already. He also called for flexibility with fixed-term faculty and workloads. He pointed out that this group just did it for the students when they increased the credits per block to 10, so could the group possibly increase faculty hours to 9? The max workload would give them the ability to teach a 1/3 or a 3/1.

Puri Martinez: said before they make a decision about that, she would want to collect more information from her departments. She is not sure whether they would be on board with that.

Timm Hackett said just having that option available might be enough. He noted that students don’t only sign up for classes based on days but also times. If a student signed up for a Monday-Wednesday-Friday course at 8, the hybrid schedule is asking them to stay in class for just a little bit longer. The other option is radically changing their hourly schedule as well. Changes in the day, but also the time may cause students to want to rearrange their schedule. He really likes the middle hybrid because it keeps them on the same day and the same time plus five minutes, and even though some schedules will have to be dumped, on the other model students will need to be re-registered he does not know how re-registering all the currently registered students will be able to happen. Students would be faced with a compressed schedule and possibly having to go to class on a different day or stay much longer--he thinks it is asking too much.

Jeff Popke said he was not sensing that there was anyone who actually prefers the other model that assumes face to face hours and has 2.5 hour time blocks. He noted that what he proposed as a possible benefit (students rotating their attendance to keep the rooms the same) is not something that is being embraced as outweighing the negatives. Maybe CIT should just work with this all-hybrid model and work out the implications?

Jason Yao said he agreed with most of the comments about the face to face model but does not want to abandon it too hastily. Can it be done so the students can watch live videos? Some students would still come to class, still have interactions, still have in-class stuff. Instead of asking them to watch recording later, they are asked to watch the class live. It is still face to face, just remote. He thinks doing it that way will address some of the concerns.

Crystal Chambers said she thought about that, but that is still considered DE because it is taught remotely.

Jason Yao said if we work to do it that way, it has more interaction than just watching a bunch of videos, which is really hard to do.

Jeff Popke said that two questions he posed about this model might get at Jason Yao’s question. What is clever about the hybrid model is that it has different options at each timeslot--options that are mutually exclusive from a student’s perspective. Any of the three options presented at any timeslot can change the amount of face to face vs. online contact. Is this group happy to just allow instructors to choose whether they want 12%, 46%, 40% online content, etc. Or would that be too confusing to students? He thinks that maybe they will want to let faculty make the choice and students will adjust. Does CIT want to standardize the percentage of online content or let it be faculty-driven?

Marianne Montgomery said she thinks it should be faculty driven and program driven. The Registrar’s automatic migration algorithm needs everyone to agree and pick one of these, but then she thinks it is up to department chairs to work with faculty to adjust the automated model’s output. If they default to 55-minute classes, then adjustments would need to happen for any course for which it is appropriate to have longer class periods. That is why she is concerned about the timeline Angela Anderson gives. She thinks more time is needed after the automated migration for programs to make decisions about end times for courses.

Jason Yao asked where the 12% and the 46% numbers come from.

Marianne Montgomery said she originally developed the model with a lot of minutes but it became overwhelming so she took it out. If 1 credit is 750 minutes of time in the classroom, then you start with the number of class meetings. For instance, for a MWF 8:00-8:55, that would be 22 meetings (55 minutes plus 22 meetings). That is how we get to the
percentages online. That gives you the minutes you need online. They don’t need to necessarily be synchronous minutes, but need to think about how your classroom time should be divided between the things you do face to face and what could be moved online.

Professor Martinez requested the minutes schedule, and Marianne Montgomery said she would provide it.

Jason Yao said knowing that will help him to explain some of the things to the faculty, to the chairs.

Timm Hackett said someone earlier in the chat window mentioned the flipped classroom. The hybrid model combines the best elements of online and a flipped classroom. One of the things he was afraid of is if someone went to MWF 8-9:30 and they were only putting 12% online. The bare minimum would be online. He doesn’t know how much the university wants to eradicate Friday classes, so that is why he gravitated toward the middle one because it keeps students on a similar schedule to what they signed up for. Don’t want it to turn into Blackboard Fridays where busywork is put on there just to satisfy the online component.

Jeff Popke pointed out that he is like those instructors—he is not used to online instruction. His preference is to lecture for the longer hours and do only 12% online. Synchronous minutes for a DE course are not tracked, they assume it has been approved under certain learning outcomes, so there is tremendous flexibility and everyone has all summer to help come up with examples to provide good and interesting ways for faculty like him to accomplish the hybrid part of their course. He likes the hybrid model because it gives different faculty with different comfort levels with DE some options.

Timm Hackett said he knows that some faculty didn’t even have the syllabus or the grades online. His fear is that some faculty will see 12% and really just reduce it to 0. If everyone has to go all the way online because of the virus, then he just wants to make sure there is some presence online so it won’t be so disruptive. The first time he looked at the 55 minute class, he was considering the cleaning time factoring in as well.

Jeff Popke said that is also a good question we skipped over. He noted that Marianne’s model is suggesting faculty should be on campus no more than three times a week.

Marianne Montgomery said for Tuesday-Thursday classes, there is still a low percentage for the online option that still allows you to teach in person. It is really only the Monday-Wednesday-Friday that would need a more significant online portion to turn into a two-day-a-week on campus course.

Jeff Popke said it feels like they have a basic recommendation. They like this hybrid model with different choices. He can pass it to the ACC on Wednesday. The other concrete thing: CIT thinks the initial schedule run that allocates the classes between the two blocks needs to happen sooner rather than later. There is going to be a lot of work necessary to account for excess workload and to account for students who end up with four or five classes in one block. They will have to get advisors involved. They have these things as a basic recommendation, pending some of the health-related guidelines that we will need from facilities and cleaning groups.

Puri Martinez said she was glad Jeff Popke mentioned advising because one of the key components is to have really solid schedules done by the department and the commitment of advisors to accommodate the students. Advisors and faculty and administrators outside of her department do not have a favorable view of the importance of foreign languages and she is afraid that if a lot of classes get dumped, her department’s enrollments will suffer drastically. The commitment from advisors to help maintain the integrity of the schedule as much as possible and the opportunity for departments to develop solid schedules is key.

Crystal Chambers pointed out that the group thought about inviting academic advising before. She suggested inviting Steve Asby to be part of the conversation. She also pointed out that at no point have students been represented in any of these decisions. CIT can request from the Student Government Association (SGA) a volunteer to serve on our committee. Whether they get one on the other committees formed by the Interim Chancellor is unknown, but CIT can still invite them to participate in this one.
Rachel Roper agreed that was a really good idea and thought that would nip a lot of complaints in the bud.

Jeff Popke agreed, and said he had some conversations with the new SGA president and he can invite him to next meeting, if he can make it.

Crystal Chambers added that it would be great experience for them and would quell some of their nerves.

Jeff Popke asked what is the benefit to have the initial migration run through the 40% or 46% model?

Marianne Montgomery answered that it keeps the schedule to the normal times, and that she thought CIT needs to choose one for the migration.

Stacey Altman said she did not survey everyone in her college, but for all she did survey they were more for that one (46%) because they were less likely to have multiple changes, at least for Health and Human Performance.

Marianne Montgomery said they would need to be super clear that the Registrar would program these other available course times into Banner so a department can change the times as necessary.

Jason Yao asked for clarification: when they said two choices, were they contrasting the 12% with the 46%, where they could either have longer face-to-face sessions with a bit of online content, or the more regular face to face time and you add more significant online content?

Jeff Popke answered yes, exactly.

Jason Yao said the regular, smaller online piece will make a lot of people very comfortable because they will not have to make more changes to the traditional schedule and teaching. They will have flexibility of having some things done synchronously. But if you ask people to pretty much teach half online, you have to prepare your class both ways, and have bigger blocks prepared with material. He admitted that personally, he hated recording videos.

Marianne Montgomery said all of these would be options, but they are talking about which one the Registrar should default to for the automated piece. It doesn’t foreclose the possibilities.

Mark McCarthy said that from a perception standpoint, we went to all online in the spring. What they are proposing to do here is where almost half is online in the fall, and even though some are doing less online, etc., it is better to present it at the start as 88% face to face. Otherwise, parents and students will wonder why they are paying in-person fees when almost half is online?

Jason Yao agreed they would need to combat that perception.

Marianne Montgomery said the correct end time would be listed in Banner. That would need to be entered. It is not one size fits all. Departments would have to be able to go in and have a staff member change it so a course is ending at 8:55, no matter what model is the default.

Puri Martinez said that is why the timeline that Angela Anderson presents is not correct. Before the schedule is released to the students, those decisions need to be made by units.

Marianne Montgomery said that with an understanding there needs to be some additional minor tweaking, they need to do their level best to give students a real schedule by June 8th.

Jeff Popke said this meeting was very productive. He will pass on these key recommendations to ACC on Wednesday. CIT did not get to what kind of courses are appropriate for exemption to remain on a 15-week schedule and which should not. He felt like there is still some time to weigh in on that. He said the members of CIT can all respond individually to Angela Anderson, and they have until May 26th. Is there a desire or need for CIT to meet again this week, or should they
agree to reconvene next Monday and take up that for one agenda item and see what others they are prepared to talk through with regard to the basic hybrid model they have agreed to work with?

Marianne Montgomery said it seems like a lot of decisions are going to be made in the next few days and asked for Jeff Popke’s perception of whether it would be more useful to meet this week.

Crystal Chambers pointed out that it is easier to schedule a meeting and cancel it.

Alethia Cook said that what happens at the Wednesday ACC meeting might be something CIT wants to discuss. She agreed that they could have it on schedule and cancel it if not needed.

Jason Yao agreed, adding that after they all receive the document from Angela they may have things that warrant discussion.

Jeff Popke suggested Thursday or Friday and said Rachel Baker can look at schedules and do a comparison to schedule the time when most members can meet. He will let everyone know whether it is a good idea to keep the meeting or not.

Jason Yao said that tomorrow he would be going to a department meeting. How much can members of CIT share with chairs and faculty about the discussions from today?

Jeff Popke said nothing about this group is secretive. Members are supposed to be soliciting as much feedback as possible. He would be cautious about presenting anything as a firm, final decision yet. This group does not have authority to make that decision. But any of the things CIT has been talking about is fair to discuss.

Jason Yao said faculty are very anxious, and if they explain they are working on these things and that their concerns are being considered, it would help. Faculty are just trying to figure out how to do this.

Puri Martinez said the group should thank Marianne Montgomery for her plan because it advanced the conversation a great deal. Everyone agreed.

The meeting adjourned at 2:35 PM.