

COMMON SCHEDULE TASK FORCE REPORT TO THE SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE AND OFFICE OF THE PROVOST May 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Report.	Pages 1-4
Appendix A Regional Campus Faculty Survey	Pages 5-99
Appendix B Regional Campus Professional Staff Interviews	Pages 100-107
Appendix C Regional Campus Student Focus Groups	Page 108

INTRODUCTION

Background

After several years of discussion between the Office of the Provost, Office of the Registrar, regional campus administration and some senate and faculty leaders, a decision was made to implement a common schedule across all university campuses to begin in spring 2016. The rationale for the Common Schedule included the following:

- Help deal with increased enrollments on the Hartford and Stamford campuses
- Address the issue of empty classrooms on Fridays
- Allow for more distance learning opportunities between Storrs and the regional campuses and across regional campuses
- Help regional campus students become more comfortable with the 5-day schedule of classes when they become Storrs students by establishing the same or similar schedule at the regional campuses

At the start of the Fall 2015 semester when regional faculty and students learned of the common schedule and of the plan to implement it in the spring 2016 the following concerns were raised:

- The decision was made without consultation or feedback from stakeholders
- There was a lack of timely communication
- The impact of the common schedule at the regional campuses seemed not to be considered; lack of data to justify rationales
- The common schedule poses unnecessary problems for the commuting and working student as well as for adjunct faculty
- The Common Schedule Initiative was indicative of increasing centralization at the university

In response to these concerns the Office of the Provost held three open forum teleconferences with regional campus faculty and students. As a result, it was determined that it was important to ensure that

scheduling flexibility be available for each campus; that there be a commitment to a MWF block for some of the campuses; and that all campuses would move ahead with common start times.

In the Spring of 2016 the common schedule across all University campuses was implemented. It was implemented more fully at the Avery Point and Hartford campuses than at the Stamford, Torrington or Waterbury campuses. A key component of the common schedule was the move from MW 75-minute time blocks to MWF 50-minute time blocks. The percentages of classes offered at the regional campuses on MWF for Spring 2016 ranged from 0% (Torrington), to 1% (Stamford), to 6% (Waterbury) to 17% (Hartford and Avery Point). All campuses moved to a common start time.

All constituencies – administration, faculty, staff and students – agreed that it was important to study the implications of a common schedule and that there was a need for improved communication in the future. The Common Schedule Task Force was formed in October 2015 to study the implications of the implementation of the common schedule.

Charge to the Common Schedule Task Force

To study the implications of a common schedule across all UConn campuses, including the following:

1. Identify benefits, drawbacks and challenges
2. Investigate the impact on full-time faculty, students and adjunct faculty (trends and how many exceptions granted)
3. Conduct focus groups, as well as interview randomly selected students; include students who have classes on Fridays and those who don't
4. Meet with regional campus directors and select faculty
5. Identify professional development opportunities and on-line teaching support for faculty
6. Investigate student work schedules and the impact of common schedule on students' work

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The task force employed several data gathering methodologies between October 2015 and April 2016 to assess the impact of the common schedule on full-time faculty, adjunct faculty and students. Data were collected through:

- a survey sent to the faculty (See Appendix A)
- interviews conducted with professional staff (See Appendix B)
- student focus groups conducted at each regional campus by the Regional Campus Student Welfare Task Force (See Appendix C)

The findings triangulated rather definitively and reflected anecdotal evidence and “hallway chatter.”

Key Findings

Based on conversations among the task force members and on the results from these studies, two major topics emerged 1) the process of determining/communicating/implementing the common schedule/common start time and 2) specific drawbacks/challenges and benefits/opportunities related to the common schedule/common start time. Appendices A, B and C provide more nuanced details; here we identify key findings and offer recommendations:

The Process of Determining/Communicating/Implementing the Common Schedule/Common Start Time

- Findings
 - The lack of systematic input from the regional campus administration, faculty, staff and students as part of the decision-making process resulted in feelings of disenfranchisement, anger and low morale.
 - Concerns were raised that the initiative to implement the common schedule was done without gathering data; rationales given for the change in scheduling were questioned.
 - Storrs-centered approach seemed to not understand the working and commuting student, the success of the schedules already in place or the regional faculty - particularly the adjunct faculty.
 - The 'rush to implement' (i.e. announcing in September 2015 with a Spring 2016 implementation date) resulted in challenges for scheduling and additional angst for faculty, students, administrators and staff.
- Recommendations
 - Carefully consider a process by which policies relating to regional campuses can be vetted, with an understanding that each campus is unique in the programs it offers, the student body that it serves and the make-up of the faculty.
 - Establish clear, timely and consultative communication between Storrs and regional campuses.
 - Flexibility in scheduling is best to meet individual campus needs. Flexibility occurred in Spring 2016 and should continue to occur.

Specific drawbacks and challenges related to the common schedule/common start time

- Findings
 - The key negative finding related to the 50-minute classes and scheduling classes on Friday.
 - Faculty and students who participated in the studies have a *strong* preference for 75-minute twice a week and 2 ½ - 3 hour once a week vs. 50 –minute three times per week. Faculty reasons focus on pedagogical approach, wasted start-up time in class, commuting time/costs; scheduling time for research; travel time to Storrs campus. Student reasons focus on work schedules: the vast majority of students work, i.e. 40% of the student body works twenty hours or more per week and a significant majority of the student body works on Fridays; increased commuting time/costs.
 - Some expressed concern that adjuncts would end up with the less desirable teaching schedule (MWF), increasing their commuting time and potentially creating difficulties for their over-all teaching schedules that can include multiple campuses and/or multiple institutions.
- Recommendations
 - Follow the common start time schedule, allowing flexibility in scheduling to best meet the needs of course delivery (some courses are amenable to three-day, two –day and one-day per week format), student work/school schedules and faculty responsibilities.
 - Scheduling sensitivity to faculty and student needs.
 - Greater transparency. Communicate the challenges in scheduling. Course scheduling is complicated for the administrators attempting to manage many conflicting interests – pedagogical, class room availability, scheduling courses so that they do not conflict with/cannibalize enrollments in other classes, faculty requests.

Specific benefits and opportunities related to the common schedule/common start time

- Findings
 - Potential for increased number and availability of on-line and hybrid courses that many students seem to like. Opportunities for hybrid courses increase with the MWF schedule as many faculty and students prefer the on-line option for Friday as opposed to meeting FTF three times a week.
 - Increased vibrancy on campuses on Friday as a consequence of MWF schedule.
 - Help with increasing enrollments in Hartford and Stamford.
- Recommendations
 - ‘Local’ - i.e., at each campus - resources must be in place to support all faculty who take advantage of on-line and hybrid course delivery opportunities.
 - Specific efforts need to focus on providing training and resources for adjuncts who comprise 70% of the regional campus faculty. Many adjuncts work at multiple institutions and as such, though they have less vested in UConn, many are willing to invest their time in course development with the proper support.
 - Engage CETL to consider ways to make on-line, hybrid and distance learning more attractive.

CONCLUSION

The Common Schedule/Start Time Initiative has raised concerns as well as opportunities for the University. Working collaboratively on this and other issues across all campuses will promote a more shared vision of the University and its efforts.

The Task Force wishes to thank the university senate and the offices of the Provost for their support, and the faculty, staff and students who shared their perspectives on the common schedule initiative.

Respectfully Submitted,

Pam Bramble, Associate Professor, Department of Art and Art History (Waterbury; co-chair)

Dennis Breslin, adjunct faculty, AMST: Sociology (Avery Point)

Robin Coulter, Professor, Marketing (Storrs)

Lisa Eaton, Assistant Professor, HDFS (Hartford)

Katie Martin, Director, Business and Student Services (Hartford)

Judith Meyer, Associate Professor, History (Waterbury)

Steve Park, Director, Academic Services (Avery Point)

Tina Reardon, Lecturer, East Asian History (Torrington)

Sally Reis, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (Storrs, co-chair)

Shahanara Shahjahan, student (Stamford)

Bob Tilton, Professor, English (Stamford)

APPENDIX A

REGIONAL CAMPUS FACULTY SURVEY

UConn Common Schedule/Start Time Initiative:

Regional Faculty Survey Results

May 9, 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OVERVIEW AND DATA COLLECTION

BACKGROUND.....	7
SURVEY OBJECTIVES.....	7
DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES AND RESPONDENT PROFILE.....	8
1. Faculty at Regional Campuses (OIRE).....	8
2. Faculty Response and Respondents by Home Campus.....	9
3. Faculty Respondents by Faculty Rank.....	10
NOTES AND INTERPRETATION OF THE FACULTY SAMPLE	11

FACULTY SURVEY FINDINGS

CLASS TIME INTERESTS AND IMPACT ON COURSE DELIVERY	
1. Interest in Class Times.....	12
2. Impact on Student Learning.....	12
3. Class-Time Preference by Campus.....	13
4. 50-Minute Class Time: Summary of Advantages/Challenges of Class-Times.....	14
5. 75-Minute Class Time: Summary of Advantages/Challenges of Class-Times.....	15
6. 2.5-3 Hour Class Time: Summary of Advantages/Challenges of Class-Times.....	16
TEACHING ONLINE AND HYBRID COURSES AT UCONN	
1. Percent Teaching Online and Hybrid Courses at UConn.....	17
2. Interest in Online and Hybrid Teaching	17
3. Online Course Format: Summary of Advantages/Challenges	18
4. Hybrid Course Format: Summary of Advantages/Challenges.....	19
PERCEPTIONS OF THE EFFECTS OF THE COMMON START TIME INITIATIVE	20
CHANGES TO FACULTY COURSES IN SPRING 2016	
1. Percent of Faculty whose Schedule Changed in Spring 2016 (OIRE).....	21
2. Faculty Survey Respondents Reporting a Schedule Change in Spring 2016.....	21
3. Impact of Common Start Time for Those whose Schedule Changed in Spring 2016	22
4. Responses - Impact of the Common Start Time for Those whose Schedule Changed in 2016.....	22
NEED FOR REGIONAL CAMPUS REPRESENTATION	23
FINAL COMMENTS	23
TABLES.....	24-86

Table 1: Reactions to 50-Minute Class Meetings: Full-Time Faculty: Advantages/Challenges.....	24
Table 2: Reactions to 50-Minute Class Meetings: Adjunct Faculty: Advantages/Challenges.....	31
Table 3: Reactions to 75-Minute Class Meetings: Full-Time Faculty: Advantages/Challenges.....	39
Table 4: Reactions to 75-Minute Class Meetings: Adjunct Faculty: Advantages/Challenges.....	43
Table 5: Reactions to 2.5-3 Hour Class Meeting: Full-Time Faculty: Advantages/Challenges.....	49
Table 6: Reactions to 2.5-3 Hour Class Meeting: Full-Time Faculty: Advantages/Challenges.....	53
Table 7: Online Courses: Advantages/Challenges: Full-Time Faculty.....	59
Table 8: Online Courses: Advantages/Challenges: Adjunct Faculty.....	64
Table 9: Hybrid Courses: Advantages/Challenges: Full-Time Faculty.....	69
Table 10: Hybrid Courses: Advantages/Challenges: Adjunct Faculty.....	73
Table 11: Impact of Common Start Time: Full-Time Faculty.....	76
Table 12: Impact of Common Start Time: Adjunct Faculty.....	80
Table 13: Final Comments: Full-Time Faculty.....	83
Table 14: Final Comments: Adjunct Faculty.....	85

APPENDIX (FACULTY SURVEY).....87-99

OVERVIEW AND DATA COLLECTION

BACKGROUND

After several years of discussion between the Provost's office, the Registrar's office, Regional Campus Directors and some Senate and faculty leaders, a decision was made to implement a common schedule across all campuses to begin in Spring 2016. The primary expectations related to this initiative were: 1) that consideration be given to changing some Monday-Wednesday scheduled courses to meet on a Monday-Wednesday-Friday schedule, and 2) to have start times match across all UConn campuses.

In response to comments by regional faculty and staff during Fall 2015, the Office of the Provost, at the recommendation of the Senate Executive Committee of the University Senate, appointed the Common Schedule Task Force. Further, the University administration understood that transitioning to common start times for Spring 2016 may work for some courses and not for others, and made accommodations accordingly.

This survey, conducted by the Task Force, addresses two of the initiative's four strategic reasons:

- to provide additional class schedule options to deal with increased enrollments, with particular needs on the Hartford and Stamford campuses, and
- to enable additional distance learning opportunities among all campuses.

SURVEY OBJECTIVES

The Common Schedule Task Force prepared a survey (Appendix A), with questions:

To assess faculty reactions to:

- The common start time initiative with attention to:
 - the advantages and challenges associated with teaching classes scheduled for: 1) 50 minutes, three times a week; 2) 75 minutes, two times a week, and 3) 2.5-3 hours, once a week.
 - effects of the initiative on faculty teaching in Spring 2016, and on the effect on the classroom teaching and learning experiences.
 - extent to which faculty perceived the initiative raised concerns among faculty generally, the staff, and students.
- Teaching online and in a hybrid format with attention to:
 - experience and interest in these formats.
 - advantages and challenges associated with teaching in these formats.

To detail the survey's respondent profile on the following:

- Recent teaching class time
- Status as full (part)-time vs. adjunct
- "Home" campus affiliation

DATA COLLECTION PROCEDURES AND RESPONDENT PROFILE

The survey was prepared on Qualtrics. The survey was targeted to 444 full(part)-time and adjunct faculty teaching undergraduate courses at the regional campuses, including Avery Point, Hartford, Stamford, Torrington, and Waterbury in Spring 2016.

OIRE emailed the survey link to the targeted faculty on March 22, 2016, and a reminder email was sent on March 30, 2016. A total of 99 full-time, part-time, and adjunct faculty responded to the survey by the April 3, 2016 deadline.

This section first provides details of the 444 faculty and their campus affiliation, and follows with profile information on the 99 faculty completing the survey.

1. Faculty at Regional Campuses (Source: OIRE)

The number of full-time (part-time) and adjunct faculty at each of the regional campuses teaching undergraduate courses in Spring 2016 is shown below (under “Head count”).

In Spring 2016, 444 instructors taught at the regional campuses; approximately 31% (138) are full-time/part-time UConn faculty; 69% (306) are adjunct faculty.

Campus	Total	Spring 2016 Regional Campus Faculty Teaching Undergraduate Courses			
		Full (Part)-time faculty		Adjunct faculty ^a	
		Head count	%	Head count	%
Avery Point	83	28 (0)	34%	55	66%
Hartford	130	33 (1)	26%	96	74%
Stamford	139	48 (1)	35%	90	65%
Torrington	26	2 (0)	8%	24	92%
Waterbury	66	25 (0)	38%	41	62%
TOTAL	444	136 (2)	31%	306	69%

^a Adjunct faculty includes those identified in the special payroll teaching file who: 1) have no record in the regular payroll file, 2) are coded as professional staff in the regular payroll file, and 3) are coded as graduate assistants in the regular payroll file.

2. Faculty Response and Respondents by “Home” Campus (Source: Faculty Survey)

The overall response rate for the survey was 22% (99 of 444 faculty responded).

Of the 99 faculty respondents, 5% did not report their “home” campus; of those 94 responding, 92% teach at one campus, 6% teach on two campuses, and 2% teach on three campuses. The majority of faculty responding (84%) had a “home” campus affiliation with Hartford (34%), Avery Point (24%), or Stamford (24%).

The percentage of “home” campus faculty who responded to the survey was: Avery Point (28%) and Hartford (25%) than at Waterbury (20%), Stamford (17%), and Torrington (8%). The footnotes below provide an interpretation of the data in each column.

Home Campus	% of respondents identifying “home” campus (n = 99)	% of respondents identifying “home” campus (n = 94)	% of “home” campus faculty responding to the survey
Avery Point	23% ^a (n = 23)	24% ^b	28% ^c (n = 83)
Hartford	32% (n = 32)	34%	25% (n = 130)
Stamford	23% (n = 23)	24%	17% (n = 139)
Torrington	3% (n = 3)	3%	8% (n = 36)
Waterbury	13% (n = 13)	14%	20% (n = 66)
Not reported	5% (n = 5)		

^a Of the 99 faculty responding to the survey, 23% reported that their “home” campus as Avery Point.

^b Of the 94 faculty who reported a campus affiliation, 24% reported this “home” campus as Avery Point.

^c At Avery Point, 83 full (part)-time and adjunct faculty taught an undergraduate course in Spring 2016; 23 of the 83 (28%) responded to the survey.

3. Faculty Respondents by Faculty Rank (Source: Faculty Survey)

Of the 99 faculty participating in the survey; 43 were full-time faculty, 47 were adjuncts, and 9 did not report their faculty rank. Of those 90 faculty who provided information about their status, 47.8% were full-time faculty; 52.2% were adjunct faculty.

Faculty Status	% of respondents identifying faculty rank status (n = 99)	% of respondents identifying faculty rank status (n = 90)
Full-time	43.5%	47.8%
Adjunct	47.5%	52.2%
Not reported	9.0%	

The distributions of faculty rank for all 99 faculty respondents (including those who did not report), and for those 90 who did report a rank are as follows:

Faculty Rank	% of respondents identifying faculty rank status (n = 99)	% of respondents identifying faculty rank status (n = 90)
Assistant Professor	5.1%	5.6%
Associate Professor	18.2%	20.0%
Full Professor	5.1%	5.6%
Assistant Professor In-Residence	13.1%	14.4%
Associate Professor In-Residence	1.0%	1.1%
Full Professor In-Residence	1.0%	1.1%
Adjunct	47.5%	52.2%
Not reported	9.0%	

NOTES AND INTERPRETATION OF THE FACULTY SAMPLE FOR THE SURVEY

As a basis for interpretation of the data in this report, please note the following points.

- The survey ensured anonymity, and data were not examined related to an individual respondent's question responses. The survey included questions about campus affiliation, faculty rank, and college/school affiliation; these were used to aggregate data for this report. Notably, some respondents report a distrust for the data collection and hence did not complete these "identifying" questions.
- In constructing the survey and in interpreting the results, we were attentive to face, construct, and external validity. As related to face validity, our survey questions were reviewed carefully to ensure that the questions were relevant and going to measure the issues of interest; further, the results have face validity in that they resonate with "in the hall chatter" at the regional campuses. Construct validity refers to the extent to which the questions used measure "constructs" of interest; in this survey we used Likert-scale (7-point items) and open-ended questions to understand faculty attitudes (advantages and challenges) related to: class times, teaching online and hybrid classes, changes to their own teaching, and also more general sentiments. Finally, external validity relates to the generalizability of survey participants' responses to a broader population, and in our case, the extent to which faculty responding to the survey represent those who did not respond. The survey was sent to all 444 faculty teaching an undergraduate course in Spring 2016, and 22% of the faculty responded. It is important to note that individuals who perceive topics as very important and/or have strong opinions on the topic are more likely to complete surveys than those who perceive the topics are less important and/or have weaker opinions. Thus, the opinions of these 22% cannot be interpreted as representative of, or generalizable to, all of the faculty teaching at the regional campuses. In other words, the opinions of the 78% who did not respond to this survey and their opinions cannot be inferred from those who did respond.
- A greater percentage of the faculty at Avery Point (27.7%) and Hartford (24.6%) campuses versus the percentage of faculty at the other campuses responded to this survey. This higher response rate is likely because a greater percentage of courses was offered on a MWF schedule in Spring 2016 at these two campuses. As noted in the January 21, 2016 Task Force Report to the SEC reported, "percentages of classes offered at the regional campuses on MWF range from 0% (Torrington), to 1% (Stamford), to 6% (Waterbury) to 17% (Hartford and Avery Point)."
- Adjuncts represent approximately 70% of the instructors of undergraduate courses in Spring 2016; as a percentage of those indicating their faculty status (as 9% did not report their status), adjuncts account for approximately 52% of responses and full-time/part-time account for 48% of responses.

FACULTY SURVEY FINDINGS

CLASS TIME INTERESTS AND IMPACT ON COURSE DELIVERY

1. Interest in Class Times

Respondents indicated their level of interest in teaching an undergraduate course in each of the three “in-class” time schedules. As shown below, interest is highest for 75-minute classes among both full-time and adjunct faculty; 2.5-3 hour classes also are of interest. The 50-minute class receives very little interest from both the full-time and adjunct faculty.

	Interest (Mean) in Class Times for each Faculty Group ^a		
	All faculty (n = 97) ^b	Full-time faculty (n = 43) ^b	Adjunct faculty (n = 47) ^b
75 minutes–2 times a week	5.79	6.00	5.45
2.5-3 hours–once a week	4.73	4.47	4.83
50 minutes–3 times a week	1.95	1.65	2.21

^aScale: (1) Not at all interested – (7) Very Interested

^bThe reported means for “All faculty” are based on 97 faculty; the reported means for “Full-time faculty” are based on 43 faculty; and the reported means for “Adjunct faculty” are based on 47 faculty. The sum of the full-time faculty (43) plus adjunct faculty (47) does not total to 97 because seven (7) faculty did not report their faculty rank.

2. Impact on Student Learning

Respondents indicated the extent to which each of the three time schedules provided them the time in class needed to accomplish the learning objectives of the undergraduate course(s). Consistent with “interest in class times” (above), faculty report that the 75-minute and 2.5-3 hour class times (vs. the 50-minute class time) have a more favorable impact on the delivery of their courses.

	Impact on Course Delivery (Mean) for Each Faculty Group ^a		
	All faculty (n = 97) ^b	Full-time faculty (n = 43)	Adjunct faculty (n = 47)
75 minutes–2 times a week	5.71	6.02	5.32
2.5-3 hours – once a week	4.97	4.95	4.89
50 minutes–3 times a week	2.65	2.44	2.81

^aScale: (1) Very negatively impacts the delivery of my course – (7) Very positively impacts the delivery of my course

^bThe reported means for “All faculty” are based on 97 faculty; the reported means for “Full-time faculty” are based on 43 faculty; and the reported means for “Adjunct faculty” are based on 47 faculty. The sum of the full-time faculty (43) plus adjunct faculty (47) does not total to 97 because seven (7) faculty did not report their faculty rank.

3. Class-Time Preference by Campus

Faculty at all campuses have the least interest in 50-minute (vs. longer) classes. Avery Point, Hartford and Stamford (*Waterbury and Torrington have smaller samples and are not reported*), however, have different preferences for class time. Avery Point and Hartford have the stronger interest for 75-minute classes, whereas Stamford has the strongest interest in 2.5-3 hour classes.

	Impact on Course Delivery (Mean) for Each Faculty Group ^a		
	Avery Point (n = 23)	Hartford (n = 32)	Stamford (n = 23)
75 minutes–2 times a week	6.5	5.7	5.0
2.5-3 hours – once a week	3.4	4.9	5.5
50 minutes–3 times a week	2.5	1.9	1.3

^a Scale: (1) Not at all interested – (7) Very Interested

4. 50-Minute Class Time: Summary of Advantages/Challenges of Class-Times

SUMMARY of 50-MINUTE CLASS MEETINGS: FULL-TIME AND ADJUNCT FACULTY RESPONSES (See Tables 1 and 2 for all responses)	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
Faculty and Students <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More face-to-face and touch points • Best for courses that require regular and frequent exposure and reinforcement of material (math, language); 2 lectures and a discussion section • More consistent with student attention span and ability to digest information Students <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less time between classes could mean better comprehension • If a class is cancelled or a student misses a class, the student misses less content 	Faculty <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Course delivery is compromised: not enough time to review material, teach, discuss and wrap up, work in teams; less flexibility on exams • Difficult scheduling for full-time and adjunct faculty teaching at multiple UConn campuses • Difficult scheduling for adjuncts who also teach at other colleges/universities • Compromises faculty time related to research agenda • Compromises participation in meetings on Storrs campus, as well as department and campus meetings • Compromises availability to meet with students • Time required restructuring of course from 2-days/week • More travel time; travel time exceeds class time; it's a pay cut • Expectation of lowered enrollments due to listed challenges Students <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not sufficient time for students to engage in active learning/thinking in class • Limits student ability to work/engage in internships on Fridays • More travel time/costs per week • Additional absences • Students don't need 15 minutes to walk from one classroom to another

5. 75-Minute Class Time: Summary of Advantages/Challenges of Class-Times

SUMMARY of 75-MINUTE CLASS MEETINGS: FULL-TIME AND ADJUNCT FACULTY RESPONSES (See Tables 3 and 4 for all responses)	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
<p>Faculty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows for sufficient time to review material, teach, in-class activities, discuss and wrap up, work in teams; have guest speakers; more flexibility related to content and exams/assessments • Opportunities to “flip” the classroom – bring more engagement to the class • Less “housekeeping” (start-up/attendance) for 2 (vs. 3) days/week • Less prep time for 2 (vs. 3) days/week • Allows for flexibility related to research agenda, participation in meetings on Storrs campus, as well as department and campus meetings • Allows for easier scheduling (vs. 3 days/week) of teaching at other UConn campuses (full-time) and for other colleges/universities (adjunct) <p>Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows sufficient time for students to engage in active learning/higher level thinking in class • Preferred (vs. 1 day/week) for student attention and engagement • Students are more likely to bond with one another in classes that are 75 (vs. 50) minutes • Enables stronger student-faculty relationship • Less student absences than 3 days/week • Allows students time to work/participate in internships on Fridays <p>Faculty and Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less travel time for 2 (vs. 3) days/week; smaller environmental footprint 	<p>Faculty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intense “competition” for 2 day/week schedules among faculty • More stamina is needed than for 50 minute classes • Keeping students engaged to 1.25 hour classes • Student absences and snow days for a 2 (vs. 3) day a week are more challenging because of the added time missed on a class day • More difficult to schedule guest speaker in a 75-minute class than in a 2.5-3 hr class <p>Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keeping students’ attention for 75 minutes • Longer gap (less continuity) between classes - Thursday to Tuesday (vs. Friday to Monday) • 2 (vs. 3) days/week class is less of a “presence” in the student’s week <p>Faculty and Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More travel time than once a week (particularly noted for adjunct faculty)

6. 2.5-3 Hour Class Time: Summary of Advantages/Challenges of Class-Times

SUMMARY of 2.5-3 HOUR CLASS MEETINGS: FULL-TIME AND ADJUNCT FACULTY RESPONSES (See Tables 5 and 6 for all responses)	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
<p>Faculty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allows maximum flexibility related to scheduling university service, advising, office hours, research • Provides significant class time for thorough/in-depth content coverage team projects, discussion, inclusion of guest speakers; appropriate for upper-level, experiential learning, and service learning courses • Allows for easier scheduling across UConn campuses (full-time) and across teaching at other colleges/universities (strongly preferred option for adjuncts) <p>Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Particularly night classes serve students with full-time jobs • Increased likelihood of attendance • More time between classes to complete assignments <p>Faculty and Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less travel time (vs. more frequent class meetings) • Increased ability to get to know one another during longer class time 	<p>Faculty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Difficult to maintain student attention • Requires multiple in-class activities; not appropriate for straight lecture courses • Endurance challenge for faculty <p>Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too much material to students to digest • Less opportunity for students to have a sense of community because of fewer meetings per week • Less access (across weekdays) to instructor <p>Faculty and Staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not workable for lower division courses – too much material to cover in one setting • Miss one class and you miss a week of work • Requires a 10-minute break in the class time

FACULTY SURVEY FINDINGS

TEACHING ONLINE AND HYBRID COURSES AT UCONN

1. Percent Teaching Online and Hybrid Courses at UConn

Overall, relatively few faculty who responded to the survey have experience teaching online or hybrid courses. A higher percentage have taught a hybrid (15.5%) than an online (9.3%) course.

There is a significant difference between the extent to which each of these course formats is taught by full-time and adjunct faculty. Specifically, a larger percentage of full-time (14.0%) versus adjunct (2.1%) faculty have taught an online course. Similarly, a larger percentage of full-time (20.9%) versus adjunct (8.5%) have taught a hybrid course.

	% Teaching Online and Hybrid Courses for Each Faculty Group		
	All faculty (n = 97) ^a	Full-time faculty (n = 43) ^a	Adjunct faculty (n = 44) ^a
% who have taught online	9.3%	14.0%	2.1%
% who have taught hybrid	15.5%	20.9%	8.5%

^aThe reported means for “All faculty” are based on 97 faculty; the reported means for “Full-time faculty” are based on 43 faculty; and the reported means for “Adjunct faculty” are based on 47 faculty. The sum of the full-time faculty (43) plus adjunct faculty (47) do not total to 97 because of seven (7) faculty who did not report their faculty rank.

2. Interest in Online and Hybrid Teaching

The adjunct (vs. full-time) faculty express greater interest in teaching: 1) online courses, 2) hybrid courses, and 3) the MW in-class/F-online class. There is, however, relatively little interest in the MW in-class/F-online class format.

	Interest (Mean) in Online and Hybrid Formats for each Faculty Group ^a		
	All faculty (n = 97) ^b	Full-time faculty (n = 43) ^b	Adjunct faculty (n = 44) ^b
Online	3.95	3.37	4.15
Hybrid	4.78	4.09	5.15
MW in-class; F online	2.87	2.23	3.17

^a Scale: (1) Not at all interested – (7) Very Interested

^b The reported means for “All faculty” are based on 97 faculty; the reported means for “Full-time faculty” are based on 43 faculty; and the reported means for “Adjunct faculty” are based on 47 faculty. The sum of the full-time faculty (43) plus adjunct faculty (47) do not total to 97 because of seven (7) faculty who did not report their faculty rank.

3. Online Course Format: Summary of Advantages and Challenges

SUMMARY of TEACHING ONLINE: FULL-TIME AND ADJUNCT FACULTY RESPONSES (See Tables 7 and 8 for all responses)	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
<p>Faculty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assistance in course development is necessary; CETL can be a resource • Can make faculty rethink what they are teaching • Course dependent; not appropriate for hands-on courses (focused on teaching students to think, analyze, argue, discuss, and write; not appropriate for lab classes) • Takes advantage of technological innovation • Enables all students (including shy/introvert) to participate in discussions <p>Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Best for self-motivated and independent students; may help to foster independence • Students learn at their own pace • 24 x 7 access to material in general and during illness and other issues that prevent student from coming to class • Possible access to courses offered across campuses <p>Faculty and Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eliminates travel time, environmental footprint • Provides convenience and flexibility related scheduling of professional and personal time • No need to worry about winter weather delays, cancellations 	<p>Faculty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Personal contact is key and fundamental to student learning • Nothing can replace face-to-face/love the students and getting to know them, having fun teaching and seeing them learn; online is less rewarding experience • Success depends on the type of course; not favorable for humanities, sciences and psychology: • Significant investment of time to develop a successful online course; faculty should be compensated for their time • Requires appropriate CETL support at regional campus • Online does not allow for spontaneity and creativity • Managing the course is time-consuming/more administrative time spent on these courses than for face-to-face means less time for other teaching and research responsibilities • Class size (of 25 or less) important for success • Concerns about ability to address student questions/problems in an online environment • Concerns about plagiarism; rampant cheating • Concerns about group work and quality of discussion • Concerns about technical glitches <p>Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students don't have the opportunity to bond, have classroom chemistry, or establish learning communities; feel alienated • Students don't take the class as "seriously" and understand the level of effort needed • Students need to be disciplined, and able to manage their time • Students need to have computer skills and access to a computer
<p>General Comments about Online Teaching</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cynicism about how online has cost advantages for the University's interest in profit maximization-- but not good for pedagogy; online education is pseudo education invented by accountants • Concerns about how we are making our education into another "social media" experience • Fears that online courses will put adjuncts out of work • Fears that the University will take my (online instruction) work and give it to another instructor • Online courses cannibalize face-to-face courses; low enrollments can result in job loss • Research indicates higher drop rate and lower student learning and satisfaction with fully online format 	

4. Hybrid Course Format: Summary of Advantages and Challenges

SUMMARY of TEACHING HYBRID COURSES: FULL-TIME AND ADJUNCT FACULTY RESPONSES (See Tables 9 and 10 for all responses)	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
<p>Faculty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of different teaching methods can be an advantage • Best of both worlds (online and in-person); requires in-class 2x week and online for another class • Would help if the online component could easily support video, film and multimedia • Works well for “flipped” classes • Use online for assessments, snow day “make-up,” mid-term conferences • Alleviates the stress of “getting through the material” in a class period • Enables teaching a course to students at multiple campuses • Eliminate enrollment limits <p>Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students can learn on their own and/or at their own pace • Students can form a community and have interaction face-to-face <p>Faculty and Students</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flexibility and efficiency in scheduling and the use of one’s time • Less travel time 	<p>Faculty</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction of face-to-face time from two 75 minute classes • Time-consuming and difficult to design and manage hybrid course; faculty should be compensated • Student-related concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ access to the required technology and computer skills ○ students need to self-motivated and disciplined ○ cheating and other assessment challenges ○ difficult to know if students are struggling (without seeing it in their faces) ○ not familiar with scheduling hybrid courses • Lack of IT support for faculty and students on campus • Less student in-class time; loss of classroom engagement
<p>General Comments about Online Teaching</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students learn less online than they do face-to-face. People who write budgets and who never teach are happy • Cynicism about how online has cost advantages for the University’s interest in profit maximization-- but not good for pedagogy • It strikes me as neither fish nor fowl, so fairly pointless 	

FACULTY SURVEY FINDINGS

PERCEPTIONS OF THE EFFECTS OF THE COMMON START TIME INITIATIVE

Faculty respondents (both full-time and adjunct) reported that the common start time initiative has caused significant concern among the faculty and the students, and to a lesser extent among the staff. The concerns were most salient among Avery Point and Stamford faculty.

Concern was voiced by both full-time and adjunct faculty that the common start time initiative preempted the “common free time/period” to schedule department or campus-wide events. This concern was most salient among Avery Point faculty.

The faculty (both full-time and adjunct) across campuses do not perceive that being able to connect with Storrs or other campus courses via distance learning as a benefit.

	Agreement (Mean) by Faculty Group ^a		
	All faculty (n = 95) ^b	Full-time faculty (n = 43) ^b	Adjunct faculty (n = 47) ^b
The common start time initiative has caused a lot of concern among:			
Faculty.	6.22	6.35	6.06
Students.	5.92	6.09	5.77
Staff.	4.93	4.98	4.98
There is concern because the common start time initiative does not allow for a “common free time/period” to schedule department or campus events.	5.12	5.19	5.06
My course(s) would benefit by being able to connect via distance learning with similar/related course(s) on the Storrs or other regional campus.	2.82	2.79	3.00

^a Scale: (1) Strongly disagree – (7) Strongly agree

^b The reported means for “All faculty” are based on 95 faculty; the reported means for “Full-time faculty” are based on 43 faculty; and the reported means for “Adjunct faculty” are based on 47 faculty. The sum of the full-time faculty (43) plus adjunct faculty (47) do not total to 95 because of five (5) faculty who did not report their faculty rank.

FACULTY SURVEY FINDINGS

CHANGES TO FACULTY COURSES IN SPRING 2016

1. Percent of Faculty whose Schedule Changed in Spring 2016 (Source: Regional Campus Administrator)

In Spring 2016, 75 MWF sections were taught across the regional campuses (the distribution of the sections is shown below, and was reported in the January 21, 2016 Task Force Report to the SEC). It is noteworthy that some of courses being taught in as MWF sections in Spring 2016 were previously also on a MWF schedule.

This chart documents the percentage of faculty at each campus teaching a MWF section in Spring 2016.

Home Campus	Number of MWF sections	MWF sections as % of campus sections	% of campus faculty teaching MWF sections
Hartford	36 ^a	17% ^b	17% ^c
Avery Point	28	17%	23%
Waterbury	8	6%	6%
Stamford	3	<1%	2%
Torrington	0	0%	0%
Total	75	8%	10%

^a 36 MWF sections were taught on the Hartford campus in Spring 2016.

^b 17% of the courses taught on the Hartford campus in Spring 2016 followed a MWF schedule.

^c 17% of the faculty teaching on the Hartford campus in Spring 2016 taught a MWF schedule.

2. Faculty Survey Respondents Reporting a Schedule Change in Spring 2016

Approximately 44% of the faculty responding to the survey reported that their courses changed in Spring 2016. The change rates related to number of courses changes and relative to full-time and adjunct faculty are reported below. A greater percentage of adjunct (48.9%) than full-time (39.5%) faculty reported changes to their schedule.

% reporting changes	% of Course Change in 2016 for Each Faculty Group		
	All faculty (n = 95) ^a	Full-time faculty (n = 43) ^a	Adjunct faculty (n = 47) ^a
No changes to my schedule	55.8% (n = 53)	60.5% (n = 26)	51.1% (n = 24)
Caused changes to my schedule	44.2% (n = 42)	39.5% (n = 17)	48.9% (n = 23)
One course changed	17.9%	16.3%	21.3%
Two courses changed	22.1%	14.0%	27.6%
Three or more courses changed	4.2%	9.2%	0.0%

^aThe reported percentages for "All faculty" are based on 95 faculty; the reported percentages for "Full-time faculty" are based on 43 faculty; and the reported percentages for "Adjunct faculty" are based on 47 faculty. The sum of the full-time faculty (43) plus adjunct faculty (47) does not total to 95 because five (5) faculty did not report their faculty rank.

3. Impact of Common Start Time for Those whose Schedule Changed in Spring 2016

The faculty whose class times changed in Spring 2016 report unfavorable effects on themselves, their courses, and their students. Full-time (vs. adjunct) faculty report perceptions of a more negative impact of the CSTI on students.

	Effect (Mean) of CSTI on each Faculty Group ^a		
	All faculty (n = 41) ^b	Full-time faculty (n = 17) ^b	Adjunct faculty (n = 23) ^b
You, personally	2.46	2.59	2.43
Your course	2.56	2.53	2.65
Your students	2.15	1.76	2.48

^a Scale: (1) Not at all favorable – (7) Very Favorable

^bThe reported means for “All faculty” are based on 41 faculty who reported their schedule for Spring 2016 changing; the reported means for “Full-time faculty” are based on 17 faculty; and the reported means for “Adjunct faculty” are based on 23 faculty. The sum of the full-time faculty (17) plus adjunct faculty (23) does not total to 41 because one (1) faculty did not report faculty rank.

4. Summary of Impact of the Common Start Time for Those whose Schedule Changed in 2016

SUMMARY of CHANGES TO TEACHING SCHEDULE - SPRING 2016: FULL-TIME AND ADJUNCT FACULTY RESPONSES (See Tables 11 and 12 for all responses)	
Changes to Teaching Schedule <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change of start times – Little to no effect • Switch from 2x/week to 3x/week • Switch from 1x/week to 2x/week • Switch from 2x/week to 1x/week • Extended MW to longer class, added online component 	
Effects of Teaching Schedule Changes are Linked to Specific Changes – see Tables 11 and 12	
General Comments about Changes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Class disruption: Student absence rate up on Fridays/ students arrive late to the early start- time classes/students who have work (and family) obligations and those who use mass transit leave late-start time classes before the end of class • The common schedule is an unmitigated disaster. The building is packed on Tuesdays and Thursdays and nearly empty on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays...The Common Schedule was almost literally forced down the throats of students and faculty alike for reasons that were completely unconvincing; morale was destroyed and students were walking around in the halls making arrangements to transfer out on their phones. • If the university wanted to find a way to alienate branch faculty and students, and do it in one fell swoop, they certainly succeeded. • Destroyed faculty and student morale/made people feel alienated from Storrs/ change in schedule made it quite hard for students to coordinate their school-work schedules thus negatively affecting their desire to learn and the teaching and learning environment /our students are commuters and this was a huge disruption to students’ work schedules. 	

FACULTY SURVEY FINDINGS

NEED FOR REGIONAL CAMPUS REPRESENTATION

Both full-time and adjunct faculty strongly agree that a regional faculty committee should be created so that the regional faculty have a voice in future initiatives that affect their campuses.

	Agreement (Mean) by Faculty Group ^a		
	All faculty (n = 95) ^b	Full-time faculty (n = 43) ^b	Adjunct faculty (n = 47) ^b
A regional campus faculty “committee” should be created so that regional campus faculty have a voice in future initiatives that are under consideration.	6.34	6.33	6.30

^a Scale: (1) Strongly disagree – (7) Strongly agree

^b The reported means for “All faculty” are based on 95 faculty; the reported means for “Full-time faculty” are based on 43 faculty; and the reported means for “Adjunct faculty” are based on 47 faculty. The sum of the full-time faculty (43) plus adjunct faculty (47) do not total to 95 because of five (5) faculty who did not report their faculty rank.

FINAL COMMENTS (OPEN-ENDED QUESTION)

SUMMARY of FINAL COMMENTS ON COMMON SCHEDULE: FULLTIME AND ADJUNCT FACULTY RESPONSES (See Tables 13 and 14 for all responses)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Common Schedule was “handed down” with no input from or consideration to regional full-time, part-time and adjunct faculty • Attributions about university’s profit maximization motives versus attention to the mission of the regional campuses – which is presumed to be to serve the regional student population (most of whom are perceived to be “non-traditional students” (commuting; working full-time or part-time; with families; first generation students) • Angst remains about the autocratic implementation • It was assumed that the Common Schedule would help with DL classes, but has not • The stated costs to faculty of MWF classes are significant (as reported on the summary of disadvantages of the 3 day 50-minute class) • Majority see no benefits to 3 days/week 50-minute classes for courses (particularly upper-level courses and courses that require much hands-on, experiential learning)

**TABLE 1: REACTIONS TO 50-MINUTE CLASS MEETINGS
FULL-TIME FACULTY RESPONSES**

ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
This schedule allows content to be broken into more manageable bits for students to digest. Shorter class times mandate a more focused presentation. Allows for more consistent contact with students over the week.	The schedule reduces the amount of time I can allow for discussion; I have to leave some material out of consideration; Fractures into smaller pieces the week, making meeting scheduling, research, and writing more challenging to schedule. It also inhibits the time available for public engagement outside the university. / / For my students, this schedule reduces their ability to work (to pay for UConn) by a full day (and where I teach, Friday shifts are necessary earning time). It also increases their commuting costs. And, frankly, it makes other CSU offerings (still offered on a twice a week schedule) more appealing.
I frankly see no advantages for M-W-F 50-minute classes.	It is VERY difficult for the students on the Avery Point campus to attend Friday classes. Students on the Avery Point campus on average work 30 hours per week (in addition to taking 4 or 5 courses per semester). Friday is one of the main days that they work. Many of them are unable to take required courses that are on the M-W-F schedule because they cannot give up their jobs as they are totally dependent on the income.
*see the students more often	*too short for meaningful discussion / *it creates a difficult workplace dynamic. I'm a tenured faculty who comes to the office five days a week, so I should be the one to take on this schedule if necessary (rather than an adjunct commuting to campus only on teaching days). Unfortunately, my Storrs meetings are most Weds and several Mondays and Fridays. That means I need to take the more attractive TuTh schedule, which leaves everyone feeling bad.
No advantage, much more time wasted on overhead and recapitulation.	Much more time wasted on overhead arrangements and recapitulation.
Do not see any advantages for Avery Point students because 3x week would interfere with the employment many of these students need in order to afford Avery Point.	Many Avery Point students are not ready for Storrs academic standards when they enroll. 2x week enables us to work with them more intensively than 3x week. Also, besides the student employment issue above, Avery Point 3x week scheduling is a nightmare. Most of our faculty are adjuncts who combine this employment with other work and will face employment chaos. Many have taught at the campus for years. Having a reasonably stable faculty is important for our students.
Either is fine with me. I like the longer class times for flexibility.	Too chopped up.

TABLE 1: REACTIONS TO 50-MINUTE CLASS MEETINGS FULL-TIME FACULTY RESPONSES	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
I consider such a class best for lower level, really mainly 1000-level, courses so that lectures can be kept to reasonable lengths and material spaced out over the week. In courses at my department at Storrs, classes that meet according to this schedule are overwhelmingly lower level courses in which TAs lead discussions sections once/week (something that does not apply to regional campuses, at least for courses in my department).	I do not believe that this schedule has any pedagogical value for upper level (2000 and higher) history courses. There is time either to lecture or do some kind of hands-on, in class work, but not enough time to do both, whereas doing both in the same period, when they relate to the same topic/theme reinforces learning and is a much more efficient use of time. By contrast, time would often be wasted if two class meetings were schedule to do some lecture and some hands-on work, or else class meetings would have to jump from finishing one topic to starting another.
Lectures of 50 minutes are closer to typical student attention spans	Since Avery Point is a commuter campus and many students take courses in other places (other UConn campuses, other institutions), holding classes 3X per week is not ideal or desirable.
More face-to-face meetings	It is extremely difficult to: / - make appropriate exams to fit in 50 minutes. This time restraint forces me to give more multiple choice and fewer written questions. / - have a lecture and group project all in one class time. I am forced to pick one, or have to split it up. / - students at regional campus resent being in class three times a week- the reasons are many. Regardless, they take out this frustration on the instructor. / - for faculty teaching multiple classes, the additional day of teaching severely restricts our ability to conduct extramural research. / - the additional time spent in class detracts from our availability to students. I find myself much less able to accommodate the students' diverse schedules because mine is so full of in-class time. / - for faculty accustomed to teaching in longer class times, a complete re-structuring of their courses is required.
For the way in which I deliver science courses, I see few advantages of a 50 min period 3x per week.	The challenges of a schedule that includes 3, 50-min class periods include insufficient time to conduct all of the activities of each class including: a) reviewing briefly and making connections with material presented in the previous class; b). spending time on "active learning" group questions that test for understanding of important concepts; c) fielding questions from the students; d) connecting the material to the Monday Wednesday lab periods, and e. covering the necessary content. The longer class period also provides more flexibility with exams. For example, my exams include a section that is completed by a small group of students. A 75 min period allows me to assess the students individually and in a group setting (a learning tool). Having all of this in one class period improves continuity and learning.
It is hard for me to think of advantages	More absences, more time spent getting into the flow, complete design of existing lectures, redesign of exams

TABLE 1: REACTIONS TO 50-MINUTE CLASS MEETINGS FULL-TIME FACULTY RESPONSES	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
Seeing students more often is always an advantage. It works better for courses that focus on small segmented material delivery, but my courses often relate back to the big picture. This often involves making connections from previous content and courses which requires more time.	In my opinion, 50 minutes isn't enough time to answer student questions, review old content, present new material in a meaningful way, and go through examples in class. Lectures have to be heavily supported by online content (quizzes and mediasite videos) creating significantly more prep work for a course. / / Since 50 minutes isn't enough time, introducing new topics to students over a multi-class period can be incoherent and momentum to a topic can be lost. / / This semester I am giving daily quizzes, that I would probably not have the time for in a 50-minute class. / / My preference is 2 - 75 minute classes - support material online isn't as intense and the classes can be more dynamic and engaging without worrying about a time constraint. / / All of my students have work commitments that interfere with Friday classes.
Several shorter exposures to content makes more sense for learning, if other courses coordinate with those times.	The course I am teaching is part of an accelerated program with extensive clinical and lab time. The didactic portion is completed in one day per week on all campuses, to allow for full day clinical and lab times the rest of the week, including weekend time. Scheduling this course for classroom time multiple days a week would not work for delivery of content or for student convenience.
Regular Reinforcement for Concepts / Additional Opportunities for Feedback / More Chances for Students to Lead / Less Material to Cover Per Session / Easier to Cover Multiple Smaller Texts (short stories/poems)	More Prep Time Required / Less Concentrated Focus / Less Chance for Depth / Harder to Establish Multiple Class Sections / Harder to do Useful Peer Review /
None.	50 minutes is a BIG liability. Any chance for meaningful momentum is precluded. Students need to learn how to THINK. This requires sustained focus and momentum. / / High School classes last longer. 50 minutes is a dumbing down approach.
Frequent exposure to course material.	Too much time lost in transitions at beginning and end of class. Not enough minutes for exams. Complex topics can be difficult to develop in 50 minutes.

TABLE 1: REACTIONS TO 50-MINUTE CLASS MEETINGS FULL-TIME FACULTY RESPONSES	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
	<p>I have been teaching a rotation of 7-8 classes for 20 years. These classes are geared to a 2-day a week schedule. My pedagogy is built around a 75 minute class, allowing me the time to lecture, develop the students' knowledge, and then allow discussion time for the readings I assign. I fear the end of discussion time given the time constraints of a 50 minute class at this point (the last time I taught a M-W-F schedule was Spring of 1995). But the main issue for teaching at the Hartford campus is that students have family, work, and other obligations and have chosen this campus, in many if not most cases, precisely because they can fit their class schedules into their busy lives. I have heard many complaints from students about the challenges of 3-day a week classes, and many have avoided the M-W-F schedule and are cramming all their classes into Tuesday-Thursday and night classes (I have students who must leave my 4-6:30 class early in order to get to their next night class that begins at 6:30, disrupting my class to the extent that I end class 10 minutes early as a result). I understand there are issues related to space constraints at the new campus that seem to dictate moving to the new schedule but this seems the only advantage. And it seems that space considerations should have been part of the planning for the move downtown. I was part of the move downtown at the Stamford campus, and the building was much bigger than we needed, allowing room for growth. I really can't understand moving into a smaller space at the Hartford campus, and then trying to retrofit the class times to deal with a problem that only arose because of poor planning. I can say that many are upset about the schedule change, again because of the challenges our students face at the branch campuses.</p>
Three meetings allows you to have more breadth of coverage.	<p>I teach a law-focused course. In terms of content delivery, it is much easier to review/convey the essential material and foster engagement on the part of students with 75 minutes. It is much more difficult to get into the material as deeply in 50 minutes. I also do simulations that would not be possible in 50 minutes. Personally, I also commute (I teach on two campuses) and it would be challenging to manage three times a week.</p>
Three times a week gives students more breaks between classes to work on homework, however, in the short class time, they can not digest the material.	<p>The additional per-class time is needed to: introduce and invest the students in the topic, then analyze it, then discuss and evaluate it.</p>

TABLE 1: REACTIONS TO 50-MINUTE CLASS MEETINGS FULL-TIME FACULTY RESPONSES	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
Easier to break down the content and its better for students to digest the material this way.	The real problem is that all regional campuses are commuter schools so you really have to balance how many times students come and go and the increased traffic, and decreased likelihood that they even get to class. It becomes much harder to create a schedule in that circumstance.
shorter, more frequent classes tend to allow more continuity in students minds, and better absorption of materials in each class	the challenges are more transportation time getting to and from class, and difficulty for both students and professors in scheduling other activities, such as internships, make up classes, and conferences. Also, as a professor, the same amount of teaching over more sessions is far more disruptive to scholarship.
I believe that some classes -- mathematics, foreign languages, some sciences -- can work in 50 minute segments, as they can be focused on one specific lesson or task. Most others do not.	A 50-minute meeting does not allow for much discussion. One begins to lecture and it seems as though the class is over.
None	Conflicts with student schedules outside of class (i.e. work, caretaking).
Shorter in-class schedules may be advantageous to some students who are unable to attend for longer periods (e.g., 75 minutes);	in courses that include intensive media in addition to lecture, 50 minutes may be too little class time; this is not the preferred schedule (3x per week) for faculty who commute long distances to campus.
--for students, frequent, smaller delivery of information can be useful (allows digesting) / --if one does one day a week "lab" or hands on activity etc., one of the three days can be devoted to that (this is more useful in STORRS where we have grad stude	--One of the very important things that makes having graduate students and a home department (graduate training area) based in Storrs and still be able to teach at a regional campus are teaching demands that are limited to two days a week--any active rese
No advantage at the regional campuses for both students and faculty.	Our students are predominantly full time students with full time jobs. They do not have the time to come to school 3X per week per class. / / In addition, I teach a 7 course load at potentially 4 campuses -- 3X per week per class at different locations would be a logistical nightmare for me.
Not as difficult to keep the student attention for the full class period	Time goes by to quickly; can't work on longer problems; too much time spent on start and finish of a session
I see very few advantages to a course that is 3x a week at 50 minutes. As an instructor, you barely have enough time to get into details of a lecture before the time is up. It also creates more challenges with any breakout assignments, student presentations, or team presentations.	In my field, we have a ton of team-based learning and in-class breakout sessions and discussions. 50 minutes severely limits the ability to execute these in an effective fashion.
This is too short a time to get in-depth experiences of learning for students.	This is too short a time to get in-depth experiences of learning for students.

TABLE 1: REACTIONS TO 50-MINUTE CLASS MEETINGS FULL-TIME FACULTY RESPONSES	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
None	I cannot employ the techniques I've developed to help Stamford students achieve. / I schedule courses to avoid conflicts for students. Given the schedules for labs, I have not been able to find three slots that work. / For 3 credit 1000 level courses I am converting to hybrid courses so I can fit the new time slots. I use two 55-minute periods for in class quizzes, exams, homework, and practice. I am creating videos for all of the lessons. I have to leave the four credit 1000 level courses as two 100-minute classes. I obey the starting times, but continue to run these courses on Monday and Wednesday only. I have been granted permission to do this because there is no other slot that avoids conflicts for students for these specific courses. The restrictions placed by other departments with associated offerings, the lack of multiple sections, the limited number of qualified faculty, and the limited number of rooms that can accommodate a large number of students result in no flexibility for when I offer these courses, / For 3000 level three credit seminars, I run one day or night per week to allow extensive use of guest session leaders. / I started running 2000 level traditional 4 credit courses as hybrid course, meeting 100 minutes one night per week and providing most lessons by video.
There are no advantages to this schedule.	Commuting students have a very difficult time with the travel. It messed up student work schedules. Classes are so short that just as the class gets engaged, it's over. I had this schedule as an undergraduate and it is a waste of time.
There is more opportunity to actually see students and "check-in" with them over the course of the week if you're meeting three times per week.	The main challenge I see is the 50-minute block of time is often difficult to cover content thoroughly - especially with larger class sizes. I also anticipate there would be more absences in the case of more frequent, shorter duration classes.
None	Virtually 100% of my students work on Fridays
There are no advantages that I can see whatsoever. The number of contact hours remains the same.	First of all, they aren't "challenges." The antonym of "advantage" is "disadvantage." I find that attendance, especially on Friday, is greatly reduced. It is routine for us to have the clock run out in the middle of a discussion. The lengthy time (15 minutes) between classes, appropriate for the Storrs campus but not on a campus that you can walk from one end of to the other in three minutes, leads students to try to engage other activities between classes, and they are consequently routinely tardy. The amount of "slack" time (the time it takes the class to get up to speed) is multiplied by 50% over a two day schedule.
There is an advantage for classes where it is necessary to understand previous material to understand new material. This allows students time between classes to gain competence in material before new material is presented. This seems to be particularly appropriate for more quantitative classes.	One personal problem with three day a week classes is that it includes Fridays. I need Fridays free to attend research seminars in Storrs. It is not sufficient to video conference the seminars to the regional campuses, more important than actually attending the seminars, is the personal contact with the speakers and colleagues to discuss research ideas.

TABLE 1: REACTIONS TO 50-MINUTE CLASS MEETINGS FULL-TIME FACULTY RESPONSES	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
None. 50 minutes is too brief to accomplish much. Furthermore, students will frequently skip classes on Fridays.	50 minutes is too brief to accomplish much. Furthermore, students will frequently skip classes on Fridays.
I don't see any advantages.	It feels as though I do not have enough time to cover the material. The class feels very rushed and there is little time for open and engaged discussion.
Students who miss one class only miss 1/3 of the week that one time, however this advantage evaporates if students miss more frequently which is a real possibility for a variety of reasons.	Fifty minutes is not enough time to delve into an assigned reading with several important concepts. A sustained hour with ten-fifteen minutes additional time for announcements, short in-class quizzes, and returning assignments is the minimum for humanities discussion courses.
Students dislike 3 times a week. They are commuters. I do not see any benefit because they do not like them.	Our students are commuters. They do not want to drive another day per week. They purposely do not choose courses that are offered three times per week. This is an economic burden for regional students.
None.	Not enough time to engage in sustained and reflective discussions; peer review sessions; or much of anything. Work feels rushed, fragmented and superficial.
No advantages	pedagogically prefer longer class time. 50 minutes does not allow for material to be covered and for a meaningful discussion to take place. / / if I were required to move to a 50 minute time block, I would need to do a fair amount of revision to my courses so that the material covered in 50 instead of 75 minutes 'fit' appropriately.
More interpersonal contact. Becomes a habit. Suitable for a highly targeted, limited approach to content	More travel. Limited time to carry out a lesson plan or have discussion. More opportunities for students to miss class. Harder to fit into schedules. Inefficient. Harder to develop momentum. Need to spend more time rehashing (each time) what happened last time.
None	*regional campus faculty with departmental commitments at Storrs - days conflict with prior commitments & increase the number of days commuting required / *regional campus students have to commute and an additional day of commuting is likely not feasible with other commitments (work, family, internship, etc.) / *pedagogical - challenges in being able to have a combination of lecture, group activity, & then class analysis of the material for a given topic in such a short period of time...information that you wouldn't want to break up over multiple classes because integration is important. Plus there is wasted time getting class "started/warmedup" (plus late students) and "wrapped up" with the additional class section.

**TABLE 2: REACTIONS TO 50-MINUTE CLASS MEETINGS
ADJUNCT FACULTY RESPONSES**

ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
Seriously, no advantages.	Not enough time for ramp up, lecture, activity/discussion, ramp down. Students not motivated on Friday: regional campus students are very different from Storrs students, especially vis a vis family responsibilities, job responsibilities (80-90% of my students are paying their own way, contributing to family expenses, taking care of younger sibs, dealing with aging relatives, etc)
None. This is not high school. I do not need to see my students more often to get the course work done	Just more potential scheduling problems
I see no advantages	50 minutes is not long enough to cover various topics. Two of the courses I presently teach started out meeting once a week so I have already had to redesign two classes. Although I prefer meeting twice a week I am afraid if I have to meet three times a week the attendance will drop. Many of my students have full time employment.
student tolerance time for lecture	commuting hassles to come to campus 3 times a week for a 50 min class each day
Prefer shorter class time for large lectures or freshman/sophomore level classes	
I can schedule Friday class online proving students with mix of in- class and online learning experiences	Actual class on Fridays - many students work
Short time periods so students do not lose focus much. Few things can be discussed. Not my personal preference	Discussions sometimes have to end because of lack of time. Not enough time to discuss things in detail especially with the scientific and technical courses. Attendance by students is very poor on Fridays.
For math courses, 50 minutes is a good block of time to cover a topic. In a 75 minute class, the students may tend to zone out in the last 15 minutes.	The primary challenge is student absences on Friday afternoons which I don't have on Monday - Wednesday classes. I'm not sure if morning class would be better.
No advantage	Less material will be covered because I will have to summarize the last lecture 3 times instead of 2. / Less time to have in depth discussion. / Less time for in-class activities
No advantage - They don't show up on Fridays / Also, they don't sign up for MWF classes when they can only pop in twice a week.	

TABLE 2: REACTIONS TO 50-MINUTE CLASS MEETINGS ADJUNCT FACULTY RESPONSES	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
	<p>Because I teach at a commuter school, this type of course involves extra driving for the students. Most of mine drive 30-45 minutes each way. So a third day adds one to two extra hours of driving; around Hartford this can be nasty driving since public transport is awful compared to other cities. / / Teaching three times a week also limits discussion time. There is a "settling in" time for every class (now three times a week rather than two) so class time is really closer to 45 minutes. Tests of course have to be shorter; explaining assignments and quizzes eat into lecture time and the students overall seem more tired and less focused than with the longer class periods. / / This would matter less, I think, at Storrs where large classes do not interact with the lecturing professor as the teacher (students meet a third day with a TA to go over ideas, discussion and work). At the branch campuses, teachers do more pedagogically in each class than lecture. / / Finally, making a 2x a week course into a 3x a week course involves completely revamping, reorganizing and re-delivering the material. I usually revise 1/3 of my lectures each term to keep them current with the literature. Now I'm essentially rewriting them all in one go. / / I drive one hour each way to the branch campus; my commuter time, too has increased. In addition, I teach elsewhere and the new schedule has required some creative scheduling. I see my children a lot less.</p>
	As an adjunct, there's no way I can come to campus three times a week to teach one course.
Good for students who seem to prefer shorter meeting events.	Too much travel time for adjunct instructor. Not enough depth of content achieved in such a short time.
The only advantage I see in meeting three times a week is that students are more connected to what is going on, but there is a down side to this; see next answer.	In 26 years of teaching, I have always found 50 minute classes to be problematic. There doesn't seem to be sufficient time to do group work or show a film; no films are under 50 minutes. In terms of group work, there is time for the group to interact, but no time to assess what the group work has accomplished. Everything always seems rushed during this schedule. I avoid it anyway possible. / / Also, I feel that the frequent meetings encourage students to skip more class periods, creating more problems in terms of group work, particularly.
	Considerably more travel to/from campus. / Shorter time with students. A couple of questions can consume the entire period.

TABLE 2: REACTIONS TO 50-MINUTE CLASS MEETINGS ADJUNCT FACULTY RESPONSES	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
For another course, the benefit would be to spread material out throughout the week. For a strictly lecture based class, this would be a good format to ensure students are not overtaxed in the amount of information presented. However, for my class there has been no benefit as each class is rushed.	The 3x a week format would be better suited to a less hands-on/problem oriented class. For my class, we have lecture, hands-on examples and group problem solving. I have found the 50 minute format has us rushing to cover the same amount of material that was easily covered in the 75 minute format. We have had to drop a few hands on activities simply because there is no longer time to get to them.
I find that I get to know the students better. / It is easier to hold the students' attention in a shorter class.	It is harder to have an extensive discussion / It is harder to use items like videos that take any amount of time / It is harder to give reasonable tests since the students have less time to work on them. This pushes us into using shorter formats rather than essays. / It is harder to grade papers quickly. I used to be able to assign a paper on Wednesday and return it with comments on Monday. I can no longer do that. That means the students wait longer for comments and the longer they wait the less meaningful are the comments / It is a pay cut for me - I am now being paid the same amount for more travel
frequent contact with students	sessions too short
The only way to make this beneficial for humanities lecture courses is if the first two 50 minute sessions each week are lectures and the third 50 minute session is devoted to discussion (like a discussion section). The advantage to this is that, for example, by Friday, the students have had more time to do the assigned readings and digest two lectures and may be more ready to engage in fruitful discussion.	As I said above, 50 minutes is not a lot of time to present material AND get student feedback and discussion. I personally prefer to integrate discussion and lectures and there is no time to do this in a 50 minute session. / Most students at the Greater Hartford campus are commuting some distance to campus and working almost 40 hours a week, in addition to taking several courses. Having three meeting times each week makes it more difficult for students to balance their work and their studies. I think having three meeting times means that students will do less homework (readings and research) outside of class because they have to factor in the extra commute time and reshuffle their schedules. Given how tight their schedules are, it's a zero sum situation--any extra hour commuting comes out of time they can give to their studies.
	I teach history and I have never cared for the M/W/F schedule because I like to have some time to dig into the subject and still elicit comments and questions from students.
Increased numbers of contact time create a greater consistency; if a class is cancelled, the gaps between meeting times is reduced.	50 minute classes encourage a pedagogy intent on delivering information, rather than engaging students in constructing knowledge. Of course, lecture-based pedagogies are, in my mind, antithetical to 21st century thinking--and the skills and habits of mind students need to contribute to a knowledge-based society.
I teach a writing class and this time frame is not enough time for writing assignments. Films that I use are too long for that time period. It leaves no discussion. NO ADVANTAGES	This timeframe is far too short for a writing class.

TABLE 2: REACTIONS TO 50-MINUTE CLASS MEETINGS ADJUNCT FACULTY RESPONSES	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
This schedule is well suited for introductory, survey type courses in my discipline (Psychology). Such courses are primarily lecture format and this benefits from a shorter class time.	This is less appropriate for upper division classes that involve more issue discussion (which is more difficult to 'time predict'; discussions don't work as well if carried over into the next class period. They are also not as effective if truncated due to time). It is also less desirable for any classes that involve lab work (in my discipline, meaning work done on the computer).
I don't really see any advantage except perhaps the students find it easier to sit through a shorter class	I've had to adjust to the schedule in terms of staying on schedule. The other challenge is having to divide up longer lectures in to shorter ones (ending a lecture before I'm done and then having to pick it up in the next lecture and the issue of having to drive an extra two hours a week
One advantage might be for courses in which there is frequent need for instructor-student interaction because meeting three times a week would increase opportunities for that interaction and would enable instructors to get to know each student more quickly. For example, if the course requires students to write and submit papers frequently, meeting three times a week might make each easier for an instructor to meet with each student weekly to review his or her work, answer questions related to particular essays and so on.	For those survey courses in which each session is devoted to one topic the difference between 50 minutes and a longer class can be a challenge, especially if the material is better understood with class discussion or activities. Also if the course requires set up and removal of equipment such as using a camera to record student presentations, having only 50 minutes can be a real disadvantage.
I see no advantage to this type of course.	Course delivery is difficult. Once we begin, we must leave so there is no time to develop material for any of my three different courses. I prefer not to teach three times a week and it is difficult for students as well. My work schedule at other places and that of our students at other places are disrupted. Precious time is wasted. It is difficult to have a long commute for this type of class. The commute takes longer than the class.
Advantages: Increased interaction with students; multiple opportunities for students to ask questions related to topics presented earlier in week; more immersion within material for students, as they are exposed to same course 3x per week, so as to allow them to always have reminders concerning studying and better re-call of subject for quizzes and testing	Challenges: Very short time for significant lecture/discussion session per class meeting; group project per class meeting among students very challenging in time allotted; Lecturer feels pressure of "speeding" through material within any one class time; every minute needs to "count" to ensure absolute quality of class time usage; quick questions addressed only as lecture needs to proceed through session; very much like High School (negative)- almost like Professor is "shoving" information into their brains for students, rather than students taking personal responsibility for self-guided study and mature learning, as Real College (positive).

TABLE 2: REACTIONS TO 50-MINUTE CLASS MEETINGS ADJUNCT FACULTY RESPONSES	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
For a course at a regional campus, there are NO advantages to having a course that is scheduled to meet 3 times a week for 50 minutes on each day. There are only disadvantages!!! It is ludicrous to think that a campus of commuters should be treated the same as the Storrs campus where the majority of students live in dorms. All of the reasons cited by UConn administration in switching from 2 times to 3 times a week are nonsense, BS. The only possible reason for M-W-F classes is to make it look like UConn employees busy 5 days a week.	50 minutes is not enough time to deliver a solid in-depth classroom lecture/presentation. It is also difficult to administer a comprehensive test in such a short time period; exams must now be administered during two separate periods or by an in-class/take-home hybrid. Regular on-time attendance is difficult for a regional campus where all students must commute to class (as opposed to the Storrs Campus where most students live in dorms). Traffic to and from campus and parking at the West Hartford are challenges. By forcing students to drive to campus 3 times a week instead of 2 times, UConn is contributing to global warming.
no advantages at ALL!	prefer 75 minutes class: taking attendance on daily basis, giving quizzes and other assignments weekly / 50 minutes is not enough time to show a film and deliver material in my field
A course that meets three times a week is good for catering to shorter attention spans, and provides more chances to modify your teaching approach if it is not working.	I live in West Hartford: I would not want to commute 3 times a week.
This is best for students with shorter attention spans or for courses where you can break up the material into smaller chunks. This is also best for students who aren't working.	This course schedule is hardest on students who work full or part time. Some courses need a longer time format, particularly upper level classes and especially seminar style classes. Sometimes it can take a long time to really get rolling on a great discussion, and for 50 minute classes, that leaves little time to continue that discussion.
More continuous contact time with the students is the primary advantage with less time between meetings (subject retention) probably the second best advantage.	A significant fraction of time is spent on administrative issues (announcements, questions, etc) and review ("recall we were discussing...") which means less time for content in 50 minute courses. With 75-min, better more in-depth lectures can be constructed. There is no comparison here in terms of the ability to construct better in-class content if the amount of continuous time is longer. / / Many students at Regionals are working full-time. 2 days a weeks better accommodates them for work scheduling. The idea of full-time matriculated students really doesn't work for a significant fraction of the students I teach. / / As Adjunct, the salary is, well frankly, pathetic. I must have other income. It is extraordinarily difficult to concentrate on other issues if more days are divided into different tasks. Two days a week devoted to teaching considerably frees up time for other (paying) projects.
I don't see any advantage.	Students commute a distance and this puts a strain on their schedules, especially if they work.
There are no advantages. My students all work during the day and need to take more than one course per semester, so three one-hour class meetings wouldn't work for them, no would they work for me.	As an adjunct professor teaching more than one course each semester, a single class meeting per course is not just the best schedule, it's the only schedule I could maintain and teach other classes.

TABLE 2: REACTIONS TO 50-MINUTE CLASS MEETINGS ADJUNCT FACULTY RESPONSES	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
I see absolutely no benefit to this schedule.	Travel time triples. It is difficult to work three things into a busy schedule. The lecture is so short that one can hardly cover one topic completely. Seemingly, as soon as we get started the class would be over.
I see no advantages to a course that is scheduled 3 times a week for 50 minutes.	A course which meets 3 times a week for 50 minute often ends before it begins. On days when I include a multi-media presentation, there is very little time left for a discussion, so the next class must begin with the deferred discussion or lecture. I am fortunate that my students frequently arrive on time which allows me to go right into the content but 50 minutes is insufficient time to cover content in great detail and require feedback.
I do not see any advantages to courses that meet three times per week in any of the disciplines in which I have taught (WGSS and English). They might work for some other disciplines, perhaps in courses that are delivered solely by lecture.	The disadvantages are numerous. Personally: I am adjunct who teaches one course per semester and who works nearly full-time as a freelance writer. Driving 40 miles each way (close to an hour commute) in order to teach for 50 minutes?— and doing that three times a week? I don't think so. You will hear the same from other adjuncts, as most of us have other work responsibilities. / For students: So many of our students have work and family obligations. The longer, less frequent classes work much better for them. Much easier to negotiate with a boss to be able to (let's say) leave early once a week for class than to try to get out of work several times a week for one course. Same for (another example) hiring child care. / Pedagogically: 50 minute classes would be a disaster. There is no way to teach complex material in 50-minute chunks. Building a good discussion (and my classes are discussion-based) requires time and often patience. I structure my classes so that there is time and space for students to think, question, respond to me and to each other. You don't have that kind of time and space in a 50-minute class, once the class gets settled each time. I could go on about curriculum as well but will stop here.
I enjoy shorter class times and more meetings with students.	
The advantage is for courses with multiple assignments. Classes that meet 3 times per week allow for the instructor to help students stay up-to-date and gain skills.	It is challenging at a branch campus because students often have jobs or lack transportation. Class attendance suffers.
In the courses that I teach in general, there are NO advantages to have courses scheduled to meet 3 times a week for 50 minutes. The period of 50 minutes is too short for significant classroom activities to be developed and performed.	--Time would be too short to unfold complex class discussion of readings. / --Time would be MUCH too short to schedule (as I do in ENGL 1010 and ENGL 1011) 5 (five) writing group tutorials/conferences per week. In the 2 times a week 75 minutes schedule I
I have taught on this schedule at other universities and see no advantages in this schedule for a composition course. /	Course delivery and pedagogy: difficult to accomplish enough in a composition course in just 50 minutes per session, especially on days when we use technology, which is a tenet of my pedagogy / Personal preference: I cannot work in person on Fridays but could do an online module in a hybrid course on that day

TABLE 2: REACTIONS TO 50-MINUTE CLASS MEETINGS ADJUNCT FACULTY RESPONSES	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
One has the opportunity to meet with students and to review their work with them in class more frequently.	Students have less time for reflection, so their tasks become more assembly line like. There is less time between classes for the instructor to review and grade student work, which is critical in a first-year writing course. / / Students would be reluctant to take such classes because most students at regional campuses are employed outside of school (their ability to hold those jobs would be compromised). / / Many students would be reluctant to take such classes because a significant number of them commute from a distance; they would see the added day as a significant financial burden.
I have not taught this schedule but I believe it has its advantages. I notice a big difference when I teach a twice a week course compared to once a week. I do prefer the twice a week schedule, so adding one more day would be OK with me.	Particularly at the branches, it might be tough for students to commit to 3x per week considering many of them also work part time. I think the advantages far outweigh this challenge however.
None	For my class, meeting 3 times at 50 min a week wouldn't work well. It wouldn't give the class sufficient time for film viewing and discussion.
flexibility to use an concessional class time for outside project without sacrificing too much lecture/discussion time / can have shorter lectures with time for discussion	not enough time to thoroughly engage the students after a reasonable lecture/presentation / not enough time to show a full-length documentary / not enough time to engage in inclass activities
I can not see any advantages -- as in zero -- in a 3 times a week meeting schedule for a regional campus course. Regional campus students work and have families. The campuses are located in places that have significant traffic and therefore require significant commuting time. Forcing students to do this three times a week is brainless. And it was utterly idiotic to state, as was stated last summer/fall when the common schedule was announced, that 2 and 3 times a week classes would make it easier (EASIER !!!!) for regional campus students to attend classes at multiple campuses. Moreover, the description in the covering email and at the start of this survey regarding the motivation for the common schedule is totally disingenuous. It runs contrary to the motivations stated at the time the common schedule was imposed. The entire process behind this university effort has been duplicitous, and that's being kind.	I can teach my courses under a variety of different meeting schedules. Moreover, this is one of the things I'm paid to do. But the common schedule and imposing inappropriate 2 and 3 times a week class meeting schedules on regional campus students in order to meet Storrs-based priorities is shameful. It's even more shameful to be so dishonest about it.
More reinforcement of material. You see the material more frequently.	Unable to dive deep into a topic. Your run of class time when discussing complex STEM topics. The break in between class means I have to spend too much time redoing the prior concepts. I actually waste time doing this.

TABLE 2: REACTIONS TO 50-MINUTE CLASS MEETINGS ADJUNCT FACULTY RESPONSES	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
Because of the disadvantages (see below) that I see for the kinds of courses I teach and my own teaching style, I cannot see that the 50-minute class slot has any advantages for me. It might well be optimal for other instructors in other disciplines, but I leave it to them to affirm that preference.	I have not used the 50 min/3 times per week format since teaching at a high school prep school many years ago. For the past 20+ years at UConn I have been scheduled for either 75 minute or 2.5 hour class periods. In terms of my courses and my teaching style, the 50 minute slot has serious drawbacks. Lengthy discussion periods (for example, when students are asked to respond to specific reading assignments), viewing documentaries and following those experiences with discussion or writing exercises only work well (for me) in the longer class periods. The same is true for the kinds of midterms that I give, which always involve essay components that would be difficult, if not impossible, to complete in 50 minutes.
There should be a screening question in the beginning for faculty who do not teach undergraduate courses. /	
I don't see any advantage to having classes meet 3 times/week for 50 minutes each day.	
I guess the only real advantage I see is that students get to check in an extra time with the faculty member. I would also guess that perhaps an introductory math course would work well in short chunks like this, as the learning is often linear and moving from one step requires full understanding of and practice with the previous step (making baby steps reasonable).	50 minutes is not enough time to engage students in effective group work, problem solving or discussions--and to reflect as a group on the experience--at least not in humanities or advanced courses. Deep, higher-order, critical thinking doesn't come quickly to modern students; they need to be eased and cajoled into it, and that takes time. Years ago, longer class periods just meant longer stretches of potentially boring lectures, but modern pedagogical techniques have faculty members leading students through various active learning exercises and activities designed for different learning styles, making the class period varied and interesting and more likely to engage and teach more students.
This option covers 3-credit classes only. / I teach MATH 1131Q and 1132Q, both are 4-credit classes. That being said, I feel it is best to meet with math students at least twice a week. In class contact for Q&A, discussion, and practice promotes student success as well as confidence.	This option covers 3-credit classes only. / I teach MATH 1131Q and 1132Q, both are 4-credit classes. That being said, I feel it is best to meet with math students at least twice a week. In class contact for Q&A, discussion, and practice promotes student success as well as confidence.
no advantages	difficulty for students and teachers to have to come to class 3 times / / 50 minutes is a very short period
The only advantage I can think of for such a schedule is that students' attention spans are less likely to wane in a 50 minute class.	At a branch location such as mine, all students are commuters, (many of whom are employed part to full-time) and most faculty are adjuncts who teach at other universities and colleges simultaneously. Having to come to campus three days instead of two makes coordinating work/family/transportation schedules much more of a challenge for both students and faculty. It also puts an additional strain on faculty (and students) who have young children at home: this means an additional day of childcare, not to mention having to coordinate an extra day of transportation to and from childcare and/or getting an older child on or off the school bus. Personally, I live over an hour's drive (50 miles) from my campus, so a third day's commute would also add to my transportation expenses.

**TABLE 3: REACTIONS TO 75-MINUTE CLASS MEETINGS
FULL-TIME FACULTY RESPONSES**

ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
I can more fully develop content, and allow time for discussion. It provides students more time between classes to complete readings. I can focus on students more during the days I teach, extending office hours as needed to field student meetings. Because the week is not as broken up, it allows for easier scheduling of administrative meetings, advising meetings, public outreach, research and writing, proposal development, and university service.	Twice a week poses some challenges to maintaining presence in student's week (one when compared to courses running three times/week, however). More in-depth discussions also challenge students more (though I don't see a problem with that).
Twice a week for 75 minutes is ideal for teaching. The class session is long enough to cover all the material but meeting twice per week works much better pedagogically for the students than meeting once per week. Meeting once per week means that there is too much for the students to absorb, but twice per week is ideal.	There are no challenges; twice per week for 75-minute classes is IDEAL.
*for me, 75 minutes is a great amount of time. Students can sustain that much attention easily and we can get really into a deep discussion. When I teach a night class, I always do two 75-minute halves with a ten-minute break.	*there's a long gap between Thurs and Tues. However, I usually require an online discussion in that gap to keep students engaging with the material.
More time for in depth discussions, less time on organization and less time on recapitulation.	Teachers need better preparation and more stamina.
We can get more done in class 2x week because of less frequent housekeeping (attendance-taking, giving announcements, etc.) More time for group projects. More opportunities for discussion: instead of two lectures to large groups and one TA-led discussion section per week, the class periods are long enough for some extended discussion each meeting. Also, the instructor of record holds the discussion. In my courses, two related topics per week work well. Dividing them among 3 periods per week would confuse the students.	We are a small enough campus that fewer formal class meetings per week does not seem to cause a problem for us -- as it might at Storrs.
What I am used to and would like to continue with.	No thoughts
There is sufficient time in a 75 minute period to do more than one thing: give a short quiz, lecture for part of class, have a hands-on writing or small group discussion exercise, etc.	This schedule is challenging if, pedagogically, a longer class meeting time would facilitate experiential education, outside of the classroom work, etc.
	Instructors need to "teach smart" - diversify content and format - to keep students engaged for the whole period.
This answer, of course, is the inverse of the challenges of a schedule that includes 50 min classes 3x per week. Please see that answer.	One of the few challenges to a longer class time is keeping the students engaged for an extra 25 min. However, inserting an "active learning" break ca. half-way through the period, increases the connection with previously learned material, providing me with an opportunity to assess the students' understanding of the said material, and material that will be covered in the second half of the session.

TABLE 3: REACTIONS TO 75-MINUTE CLASS MEETINGS FULL-TIME FACULTY RESPONSES	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
More time for a fluid class filled with lecture, discussion, activities. Lectures and exams have already been created to fit this format. Students are less likely to miss class.	It could be hard to fill the time, although this is unlikely.
This is the method that I prefer. It gives ample class time to answer questions, work through example problems and teach a lesson plan that involves engaging activities for students. There is enough time to ask students thought provoking questions and give them time in class to reflect on their answers and share with others. This is difficult to do in an online environment. It also promotes a relaxed pace to the class and gives time for students to informally interact with me on a more personal level. / / It has the added advantage for students not to have classes on Friday allowing them to work on research, projects, or work.	You see the students less, and the 5 day break can create a disconnect. Usually online content needs to be added in a small form during that break to keep students engaged in their learning experience.
Deeper Analysis Possible / More Complete Discussions / Multiple "Class Sections" for each Session / Easier for Peer Review / Less Prep Time Required / Easier for Students to Commute	Harder to Cover Many Smaller Texts / Harder to Set Aside Entire Periods for Writing /
Lectures long enough to allow for beginning/end transition losses. Can accommodate complex topics well. Enough time available for a decent exam.	75 minutes can be a bit tiring at the end for both instructor and class. Big gap between last lecture of the week and first lecture of the following week. Snow days a problem for those of us who do not simply recite PowerPoint slides.
See my previous comments. Two day a week meeting times are better for the non-traditional students we serve at the branch campuses. And my class pedagogy at this point is geared to 75 minute sessions.	
One has time to introduce and invest the students in a topic, analyze it, then discuss and evaluate their comprehension. / There is time for enrichment in a class.	Has worked well for me. When students are motivated, they invest their off days in their homework, but have time to live life too (and maybe do some work in other classes!).
Seems pretty standard, but again you have to think that multiple faculty may work across alot of different regional campuses. I think you have to find out who just teaches at one regional and see the feasibility of this.	Travel time for faculty and students is always an issue and balancing their workload. This might be the best option depending on the type of class.
this has less continuity than more frequent classes, but does tend to work for both student absorption and connection between classes. it also makes other activities easier to schedule, and permits greater blocks of time for homework and scholarship.	there is slightly less continuity than a 3 day a week class, and requires somewhat more work to keep the students focused.
There is time for lecture and discussion. One can also schedule quizzes without using up much of the period.	I do not believe that there are many challenges to speak of.
allows opportunity to develop ideas more thoroughly, including adding time for discussion, video, etc.;	none

TABLE 3: REACTIONS TO 75-MINUTE CLASS MEETINGS FULL-TIME FACULTY RESPONSES	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
For more complex, higher level classes or seminars, it feels more effective to be able to have a longer block, especially when you are integrating an indepth analysis of some problem/paper, a discussion/hands on activity, and lecture all in one day. / / One has to have more than an hour (but usually, more like two hours) for the labs associated with our stats/methods classes. / / If you give longer exams, it is easier to manage to fit an exam into over 60 minutes than UNDER 60 minutes class session.	In some lecture classes, from the student's perspective, it can feel endlessly long to just have the instructor drone on for THAT long. Shorter classes make it more tolerable. / / Having just two classes a week (and assuming most snows only cause one day loss) means that if you have snow days you have lost more by losing a single day than you would have in a 3 day class. / / You have fewer total days to schedule things (like exams). More than 3 exams in a semester, when you just have two days a week feels like you're losing more lecture days than is ideal.
There may be some advantages to this schedule for students taking a heavily quantitative course. / Once a week, 2.5 hours, of pure quantitative work can be mind numbing after students have worked a full day. / I will test this schedule at one location in the fall, so I will have more of an opinion on this at a later date. / For the fall schedule, one location will meet once per week and another location will meet twice per week. / This way, students will have a choice. Enrollment so far is evenly distributed between the 2 choices, so there is no obvious preference of one over the other. I truly believe flexibility for regional campuses is paramount for both students and faculty.	If too many of my 7 courses (taught at multiple campuses) meet more than once per week, this could cause a logistics problem with regard to getting to class and too much unproductive time spent on the road. / / Again, please give us the respect of allowing for flexibility.
Perfect amount of time to meet; can delve into material and have time for group work	none
75 minutes provides ample time to execute both a lecture (45 minutes to an hour) and then have an additional 15-30 minutes for discussions, presentations and breakout assignments. In addition, seeing the students twice a week still allows flexibility for potential guest speakers, or balancing inclement weather cancellations.	n/a
This is a fair time for in-depth learning for students.	This is a fair time for in-depth learning for students.
Easier to staff, stronger student attendance, provides time for innovations that have proven to be effective	The only challenge is the competition for these time slots because they are so popular. I make every effort to problem solve and figure to how to deliver my courses at other times so that others in my department can use these times.
Few advantages, although better then 50 minute classes, but the same problems still exist, on a slightly lesser scale.	Same challenges as the three class sessions per week.
I personally think this is the most effective way to offer a course as it allows you enough time to "dive in" to content and discussion while seeing students twice over the week span. It can keep course content clear and concise.	There may be some challenge for students that are traveling to campus (traffic congestion and different modes of transportation cause challenges) for a twice/week class.
It allows for student to work on Fridays	None

TABLE 3: REACTIONS TO 75-MINUTE CLASS MEETINGS FULL-TIME FACULTY RESPONSES	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
Obviously, the class meets less frequently and requires less travel for both faculty and student. This is a particular concern in urban campuses that have to deal with heavy traffic. The length of time allows substantive and valuable digressions in discussions that can't be made in shorter classes. As mentioned previously, there is less slack time on start up. Students also have more time on exams and exams can be in greater depth.	The only "disadvantage" is that the current medical advice on hydration leads to students taking more bathroom breaks.
As long as I have Fridays available for travel to Storrs for research seminars, from my personal perspective, I don't see any particular advantage to two times a week versus three times per week. However, I don't like once a week classes for undergraduate students, because it is usually too much material to absorb at one time.	As long as I have Fridays available for travel to Storrs for research seminars, from my personal perspective, I don't see any particular advantage to two times a week versus three times per week. However, I don't like once a week classes for undergraduate students, because it is usually too much material to absorb at one time.
This schedule works very well. I would like to see more options to teach MW for 75 minutes. 75 minutes is enough time to get settled, any syllabus related questions, complete a lecture and have a brief discussion.	There are no challenges. This schedule works very well.
More time is available for discussion.	None
I regularly teach a 1000-level course meeting twice a week. I've structured the sequence of readings and lecture so that Tuesdays is about 2/3 lecture with 1/3 devoted to discussion of an easier reading and Thursdays will often devote 2/3 of the time to discussion (sometimes with 10 - 15 minutes of small group discussion to warm up). Then I have about twenty minutes to set up the next week's themes.	The challenge comes with academic advising and trying to help students working off campus to make a semester schedule that doesn't conflict with work. More class meeting times means that more conflicts come up.
As a teacher, this is perfect. Students can't focus over 1.5 hours. They learn better, and it is easier for me to engage and teach them. This also allows them to take other classes on the same days, since they are commuters.	I really don't know of any. I think this is the ideal for learning and teaching.
Chance to check in with students regularly; engage in sustained work.	None.
the 75 minute time block allow for material to be covered in a variety of ways - lecture, media, group work, class discussions - thus enhancing the learning experience	none
Intermediate between three times a week and one time a week.	Intermediate between three times a week and one time a week.
fits with faculty (especially regional campus faculty who need to regularly commute to Storrs for departmental activities on MW or F). / students prefer to have fewer days on campus and can do this in 2 or 4 days with current system / able to use multiple teaching techniques within a single class period - lecture, group/demonstration, and then regroup for analysis of one topic within one class	maintaining student engagement

**TABLE 4: REACTIONS TO 75-MINUTE CLASS MEETINGS
ADJUNCT FACULTY RESPONSES**

ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
Sufficient time for ramp up, lecture, activity/discussion, ramp down. Sufficient time for guest speakers, demonstrations, open-ended discussions related to content, etc. Fridays available for students to work and meet other home responsibilities.	None except when classroom gets significantly uncomfortable because of excessive heat (both winter and summer) or coldness.
Sufficient time to have meaningful instructor student interactions. Sufficient times to efficient cover material, meeting often enough to keep students on track with work load while not filling their already busy schedule	None
I typically cover one topic per week in my classes. When we meet twice a week it gives the student a chance to absorb the information over two class periods.	I prefer two times a week.
hits a good combination of commute time to class time, class can be broken into two segments to reduce monotony	?
Allows for more in class projects, which works for smaller classes;	I often have trouble filling this much time in a straight lecture format
More time to integrate lecture and in- class exercises: example part lecture then duscussion of primary sources in class - rather than doing this at the next class when relationship between lecture and primary sources not as fresh	I like being able to schedule online work during Friday class - something less able to do with 2 day per week 75 minute classes / - although I could shorten class to slow for this but I do not think it would work as well
Have enough time to thoroughly discuss concepts, especially with the scientific and technical courses. Attendance by students quite regular on these days	Students may lose focus when the time is too long.
From a teaching perspective, I can cover a lager block of material. On occasion, 75 minutes is just the about right amount of time to cover certain sections of the course. Also, I can give more comprehensive exams. Personally, this gives me a longer weekend personally and for grading exams and papers.	The primary challenge is to keep the students attention for 75 minutes. Also, I can cover more material in 3 50 minute sessions than in 2 75 minute sessions. I'm checking this out this semester.
More time for in-class activities, in depth discussion / No need for another trip to campus on a third day for only 75 minutes, cutting on car emission and expenses. / Possibility of another work on Friday for me and my students	None.
They only need to come twice a week.	A much better system

TABLE 4: REACTIONS TO 75-MINUTE CLASS MEETINGS ADJUNCT FACULTY RESPONSES	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
I went to three schools as an undergrad - a UWisconsin branch campus in high school, Wellesley College for my BA and one year at the London School of Economics as a general course student. In all, classes were two days a week, 70 - 75 minutes each, depending on the campus. (classes were also 4, not three credits). By habit I am accustomed to this rhythm. It allowed for one "reading day" every week, which is great for writing papers, doing lab work, or working on field projects. Being in class a little longer (these were small classes) allowed rapport to grow and fueled wonderful discussions, student-mentor camaraderie, and also student collegiality. You can go deeper into a subject.	None.
	Same comment as before. I can only teach evenings and for one 3 credit course, I can only do it once a week.
Students seem to like shorter meeting times.	Still too many meeting times for an adjunct plus limited meeting time inhibits a combination of lecture and application.
Advantages are that students are usually in attendance.	I don't see too many challenges in the twice weekly format. There is usually sufficient time to conduct group work and assess same, to show a film and have a brief discussion, or to give a lecture, and have a discussion period.
More time to cover material in one sitting. / Less travel to/from campus. / Allows more time in the lab. / Allows for more time for questions / Allows for more office hours adjacent to actual classes /	
For a class organized similar to mine, this allows for multiple educational preferences to be addressed adequately (I try to meet the needs of auditory, kinesthetic and visual learners in each session as much as is realistically feasible). The longer sessions also allows for better relationship building between myself and my students, as we have the time to interact with each other. We can tackle more complex problems (as they require more effort/time) and can work in various groups thus building on communication skills at the same time.	For another style of course, the longer duration course time might be daunting as there is a large amount of information covered in the time frame. It is not spread out across multiple sessions in the week.
More time to develop a thesis. More time for the subtleties of my discipline / More time for testing which means tests that are fairer and also more time for students to write essay / More time to use long videos or demonstrations	None
opportunity to have deeper discussion, conduct class activities	when student misses a class, there is a larger gap vs. 50 min class
As I said, 75 minutes leaves me enough time to lecture and integrate discussion.	I don't really see ANY drawbacks.
As I said in response to the previous question, this is my preferred format. It allows time to settle into the subject and still interact with students without feeling unduly rushed.	When a student misses a class, they miss a bit more than they do with the M/W/F setup.

TABLE 4: REACTIONS TO 75-MINUTE CLASS MEETINGS ADJUNCT FACULTY RESPONSES	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
75 minute classes offer the opportunity to structure group work, in various forms; more, the additional time allows for reflective processing individually and as a class. In short, the additional time beyond the traditional 50 minute time allows for higher level thinking and the additional development of the classroom as a community of scholars. / / Students, however, who have other demands on their time, seem to benefit from the 70 minutes, as they have more flexibility to schedule work, etc.	As much of the actual writing in a composition course takes place outside the classroom, the challenges are fewer. However, fewer meeting times does reduce, in my mind, consistency.
I don't see any advantages for this. I teach at ECSU T/Th from 11-12:15 and oftentimes it isn't enough time for films and a discussion.	Meeting twice a week might bring students together more often but many times I am rushed in teaching this but it can be done. I usually have to redo the entire syllabus for this kind of delivery. Redoing the syllabus takes a great deal of time and effort. I also can't schedule guest speakers for this kind of time frame.
I Think 2 days a week, Tuesday and Thursday would be optimal. The class times are longer than 3 days a week, but shorter than 1 day a week. And, two days a week gives some breathing room for both students and instructors.	
Basically the opposite of the previous page comments on the 50 minute class. Not as good for primarily lecture format classes, some topics may receive more coverage than is necessary if the time is there to be filled.	Again, opposite of the last page.
I has designed my lectures and schedule to fit into that time slot	There were really no challenges for me
As noted in my previous response, I see advantages in a longer time frame logistically (when using equipment) and also pedagogically in those course that combine instruction with class discussion and activities. Generally if there is a class activity connected to a particular topic, it is best to conduct that activity on the same day as the topic is covered and having a 75 minute class makes it more likely there will be time for both.	In some courses it might be more of a challenge to maintain student attention for the 75 minutes especially if the subject matter is particularly abstract or complex. The instructor might have to adjust the course structure so that part of the time slot is given for instruction and part for some form of class activity which enables students to put the instructional material into practice.
This course permits development of material and sustained discussion.	No course delivery or pedagogy problems. Travel takes time. I don't know the students as well as I do in courses that meet once a week. My preference is to meet once per week during the day.
Advantage: Perfect balance of meeting time/ lecture time/student interaction/student question time/professor question time/ group in-class project time	Challenges: Need at LEAST ONE Break during this type of session; need to be careful to make sure break is no longer than 10 minutes, and then need to re-engage students back into topic learning session for remainder of class (without this leading to student lethargy; brain fatigue; sleeping, etc.)
Longer class time means more time for in-depth coverage of the material. Easier to administer regular in-class exams where students have sufficient time to prepare their answers. Less wear-and-tear on students, their vehicles/buses/the environment. I very much prefer this format.	None, for most courses this is the ideal format.

TABLE 4: REACTIONS TO 75-MINUTE CLASS MEETINGS ADJUNCT FACULTY RESPONSES	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
would like to know my students personally - taking attendance daily / excellent time slot to discuss a current event, or problem or issue /	no challenges, prefer 75 minute class
I don't see many advantages to two times per week as opposed to other formats: the main advantage would be modifying your approach if it didn't seem to be working.	I live in West Hartford: commuting 2 times a week to Stamford would be difficult, but not impossible.
This is fine for lecture courses that don't need a third day/slot for discussion or recitation sections. Better for working students, but still not ideal. You can get more material out in one session, but the session isn't so long that the students fade out.	This can still be a challenge to students who work full or part time (which is most of the kids on the Stamford Campus).
None.	Students commute and find it a challenge sometimes to make it twice a week. Some students this interferes with a work or child care schedule. Some students also find that they think they can come once a week and still pass the class when they have a 2x week schedule.
This might be possible, but again, you would limit this to students who are not working and I would likely have a conflict with other teaching responsibilities. I also suspect that the additional prep time would impact learning without any benefit to the students.	The students are working during the day. I'm working teaching other course and preparing for evening lectures. This schedule has no practical benefits to students or faculty.
I suppose it might enable me to cover less material and as a result the student might be more attentive. Students that choose to not come to class or cannot make it to class would have less material to make-up.	Doubles travel time. It is difficult to schedule two things a week in an already busy schedule. The timing might prohibit me from doing certain activities as part of my lecture.
A class which meets 2 times a week for 75 minutes allows time for introducing new content, following up on previous content, use multi-media that is at least 30-45 minutes long with time left for discussion or lectures on Issues in Human Sexuality and Gender and Communication. These are topics that are discussion driven and also requires scholarly as well as lay examples. It is sufficient time for content delivery and keeping students engaged.	I experienced no challenges for courses that meet 2 times a week for 75 minutes.

**TABLE 4: REACTIONS TO 75-MINUTE CLASS MEETINGS
ADJUNCT FACULTY RESPONSES**

ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
Well, they make more sense than the three-times-per-week model.	Still problematic for me for the reasons noted on the previous page. I am adjunct who teaches one course per semester and who works nearly full-time as a freelance writer. Devoting one day a week solely to teaching works for me. (Of course, I do course work such as grading on other days as well, but I do not have to commute on those days). Having to chop up two work days each week would put me at a financial disadvantage. / For students: Some of the same comments apply as for the three-times-per-week courses. So many of our students have work and family obligations. The longer, less frequent classes work much better for them. Much easier to negotiate with a boss to be able to (let's say) leave early once a week for class than to try to get out of work several times a week for one course. Same for (another example) hiring child care. Of course, twice a week is easier than three times per week. / Pedagogically: 75 minute classes would be better than 50-minute classes, and could work with my intro courses. But the upper-level classes really need to be the longer form seminars. /
	Students tend to get tired going into the final 25 minutes.
This works well for most courses because attendance is better than 3 times per week. It allows for some lecture and some assessment.	The challenge is that you need to "flip the classroom." Lecturing for 75 minutes turns students off.
--This schedule has been working very well for my ENGL 1010, 1011, 2408, 2405, 1616W, and 1616 courses / --In Composition classes, it is vital to have enough time, both for class discussions/activities and group tutorials / --In all English classes, 75 mi	
Perhaps I'm not the best person to answer this, because a freshman comp course is 4 credits, so our classes are longer. But a 75-minute class twice a week gives the teacher adequate time to offer a few minutes of instruction, leaving students sufficient opportunity to write, discuss, research, and/or collaborate while the instructor serves as consultant and guide.	I haven't encountered challenges in this schedule except one: midterm conferences must be spread over more than two class periods to give all students sufficient one-on-one time with the instructor.
Students taking writing courses need time for reflection and to put their thoughts together. Classes that meet twice a week would allow them to do this. / / Students who commute significant distances would be less likely to be exhausted from having to meet many obligations, and absenteeism would not increase.	Students who fell behind might be more likely to fall farther behind faster. /
This is the schedule that I prefer - it seems to be just right in amount of time spent for me in the course that I teach.	I really do not see any challenges - I prefer this schedule and think it works best.
None	For my class, meeting 2 times at 75 min a week wouldn't work well. It wouldn't give the class sufficient time for film viewing and discussion.

TABLE 4: REACTIONS TO 75-MINUTE CLASS MEETINGS ADJUNCT FACULTY RESPONSES	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
Obviously it's possible to teach an excellent course on this type of schedule. Universities throughout the USA do precisely that. The issue is that it's a vast dis-service to many/most regional campus students, who are much more likely to be economically disadvantaged, from traditionally under-represented minorities, and immigrants, than the Storrs undergraduate population. The regional campuses were created to serve the regional communities in which they are located, not to serve the priorities of Storrs-based administrators.	
Better than 3 times a week. Again, I have more time to get into complex concepts without the fear of running out of time.	
I think I already covered the advantages (for me) in the previous responses. To recap, among other advantages, longer class periods (75 mins or 2.5 hours) allow for: / 1. In depth discussion on course material. / 2. The time to screen documentaries or view presentations and follow those with discussion and/or writing exercises. / 3. Essay components on midterm exams. /	I do not see any particular challenges that I feel when I offer a course that meets twice a week for 75 minutes other than the fact that, for some of my courses, once a week courses of 2.5 hours is sometimes preferable.
This option covers 3-credit classes only. / I teach MATH 1131Q and 1132Q, both are 4-credit classes. / Meeting twice a week has been ideal for me as well as my students for many years. Students who commute to the regional campuses and work part-time jobs appreciate the T/Th schedule. Scheduling classes on T/Th is a necessity for many students trying to juggle work & school. /	This option covers 3-credit classes only. / I teach MATH 1131Q and 1132Q, both are 4-credit classes. / Meeting twice a week has been ideal for me as well as my students for many years. Students who commute to the regional campuses and work part-time jobs appreciate the T/Th schedule. Scheduling classes on T/Th is a necessity for many students trying to juggle work & school. /
twice a week is a normal meeting schedule / / 75 minutes is a good length for a clas	no challenges
The advantages to such a schedule include fewer transportation/childcare/work coordination conflicts to deal with for both students and faculty (see the challenges I listed regarding a 3 day, 50 min. schedule) and less transportation expense, especially for those of us who have long commutes to campus. Being an English instructor, I find that a 75 min class allows for deeper, more productive discussions than a 50 min class three days a week does. I have found that 50 minute classes are simply too short to allow students the time to compose thoughts and foster meaningful discussions. 75 min classes also allow for more of a variety of in-class activities, such as small group discussions, etc. that a 50 min class simply is not long enough to allow. Personally, I have found it very difficult to "break up" lectures/discussions of texts to fit a 3 day week schedule. It often leads to awkwardly segmented reading assignments. Working with a two day a week schedule has always been easier for me in terms of planning syllabi, lectures, reading assignments, essay assignments, etc. In the past, I've also noted a drop-off in attendance on Fridays in my 3 day a week classes, unless I made a point of scheduling assignments or quizzes or such to ensure students show up.	The only challenge I can see to this schedule is the potential for student interest to wane beyond the one-hour point. I have mitigated this in the past by scheduling a brief (3-4 minute) break mid-way through my 75 min classes, or doing a small group activity during the second half of class to break up any monotony.

**TABLE 5: REACTIONS TO 2.5-3 HOUR CLASS MEETINGS
FULL-TIME FACULTY RESPONSES**

ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
This course works for senior capstones and seminar courses, as well courses seeking to introduce undergrads to a wholly new discipline. I use this format only for senior seminars. It prepares students for graduate-level instruction, allows me to run one-on-one tutorials focused on student research, maximizes students' time researching their projects, and allows for variety of teaching methods (when the class meets as a whole for the first semester) to help students wrestle with content. Obviously, it also maximizes flexibility for university service, public engagement, advising meetings, extended office hours, and research and writing times.	It's a long time for a student to pay attention. It also risks marginalizing the course from students' attentions. Two 75 minute classes allows me to cover more material than one 150 minute class.
In general, there are few advantages to a once a week course. However, once a week courses do work very well for courses that include Experiential Education (including, but not limited to, field trips and labs) and that include Service Learning.	I have taught once a week classes for many years, but they definitely don't work nearly as well as twice per week classes. There is just too much material for the students to absorb in once a week classes. Once a week classes also restrict the professor on the type and amount of reading and writing that can be asked of the students.
*it's convenient for students who work full-time and/or have a long commute / *it's not that different from my ideal schedule of two 75-minute periods, since I do 75 minutes, take a quick break, and then another 75 minutes.	I'm a very early riser, so I personally don't prefer to teach at night, which is usually my time to hang out with my kids and catch up on emails and administrative tasks (like filling in this survey!). However, when an adjunct asks if we can switch schedules, of course I'm happy to sometimes give up my nice Tues/Thurs day schedule to take a night class so the adjunct can have that time for personal matters. And hey, I can do it since I'm not required to be at Storrs on a Tues or Thurs evening.
There is no advantage	Students cannot concentrate for such a long time
Too long	Too long
I find once/week longer courses ideal for experiential education; for service learning courses; and for seminar style upper level courses that are (at least in part) intended to prepare students for graduate study.	Once a week courses are extremely challenging for first year students, who are often not prepared to take on the responsibility to schedule their own work time to get the reading and written work done.
Simplifies the logistics of commuting. May be advantageous for some types of courses.	Endurance challenge for the instructor; special class formats and structure required to keep students engaged.
I have never taught a course like this. I do not have the experience to offer my opinion	I have never taught a course like this. I do not have the experience to offer my opinion
You can engage in a variety of experiences, it is easy to put together long lectures and exams	Students become fatigued, if they miss one lecture they miss a weeks worth of activities it can be hard to work in exams
There are no advantages to this schedule for an undergraduate course unless it is a seminar or first-year experience course.	Instructors have to carefully prep their courses especially in the evenings to keep students engaged. Less content can be taught, but more depth or team work can be done during these courses.
Frees time for clinical and lab experiences, allows for projects that take more time in the classroom, immersion.	Long class times overwhelming for some students.

TABLE 5: REACTIONS TO 2.5-3 HOUR CLASS MEETINGS FULL-TIME FACULTY RESPONSES	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
Again, if we are teaching people to actively THINK, sustained focus and momentum are crucial. / / I also see people respond well to the added responsibility of doing a week's worth of prep on their own.	
I don't see any advantages.	Too long -- after one hour, attention span for difficult technical material wanes.
I teach one day a week classes on many occasions, and find that for some topics it's a better format, that allows for longer discussions, allows the integration of films or clips into the class, and fits my students needs at the branch campus. If we do switch to a 3-day a week scheduling I would opt for night classes instead given my students' needs (they have told me they'd prefer a one-day a week class over 3-day a week classes). I'm afraid that any 3-day a week classes would be seriously under-enrolled.	
I have not taught such a course, but it would provide advantages personally, since I would only have to commute once a week. Pedagogically, it would allow me to do more complicated simulations and to engage the material very deeply. I could also see it being an advantage in a W course, since the longer time block would provide opportunities for writer's workshops.	It would be difficult to keep the material fresh, and difficult to cover as much as I would like to cover.
I only have this type of course - for me I work in three different campuses; storrs, hartford and downtown hartford. The commute time is what really forces this and to be honest most of the students in the class like just having to come once a week and have it structured in such a way.	This doesnt always provide the best learning environment - first the retention goes way down and second I know all the faculty dont teach the entire time so you lose classroom hours due to that. The other issue was the schedule this year. My class in Hartford started at 4PM and ended at 6:30PM... well the class before me ended at 4PM and the class after started at 6:30PM, so there was no time between. Essentially what happened was that I was always forced to start 15 min late to prep everything and then I ended about 10 minute early so the next faculty member wouldnt have that same problem. My professional courtesy cut off almost 20 - 30 minutes off the course right away so I ended up only getting 2 hours worth of a lesson in.
the advantages are scheduling flexibility, less transport time for students combining work and school.	the disadvantages of break in continuity for teaching and difficulty remaining focused are significant.
Even moreso than in a 75 minute class, there is time for lecture and discussion. A longer unit or work can be successfully discussed.	We all run out of energy at some point. I find that such courses are brutal in the late afternoon. By evening everyone seems to have gotten their second wind.
few advantages other than only appearing once per week	these class meeting times are too long to go through with a break, but breaks durations are difficult to control and inevitably result in less instruction time (e.g., compared to 2 x 75 minutes)

TABLE 5: REACTIONS TO 2.5-3 HOUR CLASS MEETINGS FULL-TIME FACULTY RESPONSES	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
Flexibility for students who are working. They can take a course (e.g., a night course) and still be working in a traditional time and still go to school. / / It's ok (perhaps) for very advanced classes, a discussion seminar, or if you are a particularly superb teacher, you can manage to keep students engaged. (So mitigate the disadvantages...) / / As a faculty member, it gives you the maximum flexibility over your schedule (you could perhaps only be on campus once a week!)	This simply isn't the best way to learn in one block of crammed in information (you need to take in information, sleep on it, have time elapse, have rehearsal of information, and then get more information). And average-good to mediocre teachers' impact on learning on students' learning will for sure be diminished than if they delivered information in smaller amounts. / / I find it much more difficult to do myself, and I think the percentage of students on my campus who are strong enough academically to respond to this well is too small (15-30%) -- if I were better I could pull it off better (I have friends who are that good) but I think students would get less out of it than when I teach two blocks instead. / / See advantages above: A faculty member could get by with being on campus very little, which doesn't seem great for the ambience of a campus--perhaps it would be good for the university to think what they want the campus to be. If university is fine with just faculty being there to deliver a class (and with reduced interest in hiring research active faculty that's probably the case), and provide some token office hours, and no need to contribute to an active intellectual atmosphere in other ways, then the choices made about teaching times should be oriented to what students want--and the opportunity to have a night class once a week would be great for working students (see above)!
Services full time students who also work full time -- the majority of our student population. / Best for those faculty members who teach many courses at many locations.	None really. I have been doing this for over 10 years and it seems to satisfy both students and me. /
Students only have to come to one class period per week	It's a long time to keep student's attention; over w eek span in between, students sometimes don't retain some of concepts previously taught.
Faculty can cover more material in greater depth.	I think most students struggle with maintaining attention for 2.5-3 hours in a once a week setting. It also provides little to no flexibility for cancellations. Moreover, with the limited course options in Stamford, an overabundance of these courses prevent students from getting into other courses that overlap with the large time block.
This is the ideal time for students' needs for scheduling as well as in-depth learning experiences.	This time frame requires challenges to the instructor to create learning environments that are effective; but it is also the most rewarding for students and faculty alike.
This is a great format for courses with significant interaction between instructor and students, such as true seminars. / This timing allows me to make strong use of guests with specialized expertise. / This timing makes night courses popular. At night, if half of the courses were two nights per week and half were one night per week, that would be a scheduling nightmare for students. Mostly all one night works well. Mostly all two nights would be better than half and half, but would still make scheduling more difficult for the students.	We have to be careful to choose courses where a single long class makes sense. A detail intensive freshman course should not be delivered this way

TABLE 5: REACTIONS TO 2.5-3 HOUR CLASS MEETINGS FULL-TIME FACULTY RESPONSES	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
Easy commute time. Students have the time to get fully engaged. Multiple teaching methods can be implemented. Discussions don't get cut short. One meeting per week-one and done.	The only one is that students need a break. I have a break factored in and it always works out well. 10 minutes is all they need.
This class schedule lends well to courses that blend both lecture and discussion/activities.	Longer time for students to sit - more graduate school model but this is not necessarily a bad thing.
	None
Well, it only meets once a week. The format allows a great deal of flexibility in terms of adapting the content to student needs; we can go around the hills and back again talking about a good question and still cover the content that, in my judgement, needs to be covered.	Long, tedious, and tiring. Requires special efforts to maintain student interest and engagement.
It is easier to get adjunct instructors for once a week classes. However, from my personal teaching perspective, I don't see any advantages to meeting once a week.	I don't like once a week classes for undergraduate students, because it is usually too much material to absorb at one time. Another disadvantage is if students miss once class, in a once a week class versus a three days a week class, they miss three times as much material.
This schedule works very well for courses that include group work and class discussions. It also works very well for faculty members who use multiple teaching methods.	None. It is not ideal for all courses/faculty members, but it works for many.
Entire topics of the course can be completed in one session.	It is harder to keep students engaged for such a long period of time.
Seminars, especially W courses, work best in this time frame. This allows time for in-class peer review. Each class can also spend half or more time on concepts and yet also take up a writing or skills issue (modeling note taking toward writing a précis for example). In such a case, students get the message that the writing and skills are not something "on the side" but are inextricably connected to working with the concepts.	It's important to find a way to break up the rhythm in a course meeting for 2.5-3 hours. It's not practical to lecture the entire time so it requires careful planning to bring in video clips, group work and/or structured discussion.
Students love these time classes. Because they are commuters, they are likely to choose these classes. It helps them balance work and school better.	It is hard for students to focus for that long; however, at the same time, they don't like breaks because they would prefer to leave earlier than take a break. It is hard. But, I do think commuter students like these courses.
Sustained, deep, and reflective discussions and other activities that require extended stretches of uninterrupted time are possible. Classes held once a week are a great option for working students and returning/non-traditional students who have very busy lives outside of school.	Winter weather can pose challenges if the course gets canceled regularly since meetings are only held once a week. Husky CT and other online course management systems can remedy this when necessary.
gives more time flexibility for working students	maintaining the focus and interest of the student
Less travel. Less need to fit into numerous schedules. Time for in depth discussion or multiple topics. Time for alternative modalities such as longer video and group work. Better for students/faculty with complex or full schedules such as those with work or family responsibilities. More opportunity to develop richer relationships.	Need to be aware of fatigue.
fewer days students/faculty have to commute	maintaining student engagement / research indicates that information is typically learned better with spaced as compared to massed learning

**TABLE 6: REACTIONS TO 2.5-3 HOUR CLASS MEETINGS
ADJUNCT FACULTY RESPONSES**

ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
None. Far too long for standard lectures, etc.	Too long. In my experience teaching these classes (at night, unfortunately), the students have worked jobs all day and are not able to maintain attention that long...even just once a week. High absenteeism/tardiness/early departure. Perhaps OK for a residential campus, but not for students who have a 30-75 minute commute before and after class.
This evening class allows flexibility for other many working students, a challenge main campus students don't encounter as often	Bad weather cancellations have more impact on a once a week class
It allows students who have full time employment to be more flexible, perhaps take more classes.	My concern is if a student misses too many classes that their grades will suffer
good for working students - get it all done in one class per week.	fatigue by hour 3 (both prof and student)
I've not taught in this manner so it's hard to say. I can see it working quite well for an upper level class with some lecture and some in class activity.	
For upper classes I think it is great / For student scheduling and to generate in-depth attention to a topic	I do not think it works for lower division classes particularly if a student that misses a class / I also do not see the attention span in freshman that I do in upperclass students / I also think students are more invested in courses that are related to their majors so gen Ed courses less likely to benefit from once a week schedule
These are laboratory courses that need that time frame for the completion of experiments	These are laboratory courses that need that time frame for the completion of experiments
Less travel to campus and therefore good environmental outcomes.	Too much material to cover at once. / Too much information for students to process at once. / Students would lose focus. / Too much time in between classes possibly leading more disconnect with the material covered
None	Snow days ruin everything / They get bored and restless after 1.5 hours.
Advantages: There is a chance for using a wide variety of media in a class like this. In a short class, discussing an involved question can eat up the time for a film clip, a class debate, or student presentations. Longer classes give flexibility. Students get used to one another fairly quickly (often by the second class) and questions and discussions get deeper. / / The longer time allows for seminar-style teaching. Some students are a little scared of this - they'd rather absorb than think - but it's a wonderful environment for learning once they get over their initial fear. / /	One has to mix up teaching styles in a longer class, so that neither teacher nor students fall asleep. Devising good questions to allow a discussion to grow organically can take time; so does developing alternative learning strategies to keep the format varied. / / Once I taught in a room with a wasp's nest. Listening to them buzz for 2.5 hours was more irritating than listening to them for 50 or 75 minutes, I'm sure.
It's once a week	
Much better for adjuncts travel time-wise plus a good combination of content and application can be achieved. I believe this combination leads to better student learning outcomes.	Students get fatigued.

TABLE 6: REACTIONS TO 2.5-3 HOUR CLASS MEETINGS ADJUNCT FACULTY RESPONSES	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
The advantage is that students are more likely to attend once a week than two or three times. I like this format because I have a long commute, but it also gives me the advantage of doing one to three different activities, thus not losing student interest.	The challenges are keeping everyone's attention over this long period, and keeping students connected. I solve the connection problem by using Husky and frequent announcements and some discussion boards.
	Tough to sit still for that amount of time.
This would benefit the students more than myself, as it would be easier to schedule this course in with work demands. However, for an engineering course, this would be very intense and likely overwhelming. I do not really see any teaching benefit to this format for my specific course.	Very intense workload, no time to allow for digestion of information between presentation and testing.
I do not teach one day a week courses	
allows for interactive and multiple media formats, small and large group work/break-out sessions	Significant loss when student misses class
The long evening course I have taught attract students who work during the day. This is the time they can come to class. There is plenty of time to cover a good deal of ground. I usually integrate more diverse sources into each session, showing film clips or reading primary sources together as group. This is possible because of the log class sessions.	Having such a long class inevitably leads students to stop listening (it's just a really long time). A short break half way through the class usually does the trick. I also find that, though it's the same amount of class time, since the class meets once a week, students don't do as much reading as they would if the class met twice. For advanced seminars, this is a problem, precisely because more reading is required.
Gives plenty of time to delve in and in classes where I use video, it allows more time for that than in the other formats.	When a student misses a class, they've missed an entire week. / Less sense of continuity than other formats.
Deep dive.	Lack of development of community.
I like teaching this time frame as it gives me the most flexibility in scheduling films, guest speakers, lectures and hands-on class activities. I prefer this time frame and typically teach this either from 4-6:30 or from 6:30 9:00. In addition, if students need more time in writing assignments can give that to them without being rushed out of a classroom by another instructor or class.	This time frame is difficult for students to sit through so for the most part I have to give breaks during and in between lectures, class activities, and films. This is the best time frame for a writing class and also for many other courses that I have taught at UConn-W. Hartford. Even when I teach at the Storrs campus, students like this time frame as long as I provide breaks between segments within the course period.
	For the most part, it is too long to have a class.
The advantages here are mainly pragmatic, only one commute for class, more flexibility for the remainder of the week's schedule, etc. One pedagogy advantage is greater likelihood of completing a given topic without attempting to carry over to a subsequent day (this partly depends on the complexity of the topic, i.e. for more complex topics, some review on a subsequent day, is better for understanding. Classes where students work on group projects such as research methods, would also benefit.	Scheduling of exams is a big drawback in this format. Students are accustomed to having only the exam on exam day but this doesn't work in a once a week class. Either having the exam in the first half or the second half of class creates difficulties (focus is on the test and not on the class.) Also, an absence means missing a whole week, and 3 hours is way beyond just about anyone's attention span (including most instructors!)

TABLE 6: REACTIONS TO 2.5-3 HOUR CLASS MEETINGS ADJUNCT FACULTY RESPONSES	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
The main advantage that comes to mind right now is for those courses in which students need time in between class sessions to prepare their assignments. For example, courses that require the writing of longer papers or work on group projects in which the tasks are divided and each group member needs some time to work on his or her own before meeting again with other members of the group. Obviously, meeting once a week might also make the course more of an option for a nontraditional undergraduate or any student who is working fulltime or has family commitments and wants the class experience but finds meeting once a week more feasible than two or three times a week.	For those courses which are more experiential or benefit from the creation of a class community in which students get to know each other and thus feel more comfortable talking in front of each other, meeting only once a week could be a challenge or even an outright disadvantage.
This is my preferred course format. I find that I get to know the students better and they know each other better. This familiarity and trust facilitates student participation with respect to students asking questions and providing examples during the lectures and participating in learned discussions of the readings. Course material can be developed comprehensively. The course theme is set and intricacies explored.	I have taught many courses in this format and prefer it. I have had neither difficulty in course delivery nor pedagogy related issues.
Advantages: Only need to physically attend campus 1x per week; great for working students; supports pedagogy for excellent professor-student intensive discussion-interactive classes; can administer an exam, and then Also re-convene class to have further class discussion/media presentation; supports Mature Student Self Study Collegiate Type Education (positive; more likely to mimic real-world experiences); NOT High School!!! Perfect for in-class group study projects.	Challenges: Requires AT LEAST ONE 10-15 minute break within class session to avoid student engagement exhaustion; be careful not to have this break run too long; need to be able to successfully re-engage student learning process regarding topic being presented, carefully avoiding student boredom, fatigue, neural overload, etc. Students only have one day to ask professor questions regarding material; professors only have one day to assess student knowledge. Suggest online office hours in support of in-person office hours to make students feel more "connected" to learning process and invested in overall course subject matter.
Time for thorough, in-depth coverage of course material. For many topics, such as the more advanced accounting topics, I prefer this time schedule.	Only two challenges. One is a minor one - administering an in-class exam for 75-90 minutes, then getting students motivated to stay in class for a lecture/presentation. Second is trying to make up the time if more than one class is snowed out or cancelled for another reason (it's easy to make up one missed class, harder to make up for two or more missed classes).
	long hours, students cannot concentrate; missing significant amount of the material
I like the fact that you can have an intensive focus on a particular topic. Students seem to like having class only once per week, and I personally prefer only having to commute once per week. I tend to think that either this or 3 times per week are the best formats.	Once per week puts more responsibility on the students: if they miss class they miss an entire week's worth of material.

TABLE 6: REACTIONS TO 2.5-3 HOUR CLASS MEETINGS ADJUNCT FACULTY RESPONSES	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
This schedule is best for seminar style classes, but it also works for lecture classes (taking a 15 minute break half way through). It allows for flexibility in discussion, as you have lots of time. It also allows for the professor to deliver one long lecture and one short one, without having to stop in the middle of the long one because you are on a 50 minute block. Also good for watching movies as a class and still having time to discuss after. Students at the Stamford campus who are working like these classes best because they only need to take a single block of time off each week, usually in the mid to late afternoon. Having a late once a week class really helps those students put together a workable schedule. This class block is also favored by many adjuncts, especially those who have jobs at multiple campuses or who have their own family commitments that prevent them from teaching more than once a week.	It is a long time for students to sit, which is why taking that break midway is crucial. The other disadvantage is that if you miss one class, you have missed the whole week.
Concentrated targeted time to one subject is a major advantage.	Sessions longer than about 2 hours get difficult near the end. One is exhausted either taking or giving a course like this.
I found this excellent because I could cover more topics in the session. I could also get more involved in activities instead of a pure lecture in HDFS 1070. Students also could plan their work and commuting schedule by only coming for one class and not coming twice in a week. additionally, teaching 1 course, coming one evening is easier on me.	Sometimes a very long class can be tiresome for students, but if the professor changes the delivery ie, lecture, movie, activity, discussion, etc. it makes the time go faster.
This is the ideal format.	No real challenges and pedagogically, this is the most efficient and effective format.
Travel time is minimal. Lectures are comprehensive and the timing really enables us to cover topics in detail. Students, who also are full- or part-time employees, need only to leave their work once a week.	Hard on students who get sick on class day or if their is a snow day.
The advantages are getting more class content covered in one period and the ability to cover a diverse number of issues using varying supports, pertaining to the topic. There is also time to lecture for 45-60 minutes, play a one-hour documentary and have a discussion at the end.	The challenges inherent in a class that meets for 2.5-3 hours once per week is keeping students' interests for that period of time if it is not in a seminar format. That is easily rectified by breaking up the class into different activities and chapters for one period with a 5-minute stretch break. This also depends on the time of day - the evening produces more fatigued students who do not retain information as sharply as those who sign up for classes in the morning.
Ability to cover all the material and activieis necessary for the week	The only challenges are when you changed the schedules so I have to begin at 6:20 rather than 6

TABLE 6: REACTIONS TO 2.5-3 HOUR CLASS MEETINGS ADJUNCT FACULTY RESPONSES	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
Better for me personally as an adjunct. I can devote one full day a week to teaching while maintaining my freelance writing business. No one expects me to be available to them on Wednesdays. All my clients learn quickly that Wednesday is my teaching day, and we work our project scheduling around that fact. / Much easier for students to navigate and to plan in relation to work and family obligations. / Much better for in-depth discussions, and combining short lectures with discussions, and combining other classroom activities (e.g. showing a short video and being able to discuss it immediately afterwards). / I see no downsides to the 2.5 - 3.0 hour classes for WGSS courses. /	
	Terrible. The course meeting is too long and students are exhausted, particularly those who have worked all day. It's an option for them, but the hybrid course schedule is best.
The advantage is that students who work can take a class and attendance is better.	The instructor must divide up the class into lecture, student assessment, and team work, when appropriate.
--One clear advantage (especially for evening classes like 6:30-9:00 p.m., but for daytime ones too)) is the fact that students can both work their jobs (and most students on regional campuses work full-time jobs, have families of their own, and have hectic	--The fact that the course takes place just once a week may be detrimental in terms of class cancellations or absences (for any reasons). I remember well that at the beginning of the Spring 2015 semester four Mondays in a row were cancelled because of inc
In a composition course, especially for first year students, I see no advantages to this schedule.	Because I teach only first-year students I don't like this schedule for two reasons: it is difficult for students to sustain focus for a class this long, and most freshmen need more teacher contact than once every seven days, especially in a composition course,, because students have a wide variety of tasks (brainstorming, drafting, revising, editing, reading, annotating) and they usually need some guidance in moving from one to another.
None.	Students would have so little interaction with instructors that they might as well be taking a correspondence course.
The advantage to this schedule is that it is a one day commitment - allowing students to be more flexible with taking other classes and for many, fitting in a work schedule	From the instructor perspective I find this to be the most challenging schedule - it is a long class and personally, teaching mostly freshmen, I find it is too much for many of them in transitioning to college. / I find I, too am much more energetic with the 2x per week schedule.
Great advantage. Providing ample time for screening and detailed analysis.	None
excellent for seminar discussions	not appropriate for introductory survey courses. Too long for students to concentrate
This is a great schedule for some subjects and inappropriate for others. It works well for many regional campus students and it's a very appropriate format for their educational needs. Maybe it's not ideal for the Storrs' brand but is that really the point of the regional campuses? If it is, then please just turn them over to the CSU system where they're actually serious about educating their students.	

TABLE 6: REACTIONS TO 2.5-3 HOUR CLASS MEETINGS ADJUNCT FACULTY RESPONSES	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
I find that this course schedule is good when doing team projects.	I prefer more frequent class interaction with students to discuss course material and this format can be limiting with a once a week meeting.
You can cover the syllabus! You have time to explore in the class and work on more multiple step STEM problems. You need to have large blocks of time when performing calculations. / / Allows me to answer homework questions and dialogue with students better. You get to know them better. / / My personal favorite.	Can be tiring for students and the professor. You have to take a break.
The advantages to meeting once a week are fewer trips to campus and therefore more opportunity for students to work part-time jobs. I have done this in the past. It is not ideal for learning math.	The advantages to meeting once a week are fewer trips to campus and therefore more opportunity for students to work part-time jobs. I have done this in the past. It is not ideal for learning math.
only need to commute once a week / / 2.5 hours is a perfect timeframe to cover one chapter plus perhaps a short test afterward	no challenges
In my experience, this schedule is ideal. Logistically, in terms of planning transportation/childcare/outside work commitments for students and adjunct faculty, this is the most practical option. It reduces transportation costs and concerns and makes many classes more accessible to students who may work full time during regular business hours. Pedagogically, I have always found these longer classes much easier to plan, and they allow for high quality, productive class discussions. They also allow for a lot of flexibility in terms of changing up in-class activities, especially useful for students who may benefit from small group work, or simply a variety of activities in the classroom beyond lectures.	The biggest challenges inherent to these longer classes is student attention span (though there are lots of ways to avoid this issue: breaks, changing activities, etc) and that when a student misses one class, they miss a lot of material. Same is true when one of these classes has to be cancelled due to weather, it can be a real challenge to adjust a syllabus accordingly.

TABLE 7: TEACHING ONLINE
FULL-TIME FACULTY RESPONSES

ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
I see little to no advantages, for my humanities, discourse and debate-based discipline, stemming from online courses. I only see advantages for administration, marketing, recruitment, and per-unit-profit maximization.	I have seen no research indicating that online courses in the humanities perform better in enhancing student learning outcome than face to face courses. That said, I look forward to seeing research showing how I could make an online format work better. Other departments, I'm sure, adapt better to online formats. Someday we will know how to do this: I haven't seen it yet. / / Students perform better when they know their professor knows them, is willing to support them, and knows them well enough to provide those services. I'm not sure that relationship is fostered as well through online courses. Furthermore, online courses make it more difficult to advise students--and eventually help them get jobs or go to graduate school. It's not impossible through online courses: I feel it is harder and less successful, however. / / I also question how radical shifts to online teaching will affect our accreditation.
The only advantage that I see is for students who cannot make a face-to-face class because they are restricted by their work schedules. But online courses do NOT work as well pedagogically as face-to-face courses, so the students lose out.	The very best way to teach is face-to-face. The students learn exponentially more in a face-to-face course. They just don't learn as much online. Also, online courses require a lot of writing (of such things as reading responses) since there is no class discussion. Such writing often has the feel of busy work and takes up far more of the student's precious time than doing the reading and coming to class for class discussion.
I often include substantial online components to my classes (online quizzes, online discussions, videos, etc.) so I feel like doubling down on those techniques could be good if I had adequate support (I'm no expert in online delivery). I suppose there would be a certain convenience to it for students with very busy schedules.	I love talking to students -- it's why I decided to be a prof. I'm actually taking this survey from afar, since I'm at a conference this week. I taught my class online today and it was fine. We covered the material and some of the quiet students talked more. But it wasn't as much FUN. Maybe it's old-fashioned, but I really like the idea that building cultural awareness and developing writing and analytical skills should be fun. For me (and my students, when I check in after an online class), there's more laughter and shared knowledge-making when we're all in a room. This may be because I'm not particularly skilled in online delivery. If I were to teach an online class instead of an occasional class period when I'm out of town, I would work much harder to make it more fun.
No advantage	Students can't follow science classes online as well as in person
Works well for experienced college students in courses that are so specialized that students from several campuses would need to be enrolled in order to justify holding those courses.	More difficult to get to know the students. Spontaneity is lost when there is much typing to communicate. Not all students' tech will support Mediasite, etc.
None	Don't know

TABLE 7: TEACHING ONLINE FULL-TIME FACULTY RESPONSES	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
For a history course and for myself as a teacher, I cannot see how the lack of face to face interaction -- with both the instructor and with peers -- would work. As important as writing is, discussion and debate are fundamentally important in my discipline, I believe.	Among the reasons I am uninterested in online courses is the possibility that the university might take it and offer my work through another instructor.
Some instructors are wonderful in online formats. These courses can be used to eliminate enrollment limits that block student progress.	For myself, the aspect of teaching I enjoy most - and believe is most valuable and enduring - is personal contact. I have NO interest in spending more time at the keyboard.
to accommodate diverse schedules of the students.	no face-to-face time. little interaction with professor.
An obvious advantage would be that students could view the course material anywhere and at anytime.	Most of the courses I teach include a laboratory session. The challenges of doing this online are many and perhaps insurmountable. Additionally, I question whether complex concepts could be conveyed without direct interaction and immediate feedback by an instructor.
It can make you rethink your material and offerings, students can be anywhere	There is something about meeting in person, it can be easy for students to fall behind, the rapport is not established.
Flexible scheduling for students and instructors. Students can know their grade at all times based on assessment methods and use of online grade book.	Preparation of the material and keeping it interesting. Formative assessment methods are limited and the course preparation can not be as adaptable to student needs. Limited face-to-face time with the instructor.
Convenient, no need to make up due to storms, allows students to explore material individually.	Some undergrads do not keep up with the material, and do not complete the work independently. Instructor may need to spend more time to address needs individually. Technical problems may delay delivery of course. Students miss out on interactions with the rest of the class face to face (although they may interact even better on line.) Proctored assessments can be challenging - but doable.
Offers Flexible Schedule / Provides Persistent Feedback / Allows for Multiple Media / Somewhat Environmentally Friendly /	Engaging Students / Avoiding Procrastination / Creating Group Discussions
None	In my classes, active THINKING is generated through my questions and ESPECIALLY through immediate discussions from multiple viewpoints. "Chipping in" on line when one feels like it (disparate schedules) never achieves this dynamic.
I can't see any advantage other than a cost advantage to the university.	I'm not an "on line" kind of person, so I don't have any comment to offer here.

TABLE 7: TEACHING ONLINE FULL-TIME FACULTY RESPONSES	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
	<p>I have studied the research on on-line courses for my duties on an undergraduate affairs committee. What I found was that benefits and outcomes of this approach are worse than traditional courses. Research shows that students get less out of a course taught this way, and that class sizes need to be small (no more than 25) to achieve any kind of success. Also, my classes depend on the active combination of lecture, question and answer, and class discussions that are impossible in an on-line format. I refer quite often to the text we are covering, in order to show students where I am getting certain ideas from, and to help them with their critical reading skills. Students report that this helps them comprehend tough ideas, and it helps anchor our discussions to the author(s) we are covering. This approach would be impossible in an on-line format. I have had discussions with my better students about their experience with UConn on-line courses. The general response is that the courses are easy As, but that they learn very little and come away from the courses unhappy with the entire experience. They miss the classroom interaction; they miss the ability to interrupt lectures with questions, and the spontaneity of classroom discussions. They feel very alienated from the on-line experience.</p>
<p>I think the online format, if well done, can capture undergraduate students' interest well because it resembles social media formats that students are already familiar with. It also allows them flexibility and allows students that need to work to accommodate their schedule. Having lecture modules online allows students to review a given module rather than just having to rely on their notes when studying for an exam or when doing problem sets. In my experience, online discussion boards have the advantage over in-class discussions that they tend to be less dominated by a few alpha personalities. Instead, everybody, including shy students, have a chance to be heard.</p>	<p>The main challenge in online courses I experience is that I can't see my students' faces. This does not allow me to interpret their facial expressions if they have questions that they are not ready to pose explicitly. I have to rely on students explicitly asking questions via discussion board or e-mail.</p>
<p>More flexibility for students and teachers. I have not done this kind of a course, however, so have a difficult time identifying the pros and cons.</p>	<p>See above.</p>
<p>Scheduling for the students is very flexible.</p>	<p>Personally, seeing the students' faces and mannerisms is important for me to read their level of understanding. / / The personal touch adds to student experience,- mostly missing from online interactions. / / Evaluations are better when they include individual face to face conversations and discussions, and that element is missing from online courses.</p>
<p>more flexibility</p>	

TABLE 7: TEACHING ONLINE FULL-TIME FACULTY RESPONSES	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
The advantages are simple - that you can teach anyone, anywhere, but only if done right. Just providing material and maybe videos is not enough to engage people and honestly I haven't seen a case where it's been right as of yet. At UConn we don't have the resources provided to us to do that - especially at the regional campuses.	Most people don't understand how to teach in the online space and won't learn the skills necessary to do so. This ends up being a bad experience for students and lowers the level of curriculum and rigor. Essentially the students just teach themselves the material and then complain about everything.
I do not see any advantages to a course in which the instructor never interacts in a meaningful way with the students.	I do not see any advantages to a course in which the instructor never interacts in a meaningful way with the students.
flexibility in scheduling & delivering material; flexibility for students in completing work	some students may not be as disciplined about doing work without face-to-face interactions
flexibility for students / / I put tons of stuff on-line for students that they don't bother to take advantage of now at all (for reviewing for exams, and optional readings and so forth); if that was solely the course, all that work finding stuff would finally have some payoff.	reduced engagement / / I think it would take a GREAT GREAT deal of my time to get the online course first prepared to try it the first time, and then it would be many many times of repetition and tweaking before I would ever be happy with it.
It all depends on the course -- not all courses lend themselves to online delivery in my opinion.	
Flexibility	lack of face-to-face interaction; some material does not lend itself to online
The students can work at it at their convenience.	Pedagogically I am profoundly concerned about the human interaction limitations particularly with respect to nonverbal communication.
Provides flexibility to the student and for the designers of the schedule. Avoids commuting challenges for students. Relieves pressures from increased weather related cancellations	On our campus students do not start out ready to function in a university classroom. For freshmen, live courses are needed to enable us to promote growth as a student. / Our live courses enable students to develop interests, select majors, become involved in research and experiential learning, Live interactions enable students to learn how to function as professional in a discipline. Again, our students start further from the finish line and need more than the delivery of course content. / Of course, not every course needs to be live. We can greatly increase online offerings without creating a problem.
No travel time for students.	Who is doing the work? Where is the personal interaction?
Many of my students are working, balancing family and home life while trying to commit to finishing their college degree. Online courses lend to a more flexible "class" time and allow students to get their coursework done while meeting their individual needs.	There are some courses that really lend more to face-to-face and hands-on class time. I teach early childhood education courses that require students to actually get involved with activities and working together in class. Therefore, that course does not work as a fully online course.
None	Psychology undergraduates need face to face attention
Online courses, especially those in asynchronous formats, are an entirely separate challenge, and so intrinsically interesting. They allow us to serve greater numbers of students and, more importantly, often draw a greater diversity of students for interactions.	My experience with asynchronous online courses says that one problem (I refuse to use the euphemism "challenge") is that the administrative time for the professor is greatly multiplied. Another is that they attract students who are not prepared for the format and subsequently take their dissatisfaction out on the professor. (I expect the latter problem will decline as more students try them and find out whether the format works for them.)

TABLE 7: TEACHING ONLINE FULL-TIME FACULTY RESPONSES	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
Flexibility.	You lose the personal connection from a face to face lecture. Facial expressions often tell a thousand words. I haven't taught an online class, but I believe it takes a lot of work to deliver one effectively.
Coursework would be done at the students schedule.	Easier to forget to do some work.
The main advantage is that, in theory, weather or other commuting problems shouldn't affect students' ability to keep up with the course.	I know people who have embraced the creative challenge of designing an online course and I've learned from them that it involves considerable skill and experience which I don't have the time to acquire alongside other goals. I would only consider doing this if substantial technical and pedagogical support were available for using online tools.
This allows students to learn from home and to self-pace their learning. It also allows ways for shy students to participate with more comfort.	The on line discussion is not as fun, engaging, or interesting than the face-to-face discussion. The synchronous discussion is a better letter tool.
This is a great option for working/non traditional/returning students who need the flexibility. There are some great online options for peer review and other activities relevant to writing courses.	I'm not sure students take online courses as seriously as f2f courses. There is no chance to develop a rapport with students. These courses require a new way of thinking about pedagogy and demand serious attention. One cannot simply transport a class into an online environment and expect it to work.
With proper guidance and CETL support, one can create a robust and engaging on-line environment that is very conducive to effective learning. / / Everyone participates / / Can be advantageous for students with complicated course schedules and/or work/school demands. / / for regional campus studnets cuts down on commuting	Teaching on-line requires time to 'manage' in addition to teaching. / / Full time faculty and part-time faculty interested in developing an online course will need on-site IT and CETL support in order to create a really good course. An additional challenge for adjuncts is that they are paid to teach their course, but when it comes to developing an on-line course, they will be putting in their own time to do so -- they should be compensated for that time monetarily.
Asynchrony, technology	Managing HuskyCT is time consuming with unexpected technical glitches. Sometimes they want in person contact but that can be addressed through synchronous online activities and virtual office hours.
flexibility in schedule	not having the one-to-one interaction important for many regional campus students who are first generation college students

**TABLE 8: TEACHING ONLINE
ADJUNCT FACULTY**

ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
Requires on-campus presence 2x/week.	Online is far more work for instructor than many think... but not insurmountable.
Access to a course not taught at out branch	On line courses compete with traditional classes, reducing enrollment potential. As an adjunct, lack of enrollment cancellations result in job losses
It allows the student the freedom to determine their own schedule	I still feel some face to face contact is necessary
student work is structured yet self-paced	answering questions or clearing up misconceptions about the material is more difficult
Am going to try this next semester and am looking forward to it. It will allow more flexibility with my personal schedule. I am also hoping to foster more independence in the students by making them responsible for more of their own experience.	
For undergraduates: encourages students to engage online differently than they may have done so in the past; also good experience transitioning to workplace where much of learning is online / Course objectives: finding and evaluating information and using information	Again maybe not as useful for freshmen / I have asked students about full online courses and many of them are reticent because they do not understand how they work and are also concerned that they have no one to "talk to"
No advantage. My courses require direct interaction with students	No challenges. My courses require direct interaction with students
For the M-W-F format, an online Friday class might encourage more class participation. The students could do problems and obtain feedback on their solutions.	Not having taught an online course, I'm not sure about students doing their own work.
Avoiding travel to campus	Redesigning the course; learning tools for online delivery; lack of face to face and personal interactions; student access to the required technology
They can learn when it is convenient	Cheating / Lack of face to face contact /
I know that online is the new cool trend, and I think for self-starting, confident students, it is workable.	Students who require a more formal structure have trouble. There is no relationship building, neither mentor-mentee nor student collegiality. I have read some of the online discussions in sample English, History and Anthro courses at UConn, and was unimpressed with the quality of the writing or the sharpness of the thinking in most of the posts. / / Hard to write a letter of recommendation for someone one never sees or speaks to personally.
Students are well-suited to this type of delivery. UConn's tech support makes such a model fairly easy to develop.	Loss of in-person dynamic, assignments done on smart phones with less than ideal quality. Loss of spontaneity and creativity.
Online courses favor students who are introverts; they feel comfortable sharing their significant insights with the class which they would not do verbally in class, except, perhaps, in small groups. / / Students would tend to stay more connected to what is going on in class, particularly traditional students who are very accustomed to screen work.	For some students, classroom interaction is essential--on their own they flounder and lose connection, thus making it difficult to complete the work. This format is not suited to everyone, and it is difficult for students to know if they are suited for it until they actually do an online class. They should have an opportunity to do a "trial" online class.

TABLE 8: TEACHING ONLINE ADJUNCT FACULTY RESPONSES	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
Less travel to/from the campus	Impacts the in-person interaction between student/instructor. / I have had issues in the undergraduate building where WiFi causes drop outs. When the class is in-person, its easy to deal with. If the server(s) are having issues, then the class is basically a disaster.
An online course would be beneficial for a more writing based course. This would allow recordings of lectures and allow students to stop/start at their discretion.	My engineering courses are highly interactive. We work out problems together and I interact one on one as much as possible. I feel a completely online format would not be beneficial to the delivery of my content or my students. I deliberately arrive early and stay late to my classes to assist my students outside the expected format. In many cases, I have offered career counselling or other beneficial interactions to my students in those precious few minutes outside the traditional class time. I have gotten feedback each year that these times are very valuable to my students. If I had to move to an online format, this interaction would halt and I feel my students would be missing out on an important part of the college experience - learning that their professors are real people (and in my case an industry professional) who is there to assist them far beyond simply presenting material.
None.	Education is found in the personal interaction between teacher and student. Online courses eliminate this. Online education is pseudo education invented by accountants
flexibility for students and faculty	difficulty in really getting to know students
For humanities courses that are designed to teach students how to think, analyze, argue, discuss, and write, I see no benefits to an online format.	
I haven't done it, so I'm just guessing. More convenient for some students; less room for excuses re missing classes.	I hate the idea of losing the chemistry of the classroom. The feeling of in person interaction is a large component of why I want to teach at all.
Flexibility of schedule; shy students do not need to "speak."	Difficulty in creating a community; difficulty in establishing relationships with students to meet them where they are.
Writing courses are hands-on	Writing courses NEED to be hands-on
potential for introductory or survey courses. Provides more individual comment to each student, less subject to having only some students participate in large lecture hall type classes.	Difficulty in keeping students 'on track' with submitting required materials. Related is the problem of student's submitting work on time for the requirement at the end of week deadline, but not in time for others to respond in discussion during the week.
For those students who are truly independent learners and have the necessary discipline, an online course might be a good option in some subject areas.	I think there are some courses in which the face-to-face interaction is essential. I also recognize that students learn in different ways and for many students the personal interaction with an instructor makes a big difference in their success.

TABLE 8: TEACHING ONLINE ADJUNCT FACULTY RESPONSES	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
I don't believe there are advantages to teaching online course except for the travel time that is saved.	I have resisted teaching online courses because I do not believe that the students learn as well in this format. Studies have shown that online courses do not engage the students as well and they do not learn as much as in the face to face format. Course delivery is more difficult since I look to the students' expressions to determine the appropriate pace of the course and whether or not I should be asking them questions, regardless of the particular course. I do not want to teach an online course.
I have designed and instructed solely online courses before and found them to be extremely effective and interesting regarding the overall educational process. They foster student independence and Self-Guided Learning, as is highly recommended by experts within overall educational pedagogy at this current time.	Challenges only arise when students sign up for these courses who are not self-motivated, and thus should have NEVER been advised to enroll in such course styles. These students sadly perform quite poorly nearly at a rate of 100%, earning D or F grades, if they decide not to withdraw.
I have taught over 20 online courses, including one graduate level course at UConn and numerous online courses at Capital Community College, the University of Bridgeport and long-distance online with Shanghai Dianji University in China. Advantages include the flexibility in presenting the material and testing formats, and ability to easily administer weekly tests/exams. Also, less wear and tear on students and their vehicles, elimination of commuting time, reduction of traffic in Greater Hartford, less impact on the environment.	Some students have learning styles that do not lend themselves well to the online format; other students can fall behind if the online course is not designed to keep them engaged through discussion boards, weekly assignments, etc. Some professors like to assign students a team/small group project, which can be more difficult to administer in an online setting than in a live class, but I have never used this technique (not necessary in accounting courses).
	for freshman undergrads online is not an option, different learning environment, plagiarism is my biggest concern
Online courses are good for students who have outside responsibilities such as work.	Online courses make it difficult to form relationships with students. I believe that the personal touch is one of the most important aspects of higher education for certain students, and online does not deliver the same experience. Online courses also require a higher level of self-direction than in-person classes.
Flexibility.	Monitoring and engaging students could be a huge problem. I have no interest in it, I much prefer to engage with my students face to face.
Course can be done during off hours.	Rampant cheating.
i'm not sure. Perhaps it works because a student who has commuting challenges could fit it into their schedule. This would be for HDFS1070	HDFS1070, sometimes face to face is better for students, especially freshmen who take this as a mandatory class, who also need the extra "hand holding" to get through a course. I find the students expect more guidance and less autonomy at the Stamford branch.
I see few advantages -- I prefer hybrid formats for the face-to-face time.	It's hard enough to keep them interested in the classroom. Once online, it's very difficult to assess their involvement and learning without interactive video and real time conversations.

TABLE 8: TEACHING ONLINE ADJUNCT FACULTY RESPONSES	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
When students are not feeling well they could still attend class as their health allows.	We are social beings...a class offers a certain dynamic when students and professors exchange ideas. An online class does not miss out on this. / Technological difficulties. / Would not get to know the students the way I do in a classroom. Many of my students stay after class to talk. This is one of my favorite parts where I get to learn about their lives and interests and academic dreams.
Students have varying schedules and it is advantageous for them to participate in asynchronous modes of instruction. It is also good for the learner who does not require face-to-face interaction. My lectures and recommended readings and film can very easily be presented in an online course.	Working in groups might be problematic in an online environment for all the obvious reasons. It is important to remember that undergraduate students do not often translate to technology acuity. It is possible that some undergraduate students are not comfortable or disciplined enough for online instruction - unless there is a hands on course for guidance.
Helpful to students with busy schedules	Attendance and timely interaction is a challenge
Allows flexibility for students who are geographically further away, or unable to get to campus for reasons such as car problems, family issues, their own health concerns, et. al.	Diminishment in the quality of discussion. Much more difficult to build a feeling of community in a class -- something that is important in discussing sensitive issues.
	You never see anyone. And that is reason enough to avoid teaching a completely online course. Also, if you teach a course that relies on student participation, you cannot adjust the course -- it's great, I suppose, for those professors with little desire to change their course from semester to semester...you know, the lazy profs.
Many undergraduates at a branch campus are adults who are returning to change careers. An online course would insure that the course can be taken within their time constraints. It also allows for more assessment and instructor interaction.	Online courses are more work. Students expect more interaction. The textbooks must be designed to work with an online course. I know because I have been a consultant for a publisher and designed the online component.
Although I am certain that more and more English courses are being taught online, I strongly believe that teaching English -- literature, but especially Composition/Freshman English -- NEEDS the face-to-face interaction between instructor and student, because NOTHING can replace: / -- spontaneous and complex real-time class discussions, in which all students participate and learn interactively--both from teacher and from each others / --personalized advice/instruction given to any student in one-on-one, face-to-face conferences, especially about/in writing / --personal connections that form among students, and between teacher and students	The lack of personal, face-to-face interaction between instructor and students / --The lack of group face-to-face interaction among students / --The impossibility of performing spontaneous teaching moments
Motivated students, especially ones who are shy of in-person discussions, can get benefit from online learning. I have taught at Charter Oak State College for four years and am enthusiastic about the level of interaction students have with each other and with me.	Many students straight out of high school are not sufficiently well-organized to maintain online learning, especially in a composition class.
None.	The teaching of writing requires face-to-face interaction with students, so an online class would undermine the effectiveness of the course.

TABLE 8: TEACHING ONLINE ADJUNCT FACULTY RESPONSES	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
Allows a great deal of flexibility with time for both instructor and students.	In my course, I would really miss the face to face and I think I would need to do a hybrid. / I also worry about integrity - it would be much easier to cheat on exams, etc, when a course is online.
I have taught online at other institutions with great success. I don't know why foreign language classes can't be taught online by regional campus faculty at UCONN.	
None	For the film viewing it could work but it's very necessary to meet and discuss as a class. Students feel the same and actually feel it's better to view (although available online) the material in class as well.
flexibility for students who work	not all students have ready access to computers with internet / not all students respond well to the lack of human contact / does not lend itself well to seminar-type discussions / difficult to keep students on a steady pace. Some like working in spurts, which is incompatible with online discussions
For highly motivated strong students and a properly trained and supported instructor, it could be a good teaching option. In the real world, not so much.	Lack of instructional support. HuskyCT is woeful for this. Too many of these courses will be a joke.
It offers more flexibility to students especially those who work during the day as is the case with many of my students in Stamford.	The lack of face-to-face student interaction impacts the in-class experience some students prefer. The challenge to the online course would be engaging technology to create a virtual classroom that would provide the same type of experience gained in the physical classroom.
If you work as an island and need no contact with anyone (just learn by memorization) you'll love online classes.	Online courses are very difficult for students taking STEM classes. You need to help students understand the theory. You don't get it just by reading text! STEM class are not like courses that just rely on you reading a book on the weekends. STEM course require understanding, dialogue, what if scenarios, analytical thinking and solution/checking. You only get that with in-class models.
This summer will be my third experience teaching online courses. The advantages for me include the fact that, during the summer, I have the opportunity to offer my courses to a much wider student population without losing the personal contact that I have with students in traditional classes during the regular academic year. Developing online courses (with excellent campus support) gave me the opportunity to rethink course that I had taught in the past and to consider new ways of delivering course content and assessing student learning. I later integrated some ideas from my online courses to my face-to-face courses. / / More specifically, I have found that, although online courses do not typically help students develop their verbal communication skills, most students "contribute" (via online Discussion Boards) more regularly and in greater depth than they do in a traditional classroom setting.	1. As an instructor, I miss some of the personal contact that I have with students in a traditional classroom setting, although not to as great an extent as I had imagined (I do find I get "to know" my online students to a certain degree). / 2. Online courses are not a great option for students with poor study habits, those lacking a disciplined approach to their studies, etc. Online learning requires greater responsibility. / 3. It can be more difficult to get students really engaged in the subject matter unless the instructor can find ways to express her enthusiasm for the subject matter.
Obviously, logistically this is a practical option, it's convenient for all parties.	The challenges include technology issues that students may encounter, not everyone has ready access to a computer, or the technological know-how to navigate such a course. This also robs students and faculty of that face-to-face, personal dynamic that a classroom full of people fosters.

TABLE 9: TEACHING HYBRID COURSES
FULL-TIME FACULTY RESPONSES

ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
I see little to no advantages, for my humanities, discourse and debate-based discipline, stemming from online courses. I only see advantages for administration, marketing, recruitment, and per-unit-profit maximization.	I have seen no research indicating that online courses in the humanities perform better in enhancing student learning outcome than face to face courses. That said, I look forward to seeing research showing how I could make an online format work better. Other departments, I'm sure, adapt better to online formats. Someday we will know how to do this: I haven't seen it yet. / / Students perform better when they know their professor knows them, is willing to support them, and knows them well enough to provide those services. I'm not sure that relationship is fostered as well through online courses. Furthermore, online courses make it more difficult to advise students--and eventually help them get jobs or go to graduate school. It's not impossible through online courses: I feel it is harder and less successful, however. / / I also question how radical shifts to online teaching will affect our accreditation.
The only advantage that I see is for students who cannot make a face-to-face class because they are restricted by their work schedules. But online courses do NOT work as well pedagogically as face-to-face courses, so the students lose out.	The very best way to teach is face-to-face. The students learn exponentially more in a face-to-face course. They just don't learn as much online. Also, online courses require a lot of writing (of such things as reading responses) since there is no class discussion. Such writing often has the feel of busy work and takes up far more of the student's precious time than doing the reading and coming to class for class discussion.
convenience. I actually do this when I teach May term (Fridays are online). Wait -- does that mean I teach a hybrid? Well, not officially. But since the class meets for 15 days out of 19, I think it's fun to change things up as a little treat on Fridays, which is especially nice for students who commute quite far.	Some students don't enjoy it (again, this might be my own limited skill). When I do Friday online classes during May term, I go to campus and offer for students who would prefer to come to campus to sit with me in our classroom and type together; there are often a few students who take me up on this.
No advantage	Students can't follow science classes online as well as they do in person
Possibly less disruptive to student and Adjunct Faculty employment schedules on MWF schedules, provided that the hybrid element is asynchronous.	All the problems of shorter in-class periods mentioned above: less time for in-depth work in class, etc. Also, some less -experienced students (most Avery Point Students) might perceive the hybrid element as being optional, despite being told otherwise.

TABLE 9: TEACHING HYBRID COURSES FULL-TIME FACULTY RESPONSES	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
I believe this survey should have included a wider definition of hybrid. I regularly teach a distance learning course that I offer at both a regional campus and at Storrs. The class meets twice a week and I teach from each campus once during the week. This kind of hybrid course has been very possible for me with the former schedule and has become more challenging to find a timeslot/classroom for now that the regional campuses are forced to only have short classes on MWF. / / If I taught differently, so that I could put the activities requiring face-to-face time in one meeting a week and those do-able online in a separate meeting, I could imagine a hybrid course of the type the survey means being useful. But that is not how I like to teach.	
Eliminate enrollment limits that block student progress to degree.	For myself, no interest.
teaches students to become independent learners, while allowing them The safety net of in-person communications.	A tremendous amount of work for faculty to convert course to hybrid.
The advantage would be that students could receive in-person feedback from the instructor for some portion of the weekly schedule. Such immediate feedback, such as reviewing physical models of organisms, or conceptual models of biochemical processes is critical and could be accomplished at least in part.	The challenges would be similar to those outlined previously for a on-line course.
It is the best of both approaches	It can be a lot to redesign a course, students admit to preferring in person class time
This blends a traditional classroom with an online classroom and would work well for flipped classes. Students have the ability to work on their own time and still get some face-to-face time with the instructor.	There is heavy prep work at the beginning of the semester. This planning can go to waste since it is hard to pace student learning in order to suit a variety of student learning styles.
Hybrid courses can use the advantages of both online and face to face courses - act as an enhanced face to face course.	A lot of prep time.
Can't see any articular advantage. With HuskyCT it seems that courses are hybrid already.	Managing course materials and course administration in general seem daunting.
The advantage is that the hybrid format combines the advantages of in-class and online formats. It combines the flexibility that the online format provides with the in-class advantage that I as an instructor can actually see and interpret my students' facial expressions.	The in-class component compromises the flexibility advantage that the online format provides. Like the in-class format it does not accommodate non-traditional students very well or students that have to work.
I have not offered such a course, so I have a difficult time assessing pros and cons. But it would be more flexible, I imagine.	
Some flexibility in scheduling, while allowing some personal interaction.	For me, the in-class environment enriches the learning, and the on-line parts lose that.
You can do some thing online if necessary and save class time for more meaningful activities. I do this alot with discussion. I have them work online to discuss a topic before I bring it up in class so they have time to really think about it in a meaningful way instead of coming up with things on the spot.	Same as online - people dont know how to do this correctly and when to use what tools.

TABLE 9: TEACHING HYBRID COURSES FULL-TIME FACULTY RESPONSES	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
Such a course could work if there are 7 meetings per semester (at least one every two weeks) with the students, although I am still a bit skeptical.	The same challenges that one would face in an on-line course. The type of interaction that one has with students in a regular classroom setting would be lost.
similar to on-line courses in offering flexibility in delivering and completing required material	few disadvantages
the advantages of both online and both facetoface delivery (see previous screen), perhaps balancing	the disadvantages of both online and both facetoface delivery (see previous screen), perhaps balancing out
I have no experience with hybrid.	
haven't thought enough about it	haven't thought enough about it
Convenience for students.	Limits the interaction for nonverbal communication.
I find that I am able to use the hybrid mode to realize the best of both worlds. I can contribute to student growth with live interactions, easily absorb class cancellations, adjust to changes in scheduling policies, avoid enrollment restrictions. Students have responded positively. It really works for my courses	First, since there is no means to go backwards in this survey, I want to correct an omission. I omitted one of the main reasons I have not attempted a 100%online course. Enrollment restrictions mean that to run a course online I would have to cap enrollment at less than half of my usual cap of 60 students. The online section would not allow me to reduce the number of live sections at all. The way we operate now, having me d an online course the online course would not allow me to staff the courses my department must offer at Stamford. / Now, back to the challenges of hybrid courses. Despite my ability to work with technology and to problem solve on my own, the initial development is ridiculously time-consuming. My local home internet access is not reliable enough for the sensitivity of our recording software. Each interference, no matter how brief means all is lost permanently and /I must start all over. Editing is limited to blocking specific segments, not interjecting anything. University onsite access and equipment has been even less reliable than my own access and equipment. Most faculty would not be capable or would not be willing to do what I am doing. I believe the pay off will be large after start up. Weather problems, commuting problems, and scheduling problems are only getting worse. Also, student learning process are hanging rapidly. I change all aspects of course delivery dramatically when I convert a course. This moves away from my strengths as an instructor. My in class skills are much less of an advantage for me. However, this new approach does seem to match the new ways that students learn.
Reduces the negatives of online courses.	Why not just have students use video? Khan Academy? Ted Talks? YouTube?
Hybrid coursework allows for a blend of online flexibility while providing face-to-face time as well.	none
I don't see any advantages to offering a hybrid class except that I could teach online parts of the class from home.	It strikes me that these are neither fish nor fowl, and so fairly pointless.
Flexibility.	I don't see any major disadvantages, as long as it includes sufficient face to face contact.

TABLE 9: TEACHING HYBRID COURSES FULL-TIME FACULTY RESPONSES	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
It can increase accessibility for some--for those who have a private, quiet space in their homes and also have the technology (computer and reliable, fast internet access) to complete online components to classes. However, this is not the case for many of our students.	Many of our students do not have reliable computers and reliable, fast internet access. Furthermore, many students do not have a private, quiet space in their homes in which they can work.
I don't know.	Getting the material prepaped for Blackboard.
Such a course offers the opportunity for students with complicated work schedules to commit to a course requiring meeting in person once a week so long as the online component was a synchronous. If such a course could also incorporate films that might go longer than the allotted "class" time, all the better.	Not all students are comfortable with an online learning mode. In particular, the Stamford campus no longer has in-person tech support for students which makes it very high stakes if a student is rattled by some aspect of the technology. If the university wants to move in this direction it must invest in a reasonable level of mentoring and in-person tech support. It's also important to keep in mind that many commuter students don't have good internet connections at home or a quiet place at home to complete online work so a hybrid course may not be as flexible as it appears at first glance. Finally, recent pedagogical research has shown that first generation to college students do better in a face-to-face classroom. Since a high percentage of regional campus students are first generation to college, the university should be very careful about the proportion of classes such students would be expected to teach.
This is the perfect blend of face-to-face and self-learning for students. The shorter class time is also better for maintaining interest and learning. The commuters also love this option because it saves them time and money on driving.	If done right, there are no challenges to hybrid.
This seems like a way of alleviating some of the challenges of purely online courses such as the lack of opportunity to create a rapport with students and the need to totally overhaul one's pedagogy in ways that may result in less effective teaching practices.	Not sure.
Flexibility for one's schedule / / allows for everyone to participate	If just developing a course, faculty need to be properly trained and supported. Adjuncts also need compensation for their time.
Meets the need for real time face to face contact which maintaining some of the attractive asynchrony of the online course.	None
flexibility with schedule	the amount of time it will take to restructure course for new format -- especially pre-tenure faculty members

**TABLE 10: TEACHING HYBRID COURSES
ADJUNCT FACULTY RESPONSES**

ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
Requires on-campus presence 2x/week.	
Ability to use different methods to present material.	Difficult and time consuming to design
Again, allows some freedom to determine schedule- especially in regard to winter session when weather conditions are precarious	I do not perceive challenges
flexibility on part of student and professor	managing the on-line content
See previous - my class next semester will be a hybrid.	
Not sure	Not sure
No advantage	No challenges
No comment. Not sure what a hybrid course is.	No comment. Not sure what a hybrid course is.
possibility of assigning exercises, quizzes, video streaming outside of classroom.	Student access to the required technology
They can learn on their own and get help when they need it.	A good idea
I suppose for a Branch teacher a hybrid course would somewhat work like discussion section, where students and teacher go over the readings and students are encouraged to critically apply their knowledge and ideas.	My department does not allow adjuncts to do hybrid courses. So I don't think it COULD be an option for me. / / Philosophically, psychologically and spiritually speaking, I think that live interaction is almost always better than virtual in terms of education, maturation and building collegiality.
Flexible scheduling - good for both students and faculty.	Loss of in-class engagement, team-work and spontaneity.
I think the hybrid offers a great deal of flexibility for faculty as well as students and sets the stage for work in the "real world" in this century. It is a good blend of personal and distance interaction.	I really don't see any challenges with this format.
	Even when the class is in person, students sometimes "drift off" and need to be "brought back". I can see this and account for it. If the student is at home, how do you know they are actually "in-class" and not off feeding the dog? Sure it's their responsibility but freshman do not always come equipped with that capability "out of the box".
A hybrid course would be good for a class where perhaps the online portion was used for assessments only.	Again, this reduces my time in the class and direct interaction with the students. My students thrive on the interpersonal relationships we build in the classroom.
None	Students learn less. / People who write budgets and who never teach are happy
Haven't done it and so I don't know.	
Blends flexibility with community development	Confusion among students as to scheduling.
I would need more time to consider the actual structuring of a hybrid course before I could offer an opinion	

TABLE 10: TEACHING HYBRID COURSES ADJUNCT FACULTY RESPONSES	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
The advantages of a hybrid course fall midway between the disadvantage of the online course and the advantage of a face-to-face course. They would learn less than a face-to-face course. There would be less travel involved than a course that met three days each week.	As with the online course, I would have difficulty determining the appropriate course pace and activities since I am unable to read the expressions of my class. It is more difficulty getting a give-and-take among students in the online portion of the course. Pedagogical concerns are that student may wander far and wide with respect to discussions that are very tangential and waste course time. I would prefer not to teach a hybrid course.
Any questions that would arise from the online discussions could be clarified during the class meeting time	Making sure that all students were in fact computer internet knowledgeable, and had reliable service within their homes at all times.
A hybrid course offers the best of both worlds - in-class contact and live discussion combined with the advantages of online offerings.	I can only think of one small challenge, which is that some students have a learning style which does not work well with the online format, even though the online portion of the course is 50% or less of the total course. Some older students may not be tech-savvy enough. Some students claim to not know anything about going online, although I always respond by pointing out that, if they have a smartphone, they already operate online without realizing it.
Hybrid courses offer the chance to form relationships with the convenience of online, namely less travel commitments.	Hybrid courses need to be carefully structured: I believe that it is difficult to make online time in hybrid courses count the same as if it was in person.
More flexibility. Better continuity.	Cheating. Higher demands on student responsibility.
May be able to have the best of both worlds in HDFS1070.	HDFS1070, students may not work as hard with on-line and expect the professor to spoon feed information when they meet face to face.
You would at least get to know the students on the days you see them in a classroom.	Scheduling three classes over the course of a week would still be difficult. / Technological difficulties. /
A combination of face to face and online is an ideal alternative.	N/a
This is fine for students with busy work schedules. You get to see them in class, they get to know you, and you have interesting discussions online. It works, though it should not be done exclusively by any prof. It depends on the class, too.	
I have given courses at other universities where the Friday class is a discussion section. The use of case studies or problem sets with discussion enhances student learning.	Students need to be trained to take advantage of online learning. Some of my students do not own a computer and need something app enabled to take an online or hybrid course.
The online part would be easier to deal with, given The face-to-face classes (which would provide The human connections necessary to a complete educational process)	
This arrangement may hold the best of both worlds. I use online teaching/learning during snow days and midterm conferences, and it works well for most students.	Some students are not up to speed technologically, and/or are disorganized and don't manage to get around to the online portion. Also, to me a disadvantage is that the in-person class sessions would be shorter than I find effective for a first-year comp class.
Assigning and collecting writing projects might be more efficient.	There would be less time in which the students could interact with each other and the instructor.

TABLE 10: TEACHING HYBRID COURSES ADJUNCT FACULTY RESPONSES	
ADVANTAGES	CHALLENGES
I have not officially taught a hybrid, but have done so on my own as a result of loss of classes due to weather issues. It alleviates the stress of getting through the material and it has been very beneficial. Because of this , my scheduled classes for Fall 2016 are going to be listed as hybrids.	Again, the face to face is important. Finding a way to encourage online discussion groups would be challenging, but certainly doable. And of course, the assessments would be challenging to avoid cheating.
For the hybrid it does have the advantage of allowing the students to view the material online but also get the necessary time as a class/professor to discuss before writing analysis papers.	The opportunities that come with in class viewing of material would be removed. Something that students feel is helpful to them.
flexibility / allows for faceto face but doesn't force busy working students to come to campus 3x a week	not all students have ready access to computers and internet / online class cannot be held in real time,. Some students may no learn through the reading/short video medium
The hybrid course provides both the opportunity for a classroom experience and flexibility to students for working on assignments and participating in discussions online.	I really don't see any challenges.
1. Hybrid courses combine a nice balance between the contact you get in a face-to-face course and relative lack of personal contact in an online course. / 2. Hybrid courses can be offered at multiple campuses (as my is) . In my experience, I travel to each campus several times over the semester but students are combined as "one class" in their online activities on HuskyCT.	The challenges are roughly the same as those for online classes. Students need to be on top of their assignments.
The hybrid course seems like it would offer the same advantages of a completely online course (convenience, mainly) without losing the benefit of some face-to-face interaction in the classroom.	It would pose the same challenges of a completely online course: technology issues, glitches, etc. Some students may be left behind if they have trouble navigating the technology. This still poses the same scheduling problems as meeting in a classroom would, too: students (and faculty) cannot participate online if they are at work, or are at home with a young child, etc. They just wouldn't have the same transportation issues to contend with.

TABLE 11	
CHANGE TO TEACHING SCHEDULE IN SPRING 2016	HOW THE CSTI AFFECTED TEACHING STYLE
FULL-TIME FACULTY RESPONSES	
<p>We were told that this shift to a MWF course was mandatory (not "proposed" as indicated in the cover letter to this survey). Mechanisms for exemptions were widely discussed. To prevent all upper division courses from falling onto T and Th (due to department meetings on Wednesdays), I agreed to teach MWF mornings. / / I immediately had to break content into smaller units to fit the new schedule. While that allowed me to cover more topics, treatments of those topics proved far more superficial than previously. I prefer to cover fewer topics better, than more less well. / / Personally, which I take to mean pertaining to my research agenda, the change proved difficult: I lost a full day in which to research and write--the only time during the semester I can develop proposals, finish articles, and launch new projects. It also restricted my ability to represent UConn in public engagement initiatives. / / My students immediately--even before the term began--reeled with the havoc the schedule change wrought on their work schedules. I teach at a commuter campus: by definition, my students work and attend school. In response, they shied away from MWF courses, leaving the campus woefully underutilized on those days. They miss class more often, and we don't have the time to really dig into the materials in ways that keep them as fully engaged.</p>	<p>It reduced my ability to allow class discussion to unfold (when worth the time) as I would have normally. Again, it forced me to treat more material superficially than in-depth. See previous responses for more details.</p>
<p>In short: my courses are worse for the change. I cannot emphasize this enough. This is from two fronts: 1) my courses were designed to be a mix of lectures, group work, and interactive activities. I cannot do this with such short times. I also cannot tend to the needs of so many students when teaching three courses three times a week, plus engage in meaningful pedagogical research, as UConn wants me to do. 2) Students are unhappy and that bleeds into their desire to learn. I will refrain from excessive writing. This change did not benefit the regional campuses. My students specifically asked me to pass that along.</p>	<p>I have answered this question several times. I designed my courses to fit the needs of the regional students and their course times. While I understand that the main campus teaches my exact courses in shorter times they are an entirely different experience. My classes have 35, Storrs as 350. One size does not fit all. I'm constantly adjusting my course to fit a model that is not even applicable to my campus.</p>
<p>The change affected my teaching start time. I argued that the 2 day schedule (M & W) is the most efficient and should remain in place. The changing start time has had little impact.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>I have had to change both the days and the times I am teaching. I misread the first set of questions for my previous courses from Spring 2015. I taught on MW that semester, as with every other semester until this one where I switched to TuTh. It has been hard for me to plan for this and it is harder for my students to coordinate their schedules.</p>	<p>This semester it has not, but it will require a complete redesign of my lectures and activities for the fall which will take away from time I could use engaging with my students.</p>

TABLE 11	
CHANGE TO TEACHING SCHEDULE IN SPRING 2016	HOW THE CSTI AFFECTED TEACHING STYLE
FULL-TIME FACULTY RESPONSES	
A MW schedule changed to a MWF schedule, but since 5/6 of my students could not make it to class on Friday due to work commitments, we prolonged our MW meeting by 25 min since there were no schedule conflicts with the students.	Redesigning the syllabus from 28 75-minute class meetings to 42 50-minute class meetings spreads topics across 2 days. This makes topics less cohesive for the students.
I Teach on Fridays Now, Not Before / Have More Friday Absences Than Other Days /	
I moved my class from a M-W schedule, which had been changed at the last minute to a M-W-F schedule, to a Tuesday-Thursday slot. I'm feeling very put off by the late change in the schedule. We had no input into these changes, and we were notified after the class times had been finalized. If the university wanted to find a way to alienate branch faculty and students, and do it in one fell swoop, they certainly succeeded. This whole experience leaves me feeling as though I work for a major corporation where decisions are made by the top management and the rest of us are afforded no say. This had made me feel very unimportant and has made me reevaluate my entire position at UConn and my future here as well. This is no way to run a major university that purports to be concerned about the main stakeholders (faculty and students). It seems clear the administration has no interest in what we think about these matters.	
i now have to teach more classes that start earlier in the day (8am) or go past 5pm	nothing
I was not able to fit in four course this time. I offered three. / I was not able to fit in an extra help session I had been running for freshmen calculus. / The later night time slot causes some students to consistently leave class early to meet parent deadlines for returning to Bridgeport by train. This adds one more obstacle to an already disadvantaged portion of the class. / I lost one adjunct who refused to take a turn with the 50 minute format..	I answered this in the section on challenges to running the 50-minute format. I described the consequences that would be damaging if I used this format. However, I explained how I used the hybrid option and the need for exceptions to avoid scheduling conflicts to totally avoid the three 50-minute format. Except for the case where companion courses in other departments and resource limitations make it physically impossible, I can use the hybrid option to avoid any negative consequences.
It has reduced the time in between classes that occur on the same day. Originally, classes started at 2:30 and ended at 5:15, then evening classes started at 7. The leaves 1 hr 45 minutes in between. / / When classes start at 3:35 and run until 6:05, and the next class starts at 7, there is only 55 minutes between classes.	I teach them the same way.
I am teaching one class in a late time slot	It at all

TABLE 11	
CHANGE TO TEACHING SCHEDULE IN SPRING 2016	HOW THE CSTI AFFECTED TEACHING STYLE
FULL-TIME FACULTY RESPONSES	
I typically teach three classes every spring (I have a 2-3 contract). Until this semester I had two MW afternoon classes and a W night or online class. Now I have two MWF afternoon classes and an online class. I continually find my classes running over at the end. As mentioned previously, Friday classes are poorly attended, and it feels almost futile to bother with them. Tardiness is up. I am finding myself increasingly exhausted as the semester wears on. Even when I had MW classes I typically came in on Fridays for administrative work, advising, and so on, but I was not forced to. Now that time is lost. / / Frankly, the common schedule has been an unmitigated disaster. The building is packed on Tuesdays and Thursdays and nearly empty on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays. NOT ALL STUDENTS ARE THE SAME, despite what some administrators think, and students want minimal numbers of days in class so they can work more hours and PAY THE DAMNED TUITION without having to incur the enormous student loan debts so many people are talking about. They Common Schedule was almost literally forced down the throats of students and faculty alike for reasons that were completely unconvincing; morale was destroyed and students were walking around in the halls making arrangements to transfer out on their phones. / / Now that I have sufficient seniority in my department, for Fall I'll be going back to a two-day-a-week schedule.	I think this has already been covered. I am not teaching any classes that I had not previously; attendance is down. Tardiness is up. My ability to give excellent questions the time to follow them up is greatly restricted.
The main problem is that there aren't enough options for twice weekly 75 minute classes. Many courses overlap, which limits students' options.	I had to restructure my courses, which created additional work, but my pedagogy remains sound.
I now teach shorter classes and have to prepare for blackboard.	I am teaching and planning more blackboard work and less in class work.
Because the once a week afternoon time slot is severely reduced and I am doing two seminar courses, I was pushed into teaching both of them at night which has been an exhausting arrangement.	I'm still using the same course design, just forced into two night time slots.
One of my classes was a 1 per week course. Because of the start time, I had to change it to a hybrid and slightly change the time of the course. Fortunately, I was able to keep it on the same day, but was told that it would have to change for the future. I also do not show any movie clips or films in class because it wastes too much time for a hybrid course that meets once per week. I would prefer to have the students watch the documentary outside of class, but the library does not support streaming of the documentaries that I have, and I refuse to make students pay for movies. The documentaries I show are also not supported by Netflix or other means.	The common start time made my once per week course change to a hybrid course. I did not want to make students commute another day. The hybrid course has cut down the content I go over in class - and it does not let me show any documentaries/pertinent media because I will not use the little time I have with students face-to-face on films. The library will not support streaming of my films, so I feel students miss out on seeing concepts in action. My films are not offered by Netflix or free movies on line.

TABLE 11	
CHANGE TO TEACHING SCHEDULE IN SPRING 2016	HOW THE CSTI AFFECTED TEACHING STYLE
FULL-TIME FACULTY RESPONSES	
Because (for now at least) the regionals have some flexibility and are able to keep once-a-week evening courses, which our students desperately need, the start time of my class has changed by just about 30 minutes. Therefore, there has not been a significant effect on me or my students.	None.
The start time changed.	

TABLE 12	
CHANGE TO TEACHING SCHEDULE IN SPRING 2016	HOW THE CSTI AFFECTED TEACHING STYLE
ADJUNCT FACULTY RESPONSES	
Different days and times. Very difficult to schedule outside-of-UConn obligations (other employment, volunteer work, etc) when UConn schedule is always changing.	
I teach in class on Monday and Wednesday and "flip" for Friday /	More online work - which for some students is great - but for less disciplined students not so great /
Now teaching on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays. Start time have not changed.	The 50 minute time periods do not allow me to complete discussions.
I teach two sections of the same course. One section meets M-W for 75 minutes and the other section meets M-W_F for 50 minutes. My class planning has changed in an effort to keep the classes together content wise. I like to give the exams on the same day to both sections. The students need the discipline to show up for the Friday class.	No impact.
Because I have a second job (as do most adjuncts), the change to a MWF schedule threatened that other job. I was told I could not switch to T/TH. (Ironically, I used to teach T/TH, but changed at the request of the department several years ago.) Because I could not teach Fridays, T, or TH, and the option for teaching days on MW only was not allowed at W. Hartford, I now teach two evenings a week. / / This is tough on my family and not ideal for me. I was deeply contented with the old schedule.	N/A - I am still teaching two days a week, just at night.
My classes are scheduled prior to the start of the semester and the day(s)/time(s) are then sent to me. I do get to influence both to the extent possible given the constraints of all the other scheduled classes.	I am not sure that we are on a "common schedule" yet.
My lecture session moved from 75 min, 2x a week to 50 min, 3 x a week.	I have had to break up my lessons and we have less time for group problem solving. We are trying to cover the same amount of information however due to the chopped up nature of the sessions, we can't really dive in as deep to the material as I have the previous 2 times I've taught the class.
I am teaching for a third day a week. That means I am spending more money to come to campus but earning the same amount. This is a financial hardship. / It is hard to adjust to the new schedule. My sense of timing for my classes is off. They rhythm of my classes is off. It is harder to construct fair tests. It is hard to grade papers. Time I spent grading papers is now spent driving my car to campus. I am talking to students less in office hours and before classes because students are rushing off to other classes or to work. Attendance is down especially on Fridays / Students complain about having less time to work.	I have less time to develop ideas. / / This question seems to repeat earlier questions. Just read my previous answers
Nothing has changed except for having to adjust my lecture schedule and drive an extra day	the structure did not change
It has changed the number of days I teach.	I had to break the course content into many pieces and it has hampered the students' understanding of the material.

TABLE 12	
CHANGE TO TEACHING SCHEDULE IN SPRING 2016	HOW THE CSTI AFFECTED TEACHING STYLE
ADJUNCT FACULTY RESPONSES	
I now have to drive to campus 3 days a week instead of 2 days! I've had to alter my lesson plans and break them up into smaller chunks that do not always make sense.	I've already answered this question! I've had to break up my lesson plans, and alter my testing schedule and format. There has been a noticeable problem with student attendance, especially on Friday afternoons where up to 65 - 70% of the students are absent, so i find that I am often repeating my presentations.
affected negatively me, personally, and my students.	all negative
I went from teaching Tuesdays 2:35-5:15 to Tuesday-Thursday 11:00-12:15. I'm not even sure how I will be able to teach one of my courses on the new schedule--it is very much a workshop and discussion based seminar. / I vastly prefer once a week scheduling as an adjunct. I resent having to come a long distance to teach twice a week when I could easily do it in one session. / Again, many of my students work full time. The afternoon block on Tuesdays is something they could arrange with their bosses. Now for some reason that slot is gone, and the other afternoon slots start later. Many of our Stamford students are older and have families they need to get back to. The later start time (3:30 say) means they can't be home to make dinner for their kids. Same for the professors!	In lecture classes I will have to cut some lectures shorter, because I will have to stop at the 75 minute mark, whereas when doing a 2 hour40 minute block, I can let the lectures go long or short. This will also impact my midterm, which was designed to take 2 hours, but will now have to be shortened to fit the 75 minute block. I really don't like that at all.
Start times have changed but that is it for the courses I am currently teaching. I will be moving to a hybrid model in the fall.	I worry that certain topics will not be covered in the same amount of depth when class time goes to a shorter in-class time.
1. I feel I am not covering the same amount of topics due to the breaking up in two sessions. I can't go as deep per class. / 2. I dislike having to spend more money commuting to do the same job twice a week instead of once. / 3. I don't feel the students are as engaged and think it's ok to come once a week and will get the same outcome if they came to both sessions a week.	I don't have time to teach deeper and go into discussion as much. When I go from topic to topic, sometimes I have to cut it short because we're 5 minutes from dismissal and it's pointless to start. When teaching in one long class, there's more opportunity to move throughout the topics. Additionally, I find that students are arriving late because it's a "shorter" class so they don't feel like they are missing too much. I also have to dedicate one of the classes to test taking due to the short time so I loose a class period. In a long class I can teach for the first half then give the test.
Initially my Friday morning class was not even an option although I have been at maximum or near-maximum capacity. Someone, the course was put back on the schedule. / / The other course changed from an afternoon course to a later afternoon/evening course.	Given that I still teach a once a week course, my course has not changed. / / Overall, however, I feel like UCONN is not really interested in my needs or my schedule. As an adjunct, I feel very under-appreciated.
Shortened the amount of time I had for a session by 20 minutes	Had to shorten the session
Instead of teaching my upper-level course in the evening (as I have done in past spring semesters), I am teaching it in the 3:35 - 6:05 time slot.	Since I am still teaching 2.5 hour class — just in an earlier time slot — the course itself has not been changed by the common start time.

TABLE 12	
CHANGE TO TEACHING SCHEDULE IN SPRING 2016	HOW THE CSTI AFFECTED TEACHING STYLE
ADJUNCT FACULTY RESPONSES	
I am teaching hybrids, so I suppose that has nothing to do with the common start time. One of the hybrids meets every week once a week...I note that a previous question suggested meeting twice, perhaps M & W....that sounds good, too. / But, for regional adjuncts, the main problem is we can only teach 2 classes -- not the schedule!	Not at all. / If I was teaching MWF -- which I have done previously at another institution -- I would just change the syllabus to meet that time format. It is not a big deal, though I suspect that profs set in their ways will freak out.
Start time changed.	Students are not used to this and there is an increase in late attendance. Therefore I start later to decrease class disruptions.
Only the times I teach changed, leaving me with less time for between-class conferencing. Other than that, the change has not affected the course I teach, and has not had a strong impact on me or on students.	
Start time but not days	Having shorter class periods has altered the running time of certain films that I was able to show but now can't because of the time frame of the individual class
Changed the start times of my courses	

**TABLE 13: FINAL COMMENTS
FULLTIME FACULTY RESPONSES**

I appreciate you taking the time to run this survey.
The University must not consider itself to a Monolithic organization and be sure to consider and understand the role of the branch campuses which different than the main campus at Storrs.
This scheduling decision seems to have come down from on high without appropriate faculty consultation or decision-making. It has been very disruptive for our students, faculty, and scheduling administrators. Administrators have told me that a number of Avery Point students, finding it difficult or impossible to register for needed courses, have complained to them and do not understand why these administrators cannot help them.
This survey (and, indeed, the administration in presenting the supposed advantages of the common schedule) assumes that a common start time would enhance the opportunity for distance learning. I teach a DL course each spring and have found that the common start time has made it MUCH harder to schedule my course, which I teach to students at BOTH AP and Storrs. It is very frustrating that this assumption is being made without finding out what is really true and happening on the ground.
Please switch back to the previous schedule. This doesn't help anyone.
The two objectives are to allow for more DL courses (a common start time would allow for courses not to overlap) and more class start times on MW. At Avery Point the second is not needed - as can be seen by many of the courses fitting only on a T/Th schedule this semester. I am at AVPT on Mon through Thurs and not many students are on campus on M/W giving an eerie atmosphere. Hence, let me focus the rest of this note on DL courses. / / Who is working on advanced DL courses and what will they bring to our regional campus students? / / I expected to see many DL courses offered at the same time as the common schedule implementation. Courses that would support minors and/or 2nd year (non-lab based) major required courses that are not available at AVPT. DL classrooms should all be booked at the regional campuses this semester. I don't know if this is the case – but it would be a great metric to determine if the DL objective is being met. / / I have taught one undergrad DL course from AVPT to Storrs last year with x students at AVPT and 10x students in Storrs. A common start time was not needed for this. I've also taught a grad level DL course. It is important to design these courses correctly so that students at all locations get the same learning experience. Not every course can be converted to a DL classroom and some instructors don't want to or don't have time to convert their courses. CETL may have more information on who is designing what for DL, but these classes should be designed carefully and effectively promoted at all campuses. / / DL courses can connect the university in new fascinating ways, but we have to make sure that our students are actively engaged in these classes. I'd love to see if aligning the schedules allowed more DL courses to be taught this semester and the student feedback from the DL courses that were offered. The implementation of the common schedule seemed messy, and while the objective of more class offerings is satisfied at implementation, I'd like to see more on the DL courses offered.
I am very disappointed that we were not considered before the policy was adopted, and I am particularly frustrated that regional campuses have not been given their own mandate to determine the times that best suit their circumstances. If we have to alter the times to best serve our students, then we should have more leeway in determining that.
It is a completely unnecessary initiative that was mandated in a highly ungraceful manner.
No additional comments!
The common start time is simply a bad idea. A very bad idea. Do the university systems in other states demand "common start times" among their regional campuses? I have never heard of one that does, and I am familiar with many such systems. The inability of the administration to understand the difference between commuter campuses and an in-residence campus (Storrs) is mindboggling. How reasonably intelligent people can get something so wrong defies all understanding. Will they admit their mistake? Probably not. Reasonably intelligent people in positions of power generally do not like to admit when they are wrong. That said, UConn administrators broke the mold when they initiated this crack-pot idea. Perhaps they will go "outside the box" again and cancel it, with an accompanying request that we all forget that it ever happened.

TABLE 13
FINAL COMMENTS
FULLTIME FACULTY RESPONSES
Hybrid course and increased flexibility for faculty to determine their schedules
There seems to be no real benefot to students on this campus to have changed to the common schedule. It may look good on paper and sound good in theory, but the benefits are very few and far between and the negatives are obvious. / / On another point, having Storrs Control Stamford weather closing has no logic. The weather patterns are totally different, The regionals are commuter campuses. Except for Torrington and Avery Point, they are also urban campuses. Why Storrs is making this decision is a mystery to just about everyone.
Unmitigated disaster.
I think the ideal university schedule should have a common schedule across all campuses on Tuesday and Thursdays and leave it up to each regional campus to decide its own schedule for Monday, Wednesday, and Friday classes. That should be a good compromise that meets everyone's major concerns.
This initiative was imposed on students, faculty, and staff without consulting those who would be affected and without concern about its effects, particularly on students. This is part and parcel of the administration's trend toward making unilateral decisions and focusing on the bottom line of the university with no regard to the ostensible goal of universities, which is to educate students and produce research. This has reduced morale among faculty and staff and has eroded UConn's quality of education.
The main reason given for the common schedule -- internally and to the press -- was that regional campus students are not thriving once they reach Storrs BECAUSE the are not used to thrice weekly classes. This was an embarrassing argument. Even students immediately pointed out that correlation is not causation and many, many other factors were more important. Yet, the Provost Office doubled down on this mantra. The second reason was that the campus space was not effectively used on Fridays. Yet, the claims that MWF courses could be taught as hybrid with no class meetings on Fridays seems inconsistent with both of these "reasons." There is a strong sense that the real reasons for this shift were not honestly laid out. If the goal is to put more courses online or offered by distance learning/TV, then a more honest statement of the goals, along with a more candid discussion of the skills involved and the tech and pedagogical support that could be made available -- and maybe sharing some intriguing examples of successful hybrid/ online/ DL courses -- would have encouraged more collaborative energy. It's hard to cooperate with a plan that sounds inconsistent and tone deaf to genuine concerns.
Very few changes were made at my campus and therefore AS IT STANDS NOW, the impact on faculty and students is manageable. The pre- common start time schedule worked VERY WELL for us, and given the few adjustments made for Spring 2016, it seems to works now ok. I would prefer that in the future, no further changes be made. If changes are to be considered, it would be useful to discuss with faculty and students beforehand to avoid unintended consequences. / /

**TABLE 14: FINAL COMMENTS
ADJUNCT FACULTY RESPONSES**

I have taught for 25 years at Uconn and from my Avery a Point perspective this change to MWF is solely driven by main campus issues / / I see no benefits of it. / / But I am not directly impacted by it either
I am opposed to the scheduling changes for meeting three times a week. It creates hardship for adjuncts who work part time outside of the university. Students have also expressed concerns that they can not register for the courses they are interested due to the three day schedule. / / Some student commute long distances to attend UConn and once fuel prices rise it is not economical for people to drive three days a week, also it is not good for the environment!
Incoming students would benefit from more info about Structures of learning they may encounter/experience
Personally, the M, W, F, time schedule is not favorable and should be carefully reconsidered.
No additional comments.
There was absolutely no warning that this was coming, it was a complete PR failure. / / In addition, it shows a real abyss between the Storrs administration and the stated mission of the branch campuses. The autocratic implementation of the common schedule alters that mission without addressing it. Does that mean the branch campus mission has gone by the wayside? It would be nice to know.
Thanks - personally, I believe the push to online and hybrid is too ambitious. I find that my classes are much more productive in a conventional face to face weekly setting.
I would very strongly suggest moving my ENGR1166 course back to the 75 minute lectures, 2x a week. The format worked well for both myself and my students, as evidenced on their student evaluations. I also feel strongly the in-person meetings are more beneficial than online sessions for this specific course and the material we cover.
I hate the way the common start time was imposed with little discussion and at the last minute. / It seems to have been invented by people who do not teach. How many of the people on your committee are teaching courses this semester? How many of you have ever taught courses? You are just a bunch of parasitic bureaucrats who do nothing productive for the university. You are justifying you positions by making trouble for the productive workers at the university and for students.
It is most difficult to teach a writing course that is a shortened version of what I normally teach. In addition, I use films in anthropology because students need to see other cultures as well as read about them. I also use guest speakers who typically have day jobs and can come in late afternoon or evenings. / In addition, I travel a long time to get to work and three days a week make it most difficult for me and my family.
I have not found the new schedule to be impossible to deal with just a bit inconvenient. I would love to go back to the old schedule
The Physiology and Neurobiology Department has decided, after approximately 16 years, to stop offering the following two courses at the Greater Hartford campus: / / PNB 2264- H90L- Tuesdays 6:30-9:00pm Fall semesters (40 students) (with 4 choices of Lab sections at Storrs campus) / PNB 2265- H90L- Tuesdays 6:30-9:00pm Spring semesters (40 students) (with 4 choices of Lab sections at Storrs campus) / / AND Starting Fall 2016 PNB 2264 INSTEAD ONLY offer a "general course for all commuter students FROM ALL CAMPUSES OTHER THAN STORRS " on Wednesday nights at the Storrs campus: TWO LAB SECTIONS- each with 21 students / / 4:30-6:30pm PNB 2264 Lab at the Storrs campus directly followed by: / 6:30-9:00pm PNB 2264 Lecture (42 students; ALL COMMUTER STUDENTS) at the Storrs campus / / The Hartford Campus Director apparently approved; even though CONSISTENTLY EACH FALL THERE HAS BEEN AT LEAST A 30 PERSON WAITLIST FOR A CLASS SIZE MAXIMUM OF 40 STUDENTS WHEN INSTRUCTED BY DR. KATHLEEN TOEDT FOR THE PAST 16 YEARS. / THIS "NEW" SPECIAL COMMUTER SECTION AT STORRS WILL BE INSTRUCTED BY MRS. KRIS KIMBALL / / Respectfully submitted by: Dr. Kathleen A. Toedt

TABLE 14
FINAL COMMENTS
ADJUNCT FACULTY RESPONSES
The common start time initiative is a fraud perpetrated by Storrs administrators who know little or nothing about life on the regional campuses. I speak from experience as I've taught at the West Hartford campus since 1986 (full-time until 2005, part-time ever since) and I was also a student there in the 1970s and early 1980s (3 of my siblings also attended classes at West Hartford). The only possible reason that I can think of for the initiative is that high-level administrators are worried that, if the old schedule (M-W, T-Th) continued, that outsiders would think that the campus only operated 4 days a week and that the staff sit around and do nothing on Fridays and therefore should have their hours/salaries cut - which is obviously not true, the staff work hard all 5 days of the week. Please note that the M-W, T-Th schedule works just fine at Capital Community College (where I also teach). I hope that you will take seriously my comments and those of the other faculty/staff/students who don't like the common start time initiative! although my 40 years of experience at UConn tells me that you guys will do whatever you want anyway - I hope I'm wrong this time. Oh, forgot to mention earlier - the M-W-F schedule also negatively impacts students' ability to work while going to school, a major concern in this era of constantly-rising tuition.
As a professor who commutes a long distance, being able to teach my classes once per week is strongly preferred. Although it makes for a long day, I never felt like my ability to deliver a quality experience to my students was diminished. I would strongly consider not teaching anymore if I had to commute more than once per week.
I wish that the regional campuses had been consulted before this change took place. Especially because there are so many adjuncts who teach at the regional campuses, and this really messes our schedules up. Some of my fellow adjuncts teach at four different schools, and this new schedule makes it much more difficult for them to be able to teach that load, which then of course reduces their meager earnings. Our students have no reason to be on the same time block schedule as Storrs. I don't understand why they and we are being forced to.
You are conducting this survey NOW? What took you so long? There is a clear disconnect between Storrs and Regional concerns.
I am disturbed that decisions are made without input from those who are in the classroom. Additionally, every campus has a different set of differences and student populations. I don't understand why every decision is believed to fit every campus.
I strongly urge the committee to look at the faculty and student work schedules before changing course schedules. Stamford serves a majority of working students who cannot progress with their degrees if they are limited to one course a semester that meets three times a week. The impact would be to drive students away and reduce tuition revenue.
Thank you for conducting this survey. I would be interested in reading the results so I'm hoping they will be available to us.
Obviously, this concept was spring upon adjuncts from out of nowhere. It does not affect me, but I know that other adjuncts teach at other institutions to put together a living wage and for them it may prove to be very problematic. For those of us not earning a living wage and attempting to keep our campus open and putting all of our time into teaching our students and worrying about our campus closing and offering completely different and challenging courses every semester and concerned about the closing of the campus.....we can adjust. As I know for a fact, this whole common start time was a solution in search of a problem. Now, what is the solution to this problem? Adjust. And tenured faculty members had better not complain about their schedules and should instead attempt to teach when it is most convenient for their working students! - signed, almost anonymous
Most of this discussion does not apply to me since I teach 4 credit classes, which don't fit into the common schedule time slots.
Jesus, home campus, rank, school -- why not just ask our names if you want to make this non-anonymous.

END/

APPENDIX A

FACULTY SURVEY

Regional Campus-Common Start Time Initiative

Q1.1 Hello Regional Faculty Member,

As members of the Common Schedule Task Force appointed by the Office of the Provost and the University Senate, we are writing to you in your capacity as a faculty member at one of UConn's Regional Campuses. We ask that you take a few minutes to complete this short survey, and provide input about the common start time initiative for the regional campuses focused specifically on undergraduate course scheduling.

To provide a brief background, last fall, a new schedule for undergraduate class times at the regional campuses was proposed – with implementation beginning in Spring 2016. The primary expectations related to this initiative was that consideration be given to changing some Monday-Wednesday courses to meet Monday-Wednesday-Friday, and to have start times match across all campuses. The University administration understood that transitioning to common start times may work for some courses and not for others, and made accommodations accordingly. This initiative was designed with two strategic reasons in mind:

- to provide additional class schedule options to deal with increased enrollments on the Hartford and Stamford campuses, and
- to enable more distance learning opportunities among all campuses.

With this initiative underway, we appreciate your sharing your feedback. Please know that we ensure you that your feedback is confidential. Please note that as you progress through the survey, you will NOT be able to go backwards to review previous questions. In fact, if you press the "backward arrow" in the top left near the URL, you will be exited out of the survey. Also, please note that the closed-end questions require a response, whereas the open-ended questions do not. Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey.

Sincerely, The Common Schedule Task Force

Pam Bramble, Dennis Breslin, Robin Coulter, Lisa Eaton, Katie Martin, Judith Meyer, Steve Park, Tina Reardon, Sally Reis, Shahanara Shahjahan, and Bob Tilton.

Q2.1 First, we are interested in understanding your undergraduate teaching schedule over the past three semesters. For Spring 2015, Fall 2015, and for this semester, we would appreciate you providing the day schedule and class time for each of the courses that you taught in each semester.

Q2.2 Please think back to Spring 2015, how many undergraduate courses did you teach?

- ☐ Zero (0)
- ☐ One (1)
- ☐ Two (2)
- ☐ Three (3)
- ☐ Four (4)

Answer If Please think back to Spring 2015, how many undergraduate courses did you teach? One Is Selected Or Please think back to Spring 2015, how many undergraduate courses did you teach? Two Is Selected Or Please think back to Spring 2015, how many undergraduate courses did you teach? Three Is Selected Or Please think back to Spring 2015, how many undergraduate courses did you teach? Four Is Selected

Q2.3 In Spring 2015, for your first undergraduate class, please select the schedule that you taught.

- ☐ Daytime: Monday & Wednesday; 75-minute class (1)
- ☐ Daytime: Tuesday & Thursday; 75-minute class (2)
- ☐ Daytime: Monday-Wed-Friday; 50 minute class (3)
- ☐ Daytime: 2.5-3 hours once a week (4)
- ☐ Evening: 2.5-3 hours once a week (5)
- ☐ Online course (6)
- ☐ Hybrid course (please write-in the day and time of in-class time) (7) _____
- ☐ Other (please write-in the day and time of your class) (8) _____

Answer If Please think back to Spring 2015, how many undergraduate courses did you teach? Two Is Selected Or Please think back to Spring 2015, how many undergraduate courses did you teach? Three Is Selected Or Please think back to Spring 2015, how many undergraduate courses did you teach? Four Is SelectedQ2.4 In Spring 2015, for your second undergraduate class, please select the schedule that you taught.

- ☐ Daytime: Monday & Wednesday; 75-minute class (1)
- ☐ Daytime: Tuesday & Thursday; 75-minute class (2)
- ☐ Daytime: Monday-Wed-Friday; 50 minute class (3)
- ☐ Daytime: 2.5-3 hours once a week (4)
- ☐ Evening: 2.5-3 hours once a week (5)
- ☐ Online course (6)
- ☐ Hybrid course (please write-in the day and time of in-class time) (7) _____
- ☐ Other (please write-in the day and time of your class) (8) _____

Answer If Please think back to Spring 2015, how many undergraduate courses did you teach? Three Is Selected
Or Please think back to Spring 2015, how many undergraduate courses did you teach? Four Is Selected

Q2.5 In Spring 2015, for your third undergraduate class, please select the schedule that you taught.

- ☐ Daytime: Monday & Wednesday; 75-minute class (1)
- ☐ Daytime: Tuesday & Thursday; 75-minute class (2)
- ☐ Daytime: Monday-Wed-Friday; 50 minute class (3)
- ☐ Daytime: 2.5-3 hours once a week (4)
- ☐ Evening: 2.5-3 hours once a week (5)
- ☐ Online course (6)
- ☐ Hybrid course (please write-in the day and time of in-class time) (7) _____
- ☐ Other (please write-in the day and time of your class) (8) _____

Answer If Please think back to Spring 2015, how many undergraduate courses did you teach? (INPUT #, if 0, skip to Fall 2015, else continue) Click to write the question text Four Is Selected

Q2.6 In Spring 2015, for your fourth undergraduate class, please select the schedule that you taught.

- ☐ Daytime: Monday & Wednesday; 75-minute class (1)
- ☐ Daytime: Tuesday & Thursday; 75-minute class (2)
- ☐ Daytime: Monday-Wed-Friday; 50 minute class (3)
- ☐ Daytime: 2.5-3 hours once a week (4)
- ☐ Evening: 2.5-3 hours once a week (5)
- ☐ Online course (6)
- ☐ Hybrid course (please write-in the day and time of in-class time) (7) _____
- ☐ Other (please write-in the day and time of your class) (8) _____

Q3.1 Now, please think back to Fall 2015, how many undergraduate courses did you teach?

- ☐ Zero (0)
- ☐ One (1)
- ☐ Two (2)
- ☐ Three (3)
- ☐ Four (4)

Answer If Now, please think back to Fall 2015, how many undergraduate courses did you teach? One Is Selected
Or Now, please think back to Fall 2015, how many undergraduate courses did you teach? Two Is Selected Or

Now, please think back to Fall 2015, how many undergraduate courses did you teach? Three Is Selected Or Now, please think back to Fall 2015, how many undergraduate courses did you teach? Four Is Selected
Q3.2 In Fall 2015, for your first undergraduate class, please select the schedule that you taught.

- ☐ Daytime: Monday & Wednesday; 75-minute class (1)
- ☐ Daytime: Tuesday & Thursday; 75-minute class (2)
- ☐ Daytime: Monday-Wed-Friday; 50 minute class (3)
- ☐ Daytime: 2.5-3 hours once a week (4)
- ☐ Evening: 2.5-3 hours once a week (5)
- ☐ Online course (6)
- ☐ Hybrid course (please write-in the day and time of in-class time) (7) _____
- ☐ Other (please write-in the day and time of your class) (8) _____

Answer If Now, please think back to Fall 2015, how many undergraduate courses did you teach? Two Is Selected Or Now, please think back to Fall 2015, how many undergraduate courses did you teach? Three Is Selected Or Now, please think back to Fall 2015, how many undergraduate courses did you teach? Four Is Selected

Q3.3 In Fall 2015, for your second undergraduate class, please select the schedule that you taught.

- ☐ Daytime: Monday & Wednesday; 75-minute class (1)
- ☐ Daytime: Tuesday & Thursday; 75-minute class (2)
- ☐ Daytime: Monday-Wed-Friday; 50 minute class (3)
- ☐ Daytime: 2.5-3 hours once a week (4)
- ☐ Evening: 2.5-3 hours once a week (5)
- ☐ Online course (6)
- ☐ Hybrid course (please write-in the day and time of in-class time) (7) _____
- ☐ Other (please write-in the day and time of your class) (8) _____

Answer If Now, please think back to Fall 2015, how many undergraduate courses did you teach? Three Is Selected Or Now, please think back to Fall 2015, how many undergraduate courses did you teach? Four Is Selected

Q3.4 In Fall 2015, for your third undergraduate class, please select the schedule that you taught.

- ☐ Daytime: Monday & Wednesday; 75-minute class (1)
- ☐ Daytime: Tuesday & Thursday; 75-minute class (2)
- ☐ Daytime: Monday-Wed-Friday; 50 minute class (3)
- ☐ Daytime: 2.5-3 hours once a week (4)
- ☐ Evening: 2.5-3 hours once a week (5)
- ☐ Online course (6)
- ☐ Hybrid course (please write-in the day and time of in-class time) (7) _____
- ☐ Other (please write-in the day and time of your class) (8) _____

Answer If Now, please think back to Fall 2015, how many undergraduate courses did you teach? Four Is Selected

Q3.5 In Fall 2015, for your fourth undergraduate class, please select the schedule that you taught.

- ☐ Daytime: Monday & Wednesday; 75-minute class (1)
- ☐ Daytime: Tuesday & Thursday; 75-minute class (2)
- ☐ Daytime: Monday-Wed-Friday; 50 minute class (3)
- ☐ Daytime: 2.5-3 hours once a week (4)
- ☐ Evening: 2.5-3 hours once a week (5)
- ☐ Online course (6)
- ☐ Hybrid course (please write-in the day and time of in-class time) (7) _____
- ☐ Other (please write-in the day and time of your class) (8) _____

Q4.1 Now, please think about this semester (Spring 2016), how many undergraduate courses are you teaching?

- ☐ Zero (0)
- ☐ One (1)
- ☐ Two (2)
- ☐ Three (3)
- ☐ Four (4)

Answer If Now, please think about this semester (Spring 2016), how many undergraduate courses are you teach... One Is Selected Or Now, please think about this semester (Spring 2016), how many undergraduate courses are you teach... Two Is Selected Or Now, please think about this semester (Spring 2016), how many undergraduate courses are you teach... Three Is Selected Or Now, please think about this semester (Spring 2016), how many undergraduate courses are you teach... Four Is Selected

Q4.2 In Spring 2016, for your first undergraduate class, please select the schedule that you are teaching.

- ☐ Daytime: Monday & Wednesday; 75-minute class (1)
- ☐ Daytime: Tuesday & Thursday; 75-minute class (2)
- ☐ Daytime: Monday-Wed-Friday; 50 minute class (3)
- ☐ Daytime: 2.5-3 hours once a week (4)
- ☐ Evening: 2.5-3 hours once a week (5)
- ☐ Online course (6)
- ☐ Hybrid course (please write-in the day and time of in-class time) (7) _____
- ☐ Other (please write-in the day and time of your class) (8) _____

Answer If Now, please think about this semester (Spring 2016), how many undergraduate courses are you teach... Two Is Selected Or Now, please think about this semester (Spring 2016), how many undergraduate courses are you teach... Three Is Selected Or Now, please think about this semester (Spring 2016), how many undergraduate courses are you teach... Four Is Selected

Q4.3 In Spring 2016, for your second undergraduate class, please select the schedule that you are teaching.

- ☐ Daytime: Monday & Wednesday; 75-minute class (1)
- ☐ Daytime: Tuesday & Thursday; 75-minute class (2)
- ☐ Daytime: Monday-Wed-Friday; 50 minute class (3)
- ☐ Daytime: 2.5-3 hours once a week (4)
- ☐ Evening: 2.5-3 hours once a week (5)
- ☐ Online course (6)
- ☐ Hybrid course (please write-in the day and time of in-class time) (7) _____
- ☐ Other (please write-in the day and time of your class) (8) _____

Answer If Now, please think about this semester (Spring 2016), how many undergraduate courses are you teach... Three Is Selected Or Now, please think about this semester (Spring 2016), how many undergraduate courses are you teach... Four Is Selected

Q4.4 In Spring 2016, for your third undergraduate class, please select the schedule that you are teaching.

- ☐ Daytime: Monday & Wednesday; 75-minute class (1)
- ☐ Daytime: Tuesday & Thursday; 75-minute class (2)
- ☐ Daytime: Monday-Wed-Friday; 50 minute class (3)
- ☐ Daytime: 2.5-3 hours once a week (4)
- ☐ Evening: 2.5-3 hours once a week (5)
- ☐ Online course (6)
- ☐ Hybrid course (please write-in the day and time of in-class time) (7) _____
- ☐ Other (please write-in the day and time of your class) (8) _____

Answer If Now, please think about this semester (Spring 2016), how many undergraduate courses are you teach... Four Is Selected

Q4.5 In Spring 2016, for your fourth undergraduate class, please select the schedule that you are teaching.

- ☐ Daytime: Monday & Wednesday; 75-minute class (1)
- ☐ Daytime: Tuesday & Thursday; 75-minute class (2)
- ☐ Daytime: Monday-Wed-Friday; 50 minute class (3)
- ☐ Daytime: 2.5-3 hours once a week (4)
- ☐ Evening: 2.5-3 hours once a week (5)
- ☐ Online course (6)
- ☐ Hybrid course (please write-in the day and time of in-class time) (7) _____
- ☐ Other (please write-in the day and time of your class) (8) _____

Q5.1 The University class times for undergraduate courses include three alternative “in-class” time schedules, 50 minutes – 3 times a week, 75 minutes – 2 times a week, and 2.5-3 hours once a week. We are interested in your opinions related to the advantages and challenges of each type of schedule.

Q5.2 First, let’s consider an undergraduate class schedule in which the class meets 3 times a week (e.g., M-W-F) for 50 minutes on each day. In the space below, please type in the advantages that you see to a course that is scheduled to meet 3 times a week for 50 minutes on each day. In your response please consider course delivery, personal preference, and pedagogy related to specific courses.

Q5.3 In the space below, please type in the challenges that you see to a course that is scheduled to meet 3 times a week for 50 minutes on each day. In your response please consider course delivery, personal preference, and pedagogy related to specific courses.

Q5.4 Second, let’s consider an undergraduate class schedule in which the class meets 2 times a week (e.g., Tu-Th or Mon-Wed) for 75 minutes on each day. In the space below, please type in the advantages that you see to a course that is scheduled to meet 2 times a week for 75 minutes on each day. In your response please consider course delivery, personal preference, and pedagogy related to specific courses.

Q5.5 In the space below, please type in the challenges that you see to a course that is scheduled to meet 2 times a week for 75 minutes on each day. In your response please consider course delivery, personal preference, and pedagogy related to specific courses.

Q5.6 Third, let’s consider an undergraduate class schedule in which the class meets once a week for 2.5-3 hours. In the space below, please type in the advantages that you see to a course that is scheduled to meet once a week for 2.5-3 hours. In your response please consider course delivery, personal preference, and pedagogy related to specific courses.

Q5.7 In the space below, please type in the challenges that you see to a course that is scheduled to meet once a week for 2.5-3 hours. In your response please consider course delivery, personal preference, and pedagogy related to specific courses.

Q5.8 As related to your overall assessment, please indicate your level of interest in teaching an undergraduate course in each of the three “in-class” time schedules.

	No at all interested (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very interested (7)
50 minutes–3 times a week (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
75 minutes–2 times a week (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2.5-3 hours – once a week (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q5.9 As related to your overall assessment, please indicate the extent to which each of the following time schedules provides you the time in class needed to accomplish the learning objectives of your undergraduate course(s).

	Very negatively impacts delivery of my course (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very positively impacts the delivery of my course (7)
50 minutes–3 times a week (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
75 minutes–2 times a week (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2.5-3 hours – once a week (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q6.1 Each semester more UConn faculty are offering undergraduate courses online or in “hybrid” format (i.e., a class that has both in-class and online components; for example, teaching a Tuesday and Thursday class schedule with one "face-to face" class and the other online).

Q6.2 Have you taught an undergraduate course in an online format at UConn?

- ☐ Yes (1)
☐ No (2)

Q6.3 Have you taught an undergraduate course in a hybrid format at UConn?

- ☐ Yes (1)
☐ No (2)

Q6.4 Please indicate your level of interest in teaching an undergraduate course in an:

	Not at all interested (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very interested (7)
Online format (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Hybrid format (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q6.5 Please indicate your level of interest in teaching a M-W-F undergraduate course with the Monday and Wednesday classes being "face-to-face" and the Friday class being online.

	Not at all interested (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very interested (7)
(1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q6.6 In the space below, please type in the advantages that you see to offering an online course to undergraduates. In your response please consider course delivery, personal preference, and pedagogy related to specific courses.

Q6.7 In the space below, please type in the challenges that you see to offering an online course to undergraduates. In your response please consider course delivery, personal preference, and pedagogy related to specific courses.

Q6.8 In the space below, please type in the advantages that you see to offering a hybrid course to undergraduates. In your response please consider course delivery, personal preference, and pedagogy related to specific courses. Q6.9 In the space below, please type in the challenges that you see to offering a hybrid course to undergraduates. In your response please consider course delivery, personal preference, and pedagogy related to specific courses.

Q7.1 These next questions focus specifically on your observations about the common start time initiative designed to coordinate times across all UConn campuses.

Q7.2 Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements.

	Strongly disagree (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Strongly agree (7)
The common start time initiative has caused a lot of concern among the faculty. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The common start time initiative has caused a lot of concern among the staff. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The common start time initiative has caused a lot of concern among the students. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
There is concern because the common start time initiative does not allow for a "common free time/period" to schedule department or campus events. (4)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A regional campus faculty "committee" should be created so that regional campus faculty have a voice in future initiatives that are under consideration. (5)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
My course(s) would benefit by being able to connect via distance learning with similar/related course(s) on the Storrs or other regional campus. (6)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q8.1 Let's now think specifically about the impact of the common start time initiative on your teaching schedule.

Q8.2 Has this initiative changed your undergraduate teaching schedule in Spring 2016? In other words, are you teaching the same course(s) that you taught previously, but on a different day/time schedule(s)?

- ☐ No, my schedule has not changed. (1)
- ☐ Yes, my schedule has changed for 1 course. (2)
- ☐ Yes, my schedule has changed for 2 courses. (3)
- ☐ Yes, my schedule has changed for 3 courses. (4)
- ☐ Yes, my schedule has changed for 4 courses. (5)

If No, my schedule has not cha... Is Selected, Then Skip To End of Block

Q8.3 This next set of questions focuses on the change(s) to your teaching schedule, and how it has affected: 1) the course(s) that you are teaching, 2) you personally, and 3) the students.

Q8.4 Please explain the change that occurred to your undergraduate teaching schedule as a consequence of the common start time initiative. For example, please indicate if this changed the day(s) you are teaching, or the start time, or both.

Q8.5 In your opinion, please indicate your overall perspective of how the common start time initiative has impacted:

	Not at all favorable (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	Very favorable (7)
you, personally. (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
your course. (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
your students. (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q8.6 Please indicate how the common start time initiative has impacted how you taught your undergraduate course(s). What is different in the structure, nature of the course(s) as a consequence of the initiative? How did it affect the pedagogy related to your course(s)?

Q8.7 In the space below, please indicate how the common start time initiative has impacted you personally.

Q8.8 In the space below, please indicate how the common start time initiative has impacted your students.

Q9.1 This final set of questions is for classification purposes.

Q9.2 We want to be sure to understand your regional campus affiliation, as the different regional campuses face different challenges related to the common start time initiative. In a typical year, at how many of the regional campuses do you teach?

- ☐ One campus (1)
- ☐ Two campuses (2)
- ☐ Three campuses (3)
- ☐ Four campuses (4)
- ☐ Five campuses (5)

Answer If We want to be sure to understand your regional campus affiliation, as the different regional camp... Two campuses Is Selected Or We want to be sure to understand your regional campus affiliation, as the different regional camp... Three campuses Is Selected Or We want to be sure to understand your regional campus affiliation, as the different regional camp... Five campuses Is Selected And We want to be sure to understand your regional campus affiliation, as the different regional camp... Four campuses Is Selected

Q9.3 In a typical year, at which of the regional campus(es) do you teach? (please check all that apply):

- ☐ Avery Point (1)
- ☐ Hartford (2)
- ☐ Stamford (3)
- ☐ Torrington (4)
- ☐ Waterbury (5)

Q9.4 Which of the following campuses do you consider your "home" or "primary" campus?

- ☐ Avery Point (1)
- ☐ Hartford (2)
- ☐ Stamford (3)
- ☐ Torrington (4)
- ☐ Waterbury (5)

Q9.5 Which of the following best describes your status at UConn?

- ☐ Assistant Professor (1)
- ☐ Associate Professor (2)
- ☐ Full Professor (3)
- ☐ Assistant Professor In-Residence (4)
- ☐ Associate Professor In-Residence (5)
- ☐ Full Professor In-Residence (6)
- ☐ Adjunct (7)

Q9.6 We would also appreciate knowing your school/college affiliation. Again, our goal is to understand if specific schools/colleges have special needs or challenges related to the common start time initiative.

- ☐ College of Agriculture, Health and Natural Resources (1)
- ☐ School of Business (2)
- ☐ School of Engineering (3)
- ☐ School of Fine Arts (4)
- ☐ College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (5)
- ☐ Neag School of Education (6)
- ☐ School of Nursing (7)
- ☐ School of Pharmacy (8)
- ☐ Radcliffe Hicks School of Agriculture (9)
- ☐ School of Social Work (10)

Q10.1 If you have other comments, concerns, and suggestions related to the common start time initiative that you have not recorded in previous questions, please share your thoughts below.

Q10.2 Thank you for taking the time to share your thoughts. Please be sure to click the >> button to the lower right to submit your responses.

APPENDIX B

REGIONAL CAMPUS PROFESSIONAL STAFF INTERVIEWS

Avery Point campus April 2016

Between 24 February and 11 April eight professional staff members on the Avery Point campus directly involved with the student body, recruitment and/or scheduling were interviewed individually. The interviews were open-ended, allowing for each individual to offer comments that reflected those topics and issues that s/he saw as most significant. Interviewees were guaranteed anonymity.

The interviewer asked each interviewee to comment on of how things were going now that that the common schedule (start time) had been implemented.

Key Findings

The overwhelming majority (close to 100%) interviewed:

- Concerned that T/TH is jam – packed and M/W/F schedule is too spread out
- Negatively impacted campus life and the “college experience”
- Student involvement down across the board---from tutoring center to student center to Mort’s
- were dissatisfied with the current one-size-fits all approach to policy-making
- noted the lack of autonomy afforded to each regional campus (faculty formed a formal assembly to work on campus governance issues)
- 75-minute time block preferred over 50- minute time block
- Wished for improved and timelier communication between Storrs and regional campuses.

Common topics/issues mentioned

Scheduling Process

- Schedule changes that were proposed and made without discussion with regional campus faculty and staff is an example of increasing centralization of decision-making by Storrs -frustrated by this trend. Regional campuses must have more say in what happens on their campus to better serve their student population. The initial rationales given for the common schedule made no sense. Confused as to whether we were trying to have more students physically on campus if we were telling faculty their Friday meetings could be online??
- Any changes to the schedule must be done in consultation with the individual campus; prefer these type of decisions be done on the local level.
- Expressed frustration that Avery Point and Hartford have more M/W/F classes than Stamford and Waterbury----it did not seem to be implemented evenly across the Regional Campuses
- Student Organizations negatively impacted – participation way down from past semesters. Even campus food service is seeing negative profit/loss statements
- Friday created a problems for rentals with Branford House and the student center. Finding times for rentals on T/TH near impossible, everything is booked solid.

M/W/F classes

- Majority of our students balance school/work/home responsibilities and prefer/need to consolidate their class schedules to fewer than 5 days. Most chose the Avery Point campus because they have to work, often time not just for tuition but to support themselves.
- Students have jammed their schedules into a very long T/TH --- long, tiring day. Freshmen sometimes taking 3000 – level classes because that what “fit” into their schedule
- Even though the amount of time spent on a course is not necessarily effected by when the course meets, if adjuncts asked to teach M/W/F instead of M/W or T/TH then in effect the university is asking adjuncts to teach an extra day without compensation.
- Many adjuncts teach at more than one institution and the schedule change caused many conflicts for them. High turnover this year with Avery Point hiring 12 new adjuncts when one or two is “normal” in a year.
- Disconnect between faculty and student about what a hybrid or flipped class means. Faculty give the equivalent of a 50 minute class in HuskyCT; students just see it as “more homework.” Students tell staff, “Oh, that class doesn’t meet on Fridays” when in reality the professor is giving the lecture in HuskyCT. Not an even experience in how faculty deliver the flipped class. Some are just asking students to read their lecture notes.

Online teaching and distance learning

- Unable to find much interest from faculty or students in online or distance learning classes
- Some thought that the common schedule represented a significant amount of disruption for so few synchronous DL classes.
- Some wanted to know if students with lower SAT scores at admission would benefit from more online and distance learning classes. Is this the right pedagogy for them?

Benefits, Challenges and Drawbacks to the Common Schedule

Benefits

- When giving a campus tour on Friday, there are more people around...more energy.
- Common start times should (in the very near future) help with scheduling final exams

Challenges

- Increase work-study options to make coming to campus more often (M/W/F) less of a burden.
- Distance learning: do we have enough rooms and technical support for this?
- Difficulty of staffing the regional campuses with adjunct faculty because of the new schedule, given the need to factor in the adjuncts’ schedule at other institutions.

Drawbacks

- Negative impact of M/W/F schedule on student’s work schedule and on time spent commuting.
- Distance learning streamed from Storrs could put adjuncts out of work.
- Converting to 50-minute from 75-minute time block is time consuming and may not be the preferred time block to teach by the faculty member. Particularly burdensome for adjunct faculty to convert their courses. Students seem to prefer 75-minute time block. Some students suspect that faculty are still using 75 minute exams or lectures and just “rushing” to fit them into the shorter time block.
- On-line teaching a big ask for the adjuncts.
- Represents Storrs-centric approach that disenfranchises regional campus faculty, students and staff.

- Rather than having a “student-driven” schedule, we have a schedule driven by faculty availability; competing with department meetings, research commitments, and teaching at other institutions.
- Students used to get help and trouble – shoot problems “over lunch.” Lunch break is now gone on T/TH. Having 18-years olds in so many evening classes is terrible PR--- may hurt our future recruiting efforts.
- Commuter students car pool or rely on others for transportation. Common schedule created many problems for student transportation.

Hartford Campus April 2016

Between February and April the professional staff of the Hartford Campus were interviewed. The staff comprise of individuals from the Student Services unit. The 14 respondents work in the areas of Advising, Wellness, and Center for Students with Disabilities, Student Activities and Leadership, Admissions, and SSS.

The interviewer asked each interviewee to comment on of how things were going now that that the common schedule (start time) had been implemented.

Key Findings

- More vibrant campus environment for students, faculty, and staff with a Monday through Friday schedule.
- Common schedule creates an opportunity for more programming, shared experiences with all UCONN campuses, and easier transition for students from Hartford to Storrs.
- Overall a positive move. Student pushback will quiet down after this year since many students are campus changing and the incoming student don’t know any different.
- It is more realistic for students to expect to have classes all week and better preparation for jobs after college.
- They get more out of their investment.

Common topics/issues mentioned

Scheduling Process

- Overall the transition went well.
- Not hearing complaints from students once the semester was underway.
- More students are on campus, working less and focusing their efforts primarily on classes vs. the other way around.

M/W/F classes

- Most students have adjusted just fine.
- Some students elected to avoid MWF and jammed their TU/TH too full. Advisors recommended against this approach.
- Instructors have not adjusted their exams previously taught in a 75 minute course to a 50 minute timeslot. Student report not having enough time to finish exams, which rarely came up before.
- Transportation to campus M-F is a challenge (gas, family arrangements, and bus money).
- Instructors are having a hard time converting their lesson plans into 50 minute time blocks.
- Missing classes on Friday due to having to take the bus one extra day.

- Could alienate our working non-traditional student population.

Online teaching and distance learning

- Students asked about how online classes worked. Questions about hybrid really were not asked – it would be nice to have more information regarding that option.
- Students prefer the classroom experience.
- More education on the different options and what should students expect from online/hybrid courses.

Benefits, Challenges and Drawbacks to the Common Schedule

Benefits

- Creates a more vibrant college experience when more students are on campus five days a week.
- Some students actually prefer breaking down class information into three times a week vs. twice a week.
- Missing one class does not have as big of an overall impact as it would for a twice a week classes.
- Increase access to faculty and staff.
- More opportunities to study on campus and visit the W and Q Center.
- During campus tours there is great energy on a Fridays now.
- Prepares students for the schedule they will transition to in Storrs.
- Staff work is more evenly distributed as students are not bound to accessing staff in just a four day timespan.

Challenges

- Students and staff have found a way to make this new schedule work for the most part. The focus by staff is to help students understand that this is what we will be doing moving forward. Past the initial implementation (and a few students throughout the semester) there has been very few complaints.

Drawbacks

- Students find driving to campus or taking the bus on Friday for one 50 minute class inconvenient and an additional expense.
- Most students were accustomed to working all day on Fridays and had to adjust their work schedule.

Stamford Campus April 2016

On April 19 and 20, six staff people were interviewed individually. The interviews were open-ended, allowing for each individual to offer comments on the topics/issues that s/he believed were most significant concerning the Common Schedule. Interviewees were guaranteed anonymity.

The interviewer asked each interviewee to comment on how things were going now that the Common Schedule (Common Start Time) had been implemented.

Key Findings

- Most students, faculty, and staff seem to have adapted to the Common Schedule/Common Start Times.
- The “Common Start Times” model is a better fit than “Common Schedule.”

- There have been few complaints from students during the past few months. Should “No Comment” be read as “Approval,” “Resignation,” or “Quiet Desperation”?
- There are no “One Size Fits All” answers. The University should be conscious of two facts: the regional campuses are different from Storrs and each of the regional campuses differs from the others. There should be allowances made for such differences.
- There are few problems with the scheduling of students who have yet to choose a major. The problems may begin when they need to find required, discipline-based courses under the new system.
- The campus is not appreciably more populated on Fridays.
- Many of the problems grew out of the mismanaged roll-out of the Common Schedule. This is now old news. If something can be accomplished by these meetings and surveys, it should be that this sort of mistake doesn’t happen again. Better communication is one aspect of the answer. The other is that Storrs should (must?) take the concerns of the regional campuses more seriously.
- If morale is low among some staff people, it is less because of the CS and more because they don’t know what is going to happen next.

Common topics/issues mentioned

- The Regional Campuses are commuter campuses. Storrs is a residential campus. There are differences. We all know this to be true. Why does the administration refuse to take this into consideration?
- MWF classes are largely MW classes with some assignment for the students to do on Fridays. There are a few more students present on Friday afternoons, but not many.
- Increased scheduling flexibility has led to increased accessibility for many students. This has been one good outcome.
- Challenges of on-line/hybrid/distance learning courses: students lack the necessary technical skills and/or access to the appropriate computer; the loss of one-on-one contact with the faculty; the loss of time-management skills; many faculty are not equipped to teach such courses successfully – there should be greater support for faculty, perhaps from CTL.
- the scheduling of hybrid courses, both for on-campus meetings and exams, may become an issue as the number of them increases

Benefits, Challenges, and Drawbacks to the Common Schedule

Benefits

- Greater flexibility for students and faculty

Challenges

- As enrollments increase, will we be able to hire enough adjunct faculty? The CS would seem to make this more difficult.
- More services will be required if students are expected to come to campus on Fridays. For instance, the shuttle bus to the train must have Friday hours.
- More support needed for faculty willing to teach technology-based courses

Drawbacks

- Commuting will always be an issue on our campus. We should be trying to make it easier for students to be successful, not more difficult.
- Courses that have traditionally had 75-minute meetings will now become 50-minute, three-day-per-week courses. Under the MW/Friday off-campus model, students will be spending less time with their instructors. The best students may do well. What about the rest?
- Students should understand before they arrive that some percentage of their courses will be taken via on-line/hybrid/distance learning, etc. – this might dissuade some students from attending a UConn regional campus

Waterbury Campus April 2016

Between March 8th and March 23rd ten professional staff members on the Waterbury campus directly involved with the student body, recruitment and/or scheduling were interviewed individually. The interviews were open-ended, allowing for each individual to offer comments that reflected those topics and issues that they saw as most significant. Interviewees were guaranteed anonymity.

The interviewer asked each interviewee to comment on of how things were going now that that the common schedule (start time) had been implemented.

Key Findings

The overwhelming majority (close to 100%) interviewed:

- mentioned the importance of flexibility
- commented that there were not many changes made and that they did not want more made
- noted the need for on-site support for those teaching on-line
- were dissatisfied with the current one-size-fits all approach to policy-making
- noted the lack of autonomy afforded to each regional campus
- were concerned that more M/W/F time blocks will be added
- 75-minute time block preferred over 50- minute time block
- wished for improved and more timely communication between Storrs and regional campuses

Common topics/issues mentioned

Scheduling Process

- Having the right schedule of classes is important to recruitment and retention. Each regional campus is in the best position to determine what that schedule is for their campus. One size does not fit all.
- Flexibility is key to successful scheduling. Extremely important that flexibility continue. The schedule is ok now, but what are the plans for the future?
- Schedule changes that were proposed and made without discussion with regional campus faculty and staff is an example of increasing centralization of decision-making by Storrs -frustrated by this trend. Regional campuses must have more say in what happens on their campus to better serve their student population. The initial rationales given for the common schedule made no sense.
- Any changes to the schedule must be done in consultation with the individual campus; prefer these type of decisions be done on the local level.

- Common start time is ok and seems not to have been disruptive to the students or faculty; makes the development of the schedule easier; more logical and easier now for students who are taking classes at more than one campus.

M/W/F classes

- The current schedule (Spring 2016) did not represent a huge change. As long as no further /real increases in the number of M/W/F classes occur in the future, then current schedule (Spring 2016) is ok.
- Professors moving away from this time block
- Concerned that there will be an incremental increase in the number of courses offered M/W/F. If this happens, foresee issues for students and faculty – particularly adjunct. Reasons cited include:
 - For recruitment, the M/W and T/TH schedule was seen as a positive
 - For commuters, the M/W and T/TH schedule seen as a positive. M/W/F schedule adds time commitment and expense to the commuting student.
 - If increase the M/W/F course offerings, we may not lose current students but they will most likely take classes offered T/TH or M/W. If not enough classes offered T/TH or M/W then progress towards their degree will be hindered.
 - Majority of our students balance school/work/home responsibilities and prefer/need to consolidate their class schedules to less than 5 days. Most chose the Waterbury campus because they have to work, often time not just for tuition but to support themselves.
 - Even though the amount of time spent on a course is not necessarily effected by when the course meets, if adjuncts asked to teach M/W/F instead of M/W or T/TH then in effect the university is asking adjuncts to teach an extra day without compensation.

Online teaching and distance learning

- Understand that it is suggested that if a faculty member teach M/W/F then Friday could be done on-line thus mitigating some of the concerns noted about the M/W/F schedule. This is ok IF the faculty member is interested but faculty should not be forced to do so.
- Preparing an on-line course requires CETL support. Faculty will need support and should have CETL physically on campus on a regular basis throughout the semester. Adjunct faculty who are interested in teaching on line should be compensated for their time.
- Students are interested in having online options. Students like the vast majority of their classes to be face-to-face but like having the option to take one - maybe two? - online courses per semester.
- Online may not be an option for some students who do not have consistent/regular internet access

Benefits, Challenges and Drawbacks to the Common Schedule

Benefits

- With the inclusion of distance learning courses on the schedule, more classes available to students.
- Common start time easier for students who commute to more than one campus.
- The new start times make it easier to accommodate 4 credit courses, like math or English 1010 and 1011 and science labs, because now have bigger blocks of time to work with.

Challenges

- The need for proper support for on-line teaching.
- Increase work-study options to make coming to campus more often (M/W/F) less of a burden.

- Distance learning: do we have enough rooms and technical support for this?
- Difficulty of staffing the regional campuses with adjunct faculty because of the new schedule, given the need to factor in the adjuncts' schedule at other institutions.
- Will the common start time create difficulties for the final exam schedule?

Drawbacks

- Negative impact of M/W/F schedule on student's work schedule and on time spent commuting.
- Distance learning could put adjuncts out of work.
- Converting to 50-minute from 75-minute time block is time consuming and may not be the preferred time block to teach by the faculty member. Particularly burdensome for adjunct faculty to convert their courses. Students seem to prefer 75-minute time block, particularly CAP students.
- On-line teaching a big ask for the adjuncts.
- Represents Storrs-centric approach that disenfranchises regional campus faculty, students and staff.

APPENDIX C

REGIONAL CAMPUS STUDENT FOCUS GROUPS

The Regional Campus Student Welfare Task Force provided the following report to the Common Schedule Task Force.

Report

Student focus groups were held at all five campuses. The total number of interviewees was 55. The interviews took place at various times on various days of the week. There are members of some constituencies (i.e. evening-only students, faculty, and staff) who were not questioned. The respondents were guaranteed anonymity. There were no questions that asked specifically about the Common Schedule. If anyone at any of the Focus Group meetings wanted to talk about the Common Schedule it was up to them to bring it up. Once it was on the table, the Common Schedule was open for discussion. Follow-up questions for clarification were allowed.

Synopses of those responses regarding references to the Common Schedule

In response to Question 3: How do you spend your time on campus? (attending classes only, studying, socializing, all of the above?)

- *The Common Schedule has made it very difficult to plan events and made it difficult for many students to attend them. No free period in the middle of the day is a problem that no one seems to have thought of.*

In response to Question 5: If you were in charge, what would you change about your campus?

- *The Common Schedule makes it difficult to balance school and work. The old schedule was much better.*
- *They say we should go to other campuses to get the courses we need, but the new schedule makes this very difficult. Did they account for getting from one campus to another?*

In response to Question 9: If you were the moderator, what question you would ask the group? (This question became “What subjects have we not discussed that you think are important?”)

- *The Common Schedule doesn’t work for us. It makes it hard to schedule classes and it forces us to take 50 minute classes.*
- *The Common Schedule is not fair to non-traditional students. Do they want more traditional students and fewer of us?*
- *Hybrid courses are OK, but we don’t like to be forced to take them.*
- *No one comes here on Fridays anyway. What was the point?*