



Faculty Senate

Faculty Senate

Agenda for meeting of Thursday, December 4, 2025, 3:00 – 5:00 p.m.

Location: In person at the Charge on Chamber, Student Union, Room 340

Zoom Link:

<https://ucf.zoom.us/j/97530785269?pwd=1klWkySTWc12PREHIJBXohBqQpXNzj.1>

Passcode: 931843

1. Call to Order
2. Roll Call via Qualtrics:
3. Approval of Minutes of November 6, 2025
4. Recognition of Guests
5. Announcements
6. Report of the Senate Chair
7. Report of the President and Provost
8. Unfinished Business
9. New Business
 - a) Resolution 2025-2026-4: Prioritization of Campus Safety
10. Committee Reports
 - B&A Committee- Campus Climate Report Replacing Committee Report
 - IT Committee- Crystal Miraj, IT Committee Steering Liaison
 - Personnel Committee- Matthew Mosher, Personnel committee chair
 - Research Council- Steve Duranceau, Vice Chair Research Council
 - Undergraduate Council- Jason Phillips, UPCC committee chair
 - Graduate Council- Reid Oetjen, Grad Council Steering Liaison
11. Campus Climate Report
 - a) Classroom Assignment Optimizer Update
 - i) Chuck Riley, Associate Provost for Contract Compliance and Administrator Support
 - ii) Brian Boyd, University Registrar
12. Other Business
13. Adjournment

Resolution 2025-2026-4
Prioritization of Campus Safety

Whereas, the University of Central Florida lacks a recurring central funding source for campus safety and security enhancements and maintenance; and

Whereas, the responsibility and source of funding to address and resolve ongoing campus safety concerns such as lighting, pedestrian safety, cameras, and access controls are presently passed on to individual campus units and divisions, such as the Student Government Association-funded initiative to increase visibility in low-traffic areas with lighting improvements; and

Whereas, this decentralization of responsibility to individual campus units and divisions without recurring funding results in campus safety and security enhancements and maintenance being deferred or not addressed; and

Whereas, a safe campus environment is an important factor in student recruitment and satisfaction; employee satisfaction and morale; general well-being of all UCF stakeholders; and

Whereas, studies by the National Institute of Building Sciences (FEMA, 2018) show for every dollar spent on mitigation, there is an average return of approximately \$6 in prevented losses; and

Whereas, the campus security improvements needed will prevent and mitigate crime, while aiding and assisting the University of Central Florida Police Department when responding to emergency situations, such as card readers for electronic access and automatic door locks for all exterior doors allowing buildings to be locked-down during emergency situations; therefore

Be It Resolved, that the Faculty Senate recommends to the University of Central Florida central administration, including UCF Facilities and Business Operations and UCF Public Safety, they provide additional support to campus safety with a recurring funding source for campus safety and security enhancements and maintenance, and

Be It Further Resolved, that the Faculty Senate recommends to the University of Central Florida central administration, including UCF Facilities and Business Operations and UCF Public Safety, develop a yearly plan and budget to fully address and resolve ongoing campus safety concerns related to lighting, pedestrian safety, cameras, and access control.

Budget and Administrative Committee Report: Classroom Assignment Optimizer Needs and Best Practices

Updated 11/30/2025

I. INTRODUCTION

In August 2025 the Faculty Senate Steering Committee charged the Budget & Administrative Committee to “Provide faculty feedback into the Classroom Assignment Optimizer, and make suggestions for future usage”. This is a draft document to summarize the B&A’s efforts to date, and, with further input, will serve as a foundation for the formulation of Best Practices and our eventual report to the full Senate.

While the Steering Committee’s charge is faculty-focused, we recognize that the Classroom Assignment process involves a team of many people across the university. Each person performs particular functions and has specific needs and concerns. Because faculty will not be the only constituency affected by any recommendations for procedural improvement, it is critical to consider the roles and needs of all others involved. Therefore, we began our inquiry by identifying the needs and objectives of each stakeholder group involved in the Classroom Assignment process. While each group of stakeholders is ultimately focused on student success, each group also has its own discrete needs and is impacted by Classroom Scheduling in unique ways. The stakeholder groups we have identified are:

1. Administration.
2. The Registrar’s Office (RO) Scheduling Team
3. College Scheduling Staff
4. Department/Unit Schedulers
5. Faculty

Stakeholder needs were identified through conversations with faculty, staff, and administrators who conceptualize, execute, or are impacted by the Classroom Assignment process. The administration perspective was provided by Chuck Reilly and Brian Boyd during their visit to the September meeting of the full B&A Committee. The perspectives of the RO Scheduling Team were explored at the October B&A Committee Meeting. Those of College and Department Schedulers were obtained through a series of conversations between the B&A Committee Chair, other members of the B&A Committee, and university staff in these roles. Faculty perspectives have been provided by members of the B&A Committee, who represent a cross-section of the university faculty. The stakeholder needs and objectives we have developed so far are summarized below. We welcome additional observations which have not yet been identified.

II. STAKEHOLDER NEEDS AND OBJECTIVES

Administration

- Maximize space utilization to efficiently leverage university facilities and physical resources.
- Achieve a balance between space allocations for teaching (classrooms) and research (labs, etc.) that considers the university’s strategic objectives.

- Simplify the course scheduling and classroom assignment process by standardizing course meeting times into 75 minute blocks.
- Help students take a fuller credit hour load (and thus graduate more quickly) by eliminating “cross-grid scheduling”, e.g. the possibility that the classes they need are scheduled at odd times which conflict with other classes they must also complete.
- Centralize course scheduling to occur 100% in the RO to eliminate the confusion and inefficiency caused by each college scheduling their classes independently and without coordination with other colleges.
- Empower the RO Scheduling Team and College Scheduling Staff to resolve classroom assignment conflicts and issues that inevitably arise.

Registrar’s Office (RO) Scheduling Team

- Timely and accurate input of class meeting patterns into Peoplesoft by College Scheduling Staff.
- Timely and accurate input of final enrollment caps into Peoplesoft by College Scheduling Staff.
- Firmer deadlines for submissions.
- Fewer requests for modifications after the Optimizer has run.
- Develop “a written process for both RO and colleges that outlines best practices and overall guidelines for each party” (e.g. the Best Practices website, now in progress).

College Schedulers

- Year-over-year consistency for classes which have predictable enrollments and well-defined classroom equipment requirements every semester (e.g. GEP courses, introductory courses for majors, etc.). The classroom assignments for these courses could be automatically “copied over” from the previous term and assigned the same room on the same days and at the same time every scheduling cycle.
- Timely and accurate requests from Departments/Units, including class meeting patterns and enrollment caps that aren’t modified repeatedly and/or late in the process.
- Greater control over assignments of the college’s “non-general-purpose” rooms (e.g. department conference rooms) so these are not open to any course from any college being scheduled in them.
- Clarity on why some classes get assigned and others “bottlenecked” by the Optimizer.
- Clarity on which “rules” can be programmed into the Optimizer, so they know which requests can be accommodated by the RO and which cannot.
- Clarity on policies for “horse trading” of classroom assignments between colleges.

Department/Unit Schedulers

- Clearer understanding of how the Optimizer works and why it produces the classroom assignments that result from each run. Schedulers view the Optimizer as a “black box” which operates according to a set of mysterious rules which have never been communicated to them.
- Year-over-year consistency for classes which have predictable enrollments and well-defined classroom equipment requirements every semester (e.g. GEP courses, introductory courses for majors, etc.). The classroom assignments for these courses could

be automatically “copied over” from the previous term and assigned the same room on the same days and at the same time every scheduling cycle.

- More streamlined deadlines to reduce duplicated effort. Currently the deadlines for requesting Summer assignments and Fall/Spring assignments are staggered weeks or months apart, as are “large class” and “small class” requests. This drags the entire process out, particularly when conflicts arise from the Optimizer, thereby causing unassigned classes from previous requests to carry over into the next scheduling round.
- The Optimizer needs to consider which instructor is teaching a section to avoid unreasonable (or even impossible) assignments of back-to-back classes spread widely across campus. If faculty must cut a class short or be late to another because of “commute time” it impacts instruction and student success.
- Faster access to assign classrooms to courses which the Optimizer “kicks out” during the first run. Courses which are “bottlenecked” (e.g. unassigned because too many courses were requested for that time and day) are shut out and cannot be scheduled until all other classes are assigned. By then there are only “scrap” blocks at strange hours which students don’t want and in which they won’t enroll, or classrooms that are inappropriate to the course (e.g. a 200 person room for a 30 enrollment class, rooms lacking necessary equipment or access to teaching materials, etc.).
- More insight into the process for resolving bottlenecked courses. For example, are these conflicts resolved on a first come, first served basis, or by some other procedure?
- A less manual process for solutions to bottlenecked classes. Currently schedulers must search through a cumbersome list of unassigned rooms and times in Ad Astra (if they can even access this system) until they find something that might be appropriate to course enrollment for every single course that was bottlenecked during the last run of the Optimizer. But they have no way of knowing if that classroom has already been claimed, because the system does not tell them. They must develop a list course by course, then resubmit these requests to the College Scheduling Staff, who then submits them to the RO, who then executes another Optimizer run. Inevitably, some courses are bottlenecked again, and Department schedulers must repeat the entire search and submission process again (and again) until everything is assigned. This sort of blind searching is like “throwing darts in the dark” and consumes massive amounts of department schedulers’ time.
- Flexibility to fit larger rooms if student demand exceeds initial enrollment estimates. Student registration occurs well after the Optimizer completes the classroom assignments, and some courses develop large waitlists because schedulers can’t always estimate demand in advance. This impacts department credit hour totals and results in students not being able to take the classes they need that semester, potentially dragging out graduation times.
- Streamlining of special room requests. Currently these must be manually requested in the “notes” section of the department/unit request to the College Scheduling Staff. Requests for courses which MUST be taught in a department/unit/discipline-specific laboratory, or seminar room, or computer lab with certain machines/software must be re-requested in this manner every semester, even though the requirement never changes. Moreover, classrooms with technology for ADA accommodations (e.g. for hearing impaired faculty) must also be requested every time, even though that faculty member always needs that feature in their classrooms every term. Because the Optimizer does not consider these

variables, schedulers must scramble to find appropriate rooms in Ad Astra (see the previous point) and frequently are reduced to begging and trading with other Colleges for appropriate rooms at the last minute, sometimes just days before the semester begins.

Faculty

NOTE: The following Faculty needs were discussed by the full B&A committee at the November meeting. The following list, in priority order, was approved by unanimous vote:

- Optimizer consideration of distances between classrooms. Faculty and students must have adequate time to commute between back-to-back classes.
- Optimizer prioritization of classrooms which are closer to faculty offices so they don't have a class completely across campus when there was an appropriate classroom at the same day and time with appropriate capacity and equipment in or near their own building.
- Unit room priority. The Optimizer should give departments/units "first priority" to labs, seminar rooms, and other spaces which are assigned by that department. Departments should not be shut out of their local spaces, or be forced to schedule use of these spaces at odd times and days because the space was randomly assigned to a class taught by a different department.
- Year-over-year consistency for classes which have predictable enrollments and well-defined classroom equipment requirements every semester (e.g. GEP courses, introductory courses for majors, etc.). The classroom assignments for these courses could be automatically "copied over" from the previous term and assigned the same room on the same days and at the same time every scheduling cycle.
- Clarity on course duration. An M Mode class which was formerly held twice a week for 50 minutes (100 minutes of in-person instruction per week) is now held once a week for 75 minutes (75 minutes of in-person instruction per week), resulting in a 25% reduction in teaching time. How should faculty adjust? Also, classes which were formerly taught in 170 minute blocks once a week (e.g. graduate classes) are now assigned three 75 minute blocks (for a total of 225 minutes) once a week. Is the extra 55 minutes university-required instruction time? How much flexibility do faculty have?
- Procedures for requesting classroom space on Fridays for M/W or T/R that need an established, consistently linked time for extra instruction, reviews, etc. These could be set in the same grid block time as the courses' M/W or T/R assignment, but may not occur every week or run the full 75 minutes at instructor discretion.
- Procedures for instructors to schedule other academic activities (e.g. review sessions, office hours, Student Government/clubs/other RSOs, TA hours or sessions). Who controls it...whom to call? Could these be assigned the same room at a consistent time/day when rooms are not being used for classes? Also, how do we schedule these ad hoc when there is a need during the semester?
- Optimizer consideration of class or meeting content and delivery in assigning classroom space. Potentially loud or otherwise disruptive courses and meetings for RSOs, etc. should be assigned space near like gatherings and not be scheduled in proximity to classes or other academic gatherings (e.g. review sessions). For example, a graduate seminar from 6:00-8:50 pm should NOT be assigned a room next door to a Zoomba class

with loud music, voices, and jumping around, and that is actually happening this term. Other faculty have had classes disrupted by loud applause, speeches, cheering, and other distractions from RSO meetings next door.

- Ensure the Register's Office Best Practices website:
 - Outlines the Scheduling Process Pathways between academic units.
 - Clarifies who owns which decision in the scheduling chain.
 - Includes a faculty-friendly explanation of the Optimizer logic.

III. DEVELOPING BEST PRACTICES

We discovered that the Classroom Assignment process is a complex system with many inputs, of which the Optimizer is but one. Each stakeholder group must do their part if the process is to function efficiently and meet everyone's needs. This requires a clear set of expectations and ongoing rapport between the different constituencies. To this end, RO Scheduling Staff is working to develop a comprehensive "Best Practices" website to be made available to all stakeholders involved in classroom scheduling. The B&A Committee's next objective is to work with the RO to establish a comprehensive set of Best Practices to improve communication between stakeholders and more clearly delineate stakeholder roles and responsibilities, so that all stakeholder needs are met in future cycles.