

# Overview of Genetic Algorithms in Educational Timetabling

Luca Quaer

luca@quaer.net

Wilhelm Büchner Hochschule

Darmstadt, Baden-Württemberg, Germany

## ABSTRACT

Empty

## KEYWORDS

Genetic Algorithms, Educational Timetabling, Metaheuristics

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Educational timetabling involves creating schedules for educational institutions such as schools, colleges, and universities. The problem domain can be divided into the following three main problems [5, 6]: High-School Timetabling (HTT), University Course Timetabling (CTT) and University Examination Timetabling (ETT). Although a clear distinction between these three problems is not always possible, they generally differ significantly from one another [2]. However, each of these problems essentially is a resource allocation problem with the goal of assigning classrooms, instructors, and students to specific time slots for various courses or activities, ensuring that all constraints and requirements are met. This includes avoiding conflicts (e.g., a student being scheduled for two classes at the same time), adhering to institutional policies, and maximizing the efficient use of resources.

The difficulty in finding a valid and effective solution to such a problem lies in meeting the diverse requirements of different stakeholders (e.g. students, teachers, administration), multiple constraints and resolving resource conflicts in a combinatorial complex solution space caused by the numerous constraints. Timetabling problems like these are therefore known to be NP-complete in their general form, meaning that the difficulty of finding a solution increases exponentially with the problem size, which in turn makes it impossible to find a deterministic algorithm providing an acceptable solution in polynomial time [2]. One popular approach to addressing the complexity of timetabling problems is the use of metaheuristic algorithms [2]. This class of algorithms leverages a non-deterministic search approach which compromises on finding an optimal solution in favor of better runtime performance. Consequently, such algorithms are not guaranteed to find the best solution for a given problem, but a near optimal one [1]. Despite this limitation, metaheuristic algorithms are widely used in educational timetabling due to their ability to provide high-quality solutions within a reasonable timeframe. These algorithms can be broadly classified into two categories: single-solution and population-based metaheuristics [4]. Single-solution based algorithms use a single candidate solution and iteratively improve it by using local search, but are prone to get stuck in local maxima [4]. Population-based metaheuristics on the other hand work on multiple candidate solutions during the search process, avoiding the risk of getting stuck in a local maximum by maintaining diversity among the solution candidates [4]. Popular single-solution based algorithms in the timetabling domain are simulated annealing, local search and Tabu search [3, 4]. Well-known

population based metaheuristics are genetic algorithms, particle swarm optimization and ant colony systems [2, 4].

Among these methods, genetic algorithms are known for their versatility and application in a variety of use cases with the need of searching for solutions of a combinatorial problem in a large solution space. Therefore, this paper specifically focuses on genetic algorithms and how they are used in the domain of educational timetabling.

Genetic algorithms (abbr. *GA*) are a heuristic search method inspired by the process of natural selection in biological evolution and thus belong to the group of evolutionary algorithms [4]. As mentioned previously, genetic algorithms utilize a population based approach, meaning multiple solution candidates are iteratively evolved through numerous generations imitating the Darwinian theory of survival of the fittest [4].

## 2 METHODS

To do.

## 3 BASIC CONCEPTS

To do.

### 3.1 A

Sub A

### 3.2 B

Sub B

## 4 ADVANCED TECHNIQUES

To do.

## 5 DISCUSSION

To do.

## 6 CONCLUSION

To do.

## 7 FUTURE WORK

To do.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Michael Affenzeller, Stephan Winkler, Stefan Wagner, and Andreas Beham. 2009. Genetic Algorithms and Genetic Programming: Modern Concepts and Practical Applications.
- [2] G. N. Beligiannis, C. Moschopoulos, and S. D. Likothanassis. 2009. A genetic algorithm approach to school timetabling. *Journal of the Operational Research Society* 60, 23–42. Issue 1. <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jors.2602525>
- [3] Sara Ceschia, Luca Di Gaspero, and Andrea Schaerf. 2023. Educational timetabling: Problems, benchmarks, and state-of-the-art results. , 18 pages. Issue 1. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2022.07.011>

- [4] Sourabh Katoch, Sumit Singh Chauhan, and Vijay Kumar. 2021. A review on genetic algorithm: past, present, and future. *Multimedia Tools and Applications* 80 (2 2021), 8091–8126. Issue 5. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11042-020-10139-6>
- [5] Jeffrey H Kingston. 2013. Educational timetabling. In *Automated Scheduling and Planning: From Theory to Practice*. Springer, 91–108.
- [6] Andrea Schaerf. 1999. A survey of automated timetabling. *Artificial intelligence review* 13 (1999), 87–127.