

**University of Puget Sound  
Faculty Meeting Minutes  
October 30, 2007**

1. Dean Kristine Bartanen called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. in McIntyre 103. Fifty-two members of the faculty were present by 4:10 p.m.
2. Minutes of May 1, 2007 were approved as distributed.
3. Professor Heidi Orloff M/S the nomination of David Droge as Secretary of the Faculty. There being no further nominations, Droge was elected.
4. Since President Thomas was away on University business, there was no President's report.
5. Dean Bartanen deferred her report to the item 8a on the agenda related to the National Survey of Student Engagement.
6. Senate Chair Cannon reported that the Faculty Senate had requested item 8b be placed on the agenda. He indicated that Professor Hans Ostrom would introduce this item, lauded the spirit of co-operation characteristic of prior discussions of this topic and encouraged all present to keep this spirit going.
7. George Tomlin, Chair of the Professional Standards Committee, introduced the proposed Amendment to Chapter III, Section 5d of the Faculty Code. He distributed the statement appended to these minutes (October30Attachment1). He announced that a Second Reading and vote on the amendment would occur at the Dec. 4 meeting and offered to respond to questions. He said the amendment was designed to relieve the workload of the Academic Dean by allowing an Associate Dean to assist in reviewing the "streamlined," non-controversial files

In response to questions, Tomlin noted that the Faculty Code provides for a Dean's review of streamlined files without involving the Faculty Advancement Committee (FAC). The number of such reviews has increased in recent years, and the task of reviewing and writing the review letters has become burdensome for one individual.

The decision that the review will be "non-controversial" is made by the Dean. Dean Bartanen clarified her plan would be to have all streamline reviews done by the Associate Dean (i.e., without any predetermined notions of "controversial" v. "non-controversial"), and that any concerns or questions from the Associate Dean would be raised with the Academic Dean. The current code also indicates that either a Department Chair or the Dean may request a full review in any streamlined case.

Doug Edwards raised a question about how recommendations for Distinguished Professor and teaching awards would be affected by having the Associate Dean complete streamlined reviews. Tomlin noted that since Distinguished Professor and teaching

awards are not mentioned in the Faculty Code, the recommendations could be treated separately. The Dean reported that past procedure has ensured that “streamlined” review letters are transmitted to the FAC for award consideration. Martin Jackson asked if review of streamlined cases by individual FAC members had been considered.

Dean Bartanen reminded the faculty that a Second Reading and vote on the amendment would occur on Dec. 4.

8a. Promising an expeditious presentation, Dean Bartanen introduced Randy Nelson, Director of Institutional Research and “an Overview of Results from the National Survey of Student Engagement.” After reviewing key events in the development of the NSSE, she described the student engagement survey as a means of assessing “the extent to which students engage in educational practices associated with high levels of learning and development.”

NSSE uses survey data collected from samples of first-year and senior students from 1200 institutions in all 50 states. The 1.5 million student responses represent a variety of types of colleges and universities. The survey is designed to meet the conditions favoring the validity of self-report data.

Puget Sound was a pilot NSSE institution in 1999. We participated alternate years; now we are moving to a 3-year cycle for participation in order to facilitate direct comparisons among the Higher Education Data Sharing consortia, of which we are a part.

Randy Nelson summarized the 2007 results for Puget Sound. Comparisons were made with a national sample of about 300,000 respondents. Our student response rate of 44% was above the national average rate of response.

Comparisons were made with Liberal Arts institutions and with all institutions in each of the five “benchmark” categories in the NSSE. Those comparisons were:

#### I. Level of Academic Challenge

Freshmen reported significantly higher levels of academic challenge than students at liberal arts colleges and students at all colleges

Puget Sound seniors reported higher levels of academic challenge than seniors at liberal arts colleges and much higher than seniors at all colleges

In response to a faculty query, Nelson said that the Liberal Arts category overlapped, but was not identical with, our own national comparison group of institutions. NSSE used the Carnegie categories to categorize institutions.

Puget Sound seniors read more than those at other Liberal Arts colleges and wrote more short and medium-length papers than their peers at those other institutions.

## II. Active and Collaborative Learning

Puget Sound freshmen were near the average of liberal arts campuses and above the average of freshmen at all colleges.

Puget Sound seniors were below the average of seniors at liberal arts colleges and near the average of seniors at all colleges.

Both freshmen and seniors were less likely to make class presentations and work in groups on projects but more likely to discuss ideas from classes with others outside the classroom setting.

## III. Student Interactions with Faculty

Puget Sound freshmen were near the average of liberal arts campuses and above the average of freshmen at all colleges.

Puget Sound seniors were near the average of seniors at liberal arts colleges and above the average of seniors at all colleges.

Freshmen were more likely to report that they received prompt feedback from faculty and less likely to report that they had worked with faculty on activities other than coursework.

Seniors reported greater involvement with faculty research than did freshmen.

## IV. Enriching educational experiences

Puget Sound freshmen were near the average of liberal arts campuses and above the average of freshmen at all colleges.

Puget Sound seniors were near or below the average of seniors at liberal arts colleges and above the average of seniors at all colleges.

Seniors were less likely than their liberal arts peers to report that (a) Puget Sound encouraged contact among students from different backgrounds and ethnicities, or (b) they had serious conversations with students of a different race or ethnicity.

Seniors were less likely than their liberal arts peers to report that they learned as much as they expected to in the use of computers and information technology, however they reported greater use of computers in their academic work.

Seniors were much more likely than their liberal art peers to have taken coursework in a foreign language or to have studied abroad. However, they were much less likely to have participated in a practicum, internship, or field experience.

## V. Supportive Campus Environment

Puget Sound freshmen were above the average of liberal arts campuses and well above the average of freshmen at all colleges.

Puget Sound seniors were near the average of seniors at liberal arts colleges and above the average of seniors at all colleges.

Puget Sound freshmen were more likely than their liberal arts peers to be satisfied with their academic advising and the help they needed to succeed academically.

Seniors were also more satisfied with the help they needed to succeed academically, however they reported that they received less assistance with coping with their non-academic responsibilities.

Both freshmen and seniors at Puget Sound reported greater satisfaction than their liberal arts peers with their relationships with the faculty and administrative staff. However, they reported less satisfaction with their relationships with their fellow students.

Overall, both freshmen and seniors were more satisfied with their educational experience than their peers enrolled at other liberal arts institutions. Seniors tended to be more satisfied than freshmen.

After describing some of the potential uses of these findings, Nelson indicated that more complete results were available from his office.

Dean Bartanen noted that the results reflected, for example, the institution's strong emphasis on writing, and concluded by noting her fidelity to the promise of an expeditious presentation. She asked for questions and comments. When none were forthcoming, she turned to the next item on the agenda.

8b.

Associate Dean Sarah Moore described the 2008-2009 Class Schedule Periods framework currently in use (October30Attachment2). The framework lists the available class scheduling options, including the "Finney compromise" regarding 80 minute classes outside the Tuesday/Thursday schedule. Not included on the framework were three-hour seminars, which were usually scheduled from 6 to 9 in the evening.

Professor Ostrom introduced the draft of the "Principles on Which to Base the Schedule of Classes" document (October30Attachment3). He reviewed the events leading to the formulation of this draft. Several years ago Faculty Senate sought additional flexibility in the class schedule. Out of that effort came a recognition that a gap existed between the faculty's mandated control of the curriculum and the registrar's duty to create the class schedule. The Senate appointed a Task Force to articulate a set of principles on which to

base the schedule of classes. The document was revised after consultation with departments, student representatives to the Faculty Senate, and then Associate Dean John Finney. The present document is a draft which has received no official action and is offered for discussion.

Ostrom identified three issues:

- 1) A desire for greater flexibility, especially for 80-minute classes on a MW or WF schedule. Included in this issue is the question of using evening classes more frequently.
- 2) The need to protect the 4 p.m. to 6 p.m. period historically preserved for student activities such as athletic practices and musical or theatrical rehearsals. If courses are taught in this time period, they should be courses with multiple sections.
- 3) Whether the use of more 80-minute periods would lead to fewer courses on Fridays, thus lessening the ability to use the physical plant to its fullest extent.

Associate Dean Moore indicated that copies of the “Principles” document were available.

A period of civil discourse ensued, in which the following concerns and viewpoints were expressed:

- Good pedagogical justifications exist for teaching some courses for 80 minutes and some for 50 minutes.
- Schedule planners should follow faculty principles.
- Although looking at the schedule from a principled point of view is valuable, considerations such as available facilities, activity scheduling needs, and the limited number of hours in the day warrant adjustments to any set of general principles or rules.
- Efficiency and designation of space for certain class activities (e.g., studios and science labs) seem to be at odds with one another.
- Privileging seminar spaces for extended classes should be made equivalent to the dedications of other spaces.
- Present facilities suffer from inadequacies which should be rectified in the University’s long-range facilities.
- The schedule should not prevent any student from majoring in any subject.
- The notion of a “protected hour” for meetings is both impractical and imposes a notion of commonality which does not match the reality of the University.

- The meeting rooms in Wyatt should be available for seminars
- The Finney compromise needs to be reconsidered.
- Offering courses later in the day is feasible, but that option has met with general resistance from the faculty.
- Any expectation that faculty should be on campus all five days fails to recognize the importance of research days unencumbered by teaching.—Dean Bartanen responded that there was no expectation that everyone needs to be on campus Monday-Friday; it is reasonable that a faculty member have a research day. The concern is that not all faculty members in any one program have the same day of the week designated as a research day. As well, faculty have elected to be at a primarily undergraduate institution with a strong commitment to co-curricular, residential learning; this means faculty spend time with students on campus.
- Perhaps some credit could be given to students for non-faculty-intensive activities liked internships. Current graduation requirements exhaust students. Dean Bartanen urged caution as we consider how we award credit, given the importance of the university's concerted work to raise its academic profile.
- Heavy emphasis on 80-minute classes TTh leads to very full class days for some students on those days.
- Late afternoon (3:00 and 4:0-) classes are unpopular.

Professor William Breitenbach observed that he was concerned about the time between classes as well as the length of each class. In particular, TTh courses do not allow adequate time for reading between one session and the next. He proposed the following alternative schedule:

MWF for 50 mins. at 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 1 (for a total of 6 class periods)

TTh for 80 mins. at 8, 9:30, and 11 (for a total of 3 class periods)

MTh for 80 mins. at 12:30, 2, and 3:30 (for a total of 3 class periods)

TuFr for 80 mins. at 12:30, 2, and 3:30 (for a total of 3 class periods)

W for 150 mins. at 12:30 and 3:15 (for a total of 2 class periods)

We would have 17 periods available to schedule classes.

This proposal was met with scattered but enthusiastic applause.

Tomhave was asked about the distribution of classes over the day and displayed the information (October30Attachment4). When asked how these offerings were broken down (e.g., Core/not Core, upper/lower division, junior/senior faculty), he stated he had not looked at these categories. He also indicated that the classroom capacity was not

fully exhausted at any hour; standard classrooms (those which seat 20-35) are utilized very heavily.

As 5:30 approached, Ostrom observed that he had heard no support for setting aside a protected hour for meeting. Silence was taken to indicate assent.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

David Droge, Secretary of the Faculty

## Faculty Code Amendment on the Streamlined Evaluation Process, First Reading

requested by the Professional Standards Committee

Last April Dean Bartanen requested assistance in the growing workload of single-handedly completing streamlined faculty evaluation reviews (six in AY0405, fifteen in AY0607).

Chapter III, Section 5, d. of the Faculty Code (second sentence) specifies that for faculty members choosing a streamlined review, "The dean shall write a letter of evaluation and forward it to the head officer."

At its meeting on October 5, 2007, the PSC agreed with Dean Bartanen that she should have assistance in this task. PSC members unanimously agreed that a Faculty Code amendment would be required. The PSC thus proposes to amend **Chapter III, section 5, d., second sentence** to

**"The dean or a designated associate dean shall review the file, write a letter of evaluation, and forward it to the head officer."**

The above wording would also correct an omission in the current Code specifying that the Dean shall write a letter of evaluation without mention of the dean reviewing the file.

The complete Chapter III, section 5, d. would then read

"After reviewing the file the head officer shall write a letter of evaluation and forward the file and letter to the dean. The dean or a designated associate dean shall review the file, write a letter of evaluation, and forward it to the head officer. Copies of both letters shall be forwarded to the evaluatee."

The second reading of this proposed Faculty Code amendment is intended to take place at the faculty meeting on December 4, 2007.



2008-2009 Class Schedule Periods

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>MWF</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">8:00 - 8:50 9:00 - 9:50 10:00 - 10:50 11:00 - 11:50 12:00 - 12:50 1:00 - 1:50 2:00 - 2:50 3:00 - 3:50</p> <p style="text-align: center;">8 Periods 4:00 Hour Not Used as Starting Time on MWF</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>TT</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">8:00 - 9:20 9:30 - 10:50 11:00 - 12:20 12:30 - 1:50 2:00 - 3:20 3:30 - 4:50</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>MW/WF/MF</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">2:00 - 3:20</p> <p style="text-align: center;">7 Periods</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>MTTF/MTWT/MTWF/MWTF/TWTF</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">8:00 - 8:50 10:00 - 10:50 11:00 - 11:50 1:00 - 1:50 2:00 - 2:50</p> <p>Four-day-per-week courses that begin at 9:00, 12:00, or 3:00 will have Tu and/or Th session(s) that are adjusted to fit within the closest legal 80-minute time period (see the box at upper right)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>MTWTF</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">8:00 - 8:50 10:00 - 10:50 11:00 - 11:50 1:00 - 1:50 2:00 - 2:50</p> <p>Five-day-per-week courses that begin at 9:00, 12:00, or 3:00 will have Tu and Th sessions that are adjusted to fit within the closest legal 80-minute time period (see the box at upper right)</p>

### Principles on Which to Base the Schedule of Classes

1. The schedule should reflect an efficient and effective use of the classrooms available, of the five working-days available per week, and of the hours from 8:00 a.m. to 9:50 p.m. It is understood, of course, that there are other teaching-spaces besides actual classrooms, such as laboratories and studios. "Classrooms" here is used in a broad sense, therefore. It is also understood that although the academic day may stretch from 8:00 a.m. to 9:50 p.m., in practice the vast majority of classes are scheduled sometime between 9:00 a.m. (starting-time) and 5:00 p.m. (ending-time).
2. In academia, the 50-minute and 80/90-minute periods remain effective and venerable. It is understood that, for sound pedagogical reasons, some colleagues prefer the former, some the latter, and some a combination of both. It is understood that neither period is inherently better pedagogically even if individual professors strongly prefer one to the other. Personal preference does not reflect an inherent pedagogical value of either time-slot. Therefore, the schedule should reflect an appropriate mixture of the 50-minute and 80-minute time-slots for classes.
3. No classes should begin before 8:00 a.m., and no classes should end later than 9:50 p.m. However, the schedule should reflect the majority of the faculty's preference for teaching between the hours of 9:00 a.m. (starting-time) and 5:00 p.m. (ending-time). In other words, the schedule should force no colleague to teach before 9:00 a.m. or after 5:00. Moreover, as has been the custom at the university, individuals, departments, the staff, and the administration should attempt to accommodate reasonable preferences for a class-schedule. The main scheduling-custom now seems to involve good communication among individuals, departments, associate deans, the advising office, and the Registrar. There appears to be no reason to change this customary practice of reasonable negotiation and accommodation.
4. One-day-per-week, three-hour classes should be limited to 300- and 400-level courses and graduate courses. Except in extraordinary circumstances, no professor should teach more than one of these classes per term. Currently, such classes are rarely scheduled; therefore, debate about the drawbacks and merits of such courses is probably unnecessary and wasteful. However, the 3:00-6:00 p.m. slot should be available to teach in, as long as the class is not the only section of a required class for a major (see #7 below).
5. On M-W, M-F, and W-F, 80-minute classes may be scheduled, as long as they do not erode the effectiveness and efficiency of 50-minute classes on M-W-F. [Such classes shall begin no earlier than 2:00 p.m.] One fact to consider, of course, is

that 80-minute classes require two hours of a classroom's time but use only 20 minutes of the second hour, whereas 50-minute classes leave only 10 minutes of each classroom-hour unspent. Nonetheless, the schedule appears to be able logistically to accommodate a number of 80-minute slots on M-W, M-F, and W-F. Individuals, departments, programs, and schedulers may wish to make use of M-F and W-F schedules, not only the M-W 80-minute schedule. They may also wish to make use of the **5:00-6:20** and **6:00-7:20 p.m.** slots in these M-W, M-F, and W-F schedules. [In 2006-2007, Associate Dean Finney implemented interim guidelines by which some 80-minute classes on M-W, W-F, and M-F were scheduled.]

6. For many years, some faculty-members have expressed a wish for a protected hour for faculty meetings and other activities. The current discussion of scheduling offers an opportunity to determine whether faculty and others think the need for a protected hour should be a guiding principle in scheduling. If we choose to try to protect a time, one possibility is that for a trial-period of two years, and in alternating semesters, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday from 4-5 p.m. shall be protected meeting-times each week, when no classes or labs may be scheduled. A different day of the week, that is, would be chosen for each of the four trial-semesters.
7. The university's primary mission is to educate the whole student; therefore, in addition to providing an academic education, the university continues to value students' participation in athletics; in the performing, visual, and literary arts; in media; in the ASUPS; and so on. Therefore, departments should try to avoid scheduling required classes for the majors, of which classes there are not multiple sections, after 4:00 p.m. Legitimate exceptions to this guideline may arise, and there are different kinds of "required classes," but in general, departments should include this guideline in the several considerations that go into scheduling classes.

# Fall 2007

- 40 classes begin during 8:00 hour.
- 100 during 9:00.
- 59 during 10:00.
- 97 during 11:00.
- 95 during 12:00.
- 64 during 1:00.
- 88 during 2:00.
- 45 during 3:00