

Faculty Senate Minutes

8 October 2007

Senators Present: Anderson-Connolly, Bartanen, Beck, Boland, Bristow, Bryant, Cannon, Foster, Hanson, Holland, O'Neil, Ostrom, Ryken, Singleton, Weiss

Visitors Present: DeMarais, Ham

The chair called the meeting to order at 4:04 p.m.

1. Approval of Minutes of 24 September

The minutes were approved with corrections.

2. Announcements

Cannon introduced Carolyn Ham, Coordinator for the Diversity Theme Year 2007 - 2008. Ham announced that she was seeking faculty to be on the Diversity Theme Year Committee. The Committee meets at 1:00 on Wednesdays and there are not as many faculty on the Committee as is normally the case. Ostrom asked what the theme was for this year. Ham responded that the theme is "Rebuilding the Ivory Tower," a theme that emphasizes diversity on campus. Ham suggested that a Senate appointment to the Diversity Theme Year Committee might help the situation. Weiss noted that the Diversity Committee has a liaison to the Diversity Theme Year Committee, this year it is Monica DeHart. Holland suggested that Ham go to the Department Chairs meeting with the request for more faculty representation. Bartanen stated that Ham would be welcome to come to the October 31, 2007 meeting of the Department Chairs. Cannon noted that service on the Diversity Theme Year Committee would be just as significant as service on other campus committees. Bristow wondered how we might remember to consider an appointment to the Diversity Theme Year Committee and thought that including the request in the minutes might prompt the Senate's memory. Chair Cannon affirmed Bristow's idea and Beck dutifully wrote the idea down.

Cannon noted that, because of fall break, the next meeting of the Senate is scheduled for October 29, 2007. He stated that he will be making a report to the Board of Trustees prior to the next Senate meeting and invited senators to raise issues they wish included in his report. A discussion ensued about whether the issue of medical benefits for full-time faculty who serve a single semester should be brought to the Board's attention. It was established that the issue is currently under discussion and would move to the Budget Task Force and so inclusion in a

report to the Board of Trustees is not warranted. DeMarais noted that she would be happy to keep the Senate informed on the issue.

3. Special Orders

Hanson reported on a special committee's work regarding priorities from last year's Senate. He stated that there are five items ready to go directly to the Faculty and a number of items that need to return to the Senate for further discussion. Hanson articulated a desire to bring these ideas to the next Faculty meeting. Those five items are: 1) a specific process for dealing with questions of professional ethics raised during an evaluation. Language has been developed for faculty consideration. 2) Cleaning up of obvious errors and awkward language regarding the grievance process. 3) Moving language regarding the grievance process from the by-laws to the Faculty Code. 4) Language requiring that decisions made during the grievance process be communicated to all parties involved in the grievance. 5) Language clarifying that issues of professional ethics of a faculty member be resolved through the grievance process. Hanson noted that all but the fifth item have been passed by the Senate. Seven more issues require further discussion by the Senate.

Discussion about the wisdom of sending the five issues forward to the next Faculty meeting ensued with Hanson stating that the committee believes all five items are ready for a first reading to the Faculty. Foster wanted to be sure that all items were fully vetted by the Senate before sending them on to the Faculty. Cannon stated that he is happy to place items on the Faculty meeting agenda if the Senate passed a motion that it should be done. Hanson stated that the special committee could get the changes in prior to the October 16, 2007 deadline for the next Faculty meeting. Holland voiced her concern that these items on the agenda might not encourage people to attend. Bristow agreed but said that Faculty meetings are for consideration of important issues such as these. She hoped that an explanation might be included that would encourage faculty to attend. Foster agreed that the items should move forward but argued that no items were of an emergency nature and could wait until the following Faculty meeting. Anderson Connelly stated that the committee felt the five items under consideration were relatively uncontroversial, having received considerable support on the Senate level.

Ostrom moved that the chair put all five items on the agenda for the Faculty meeting after the October 30th meeting with an explanation of why these items are important. Ostrom's motion was seconded and passed.

Hanson volunteered that the committee could craft language to accompany the items to the faculty. Cannon reiterated that he will place the items on the Faculty

meeting agenda. Singleton emphasized the significance of these items and said that the chair should be responsible for framing the issues whenever a Senate initiative was sent on to the Faculty. He did not know of any reason to suggest that these are not formal motions from the Senate and that making this fact clear might clarify the role of the Senate in doing this kind of work.

4. Reports of Committee Liaisons

Bristow reported that the Academic Standards Committee is actively moving ahead on their charges from the Senate. She noted that they are already making progress on the Academic Alert Form. The ASC is talking about the issue of honors at graduation and is currently leaning toward sticking with the current policy. She invited senators to attend the ASC meetings. Holland wondered if the ASC had started talking about scheduling yet. Bristow didn't know.

Hanson reported that the Library, Media, and Information Services (IMIS) Committee was following up on the spam filter issue and hopes to follow-up soon with the Senate.

Weiss raised 3 issues from the Diversity Committee. The first was regarding charge #7 to the Diversity Committee to "Consult with the Race and Pedagogy Initiative Task Force regarding its suggestions on the diversity work of the campus, including diversity training and advance planning of major diversity issues." The Diversity Committee suggested alternative wording. Discussion on this item was shortened when it was noted by Bartanen that the Race and Pedagogy Initiative Task Force was created by the President, performed its task, submitted its report and then disbanded. Bartanen volunteered to get the Task Force's report to the Diversity Committee.

After more discussion, M/S/P revoke charge #7 and welcome Dean Bartanen's offer to get the Race and Pedagogy Initiative Task Force's report to the Diversity Committee.

The second issue from the Diversity Committee was a request from the Diversity Committee for a Senate consideration of the report submitted regarding admission and retention of minority students. Ostrom suggested that the report be re-circulated to current senators.

Weiss then noted the third Diversity Committee issue which is a general sense of frustration of the Committee (voiced in its year-end report) with its own status on campus. With so much going on about diversity, including the appointment of a chief diversity officer, the Committee is often unsure where it fits.

Bartanen noted that the chief diversity officer sits on the Diversity Committee and that the Senate might speak with her. Weiss suggested that the by-laws may need to be changed to reflect the new diversity positions. Cannon believed the changes should be addressed.

Holland moved that the Senate move directly to agenda item number 6 (Principles on Schedule of Classes). Ostrom seconded the motion that went down to defeat.

5. Charges to Standing Committees

Student Life:

Beck reported that the changes to the Student Life Committee charges, suggested by the Senate at the last meeting, involved rewording and reorganizing the previous charges. The Student Life Committee had graciously taken on the revisions and those changes were presented to the Senate today. Beck also noted that the proposed charge that the Student Life Committee undertake a comparative assessment of the Center for Health and Wellness (CHWS) was not included for approval. After considerable discussion the Student Life Committee suggested that such a task could overwhelm the SLC and prevent them from addressing their other charges. The SLC noted that they plan to participate in the Student Affairs self-study (as a part of the accreditation process), particularly as it pertains to establishing a procedure for reviewing the various divisions of Student Affairs. Further, the SLC will provide input when CHWS conducts an internal review based on the procedures established as a part of this year's Student Affairs self-study.

O'Neil asked where the appropriate place would be to raise her concerns about CHWS. Ryken noted that at the previous Senate meeting, Dean Segawa stated that his office would be the place to begin.

M/S/P that the charges to the SLC be adopted as submitted.

1. *Provide input on various Student Affairs projects and initiatives as brought to the committee by the Dean of Students.*
 - *Follow up more rigorously and consistently the work of Student Affairs committees that request input from the SLC.*
2. *Establish ongoing communication with and provide input to ASUPS on various projects at the request of that body's executives.*

- *Work more closely with ASUPS in order to allow ASUPS officials to bring projects to the SLC for faculty input.*
 - *Discuss a request brought forth by a student member of the SLC to explore the possibility of an alternative, service-oriented Spring Break program. This year, two UPS students organized such activities during Spring Break, but the SLC plans to discuss this idea further and explore whether this can be made into a more regular opportunity (perhaps arranged through the Community Involvement and Action Center (CIAC)).*
3. *Review information sources available that could help identify issues relevant to student life. Such information sources include individual faculty, students, and staff, as well as the Office of Institutional Research and the ASUPS Student Concerns Committee.*
 - *Better inform faculty, students, and staff of the role of the SLC, and in particular, the ability of any member of the campus community to bring to the committee issues of concern related to student life.*
 - *Establish an ongoing relationship with Institutional Research that would continue beyond this year and provide a steady flow of information helpful in identifying long-term issues. These could then be addressed by the SLC in addition to emerging issues that are brought to its attention throughout the year.*
 4. *Provide a pool of faculty from which to draw for participation on Student Affairs ad hoc committees.*

Interim Study Abroad Committee

Singleton presented the proposed charges to the Interim Study Abroad Committee (ISA). He noted that they were changed from the initial charges put forward earlier. He explained the differences and the rationale.

1. *Review, revise and/or reaffirm the 2003 mission statement for study abroad.*
2. *Advance the recommendation that the Interim Study Abroad Committee become a standing committee named the International Education Committee.*
3. *Consider the recommendations of the Study Abroad Working Group and coordinate policy recommendations with the Study Abroad Working Group.*
4. *Consider the financial consequences of structural changes to the study abroad program and discuss additional funding sources for both the study abroad program and scholarship funds to help students meet the extra costs of studying abroad.*

5. *Review existing study abroad proposals.*

M/S/P that the five charges to the committee be approved.

Cannon noted that the Senate can forward charges to a committee at any time.

6. Principles on Scheduling of Classes

Cannon discussed the history of the principles on scheduling of classes. He stated that on October 9, 2006 Anton raised the issue of principles governing the schedule of classes. On October 23, the Senate adopted a motion to form a task-force that would present its findings to the Senate and to the Academic Standards Committee (ASC). Kim, Ostrom, and Sousa, were named, with Anton later replacing Sousa. On November 20 it was announced that the Registrar had published revisions to its scheduling guidelines. With Kim's departure from the University, Anton became task-force chair. On April 2, 2007, the document, "Principles on Which to Base the Schedule of Classes," was distributed to the Senate by the task-force. (See Appendix A.) On September 10, that document was sent to the ASC, with the charge that it "discuss and pursue implementation" of the principles.

Holland stated that the issue is becoming urgent and suggested that the Senate should discuss whether the charge should be taken back from the ASC and dealt with by the Senate or if the ASC should be encourage to fast track it.

Ostrom suggested that the issue is a crisis because of scheduling problems arising between chairs and the Registrar and he noted that the ASC has its plate full. He argued that the document has been through many groups already that represent most constituencies on campus. John Finney had given his input. Ostrom felt it is time to think about Senate approval of the document today.

Holland suggested that the document be approved and taken to the next faculty meeting.

O'Neil asked if there might be a conflict in the document. She noted that the principles argue for a protected hour from 4:00 to 5:00 and classes from 3:00 to 6:00. Bristow noted that the protected hour is only one day per week and as such could work in concert with classes scheduled one day per week from 3:00 to 6:00. Ostrom noted that the principles are not hard and fast but clear guidelines about the faculty's wishes, with flexibility assured.

Bristow suggested that the document would make for lively discussion at the first faculty meeting.

Anderson-Connelly wondered what the main issues are. Ostrom stated that John Finney had encouraged faculty to steer clear of schedules that might involve faculty not being on campus on Fridays. He noted that some faculty want 80-minute classes on Monday/Wednesday or Wednesday/Friday. This year the Registrar has taken a hard line on 80-minute classes.

Holland noted that department chairs had received a memo saying that scheduling must be done as per Registrar guidelines because to do otherwise was unfair and an injustice to students. She felt such a statement was inappropriate.

Bartanen noted that the Registrar had apologized for the wording and expressed a willingness to cooperate. She suggested that the situation was not a crisis.

Ostrom argued that the relationship between the Registrar and the faculty was strained and it would be good to air the issue. Bristow suggested that such an airing could well cool the issue, get the issue out, and talk with a focused voice with the Registrar. The point of such a discussion is to come to resolution where all voices are heard. Holland stated that resolution is why she is interested in this issue and she believes leaving the issue unaddressed could be contributing to low faculty morale.

Cannon noted three possible motions. 1) Continue the charge to the ASC with a request that the charge be expedited. 2) Senate endorsement of the principles. 3) Place the principles on the faculty agenda without endorsement. Cannon asked if there were other possible motions.

Ostrom moved that the Senate place the Principles on Which to Base the Schedule of Classes on the agenda for the next faculty meeting for a full faculty discussion. Hanson seconded.

Anderson-Connelly wondered if the objective was to give the faculty leverage with the Registrar. Ostrom replied that the objective is to “lower the temperature” through open discussion. The faculty could hear the principles before Senate endorsement. His objective was to hear from the whole faculty, not to seek leverage.

Foster voiced her agreement with discussion of the principles but wondered about guidelines for scheduling science lab courses. Ostrom suggested that issues like this provide all the more reason to bring the document before the faculty so we can identify where the holes are.

Bristow asked that there be a write-up of why this is going to the faculty. During the discussion of who might do the write-up, Cannon volunteered as chair of the Senate. He strongly encouraged all senators to attend the faculty meeting.

Foster asked who had been consulted about the principles. Ostrom replied that the Senate, the Registrar, department faculty, the Dean of Students, and students on the Senate had all been consulted.

Singleton wondered if there is any academic literature of the effectiveness of class schedules on student learning. Ostrom noted that a mix of 50 minute and 80 minute classes seems to be the way to go but he knows of no logical reason not to have Monday/Wednesday, Wednesday/Friday classes. The opposition seems to be based in the fear that too many Fridays will be left open. Singleton reiterated his question, asking if a literature has developed around the question of class scheduling.

Anderson-Connelly wondered what students had to say about the issue. O'Neil replied that it is better to have a day free if students are looking for an internship or if they need to work. Bryant stated that most students try to "bunch" classes for internships and jobs. Boland agreed.

Holland argued that the pedagogical preference of the professor influences student learning outcomes--the professor is best placed to determine the pedagogical needs of the course.

Foster asked what happens when a department decides that 80-minute classes are better for their courses. Trying to get all of a department's courses on Tuesday/Thursday creates a burden on faculty and students.

The motion to place the Principles on Which to Base the Schedule of Classes on the agenda for the next faculty meeting for a full faculty discussion passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:33 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Terence Beck
Associate Professor of Education

Appendix
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.