

Minutes of October 10, 2016 faculty meeting

Respectfully submitted by Amy Spivey, Faculty Secretary for 2016-2017

I. Call to order

Faculty Senate Chair Alisa Kessel called the meeting to order at 4:02 p.m. She proposed an amendment to the agenda, to move the item involving a first reading of a proposed change to the Faculty Bylaws (brought by the Curriculum Committee) forward on the agenda so that it could be considered after questions about the President's, Dean's, and Faculty Senate Chair's reports. She also proposed to add a presentation from Ariela Tubert and herself to the agenda after the Bylaws reading. There were no objections from the members present to the proposed agenda changes.

II. Approval of the minutes of September 19, 2016

Moved. Seconded.

Amy Spivey – Some minor corrections were made to the minutes since they were posted online. Also, another appendix (Appendix H) was added, containing the comments from the Staff Senate and ASUPS Senate regarding the Common Period proposal. The additions were made available in hard copy to the members present.

The minutes of 9/19/2016 were approved without further revision.

III. Questions regarding reports from the President, Academic Vice President and Chair of the Faculty Senate

1. Questions for President Isiaah Crawford –

Sarah Freeman – Any more news on the search for VP of Enrollment?

President Crawford – Yes. The search is proceeding, and candidate finalists are being brought to campus. Today is the last day of feedback from the campus. Thank you to everyone who participated in the search process.

2. Questions for Dean Kris Bartanen –

There were no questions from the members present.

Kris Bartanen – I understand there were questions about our endowment's performance. At the Board of Trustees meeting recently, the investment subcommittee met with our outsourced CIO. While Puget Sound's endowment performance was below benchmark last fiscal year, similar to the reports you are hearing in the news about Harvard and other colleges, as of August 31, Puget Sound's fiscal year-to-date and inception-to-date performance are above benchmarks. The Board of Trustees affirmed the current endowment spending policy for 2017-18, which will result in payouts for financial aid and various operating activities at an estimated rate of 4.5%.

Dean Bartanen also introduced Kate Cohn, the new assistant dean for operations and technology.

3. Questions for Faculty Senate Chair Alisa Kessel – None.

VII. First reading of proposed Faculty Bylaws change from Curriculum Committee (Elise Richman)

Elise Richman – The Curriculum Committee has endorsed transitioning from a timeline of every 5 years to a timeline of every 7 years for curriculum reviews for departments, schools, and programs. This is a change to the Faculty Bylaws, Section 6.B.b.6 (see the text in Appendix F).

IV. Informational presentation regarding consideration of the Common Period

(See also the background information in Appendix E that was sent out to faculty members ahead of the meeting.)

Ariela Tubert and Alisa Kessel took the floor to explain the Faculty Senate’s activities over the past year or two regarding the Common Period. The slides presented by Tubert and Kessel are shown in Appendix G.

Ariela Tubert – Slide 1 (2015-16 Senate action) – The Senate made the issue of the Common Period a priority, partly because of the results of the faculty governance survey and constant feedback that 4 p.m. is not a good time for the faculty meetings. The Senate amended the Principles used for basing the schedule of classes by adding a 7th principle (shown on the slide).

Slide 2 – Tubert discussed the rationale for the Senate’s action. She said that the Senate saw this mid-day option as an improvement over the current situation, even though it’s not a perfect solution.

Alisa Kessel then talked about the discussion and concerns raised in the April 2016 meeting and ways that the Senate responded to those concerns. She talked about meetings and conversations that happened over the summer between the Faculty Senate Executives and people across campus. The outcome was a modified proposal (shown in Slide 4).

Why did the Faculty Senate take action on September 26, after the last faculty meeting? (Slide 5) The Faculty Senate wanted to allow for continued discussion, and allow departments that would have difficulty implementing the Common Period to have work-arounds. She showed the modified proposal (in italics) and the original language in regular text and opened the floor for questions.

Rich Anderson –Connolly – So, the action on September 26 was taken because the guidelines for course scheduling (for the 2017-2018 academic year) were going out to departments?

Alisa Kessel – Yes. The course scheduling guidelines would have gone out without the modified language in italics (unless the Senate had taken action at that time).

Bill Haltom asked that people state their names and departments when they speak, and proceeded to summarize the names and departments of the previous speakers.

IV. Old business - Motion to suspend indefinitely the discussion on the motion endorsing the Faculty Senate's action on the Common Period

Bill Haltom withdrew the motion.

V. Old business - Motion to endorse the Faculty Senate's March 2016 action on the Common Period, consisting of the following addition to the "Principles on Which to Base the Schedule of Classes":

"Faculty members' involvement in the business of the shared governance of the university is essential. In order to facilitate deliberation and decision making that is most broadly inclusive of faculty colleagues, it is incumbent on the university to assure a Common Period where governance-related meetings can take place, and to maximize the opportunity for colleagues to participate during the work day. Wednesdays between Noon and 1:30 p.m. will constitute the Common Period. Departments should avoid scheduling classes during this time so that as many faculty members as possible are available to participate in the affairs of governance that concern the whole community."

Suzanne Holland withdrew the motion.

VI. Motion to limit the proposed Common Period to one hour (noon-1) instead of 1.5 hrs (noon-1:30)

Bill Barry brought a motion to amend the current course scheduling guidelines. The language of the motion is found in Appendix H. Bill thanked the Faculty Senate and the Academic Standards Committee. He also thanked Alisa Kessel for assistance in developing the motion and explained that Diane Kelley, Eric Scharrer, and he were bringing the motion at the suggestion of Steven Neshyba.

He made the motion to change the Common Period to noon to 1 p.m. on Wednesdays and to delete the italicized paragraph that the Senate added to the guidelines on September 29, 2016.

There was a second to the motion.

Discussion of the motion –

Diane Kelley – I am in favor of a common hour, but I feel that a 90-minute common period is too much to ask for all at once because it impacts two course hours on MWF. The numbers that Brad Tomhave has provided indicate that creating a one-hour common period at noon on Wednesdays alone would displace approximately 50 courses. Strongly encouraging that courses not be offered at 1 p.m. on Wednesdays could displace up to another 70 courses. Thus, the proposed 90-minute common period could result in the rescheduling of over 100 courses.

When? Many faculty would like to keep either a 50-minute class period or a MWF schedule for reasons that might include pedagogy, childcare, commuting or research. Thus, likely, faculty would try to reschedule those 100 courses during either the highly desirable hours on MWF or, if 80-minute periods are desirable, in already impacted hours on TTh or they could all make a run for the limited 80-minute periods that fit into the MWF schedule. Whichever may happen, those 100 courses would overlap with many classes already being taught. If we

eliminate two course hours on MWF in one fell swoop, we will very likely cause serious problems for students' ability to get the classes they need.

Ultimately, eliminating two hours from the course schedule on MWF is asking too much of students, the Registrar, departments and individual faculty, simply to allow the luxury of a 90-minute faculty meeting once per month. Prioritizing effects on the schedule over having a slot for a 90-minute faculty meeting presumes a couple of things. First, I think we all assume that there will be a transition period during which the effects of the creation of a common period will be evaluated. Second, during this transition period, we may consider holding faculty meetings twice per month for one hour instead of once per month for 90 minutes, reducing the agenda for each meeting (on a trial basis), acknowledging the importance of a smooth transition for the campus as we make this change.

Eric Scharrer is ready to propose language for recommendations regarding these items. But for the moment, we need to decide whether we want to dive into the elimination of two course hours on the MWF schedule or only one. I support the motion to limit the common period to one hour at this time.

Derek Buescher – What about the adding of the MF hour-and-a-half time slot? Can't some of the courses go in there? If we do a one-hour slot on Wednesday, that option would go away.
Brad Tomhave - Right. If you go to one hour, then you don't get the addition of the MF 90 minute slot.

Robin Jacobsen – I would like to think about the impact of this on faculty governance and other meetings for committees. We want to think about the advantages of community activities, students, etc.. One 50-minute slot is probably not enough for all of that.

Jo Crane – The problem with the 1.5 hours is that everyone was starting to have their eyes on it for other meetings, and after a while you will have conflicts with all of the meetings. If we make this explicitly for faculty meetings, then it will help us to meet more often so that we can remember what happened, etc. Steven proposed that we should meet as a faculty twice a month if we just have 50 minutes.

Last time, Nancy Bristow suggested that we need to be creative with the scheduling grid, and I suggest that we be more creative with the faculty meeting schedule, as well.

Suzanne Holland – Our last meeting showed that we need a sustained time for conversation, so we have to remember that 50 minutes can become 40 minutes of actual discussion, so even if we do it twice a month it feels inadequate. The Academic Standards Committee talked about this last year. But we could start 1-hour classes at 1:30 and just rework the afternoon schedule. It's not beyond the realm of possibility, right Brad (Tomhave)?

Brad Tomhave – Yes.

Alyce Demarais – I also wanted to speak for a 90-minute period. A shorter meeting would curtail discussion. The shorter period would hinder a number of things that we might want to do. Biology currently has a number of labs starting at 1 p.m., but we are willing to try this and see how it works.

Diane Kelley – We will have to re-evaluate, whatever we do. I just suggest that it will cause havoc to eliminate two classes. Let's try one hour, and we can try it for one year.

Bill Barry – The comparative risks for 90 minutes are much greater than a time of one hour, to the schedule. The risks for the faculty are also there, and we will have to be creative, but I don't think the risks to the faculty are as serious as the risks to the schedule.

Jonathan Stockdale – I'm trying to process what Diane and Derek have said. I am really impressed with how everyone is trying to process through this for the good of the community. My understanding is that removing two periods cuts over 100 classes, but Derek suggestions that we would create a new MF 90-minute slot.

Stockdale then asked Brad Tomhave how many classes could move to that MF 90-minute slot.

Brad Tomhave – About 30 courses.

Jonathan Stockdale – I like the idea of having 90 minutes to come together as a campus for outside speakers, etc., if it's feasible, and like 90 minutes instead of 60 minutes.

Noah Lumbantobing (ASUPS President) - I would echo that. In conversations I have had with students, 80 minutes seems more conducive for students to use that time for their own groups and student clubs. It would be really useful for the student body to be in community together, and to have an extended period of time when everyone is available would be very useful and beneficial. Thinking about the strategic plan and conversations that might happen, it would be great.

Jim Evans presented a handout showing MWF classes. (See Appendix I for this information.) He explained that the bulk of the courses shown are held only on MWF, but a few also meet on one other day (foreign languages, physics, math). He offered this data to give an example of what would happen to the MWF schedule if we keep the 90-minute time.

Jim Evans - If we look at the trade-offs, let's look at what we get with just the noon hour. What do we get? A common hour for faculty meetings, committee meetings, etc. For the extra half hour, we get a much greater disruption. The tradeoff doesn't seem worth it. I am in support of the motion. I think, with Diane, that we could try it. We have already tried to shorten faculty meetings by eliminating unnecessary announcements, etc.

Alyce Demarais – The rationale given for this motion are good ones. I think the language of the current guidelines addresses the issues because they give departments room to schedule their courses over the 1-1:30 time slot if they need to.

Nancy Bristow – I want to speak to the Senate's effort by adding the italicized portion. 50 minutes vs. 80 minutes is a big difference. Moving this way is good in the short term.

Keith Ward – There are so many appealing things to both of these proposals that it makes it a challenge to decide what is the best thing to do. The more I listen, the more I find myself leaning toward supporting Bill's motion, starting with what Jim said regarding disruption. I support it for pragmatic reasons, like (with the italicized part), we could schedule from 1-1:30, but that would be discouraged. Will the exercising of that option be less disruptive? Will we be able to schedule classes in such a way that students can complete their degrees in 4 years? The MF 80-minute slot can accommodate some courses, but I would guess that some departments would not want to put MWF classes into two 80-minute slots pedagogically. I recognize that there is a consensus that either one has advantages and disadvantages. I think the best way to begin is to do this incrementally by starting out with a 1-hour common period.

Derek Buescher – I am on the fence. Looking at it, I think the 90-minute period is superior, but I am sensitive to the departments that have trouble with this. We have these aggregate numbers, but they aren't clear. What have people found as you are trying to set your department schedules for next year?

Ariela Tubert – Part of me can go either way, but I am probably leaning against the motion for the following reason. We could easily move the Philosophy classes from MWF because we prefer 80-min slots for some of our classes. I don't think we will ever get data that will tell us which classes cannot be moved unless we try it. The Senate language, as amended, will actually give us the data that we need. It will tell us whether this is possible. Even seeing how long it takes us in this meeting; if we had a 50-minute slot, we would be adjourning now. I don't know if it's enough time for deliberation.

It's hard to get people in the door. Once we are here, isn't it better to have a longer conversation, if possible? I am open to the possibility of trying the 90-minute slot and then changing it if needed.

David Sousa – As an ex-department chair, I might have faced real problems dealing with the disruption. That it's easy to move classes is not really accurate. Open slots would be 8 a.m. or 4 p.m., to avoid conflicts between courses in my department. This is one of the things that would happen.

Jason Struna – I am one of the people who wants the MF 80-minute session because there aren't enough 80-minute sessions right now for me to schedule my classes. I want to address the comment that whatever we decide might be tested and reevaluated. I think if we do the 60 minutes as a test, we might be just as likely to just eliminate it later as we would to lengthen it. I am for the 90-minute session. I like the idea of other events being scheduled during the Common Period.

Suzanne Holland – I think we might be able to have our cake and eat it too. I don't think we can actually know what is going to happen. But, if we go with a 90-minute period and also think about the possibility of altering the schedule so that we can start at 1:30 or something, we might get a new kind of schedule. I haven't heard anyone in favor of the 50-minute period address that issue.

Keith Ward – I like very much the idea of having a slot where we can focus on building community. I also like the idea of looking at the class schedule and rethinking it. Last spring, I floated the idea of classes starting at 1:30 instead of 1 p.m. It's a great idea. I have worked out that Music can accommodate this new schedule by being flexible and using the "should" clause. But what is the cumulative effect when we take two slots of the schedule? How will it affect the students' ability to get courses they need to graduate?

Jo Crane – I would like to address Derek's question about the difficulty of rescheduling. It's not hard to find another time slot, but we need to look at students' schedules and time conflicts, particularly when classes are sequenced. That's why I think baby steps with the one-hour Common Period are better.

Jennifer Neighbors – I will speak briefly in favor of the motion. I like to teach in the middle of the day. If the schedule gets smooshed to the side, I have concerns about electronic classrooms and teaching times moving into commuting and childcare-responsibility time.

Eric Scharrer - I think departments can make these changes to the schedule, but we can't know what the impact on students is going to be. Our students (in Chemistry) can't take classes in the afternoon due to labs, so they will be compressed into morning hours, cutting out the noon period.

Aislinn Melchior – Our language classes meet four days a week, and we often teach an overload, so I am concerned about trying to schedule my courses. When I advise incoming students, they often have trouble getting the classes that they need. I worry about the compression issue, as well.

Diane Kelley – I think the idea of starting classes at 1:30 is great. We should look at that, but course schedules are due on October 24. We don't have time.

I am also concerned about the impact on small departments, particularly who are fighting to keep their majors. I am worried that going "all in" is going to have ripple effects that we cannot foresee.

Bill Barry – It will be difficult to do this in Classics. What is more important – student graduation or faculty having 90 minutes versus 50 minutes? The students are more important.

Rich Anderson-Connolly - We should plan on unintended consequences. The cost to the student is much more serious, and I am concerned about that. It would be nice to have 90 minutes, but I think it's too big of a risk. Sure, departments could move, but there is a potential "collective action" problem in that what works for individuals might cause problems for the whole.

Robin Jacobsen – We are giving up one slot, really, since we can get back the MF 90-minutes slot. I hear more than I did before the real risks to students' graduation. I don't think that if we go to 60 minutes we will ever expand it to 90 minutes. I think we are more likely to back off from 90 minutes to 60. We need to take advantage of the moment.

Brad Tomhave – There were 940 classes total in Fall 2015. On MWF at 9 a.m., there were 37 classes. On MWF at 3 p.m., there were 7 classes scheduled.

Diane Kelley – How many classes could there be?

Tomhave – It's a hard question. Space-wise, you can count on 30 class rooms available at any time. But students have conflicts.

Sarah Freeman – I am going to come back to the idea of unintended consequences and the fear of the unknown. We might have great unintended consequences, like students taking classes that they might not have taken before. That's not a bad thing. If there are too many downsides, then we adjust. I think we have to be careful not to be too afraid about losing out.

Amanda Mifflin – I want to echo Nancy's comments before about seriously thinking about changing the course grid. I'm all for adopting one of these motions, but we should look at reconfiguring our whole course grid to make it work better for everyone. I hear that people want more slots for 90-minute courses, but that's not what this is about. We should look at the grid.

Brad Dillman - I hear a fear that we might force students into an 8 a.m. class. Brad just said that 9 a.m. and 3 p.m. are underutilized. What about 4 p.m.? I would love to teach at 4 p.m. I think we have more space in our existing grid to accommodate some of the displacement.

Bill Beardsley moved to call the question. There was a second to the motion.

The vote was 20 Yes, 34 No. The motion failed. The guidelines stay as amended by the Senate.

VIII. Other business

Suzanne Holland praised and thanked the meeting chair. Applause followed.

IX. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m..

Appendix A - Attendance record

Attending

Rich Anderson-Connolly
Bill Barry
Kris Bartanen
Bill Beardsley
Francoise Belot
Nancy Bristow
Nick Brody
Gwynne Brown
Derek Buescher
Alva Butcher
Jo Crane
Isiaah Crawford
Alyce DeMarais
Brad Dillman
Jim Evans
Sara Freeman
Megan Gessel
Jeff Grinstead
Bill Haltom
Fred Hamel
John Hanson
Suzanne Holland
Renee Houston
Martin Jackson
Robin Jacobson
Kristin Johnson
Diane Kelley
Chris Kendall
Alisa Kessel
Nick Kontogeorgopoulos
Kriszta Kotsis
Sunil Kukreja
John Lear
Sam Liao
Grace Livingston
Aislinn Melchior
Amanda Mifflin
Jennifer Neighbors
Steven Neshyba
Sara Protasi
Brad Richards
Elise Richman
Steve Rodgers

Guests

Kate Cohn
Noah Lumbantobing
Ellen Peters
Brad Tomhave
Landon Wade

Amy Ryken
Leslie Saucedo
Eric Scharrer
Mike Segawa
Renee Simms
Jess Smith
David Sousa
Amy Spivey
Jonathan Stockdale
Jason Struna
George Tomlin
Ariela Tubert
Jennifer Utrata
Keith Ward
Carolyn Weisz
Linda Williams
Peter Wimberger



President's Report to the Faculty

October 3, 2016

As I complete my first three months of service and prepare for the annual board of trustees retreat this week, I offer to faculty colleagues the following brief update.

Vice President for Enrollment Search. It was my pleasure to host three finalists for the vice president for enrollment position during their campus visits Sept. 29 – Oct. 2. Each candidate has had broad exposure to campus, including forums open to students, faculty, and staff. I will be evaluating feedback from the search committee and campus community, and expect to share news soon regarding this very important appointment.

Net tuition revenue. Now that 10th day has passed, we have completed analysis of first-year, transfer and graduate enrollment and expect to meet net tuition revenue goals for FY17 in the aggregate. Our conservative projections anticipated a potential shortfall, so this is especially welcome news as the Budget Task Force commences its work and we begin planning for FY18.

Student recruitment. We are on to recruiting our next exceptional class of scholars! Faculty play an essential role in this process, and I am happy to see strong faculty participation planned during the Discover Puget Sound events on Oct. 7. U.S. News and World Report sent a reporter to campus last week for a feature in the 2017 "Best Colleges" issue; this is one of many sources of information for prospective students, and it was very helpful to have members of the faculty participate in interviews and open classes during this visit.

Advocates for Institutional Change. On Sept. 23 the President's Cabinet joined me for a meeting with the student leaders involved in Advocates for Institution Change. We discussed progress that has been made over the past year and our mutual interests in achieving a more fully inclusive and supportive community for all members of our community. Among other actions, students and faculty will be participating in a workshop on the student experience with the board of trustees at the upcoming retreat.

During the past two weeks it has been especially meaningful for me to continue meeting with so many constituent and members of the Puget Sound community, including attending the celebration of the establishment of the African American Studies major; hosting Leonard Pitts Jr. as this fall's Susan Resneck Pierce lecturer; and meeting with members of the Women's League, who presented Puget Sound with a generous donation for student scholarships.

I am looking forward to a series of scheduled listening sessions with faculty and staff in the coming months; a schedule is in the process of coming together and more information will be available soon. Meanwhile, my open office hours in Diversions are going well and offering the opportunity for me to meet with students, faculty, and staff on a drop-in basis every Thursday at 1:30 p.m.

With appreciation for all you do every day to make Puget Sound the remarkable place that it is,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Isiaah", written in a cursive style.

Isiaah Crawford
President

Appendix C – Report from Academic Vice President Kris Bartanen



October 3, 2016

TO: Faculty Colleagues

FR: Kris Bartanen

RE: Academic Vice President's Report for the October 10 Faculty Meeting

Thank you and Kudos:

- Kate Cohn '00 begins work today as Assistant Academic Dean for Operations and Technology.
- It has been a busy week in terms of nomination letters for Haley Andres '14 (Marshall Scholarship), Claire Martin '16 (Marshall Scholarship), Ben Tromly, History (ACLS-Burkhardt Fellowship), and Jennifer Utrata, Sociology and Anthropology (ACLS-Burkhardt Fellowship). I know many of you are writing letters and participating in interviews for fellowships candidates also. Thank you for that work.
- Thank you for the mentorship and support of students who presented at the recent Summer Science, Summer Arts-Humanities-Social Sciences, Summer Immersion Internship Program, and Madrid Summers Internship symposia.
- Thank you as well to those who participated in Kimberly Sluis's dissertation project interviews on student engagement.
- Thank you to Rachel DeMotts, director of Environmental Policy and Decision-Making, and to Oriel Siu, director of Latina/o Studies, as well as to George Erving, director of Humanities and Honors Programs, for significant contributions to September 30 reports to the Mellon Foundation on the EPDM and LTS grant, and the Humanities and Cultures in the Digital Age grant, respectively.
- Thank you to Kriszta Kotsis, Art and Art History, for coordinating and hosting the NW5C Visual Culture Workshop, September 30-October 1 at Puget Sound.
- Kudos to NW5C leaders, including chief diversity officers – Dean Michael Benitez, Mary James (Reed), Kazi Joshua (Whitman) – and Whitman colleagues Lisa Perfetti and Brooke Vick on acceptance of their program proposal on the NW5C Faculty of Color Network for the 2017 American Association of Colleges and Universities national meeting, January 2017; the acceptance rate for proposals was 20%.
- Great launch celebration for the African American Studies major program and (tomorrow evening) the Environmental Policy and Decision-Making major program as well!

Board of Trustees Meeting: Preparation for Board meetings always takes much preparation, so thank you for your patience when your emails do not get responded to right away.

1. What trustees are reading: The readings for the October 2016 meeting are posted on the Faculty Conversation Soundnet site (Board of Trustees folder -> Trustee Readings folder -> October 2016 folder). These include the August 2016 Association of Governing Boards *Statement on Campus Climate, Inclusion, and Civility*; a one-page summary responses to questions from that document regarding campus policies and practices; two short pieces from the American Association of Colleges and Universities on high impact practices; and the November 2015 *Chronicle of Higher Education*

collection of essays on *Race on Campus* (the latter submitted by ASUPS President Noah Lumbantobing).

2. The Board workshop is on the Puget Sound student experience. I appreciate the preparation and participation by our faculty and student representatives to the Board – Terry Beck, Education (stepping in for Dan Burgard, Chemistry), Megan Showalter '17, Development and Alumni Relations Committee); Sigrun Bodine, Mathematics and Computer Science, and Collin Noble '19, for Academic and Student Affairs Committee; Alisa Kessel, Politics and Government, Faculty Senate Chair and Noah Lumbantobing '17, ASUPS President; and Eric Orlin, Classics, and Elena Becker '17, Finance and Facilities Committee – as well as Director of Institutional Research and Retention Ellen Peters, who has pulled together much of the student data for the workshop.
3. The Academic and Student Affairs Committee will address in open session revision to the Teaching in Retirement Policy (discussed in my September update), the annual report on the graduate programs, and academic, enrollment, and student affairs updates. In closed session, trustee committee members will address one evaluation carried over from 2015-16.

Committees and Work Groups:

1. Study Abroad Work Group has had two meetings, doing good and collaborative work.
2. Faculty Advancement Committee begins its 2016-17 work today. The Committee will complete all evaluations within a group (e.g., the tenure files, then the promotion files, then the three-year assistant files, then the professor and instructor files) before sending evaluation letters to individual faculty members.
3. Budget Task Force began its meetings last week.
 - a. The Academic budget proposal is scheduled for November 10, so I ask that department chairs, program directors, and deans please support Martin Jackson by submitting your budget materials on time. It is a big job to compile and prioritize those materials.
 - b. Budget Task Force **open session for campus is October 20, 11:00**, in the McCormick Room.

Search processes:

- Contact Prof. Dexter Gordon if you would like to participate in the interview process for the Race and Pedagogy Institute Post-doctoral Fellow (or three-year visiting professor) hire for January 2017. The position is funded by a one-time allocation from President *emeritus* Ron Thomas.
- Contact Prof. John Lear if you would like to participate in the opportunity hiring process in History for Dr. Andrew Gomez, currently a Mellon-funded post-doctoral fellow under the *Humanities and Culture in the Digital Age* grant project.

Dates for your calendars:

- Opportunities for campus viewing of Shakti Butler's *Cracking the Codes: The Systems of Racial Inequity* (see www.crackingthecodes.org): **October 18, 2-4 p.m.; November 15, 3-5 p.m.; December 16, 1-3 p.m.** Departments and programs can also request a facilitated group showing by contacting the Office of Diversity and Inclusion. More details, including a link for individual viewing, will be forthcoming.
- Luce Initiative in Southeast Asia and the Environment Symposium: October 28-29; contact Gareth Barkin, Sociology and Anthropology, for more information (includes NW5C participants).
- National Conference on Peer Tutoring in Writing, November 3-6; contact Julie Christoph, CWLT/English, for more information (includes NW5C participants).

Appendix D – Report from Faculty Senate Chair Alisa Kessel

Report to Faculty from Faculty Senate Chair Alisa Kessel

3 October 2016

Strategic planning process:

The Faculty Senate welcomed President Crawford at its September 12th meeting. Among other things, President Crawford discussed the importance of identifying a sound process this year (2016-7) for developing a successful strategic plan in the following year (2017-8). Subsequently, the Faculty Senate has begun a conversation about how best to support the faculty in considering options for these processes, prioritizing faculty concerns, and communicating those concerns to the President. The Senate will continue to work to facilitate this discussion in the months ahead.

Charges for standing committees: Much of the conversation at the Faculty Senate retreat in August focused on the Senate's role in clarifying and advancing the priorities of the faculty. As part of that work, the Senate tried to limit the number of charges it assigned to standing committees in order to identify the priorities of the faculty and to support the work that committees already do as part of the standing charges. The Faculty Senate completed approval of additional charges for standing committees in its September 26, 2016, meeting. The Senate issued the following charges:

ASC:

In addition to the ongoing charges in the Faculty Bylaws, the Faculty Senate charges the Academic Standards Committee to review the policy of the university for the transfer of Running Start credits as articulated by the Offices of the Registrar and Admissions and recommend approval or suggest changes.

COD:

In addition to the ongoing charges in the Faculty Bylaws, the Faculty Senate charges the Committee on Diversity to:

1. in collaboration with International Education Committee and the Student Life Committee, develop recommendations for how Puget Sound can best recruit, welcome and support international students;
2. examine responses to Question 6 of the Department and Program Curriculum Review ("In what ways does the curriculum in your department, school, or program reflect the diversity of our society?"), evaluate whether the question elicits productive reflection on how best to support diversity in the curriculum, and propose to the Curriculum Committee, if desired, revised wording of the question; and
3. develop and implement a strategy to educate students about bias in course evaluations.

CC:

In addition to the ongoing charges in the Faculty Bylaws, the Faculty Senate charges the Curriculum Committee to:

1. investigate and report on potential impacts and opportunities of options A and B identified by the Curriculum Committee last year to equalize teaching days in Fall and Spring semester; and
2. create guidelines for unit limits for majors to fit existing practices, core curriculum, and educational goals.

IRB:

In addition to the ongoing charges in the Faculty Bylaws, the Faculty Senate charges the Institutional Review Board to:

1. make recommendations on how the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) fits into the IRB structure;
2. develop training of new IRB members, including procedures for follow-up/transition of protocols and regular reviews of Memoranda of Understanding; and
3. formulate practices for off-campus researchers to conduct research with members of campus community.

IEC:

In addition to the ongoing charges in the Faculty Bylaws, the Faculty Senate charges the International Education Committee to:

1. With respect to the issue of sexual violence:
 - a. Continue the review of sexual violence policies at study abroad programs used by Puget Sound students.
 - b. Finalize and distribute the sexual violence crisis response documents drafted last year.
 - c. Develop sexual violence prevention and response training for Puget Sound faculty and staff involved in Puget Sound study abroad programs;
- 2a. Continue to review the current list of study abroad programs and eliminate programs that do not provide something distinctive (e.g. language, discipline, or geography) or are expensive.
- 2b. Develop language that clearly incorporates this charge into the standing charge that deals with program review;
3. In collaboration with the Committee on Diversity and the Student Life Committee, develop recommendations for how Puget Sound can best recruit, welcome and support international students; and
4. Work with the Office of Institutional Research to gather and analyze study abroad participation rate data for students of color and first-generation students and, based on those findings, make recommendations to address any disparities in participation rates.

LMIS:

In addition to the ongoing charges in the Faculty Bylaws, the Faculty Senate charges the Library, Media, and Information Services Committee to work with Institutional Research and Technology Services to review and [if needed] develop policies concerning the appropriate use of institutional data on campus.

PSC:

In addition to the ongoing charges in the Faculty Bylaws, the Faculty Senate charges the Professional Standards Committee to:

1. recommend to the Senate specific, concrete changes to the evaluation process to mitigate well-documented bias in student evaluations during the evaluation process; and
2. develop a policy or set of guidelines for course/faculty evaluation of team-taught courses.

SLC: The Faculty Senate has no additional charges for the Student Life Committee at this time.

UEC:

In addition to the ongoing charges in the Faculty Bylaws, the Faculty Senate charges the University Enrichment Committee a) to determine whether there is a need to establish a guideline for funding

online, public-access fees for publication and, if the UEC determines there is such a need, b) to create and publish the guideline.

Committee chairs for fall 2016

Academic Standards Committee—Jo Crane (Chemistry)
Committee on Diversity—Kirsten Wilbur (Occupational Therapy)
Curriculum Committee—Elise Richman (Art & Art History)
Faculty Advancement Committee--*has no chair
Institutional Review Board—Tim Beyer (Psychology)
International Education Committee—Lea Fortmann (Economics)
Library, Media, and Information Systems—James Bernhard (Math & Computer Science)
Professional Standards Committee—Jennifer Neighbors (History)
Student Life Committee—Megan Gessel (Chemistry)
University Enrichment Committee—Roger Allen (Physical Therapy)

Common period

At the end of the September 19, 2016, faculty meeting, the faculty had not yet acted to endorse, amend, or withdraw the revised scheduling guideline created by the 2015-6 Faculty Senate. Upon learning that the request for the 2017-8 schedule would be distributed before the next faculty meeting and *would include the 2015-6 revised guideline*, the Faculty Senate decided to reconsider the 2015-6 Senate action to create a common period on Wednesdays from 12:00-1:30. The Senate had not anticipated taking action on the common period at this point, since the faculty was discussing (and presumably would eventually vote on) the matter, yet action seemed necessary in order to allow for the faculty conversation to continue.

In particular, the Senate reconsidered the timing of the common period, after taking into consideration the feedback it received from faculty members at the September 19, 2016, faculty meeting. The Senate perceived widespread support of the common period, but also concern, expressed by some faculty members, about whether there might be a better option for a common period on Tuesdays and Thursdays. The Senate evaluated those concerns using data provided by the Registrar.¹ In the end, the Senate re-affirmed its decision to create a Wednesday midday common period to facilitate faculty governance.² The motion carried without opposition. The Senate elected not to intervene on those

¹ Those data were shared with the faculty in an email to the facultygovernance listserv on September 23, 2016. Some of the data requested by faculty could not be provided by the Registrar (*we did ask!*). For example, requests for information about how particular students might be impacted by changes to the course schedule or how access to electronic classrooms might be impacted are difficult to determine using data based on the *existing* schedule. In essence, we need a model of a new schedule in order to answer those questions. One rationale for the modified guidelines enacted by the Senate on September 26, which *encouraged but did not require* faculty to abide by the common period, and which invited creative scheduling, was to make it possible for the faculty to begin to answer those questions.

² To address those concerns, the Faculty Senate/Senate Chair took the following action in the week of September 19-26, 2016:

- a. asked the Registrar to withhold distribution of the Scheduling Guidelines until the Faculty Senate could review its options and make a determination about how to proceed;
- b. requested, received, and distributed to the faculty a document detailing the number of classes and the number of students enrolled in classes on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays in AY 2015-6 (again, this document was requested by members of the faculty at the September 19th meeting and was distributed via facultygovernance on Friday, September 23; it was redistributed on that same listserv by Nancy Bristow on Thursday, September 29);

matters about which a consensus had yet to emerge (e.g. the length of the common period) and amended the guidelines to allow for continued discussion of these matters by the faculty at its October 10, 2016, meeting. The aim was to have workable scheduling guidelines for the AY 2017-8 even though we knew that some of the conversation about the common period would be ongoing.

The amended guideline is (amended portion is italicized):

“Faculty members’ involvement in the business of the shared governance of the university is essential. In order to facilitate deliberation and decision making that is most broadly inclusive of faculty colleagues, it is incumbent on the university to assure a Common Period where governance-related meetings can take place, and to maximize the opportunity for colleagues to participate during the work day. Wednesdays between Noon and 1:30 p.m. will constitute the Common Period. Departments should avoid scheduling classes during this time so that as many faculty members as possible are available to participate in the affairs of governance that concern the whole community.

If classes must be scheduled from 1:00-1:30, they should only be scheduled with these criteria in mind: 1) the course schedule necessitates the use of the slot, 2) when possible, courses in this slot should be staffed by instructors who do not have voting rights, and 3) if faculty members must be scheduled in this slot, they should be scheduled on a rotating basis (from semester to semester), to ensure that no faculty member is routinely disenfranchised.”

In considering this motion, the Faculty Senate utilized two criteria:

1. to minimize adverse impact on course schedules, while
2. maximizing the likelihood that faculty members could participate in governance.

Although the second criterion enumerated here has received less attention in full faculty meetings than the concern about scheduling impacts (and classroom availability) has, the minutes from the 2015-6 Senate indicate that the second concern was a central consideration in determining the best time for the common period. The Senate (both 2015-6 and 2016-7) has been especially reluctant to implement a common period that seems to disenfranchise, systematically, a large part of the faculty (and untenured or junior faculty particularly). The results from the 2014 Senate-administered survey on faculty governance (relevant portions were included in the FAQ that was recently distributed via the facultygovernance listserv) also suggest that the Senate’s attention to these concerns is warranted.

In light of positive feedback from Staff Senate and ASUPS Senate, the Faculty Senate also wanted to ensure that the common period would afford those bodies opportunities for their own governance. The Senate has worked to facilitate a conversation that is open and accessible for all, in which the concerns of the faculty are heard and addressed as much as possible, and in which we have distributed the best data available to facilitate sound decision-making.

c. reviewed reports, feedback, and minutes from last year’s ASC, Faculty Senate, and full faculty meetings to re-evaluate the rationale used to establish a common period at noon on Wednesdays; and

d. communicated with department chairs in Biology, Chemistry, Music, OT, and PT (departments whose scheduling demands are unusual and which seemed to be hardest hit by the creation of a common period). The purpose of that communication was to confirm, in light of discussion at the Monday (9/19) faculty meeting, that the Wednesday noon slot was still considered workable. Of those five departments, all five agreed that the Wednesday midday period was workable (and in some cases, strongly preferred over other options). Both the OT and Music programs had already re-worked part or all of their course schedules to accommodate the 12-1:30 Wednesday common period.

Ad hoc committee on Faculty Code sexual misconduct procedures

The Sexual and Gender Violence Committee (SGVC) has worked with relevant on-campus governing bodies over the last year to revise the University's sexual misconduct policies (for staff, students, and faculty) so that they will be compatible with Title IX and Department of Justice guidance regarding sexual misconduct. This year, the SGVC is working to ensure that the student, staff, and faculty procedures regarding allegations of sexual misconduct are also compatible with Title IX and DOJ guidance.

After some discussion, the Faculty Senate passed a motion on October 3, 2016: "to establish an ad hoc committee to: review the Faculty Code's compliance with the standards of investigation and adjudication required by Title IX and Justice Department guidance regarding sexual misconduct and, if appropriate, develop a policy clarifying and updating procedures around sexual misconduct alleged either by or against faculty. The committee shall be composed of at least three faculty members, including faculty representatives from the Professional Standards Committee, the Student Life Committee, and the policy and procedures subcommittee of the Sexual and Gender Violence Committee. The Academic Vice President will serve on the committee in an advisory role."

Board meeting

The Board retreat will be held in Kirkland, WA October 6-8, 2016. The theme of the workshop for this retreat is "The Student Experience." I will attend as an *ex officio* (non-voting) member of the Executive Committee of the Board. Board committee representatives Sigrun Bodine (Mathematics and Computer Science, representative on Academic and Student Affairs) and Eric Orlin (Classics, representative on Finance and Facilities) will attend the meeting and participate in the workshop. Terry Beck (Education) will also attend and participate in the workshop.

Kind regards,

Alisa Kessel
Faculty Senate Chair
Associate Professor and Chair, Politics & Government

Appendix E - Information related to the Common Period discussion that was circulated with the agenda ahead of the meeting

FAQ: The Common Period

Status of the common period: after several years of consideration, the 2015-6 Faculty Senate approved a change to the Scheduling Guidelines for classes, creating a 12-1:30 common period each Wednesday.

The amended guidelines state: "Faculty members' involvement in the business of the shared governance of the university is essential. In order to facilitate deliberation and decision making that is most broadly inclusive of faculty colleagues, it is incumbent on the university to assure a Common Period where governance-related meetings can take place, and to maximize the opportunity for colleagues to participate during the work day. Wednesdays between Noon and 1:30 p.m. will constitute the Common Period. Departments should avoid scheduling classes during this time so that as many faculty members as possible are available to participate in the affairs of governance that concern the whole community."

You can find a summary of the 2015-6 Faculty Senate action on this item in Ariela Tubert's last report to the faculty here <http://www.pugetsound.edu/files/resources/senatechairreport_04_12_16.pdf>.

What is the rationale for a common period?

The effort to establish a common period is one in a suite of efforts to strengthen faculty governance at Puget Sound. Current scheduling results in many faculty members being unable to attend faculty meetings and participate in this aspect of faculty governance. The intention of the common period is to create a reliable and consistent time in our schedules in which members of the faculty can prioritize participation in faculty deliberation and decision-making. While it is true that a change to our institutional arrangements does not guarantee a change in the culture around faculty governance, it is also likely that the culture will not change without institutional changes. In other words, there will be more work to do to strengthen faculty governance even if a common period is created, but the common period will at least ensure that strong faculty governance can be a priority if the faculty wishes it to be.

In addition, the common period will facilitate creative thinking about opportunities for other meetings, events, and initiatives for faculty, staff, and students.

Why is the common period being discussed?

The conversation about the common period has been going on for many years. In the 2014 Faculty Senate-administered survey on faculty governance, faculty members who do not already regularly attend faculty meetings were asked to identify circumstances in which they would be more likely to attend:

- 49% indicated they would be more likely to attend if meeting times didn't conflict with their teaching schedules
- 39% said they would be more likely to attend if meeting times didn't conflict with other professional obligations
- 42% said they would be more like to attend if meeting times didn't conflict with personal obligations

The Faculty Senate hopes that a designated common period will help strengthen faculty participation at faculty meetings by ensuring that faculty meetings do not conflict with teaching schedules or with some predictable professional and personal obligations.

What process brought us to our current conversation?

In frequent consultation with the Faculty Senate, the 2015-6 Academic Standards Committee (policy subcommittee) spent many months researching options for the common period. (The ASC had been charged with locating a common period in 2013-4 and 2014-5, but had been unable to make a recommendation, primarily due to constraints related to PeopleSoft implementation.) The ASC considered several options, informed by input from the Office of the Registrar. In addition to considering a common period (which affects every week of the term), the ASC discussed the possibility of alternatives for faculty governance (like in-service days). On recommendation from the committee, the chair (Holland) put a few options forward to the departments that are most likely to be challenged by the creation of a common period (the sciences, the Music program, and the graduate programs; she heard back from many, but not all, of the departments she polled). With feedback from those groups, the ASC made a recommendation to the Senate to create a common period from either 8:00-9:30 or 3:00-4:30 on Wednesdays. The Senate discussed the recommendations (over several meetings), and then asked Holland to return to the ASC to gauge its sense of the efficacy of other, midday common periods due to concern that an early morning or late afternoon common period would consistently burden our colleagues with children, since the common period would extend beyond the normal operating hours of local schools. After consideration of the impact of several Wednesday mid-afternoon options (particularly on the scheduling of labs), the ASC recommended that the Faculty Senate amend the Scheduling Guidelines to include a common period from 12:00-1:30 on Wednesdays.

In response to feedback to this measure from faculty at the April 2016 faculty meeting, the 2016-7 Chair of the Faculty Senate (Kessel) met with the Chair and former Chair of the Department of Chemistry (Burgard and Crane, respectively), the Director of the School of Music (Ward), the Registrar (Tomhave), the former ASC chair (Holland) and the Associate Dean (Kukreja). A modified proposal (described below) arose from these conversations. The 2016-17 Faculty Senate has continued discussions of the proposed common period.

Why was this particular common period (Wednesday, 12-1:30) chosen?

The 12:00-1:30 Wednesday common period was selected because it is in the middle of the day and the middle of the week. Here are some arguments that inform each of those decisions:

TIME OF DAY: The common period is 90 minutes long because it has been our practice to hold 90-minute faculty meetings (the Faculty Bylaws stipulate that the length of meetings of the faculty shall not exceed 90 minutes, III.2.B). Early morning and late afternoon common periods are difficult for many of our colleagues with families (particularly those with childcare needs). Afternoon common periods are also challenging for the lab schedules in many of our science departments. This is especially true for labs that are four hours long, must use designated lab space, and must be offered in almost every available time slot each week to accommodate student demand. There is also a greater likelihood that faculty will be on campus during a noon common period. In consultation with the Registrar, it was determined that the 12-1 slot regularly has fewer classes and impacts fewer students than the 11-12 slot.

DAY OF WEEK: Given the frequency with which faculty travel (particularly for conferences), a Monday or Friday common period would likely yield lower than desired attendance rates.

How would the course schedule change?

The current proposal, passed by last year's Faculty Senate, revised the Scheduling Guidelines to designate a common period from 12:00-1:30 on Wednesdays.

A *modification* of the original proposal, which has been vetted by some members of the faculty, but *has not been passed* would designate 12-1:30 as the common period, with the understanding that NO classes will be scheduled from 12-1 and that, if classes must be scheduled in the 1:00 period, they will only be scheduled with these criteria in mind: 1) the course schedule necessitates the use of the slot, 2) when possible, courses in this slot will be staffed by instructors who are not members of the faculty (that is, who do not have voting rights) and 3) if faculty members must be scheduled into the 1pm slot, they will be scheduled on a rotating basis (from semester to semester), to ensure that no faculty member is routinely disenfranchised.

Both the current and modified proposal permit the addition of an 80 minute course slot on MF from 12:00-1:20pm.

Would some departments be negatively impacted by this change? If so, what efforts will be taken to mitigate that impact?

While all of us will feel some impact, some departments may feel the pinch more than others. This is especially true of departments with labs, clinics, and rehearsals. Further, in some of these departments, the 12-1pm period on Wednesdays may be the only available time for a department meeting.

One way to mitigate some of these effects is to 1) ensure that the common period is reserved for department use when it is not being used for faculty meetings; 2) have continued assessment of student and faculty impact immediately following implementation (to see if unanticipated pressure is felt on other class enrollment, lab prep etc.); 3) ensure that important votes come up earlier (that is, during the 12-1pm part of the faculty meeting) so that faculty affected by a 1pm scheduled class can maximally participate in voting.

(How) has the Registrar assessed the impact on student schedules?

In response to requests from the ASC and the Faculty Senate chair, the Registrar provided:

- information about availability of classroom space
- assessment of impacts of various common periods on teaching schedules
- information about current class scheduling, including the number of slots offered at each time (including, for 11 a.m. and 12 p.m. courses, disaggregating graduate and undergraduate courses and identifying the total number of students impacted)
- insight about how to consider other (non-class) scheduling demands, including athletics, labs, studio time, clinics, and music lessons
- advice about which common period is the most manageable across mid-day time slots

Is there sufficient classroom space to accommodate this change?

As noted above, the Registrar has determined that there is sufficient classroom space across campus to accommodate the proposed change.

What can be scheduled during the common period?

The faculty will determine how the common period is used.

Some suggestions (which focus on faculty governance) include:

- reserving the remaining common periods for department use (meetings, programming, etc).
- scheduling some standing committee meetings during this time. (Note: not all can be scheduled in this time because each dean has multiple committee assignments.)

Student and staff groups can also use the common period to facilitate governance or, in the case of students, to hold conversations that can conceivably include the entire student body.

Would the common period adversely impact the Diner/Dining and Catering Services?

No. After communicating with the staff of the Diner, Director of DCS Terry Halverson wrote: "At our meeting yesterday we discussed the ?common period? concept and concluded that a 90 minute free period from noon to 1:30 p.m. on Wednesdays would not place undue pressure on the Diner. Instead, having a 90 minute window without classes might help spread the business out. On Mondays and Wednesdays we experience heavy volume in the Diner at 11:00 a.m., 12:00 p.m. and 1:00 p.m. as classes end and students head directly to lunch. The rushes last for 20 to 25 minutes and then it quiets down for 30 minutes. If there were a ninety minute window without classes the business would naturally spread out and some students will choose to leave campus for lunch."

What is the student/ASUPS response to this proposed change?

(We hope to have feedback from the ASUPS Senate by Friday, September 16.)

- Both 2015-6 student representatives to the ASC expressed enthusiasm at the possibilities created by a common period (particularly possibilities for student club meetings, brown-bag lectures, and discussions that could be held during this time).
- Both 2016-7 student representatives to the Faculty Senate expressed enthusiasm at the possibilities created by a common period (particularly possibilities for meetings of the entire student body).

What is the staff response to this proposed change?

(We hope to have feedback from the Staff Senate by Friday, September 16.)

When would this change be implemented?

Depending on the faculty's action, this change could be implemented as early as AY 2017-8. The faculty can also ask the Faculty Senate to revisit the efficacy of this common period after a trial period of implementation.

What objections have been raised (that are not addressed above)?

Process: some faculty have expressed concern that the 12-1:30 Wednesday time slot was not vetted by all department chairs before a recommendation was made to the Faculty Senate.

Impact on students: some faculty have expressed concern that student schedules will be unduly constrained by the loss of the 12:00 MWF time slot.

Availability of 50-minute slots: some departments would be challenged by the loss of two 50-minute course slots. (The *modified* proposal described above, which allows some scheduling during from 1-2pm, attempts to resolve this problem.)

ASUPS Senate feedback on the proposed common period
(submitted by ASUPS faculty representative Steven Neshyba):

The response was altogether quite positive.

-One senator reported that he asked a few friends about it, and no serious concern came up.

-President Lumbantobing expressed the idea that it could be a good opportunity for students, e.g., club meetings.

-I [Steven] mentioned the possibility that an idea that is going around is to make it noon-1 pm instead of noon-1:30. Responding to that, a senator expressed concern that professors would be able to make it on time to a 1 pm class. Another point made was that if the Monday/Friday noon slot were kept open, students who have afternoon labs or other commitments would be able to eat lunch.

-Lumbantobing summed up the sentiment by saying that the proposal “looks like a good deal for everybody”.

Data on class enrollments at different times provided by the Registrar –

Tuesday		Graduate	Graduate	Undergraduate	Undergraduate	Total	Total
Term	Time	Classes in Session	Students in Class	Classes in Session	Students in Class	Classes in Session	Students in Class
Fall 2015	8:00	6	175	24	570	30	745
Fall 2015	9:00	11	367	66	1277	77	1644
Fall 2015	10:00	11	347	71	1417	82	1764
Fall 2015	11:00	17	270	71	1307	88	1577
Fall 2015	12:00	17	240	96	1736	113	1976
Fall 2015	13:00	11	214	75	1232	86	1446
Fall 2015	14:00	11	214	66	916	77	1130
Fall 2015	15:00	5	158	83	1164	88	1322
Fall 2015	16:00	6	148	42	573	48	721
Spring 2016	8:00	6	78	14	326	20	404
Spring 2016	9:00	14	193	70	1282	84	1475
Spring 2016	10:00	9	134	75	1391	84	1525
Spring 2016	11:00	5	102	69	1165	74	1267
Spring 2016	12:00	3	38	99	1690	102	1728
Spring 2016	13:00	8	157	75	1166	83	1323
Spring 2016	14:00	12	273	66	898	78	1171
Spring 2016	15:00	12	254	85	1202	97	1456
Spring 2016	16:00	17	322	42	560	59	882

Wednesday		Graduate	Graduate	Undergraduate	Undergraduate	Total	Total
Term	Time	Classes in Session	Students in Class	Classes in Session	Students in Class	Classes in Session	Students in Class
Fall 2015	8:00	10	274	5	59	15	333
Fall 2015	9:00	11	294	45	943	56	1237
Fall 2015	10:00	11	234	66	1243	77	1477
Fall 2015	11:00	18	233	72	1247	90	1480
Fall 2015	12:00	16	202	37	626	53	828
Fall 2015	13:00	18	339	65	896	83	1235
Fall 2015	14:00	14	253	81	1109	95	1362
Fall 2015	15:00	4	121	80	993	84	1114
Fall 2015	16:00	4	63	32	431	36	494
Spring 2016	8:00	5	160	3	38	8	198
Spring 2016	9:00	7	230	37	734	44	964
Spring 2016	10:00	7	106	63	1129	70	1235
Spring 2016	11:00	7	106	63	1129	70	1235
Spring 2016	12:00	2	30	43	746	45	776
Spring 2016	13:00	6	162	57	890	63	1052
Spring 2016	14:00	7	177	77	1080	84	1257
Spring 2016	15:00	7	156	78	1113	85	1269
Spring 2016	16:00	10	131	34	520	44	651

Thursday		Graduate	Graduate	Undergraduate	Undergraduate	Total	Total
Term	Time	Classes in Session	Students in Class	Classes in Session	Students in Class	Classes in Session	Students in Class
Fall 2015	8:00	6	209	21	517	27	726
Fall 2015	9:00	10	361	62	1276	72	1637
Fall 2015	10:00	10	342	61	1276	71	1618
Fall 2015	11:00	16	265	62	1154	78	1419
Fall 2015	12:00	20	306	112	1961	132	2267
Fall 2015	13:00	12	246	73	1204	85	1450
Fall 2015	14:00	11	215	64	898	75	1113
Fall 2015	15:00	5	159	77	1086	82	1245
Fall 2015	16:00	5	144	29	404	34	548
Spring 2016	8:00	5	72	16	389	21	461
Spring 2016	9:00	9	165	67	1248	76	1413
Spring 2016	10:00	4	108	70	1316	74	1424
Spring 2016	11:00	4	126	62	1069	66	1195
Spring 2016	12:00	6	122	95	1584	101	1706
Spring 2016	13:00	8	180	68	1032	76	1212
Spring 2016	14:00	10	180	62	857	72	1037
Spring 2016	15:00	6	118	79	1140	85	1258
Spring 2016	16:00	16	228	34	478	50	706

Appendix F –

First reading of proposal to amend Section 6.B.b.6 of the Faculty Bylaws (regarding standing charges to the Curriculum Committee):

Original:

review the curriculum of each department, school, or program at least once every five years.

Proposed amendment:

review the curriculum of each department, school, or program at least once every seven years.

Appendix G – Slides shown by Ariela Tubert and Alisa Kessel in their update about Faculty Senate activities related to the Common Period

Slide 1

Action of the 2015-6 Faculty Senate

On March 28, 2016, the Faculty Senate amended the “Principles on Which to Base the Schedule of Classes,” adopted by the Senate in 2007, by adding the following new principle:

“Faculty members’ involvement in the business of the shared governance of the university is essential. In order to facilitate deliberation and decision making that is most broadly inclusive of faculty colleagues, it is incumbent on the university to assure a Common Period where governance-related meetings can take place, and to maximize the opportunity for colleagues to participate during the work day. Wednesdays between Noon and 1:30 will constitute the Common Period. Departments should avoid scheduling classes during this time so that as many faculty members as possible are available to participate in the affairs of governance that concern the whole community.”

Slide 2

Rationale for 2015-6 Faculty Senate Action

The importance of faculty governance and of prioritizing time for governance.

Recommendation following extensive work of the Academic Standards Committee.

Conclusion that a mid-day option would be best given:

the existing conflicts with the 4pm slot: teaching, personal obligations

attendance at faculty meetings is unlikely to increase with an 8am meeting time

The Academic Standards Committee recommended Wednesday 12-1:30 as a viable mid-day option (voted on by the committee during its 3/11/16 meeting.)

The Senate saw this option as an improvement over the *status quo*, which creates conflicts for many people because it would minimize adverse impact on course schedules, while maximizing the likelihood that faculty members could participate in governance.

Slide 3

Response to concerns raised at the April 2016 faculty meeting:

- Impact on campus community (DCS, staff, students)
- Loss of two 50-minute MWF slots
- Impact on overall course schedule and room availability
- Desire for a more open process for sharing information about choosing a common period

Slide 4

Outcome of summer Senate action: a modified proposal

The common period is on Wednesdays from 12-1:30; classes should not be scheduled from 12-1. If the period from 1:00-1:30 must be used, faculty should schedule using the following criteria:

- 1) the course schedule necessitates the use of the slot,*
- 2) when possible, courses in this slot should be staffed by instructors who do not have voting rights, and*
- 3) if faculty members must be scheduled in this slot, they should be scheduled on a rotating basis (from semester to semester), to ensure that no faculty member is routinely disenfranchised.*

Slide 5

Rationale for amendment to the scheduling guidelines, September 26, 2016

- the faculty had not taken action but seemed supportive of the common period
- the Senate re-considered of options using new information
- “soft” implementation of the common period with sufficient ‘wiggle room’ for those departments and programs that require it
- opportunity for continued discussion of contested issues (such as the length of the common period) at the October 10th faculty meeting

Slide 6

Current guidelines (as of September 26, 2016)

The amended guideline is (amended portion is italicized):

“Faculty members’ involvement in the business of the shared governance of the university is essential. In order to facilitate deliberation and decision making that is most broadly inclusive of faculty colleagues, it is incumbent on the university to assure a Common Period where governance-related meetings can take place, and to maximize the opportunity for colleagues to participate during the work day. Wednesdays between Noon and 1:30 p.m. will constitute the Common Period. Departments should avoid scheduling classes during this time so that as many faculty members as possible are available to participate in the affairs of governance that concern the whole community.

If classes must be scheduled from 1:00-1:30, they should only be scheduled with these criteria in mind: 1) the course schedule necessitates the use of the slot, 2) when possible, courses in this slot should be staffed by instructors who do not have voting rights, and 3) if faculty members must be scheduled in this slot, they should be scheduled on a rotating basis (from semester to semester), to ensure that no faculty member is routinely disenfranchised.”

Appendix H – Motion regarding the Common Period (brought by Bill Barry)

Motion: To change the common period, as defined in the “Principles on Which to Base the Schedule of Classes” (last amended by Faculty Senate, 9/26/16) from 12:00-1:30 to 12:00-1:00 p.m. and to delete the paragraph that begins, “If classes must be scheduled from 1:00-1:30...”

Changes to current “Principles on Which to Base the Schedule of Classes” (last amended by Faculty Senate 9/26/16), as proposed by this motion:

Faculty members’ involvement in the business of the shared governance of the university is essential. In order to facilitate deliberation and decision making that is most broadly inclusive of faculty colleagues, it is incumbent on the university to assure a Common Period where governance-related meetings can take place, and to maximize the opportunity for colleagues to participate during the work day. Wednesdays between Noon and 1:00 p.m. will constitute the Common Period. Departments should avoid scheduling classes during this time so that as many faculty members as possible are available to participate in the affairs of governance that concern the whole community.

~~If classes must be scheduled from 1:00-1:30, they should only be scheduled with these criteria in mind: 1) the course schedule necessitates the use of the slot, 2) when possible, courses in this slot should be staffed by instructors who do not have voting rights, and 3) if faculty members must be scheduled in this slot, they should be scheduled on a rotating basis (from semester to semester), to ensure that no faculty member is routinely disenfranchised.~~

Appendix I – Information brought by Jim Evans regarding courses offered on MWF currently

M-W-F Undergraduate Classes 2015-2016 Academic Year

Fall 2015 (Total of 244 MWF courses offered)	Number of courses	As a percentage		
12:00 p.m.	28 courses	11.5%	} 26.6 %	526 students
1:00 p.m.	37 courses	15.2%		597 students

Spring 2016 (Total of 231 MWF courses offered)	Number of courses	As a percentage		
12:00 p.m.	33 courses	14.3%	} 27.7 %	617 students
1:00 p.m.	31 courses	13.4%		553 students