

Faculty Senate Minutes

April 24, 2006

Senators: Barry Anton (Chair), Kris Bartanen, Nancy Bristow, Derek Buescher, Bill Haltom, Suzanne Holland, John Hanson, Max Harris, Eric Orlin, Keith Maxwell, Barbara Racine, Jessie Rowe, Ross Singleton, David Sousa, and Peter Wimberger.

Guests: Greta Austin, Terry Beck, Martin Jackson, Chris McKim, Ray Preiss, David Tinsley, Mike Valentine

Senate Chair Anton called the meeting to order at 4:30 pm.

The minutes from the April 10 meeting were approved as amended (to include the fact that Buescher was present).

Announcements

Elections for the Faculty Senate and the FAC are ongoing. One faculty member on sabbatical in Germany thanked the Senate secretary for having online voting. Sousa noted that some faculty had noted troubles with the online voting. It was suggested that they contact the Senate secretary, Eric Orlin.

Bartanen announced that Sherry Mondou and Rosa Beth Gibson were working with University Counsel on revisions to the Early Retirement Plan that are required due to changes in the Internal Revenue Code (Section 409A). The gist of the change is that faculty members will no longer be able to choose between either a lump sum payment or a multi-year payment plan. Only a lump sum payment will be possible in the future. This will require a one sentence amendment to the Faculty Code. More information will be forthcoming with all details in Fall 2006.

Bartanen also distributed a copy of the most recent outline of the University's strategic plan.

Anton noted that on Wednesday at 4 pm there will be a retirement reception for Jim Davis. The Senate will present a gift and proclamation at the reception.

Holland announced a talk by Greta Austin and Doug Edwards on the Gospel of Judas (Thursday, 5 pm in WSC 101).

Reports from Faculty Senate Committees

The reports presented to the Senate are appended as attachments. The minutes below do not repeat information already presented in those reports.

Institutional Review Board (Ray Preiss)

Preiss reported that John Finney is the person that files all the appropriate paperwork to keep us in compliance with federal guidelines related to research protocols. Preiss suggested that it would be prudent to have Finney train someone else in this process, (just as a hedge against the possibility that Finney may eventually want to retire).

Preiss also reported that the IRB is involved in ongoing discussions with the Comparative Sociology department about how to accommodate situations where an ethnographer needs to adapt research protocols on the fly in reaction to what they are observing in the field. He also reported that the IRB has been working with the Psychology department to clarify which type of research protocols involving deception require a full IRB review and which types don't.

Orlin wondered about whether we are in violation of federal law since we do not have a "compliance officer". Wimberger wondered what other small schools do. Preiss replied that 80% of small schools do less than we do. Holland opined that the federal guidelines are more geared to Research 1 institutions, so we may be doing more than we need to do.

M/S/P to receive the report from the IRB.

Diversity Committee (Terry Beck and Mike Valentine)

Sousa was interested in getting more information about the statement in the report that the Diversity Committee was meeting with the PSC to discuss inserting language relating to diversity into faculty evaluation criteria. Beck clarified that the focus is to put language into the "Faculty Evaluation Criteria and Procedures". In response to a question from Holland about the purpose of this new language, he elaborated that the University values diversity on campus (as evidenced the University's mission statement) and that this value needs to be acknowledged and articulated in other University documents. Faculty should be recognized for their efforts to promote or support diversity.

Holland wondered about how a department chair would recognize and reward this? Valentine replied that if you are mentoring a student organization that promotes diversity or if you are in other ways helping students of color, this should be recognized as a positive contribution to University service.

Sousa noted that there are things in the mission statement that aren't reflected in the "Faculty Evaluation Criteria and Procedures" document. He wondered how this would be weighed in an evaluation. Is it a "bump or a demerit"? He was not sure that this needed to be in the evaluation document. Bartanen replied that the proposal is not to change the various evaluation categories in the code, it is just to insert the University mission statement and diversity statement into the "Faculty Evaluation Criteria and Procedures" document. The goal is to allow work related to supporting diversity on campus be recognized as University service in evaluations.

M/S/P to receive the report from Diversity Committee.

Student Life Committee (Chris McKim)

In addition to the work described in their report, the SLC has been struggling to find a sense of direction and clearly define its role. The student affairs office has become much more active than they were 20 years ago and now deals with many issues that the SLC might have dealt with in the past. The SLC is working to find how it can serve as a resource for others. Buescher wondered whether the SLC should be sunsetted in favor of other forms of faculty involvement. McKim replied that the SLC did not think it should be sunsetted, they still feel that they are an important faculty voice about issues surrounding student life. It's just that there are some redundancies that have been introduced by changes in student affairs. The SLC is working closely with the Dean of Students to help define its role.

Rowe inquired about the Committee's work on Charge #4: "To explore on campus living needs of Juniors and Seniors". She was concerned that part of the Master Plan is to take replace campus houses with apartments, which seems to go against the desire of Juniors and Seniors to have more house-like living arrangements. Singleton noted that there is a Master Plan Implementation Team that deals with these types of issues. Bartanen noted that in the current master plan the Lawrence St. houses are not eliminated. In addition, she pointed out that the Apartment and Townhouse style units that are proposed in the master plan are different from the Suite-style units (e.g., they have full kitchens). Bartanen also noted that these developments are many years in the future, and as the time approaches for these parts of the master plan to be implemented, there will be new surveys and opportunities for input into the actual form that they will take.

Rowe also inquired about how the hardware used for the "Optimum Power" substance abuse prevention program could be used for other programs. (Apparently this hardware consists of a series of keypads that students can use to answer questions. The results are then processed and immediately displayed on a screen.) Harris replied that in his High School a teacher had used this technology in class to ask students questions and get immediate feedback on whether the class as a whole had a good understanding of the material.

M/S/P to receive the report from the Student Life Committee.

Faculty Advancement Committee (Kris Bartanen)

The FAC did not file a written report. Bartanen reported that the FAC had evaluated 44 files, plus an additional 7 files under the new "streamlined" process. They are still working.

Holland inquired as to whether any consideration had been given to having FAC members get two release units instead of the one they get now. Bartanen replied that this would be essentially equivalent to a full faculty position. She concluded by noting that the matter was not under active discussion.

Haltom inquired into whether the FAC was going to appoint a chair. Bartanen replied that they would consider this after they were done with their work.

Wimberger wondered about whether it would be useful to have a written report from the FAC that outlined a summary of the actions taken. Anton noted that bylaws mandate that a request for a report be made, so he had done so. Bartanen said that she would ask the committee to write a report. Haltom noted that in the past the reports used to be "done on the fly".

M/S/P to receive the report from the Faculty Advancement Committee.

Academic Standards Committee (Martin Jackson)

Hanson expressed concern about the new withdrawal policy since it would be harder to encourage students who had a poor first exam to keep trying and see how they did on the second exam before deciding to withdraw since under the new policy he would clearly be expected to give a WF whereas under the old policy he felt he could give a W.

Jackson replied that there was a lot of discussion in the ASC about how to change the policy and the new policy was a compromise that extends the period for automatic W to 6 weeks but then is clearer about the requirement that a WF be given after this time unless there are exceptional circumstances. He suggested that there is value to insisting that students commit to a course early. He noted that a proposal to extend the W period through the 12th week was defeated last year.

Singleton also supported the notion of allowing faculty to work longer with students before being required to give a WF which he characterized as a punitive grade. He inquired as to how many other schools have WF grades. Jackson replied that we are the only school in the Northwest, and one only a few in the country that have WF's: most just have W's. Jackson personally agreed with Singleton about getting rid of the WF, but reported that the proposal to abolish the WF was rejected by the ASC.

Jackson also reported that in the 04-05 academic year there were 60 W's and 10 WF's recorded in the 15th week. He noted that this was problematic to the ASC. They tried to solve this problem by extending the automatic W period and then making the WF harder to avoid.

Haltom noted that this could be an issue that the Faculty Senate might take up at its summer retreat. Wimberger noted that it could also be taken up at a Faculty meeting.

Holland thanked the ASC for their report on course scheduling. She also noted that there were no particular recommendations in the report. Jackson noted that there was a sense on the committee that this was a complex issue that was outside of their purview.

Bartanen noted that with the construction/renovation of Thompson Hall there is a lot of creative scheduling going on to make things work. Orlin inquired as to whether there

would be more classroom space after the completion of the science building project. Bartanen was not sure.

Holland noted that she didn't want this issue to get dropped and all the work of the ASC to be lost. Anton noted that we could take it up at the Faculty Senate retreat. Jackson noted that the faculty had looked at this two times (1999 and now) and that both times there was no action recommended. He opined that the current system makes everyone modestly dissatisfied.

Wimberger inquired about whether Jackson thought the committee would be able to finish up the transcribing issue this year. Jackson said that they probably wouldn't finish it up this year, but that John Finney would be working to prepare some mock ups of possible transcripts that the committee could look at next year.

M/S/P to receive the report from the Academic Standards Committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:50 pm.

Submitted by,

John Hanson



The University of
Puget Sound

Office Memorandum

TO: Barry Anton, Chair
Faculty Senate
FROM: Ray Preiss, Chair
Institutional Review Board
DATE: April 19, 2006
RE: Institutional Review Board End-of-year Report

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) entered the 2005-2006 academic year with the charges of implementing the Puget Sound guidelines for protecting human subjects (monitoring and reviewing protocols), maintaining a web presence, conducting outreach, and considering changes in policies. I am pleased to report considerable progress on these issues, as this report documents.

On-going Charge to the IRB

Considering our activities this year, we have diligently pursued two standing charges from the Faculty Senate: (a) The routine activities of monitoring protocols and (b) Maintaining our presence on the World Wide Web.

Routine activities: As a Standing Committee, the IRB is tasked with monitoring protocols, maintaining a system for managing records, and deliberating on policy questions. During the 2005-2006 academic year, most of our time was devoted to evaluating protocols. We received and approved 16 protocols during our deliberations.

All deliberations are posted in IRB Committee Minutes. Because the Chair is often contacted with questions related to these deliberations, the Chair's Notebook tracks all protocols. The Associate Deans Office is the repository of records, protocols, and final reports.

Presence on the World Wide Web: The IRB established a presence on the World Wide Web in the Summer of 1998 (www.ups.edu/dean/irb/). Documents posted on the IRB Web Page include the revised IRB Guidelines document and various forms for protocol preparation. These forms can be downloaded. In addition, the Web Page includes the IRB policy on the Ethical Care and Use of Animals that was adopted in the Spring of 1998. Based upon work three years ago, the IRB provides a link to the University of Puget Sound IACUC. Forms and procedures are now available on the IACUC Web Page.

We continue to add documents and links to resources that may assist student and faculty researchers. Currently we post links to the National Institutes of Health Office of Extra-mural Research, as well as an array of on-line resources useful to active researchers and students enrolled in research methods courses or engaged in independent research projects. In addition, the page now includes a description of the activities of the IRB, a roster of IRB members and department IRB designates, scheduled IRB meetings, and a list of frequently asked questions.

Informal feedback regarding the Web Page continues to be favorable. The Web Page is consulted regularly for forms and procedures, to resolve questions related to individual research projects, and as a guide for protocol preparation. We will continue to refine the Web Page as the needs of our students and faculty evolve. We are pleased to report that the Web Page has increased the visibility of the IRB and provides a useful resource.

One charge from the Faculty Senate was to establish a Frequently Asked Questions page on the web. This year we gathered possible questions for this page. To date, 35 potential questions have been generated. We have searched IRB web sites at other universities, examined questions used by Federal regulators, and identified issues idiosyncratic to UPS researchers. In an effort to tailor questions to Puget Sound needs, we are currently pruning the list and outlining UPS-IRB answers. We expect to post the FAQs in 2006-2007.

Outreach to the University Community

This year the IRB continued its efforts on the area of outreach and education. We were contacted by members of the Comparative Sociology department regarding the impact of IRB review upon class assignments involving ethnographic research. The IRB is anxious to avoid becoming a burden for research methods courses. The tradeoff involves potential risks when students collect observations off campus. This discussion is currently underway with Comparative Sociology colleagues.

A related outreach effort was initiative with colleagues in the Psychology Department. Because various members of the department disagreed over the interpretation of experimental social procedures (the use of 'cover stories'), the

department asked for input regarding student projects that deceived participants in order to attain responses and projects that used a cover story followed by debriefing. In the “hard deception” category, participants might be placed in a simulation where they were could help a “lost” student who was actually a confederate. In the “soft deception” category, participants might be asked to read newspaper editorials that were actually written to elicit attitude change. While both categories involve deception (and both categories require debriefing participants), psychology colleagues asked that they be allowed to expedite “cover story” research. After deliberation, the IRB approved this policy. The IRB also specified that all research involving hard deception would require Full IRB review. Also, it was determined that the IRB would monitor this issue to determine if the outcome was consistent with Federal mandates.

Proactive Monitoring of Protocols

The IRB was charged by the Faculty Senate to consider developing guidelines for oversight of ongoing research. Federal mandates, for example, require a “Compliance Officer” to insure that steps specified in the protocol are actually performed (and no additional steps are performed) in the laboratory. Some members believe that an “IRB Police Force” is not warranted. Others members note that we have inadequate resources for this task. We estimate that we would need two release units each semester to conduct on-site visits. A standardized report format is not feasible, as department norms dictate this content. We continue to discuss guidelines and consider ways to ensure confidentiality and consent. To date, we do not have a Compliance Officer.

Upcoming Agenda Items

The IRB has identified the following goals for the next academic year:

1. Continue to monitor protocols and maintain and manage records for research involving human subjects.
2. Upgrade and refine the IRB Web Page.
3. Post FAQs appropriate for UPS researchers
4. Continue developing a system for monitoring ongoing research.
5. Plan for the transition to a new Associate Dean and IRB liaison with the administration.

I owe special thanks to IRB members for hard work at inconvenient hours: James Evans, Patrick Coogan (Community Representative), Lisa Ferrari, Leon Grunberg, Judith Kay, Kathi Lovelace, Sally Westcott and John Woodward.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ray Preiss, Chair
Institutional Review Board

Faculty Committee on Diversity

2005-2006 Annual Report to the Faculty Senate

Introduction

The Diversity Committee engaged in a wide variety of projects and discussions during the 2005-2006 academic year. Because issues of diversity cut across the University community, the Committee boasts one of the largest memberships of any faculty committee and includes a number of students and staff members. This report begins by listing the Committee's membership before giving a brief general history of the committee's work. The general history is followed by a review of the Committee's charges and recommended charges for next year.

Committee Membership

The membership of the 2005-2006 Diversity Committee (in alphabetical order) consisted of: Terence Beck (School of Education) co-chair; Kim Bobby (representing Vice President George Mills); Amber Brock (Library Staff); Julie Christoph (English); Rosa Beth Gibson (Human Resources); Rebecca Herman ('06); Jean Kim (Dean of Students); Mikiko Ludden (Foreign Languages and Literature); Janet Marcavage (Art); Yoshiko Matsui (Associate Director for Student Services); Jim McCullough (Business and Leadership); Nell Shamrell ('07); Mike Valentine (Geology) co-chair; Carrie Washburn (for Dean Kris Bartanen); Nila Wiese (Business and Leadership); Jesse Zumbro ('06)

The committee received six charges from the Faculty Senate. These charges, shown in italics, were specific, gave the Committee direction, and helped guide the year's activities. The charges all relate to the task of helping the University community become more welcoming to a diverse variety of students, staff, and faculty. The Committee received a small budget to support activities related to the work of the Committee. In addition to the charges from the Faculty Senate, the Committee worked with the Professional Standards Committee (PSC) to consider how language might be added to University documents encouraging and rewarding greater faculty involvement in diversity issues.

Review of Charges for 2005-2006

- 1. Continue working with the Office of Admission, the Office of Human Resources, and other appropriate offices and governing bodies on support of efforts to recruit and retain an increasingly talented and diverse faculty, staff, and student body.*

The Committee felt that it would be best to get started on this charge as soon as possible so that efforts could be initiated in time to help with recruitment of a diverse group of students for the 2006 incoming freshman class. To this end, the Committee invited Melanie Reed, Director of Freshman Admission, to meet with the Committee on October 22. Melanie was asked to report on the 2005 freshman class and present ideas on how the committee, and the faculty at large, could assist in recruiting for 2006. She reported that Twina Franklin ('06) had been hired as Student Coordinator for Multicultural Enrollment, Admission. Melanie also presented several possible ways the Committee and the faculty could assist Admissions in recruiting a diverse freshman class for 2006. The Committee offered to assist in any way we could, and encouraged Melanie to maintain contact with the committee regarding how we could best assist in these efforts. Once again, members of the Committee and other faculty members contacted accepted students of color in an effort to attract them to U.P.S. The Committee requested that Dean Bartanen again issue a letter encouraging faculty to call students of color and participate in other activities to create a more diverse student body and reinforcing that such activities are of value as service to the University.

2. Complete development and implementation of a crisis response team to address incidents related to diversity.

A subcommittee was constituted to continue developing ideas for the response team and lay groundwork for its implementation. It was decided that the team should not simply respond to diversity-related incidents, but should be proactive in order to track trends in incidents and campus climate. This would allow the team to educate the campus on appropriate issues surrounding diversity. The team will be called the "Bias and Hate Educational Response Team", and the subcommittee has proposed a tentative membership, structure, and implementation process that will be finalized by the end of this academic year. Although a fully functioning team will not be in place this academic year, it should be ready early next fall.

3. Continue a program of national participation by sending delegates to gather information at one of the several conferences devoted to diversity issues in higher education.

The Committee used its limited funds to support students Rebecca Herman's and Nell Shamrell's participation in The Power of One: Building Bridges, April 21-22 at the University of Washington, Tacoma. Co-chair, Terry Beck, attended the South Puget Sound Diversity Partnership Institute in February.

4. Support or assist with the national diversity conference organized by Race and Pedagogy.

Diversity Committee members Kim Bobby and Carrie Washburn also serve as members of the steering committee for the Race and Pedagogy Conference. Julie Christoph serves on a Race and Pedagogy sub-committee. They have reported regularly to the Committee about the progress and needs of Race and Pedagogy. Diversity Committee members have attended Race and Pedagogy preparatory sessions when possible and hope to assist by acting as day hosts for invited speakers to the conference.

5. Provide liaison between the faculty, staff, and student organizations related to diversity issues and continue working with the Student Diversity Center and the Office of Multicultural Student Services to support the work of Student Diversity Center organizations, Diversity Theme Year, and other existing and emerging organizations and programs.

Support for student groups was identified as the principle focus under this charge. Therefore, the Committee started the year by assigning faculty and staff members in liaison roles to student organizations. As liaisons, Committee members attended meetings of diversity groups in an effort to improve communication and provide support when necessary. Liaisons reported back to the Committee that their support and presence were appreciated, and the year has been free from major negative incidents.

6. Support the Office of Institutional Research collection of data regarding staff and faculty members' attitudes toward and experiences of diversity as an element of the campus climate through programs to increase participation of faculty, staff, and students in the Campus Climate Survey.

Diversity Committee members Kim Bobby (staff), Yoshiko Matsui (staff), Nell Shamrell (student), and Janet Marcavage (faculty) volunteered to join Jean Kim (administrator) in representing the Committee on the newly formed Diversity Planning Task Force (DPTF). The DPTF took on the primary responsibility for working with the Office of Institutional Research to create and administer the Campus Climate Survey. The Committee provided considerable support on the creation of the survey both through its four representatives and through a Committee meeting dedicated to discussion of the survey.

Committee Generated Charge: Work with the appropriate University groups to promote language in University documents that encourages and rewards greater faculty involvement in diversity issues.

Upon discussion with the Faculty Senate chairperson and our Faculty Senate liaison, it was determined that the Committee was free to go beyond Senate charges. The Committee decided that the Committee's general mission of creating and maintaining a welcoming and accepting climate might be best realized with the assistance of formal language around diversity as a value in University evaluation documents. The Committee researched current language in the Faculty Code and Faculty Evaluation Criteria related to diversity, generated possible language for inclusion in both documents, and engaged in frequent conversations with the Professional Standards Committee (PSC) around the possibility of adding such language. At the time of this writing, the Committee is working on language for possible inclusion in the Faculty Evaluation Criteria centered on the University's Diversity Statement and how such a statement might be realized in the work of faculty. The PSC has agreed to remain in conversation with the Diversity Committee around this topic.

Proposed Charges for 2006-2007

- 1. Continue working with the Office of Admission, the Office of Human Resources, and other appropriate offices and governing bodies on support of efforts to recruit and retain an increasingly talented and diverse faculty, staff, and student body.*
- 2. Implementation of the Bias and Hate Educational Response Team to address trends and incidents related to diversity.*
- 3. Continue a program of national participation by sending delegates to gather and disseminate information at one of the several conferences devoted to diversity issues in higher education. This should include support and participation in the National Race and Pedagogy Conference at Puget Sound.*
- 4. Provide liaison between the faculty, staff, and student organizations related to diversity issues and continue working with the Student Diversity Center and the Office of Multicultural Student Services to support the work of Student Diversity Center organizations, Diversity Theme Year, and other existing and emerging organizations and programs.*
- 5. Support the Diversity Planning Task Force (DPTF) in developing and implementing the Strategic Diversity Plan for the Puget Sound campus.*
- 6. Work with appropriate University groups to promote language in University documents that encourages and rewards greater faculty involvement in creating and maintaining a welcoming and accepting climate for diverse students, staff, and faculty.*
- 7. Complete the committee self-evaluation process.*

STUDENT LIFE COMMITTEE
2005-2006 END OF YEAR REPORT
April 18, 2006

Members of the Student Life Committee: Jean Kim (Dean of Students), Carrie Washburn (representative from the Dean's office)
Faculty members: Chris McKim (chair), Jac Royce, Mark Harpring, Cathy Hale, Greg Elliott, Oswaldo Estrada
Students: Ben Engler, Lindsey Stermole, Autumn Best

The Student Life Committee met during the 2005-2006 academic year to discuss the following charges from the Faculty Senate:

1. To continue to explore ways to encourage campus conversations aimed at promoting greater responsibility, accountability and civility on campus.
2. To review and consider the recommendation of the purchase of an on-line alcohol awareness tool that students would have to complete prior to arriving on campus.
3. To discuss the university's position on parent notification when there is an incident of drug or alcohol "abuse".
4. To explore the on-campus living needs and desires for juniors and seniors.

Charge #2 –The committee first reviewed the current and proposed alcohol education program. Charee Boulter from Substance Abuse Prevention then facilitated a discussion on drug and alcohol abuse on campus. We used the *Summary of Optimum Power Technology and the findings from Texas A &M* to discuss the benefits of purchasing Optimum Power. As a group, we discussed how much we need it within our student community; how it would work; how we could use this technology all over campus (for other programs); and how we could implement its use in addition to our existing speakers program, and alcohol and drug abuse prevention program (Six Pack of Common Sense).

ACTION: the SLC endorses the implementation of Optimum Power Technology.

Charge #3 - Dean Kim informed the Committee about the University's current policy, which is regulated by FERPA. Currently, parents are notified if: 1) a student is admitted to the emergency room or is hospitalized due to alcohol abuse or poisoning or due to drug abuse; or 2) if a student has been involved in several conduct issues, such as sexual assault or bodily harm to others. The objective of the parent notification policy is for the University to work with parents or guardians to identify an appropriate plan of treatment or action for the student. Dean Kim also outlined the policies of other universities. After discussion of the roles of the Dean of Student Affairs staff and of university faculty, Committee members voted unanimously to approve the following action:

ACTION: The current policy of parental notification in cases of student alcohol or drug abuse is seen as effective and appropriate for the needs of the university community.

Charge #4 – Preliminary investigation of this charge showed that much has already been done to evaluate the future of on-campus housing. Shane Daetwiler summarized for the committee an analysis of a residential survey. The main points were:

- students want more space, privacy and independence
- the ability to choose more effectively with whom they live
- kitchens to cook for themselves
- spaces that are more like houses than dorms
- less monitoring by student staff members

Recent changes in the lottery process appear to have increased participation by juniors and seniors; perhaps the perception has shifted that there is a greater likelihood for success. Trimble Hall has also shifted the choice pattern; with more room for sophomores on campus there are more options for juniors and seniors for off-campus houses.

Charge #1 – The committee was unable to clarify this charge sufficiently for any action to be taken on it.

Additional Topics - The Committee also assumed the following charge:

To support, review, and respond to the work of the Task Force on Defining Integrated Student Learning Outcomes (ISLO) on behalf of the Faculty Senate.

Much of the committee's work during the Spring was dedicated toward self-evaluation and redefinition. During the past several years this committee has

struggled with charges that are vague or redundant to other work currently being done on campus.

**SUGGESTED CHARGES FOR THE
2005-2006 STUDENT LIFE COMMITTEE**

Suggested Charges for the committee will be dealt with in the Self-Evaluation process. Most of the projected charges will be derived from a closer association with the Department of Student Affairs and the Dean of Students.

Final Report for the 2005-06 Academic Year
Academic Standards Committee
April 14, 2006

During the 2005-2006 academic year, the Academic Standards Committee conducted the following business.

Petitions A subcommittee heard and acted on student petitions for waivers of academic policies. As has been the practice in recent years, the ASC delegated authority to the Office of the Registrar to approve specific types of petition, either under established circumstances or on the judgment of a Petition Preview team.

Hearing Boards Two Hearing Boards were convened, one to consider a grade complaint and the other to consider a charge of academic dishonesty.

Withdrawal Grades Policy Per a Senate charge, the ASC continued a discussion of the Withdrawal Grades policy that began during the 2004-05 academic year. In Spring 2005, a motion to revise the policy failed. A subcommittee was formed to study the issue during summer 2005. The ASC continued its discussions this year on the basis of a report from that subcommittee. The end results were revisions of the Withdrawal Grades and Re-registration for the Same Course policies in the Academic Handbook. The revised policies are attached.

The committee was convinced that current practice is not consistent with the current policy. In addition to the anecdotal evidence with which most of us are familiar, we looked at data provided by the Registrar for the number and type of withdrawals by week during AY 2004-05. We concluded that some of the discrepancy between practice and policy is due to the wording of the current policy because it can easily be misread. Other factors are at work including the pressure a faculty member might feel from a student request for a W rather than a WF. Also, some faculty committee members describe using the current policy to extend the period in which they can work with a struggling student to recover after a poor start in a course, perhaps due to inadequate background or initially poor effort. This is often negotiated along the lines of “stay in the course through the next exam and then you can withdraw with a W if you’re still not doing well.” In most cases, this practice is not consistent with the current policy if taken literally.

Here is a summary of the main changes we have approved:

1. Extend the period for withdrawal with an automatic W through the sixth week of classes. In the current policy, this period goes through the fourth week of classes.
2. Introduce a new deadline at the end of the twelfth week of classes beyond which a faculty member cannot assign a W. During the seventh through twelfth weeks, a faculty member can assign a W if three conditions hold. These conditions are in the current policy. We have reworded the third condition to be more flexible. We introduce a new requirement that a faculty member submit a form attesting that all three conditions are met as part of assigning a W.

3. Provide authority to the ASC to assign a W after the twelfth week upon petition by a student. The process is similar to the process in the existing Medical Withdrawal and Emergency Administrative Withdrawal policies.
4. Define a "course attempt" to include those in which a W or WF is assigned. This involves revisions to the Re-registration for the Same Course policy.

We have endeavored to reword the Withdrawal Grades policy so misreading is less likely. In particular, we emphasize that after the sixth week, a WF is the norm and a W is the exception.

Waivers of the Foreign Language Graduation Requirement Per a Senate charge, the ASC considered a framework for granting waivers of the foreign language graduation requirement on the basis of learning disabilities. The ASC approved procedures a student should follow in petitioning for a waiver. The procedure includes getting a written recommendation from the Disability Services Coordinator in accordance with the established guidelines for requesting disability support services.

Re-evaluation of the Course Schedule Framework Per a Senate charge, the ASC discussed the course schedule framework. The committee prepared a report summarizing its findings (attached). No motion was made during any of the four meetings at which we discussed this issue.

Transcripting of Study Aboard Courses Members of the Interim Study Abroad Committee brought an issue to the ASC for consideration. ISAC members asked the ASC to recommend that courses and grades a student takes in "partner program" appear on the student's UPS transcript. The ASC will continue discussing this issue at its remaining meetings. We recommend that the ASC be charged with continuing these discussions in the 2006-07 academic year if we do not reach a conclusion this year.

Attachments

1. Revised *Withdrawal Grades* policy
2. Revised *Re-registration for the Same Course* policy
3. Report on course scheduling

Withdrawal Grades

Withdrawal without record on the permanent academic record is permissible through the first two weeks of the fall and spring terms when a student completes official withdrawal procedures.

Withdrawal Passing (W) is granted during the third through sixth week of the fall and spring terms when a student completes official withdrawal procedures. After the sixth week of term, Withdrawal Failing (WF) is given except as noted below.

During the seventh through twelfth weeks of the fall and spring terms, a grade of W may be granted by the instructor only if all of the following conditions are met: (1) a student completes official withdrawal procedures and (2) there have been exceptional circumstances beyond the student's control, in which case the student must demonstrate in writing to the satisfaction of the instructor that exceptional circumstances exist, and (3) either the student's work has been of passing quality or the exceptional circumstances have prevented the student from completing work of passing quality. For a W to be assigned during this period, the course instructor must submit the "Form to be Named Later" form available in the Office of the Registrar.

After the twelfth week of classes, the Academic Standards Committee may permit a grade of W to be assigned. The student must withdraw from the course and submit a petition to support a claim of exceptional circumstances. The petition must include a statement by the course instructor on the quality of the student's work in the course. If the petition is approved, a grade of W is assigned. If the petition is denied, a grade of WF is assigned.

Completing official withdrawal procedures after the last day of regularly scheduled classes is not allowed.

A withdrawal at any point past the date for withdrawal without record counts as a 'course attempt' if the student re-registers for the course.

Withdrawal deadlines for summer and in-service courses are published in class schedule brochures.

When a student abandons a course without completing official withdrawal procedures, the instructor assigns an appropriate grade, normally the WF. If the instructor does not assign a grade, a grade of WF will be entered by the Registrar.

Re-registration for the Same Course

A student may repeat a course one time. This policy allows students to take a course again to improve a grade or to complete a course for which the student previously received a W or WF grade. Both courses and grades remain on the student's permanent academic record. The course with the higher grade is included in unit and grade point average calculations. If one of the assigned grades is a W, then the other assigned grade is used in unit and grade point average calculations. If a student attempting to improve a grade earns the same grade again, then the more recent grade is included in the appropriate calculations.

An attempt of a course occurs when a student enrolls for a course and withdraws after the date for withdrawal without record.

Exceptions to this policy are independent study, cooperative education, physical education activity, and varsity sports courses, COMM 292, music performing groups, and other courses that the catalog states may be repeated for credit.

A student may ask to repeat a course at another institution by submitting a Transfer Evaluation Request to the Office of the Registrar (Jones 013) listing the Puget Sound course to be repeated and the proposed course at the other institution. Permission may be granted subject to the student's status and with the specific approval of the appropriate academic department. (Some departments do not allow Puget Sound courses in which the student earned a low grade to be repeated at another institution). If a Puget Sound course is then repeated at another institution, and if the grade earned elsewhere is the higher of the two, the Puget Sound grade will be removed from the grade average, but the transfer grade will not be computed in the grade average. Credit for the Puget Sound course will be removed and replaced by the transfer credit, even if there is a difference between the two. (See section on Transfer Information for other policies governing transfer credit.)

Report on Course Scheduling
Academic Standards Committee
April 14, 2006

For AY 2005-06, the Senate charged the ASC to “re-evaluate the class schedule with respect to the goals for which it was implemented and consider a protected time for faculty meetings.” As its response to this charge, the ASC gathered relevant information and suggestions in several forums. Individual ASC members solicited comments from colleagues. John Finney and Martin Jackson lead a discussion of scheduling issues at the February 3, 2006 meeting of department chairs, school directors, and program heads. Further comments from chairs, directors, and heads were solicited by e-mail. Over the course of four meetings, the ASC identified issues of concern with the current schedule system and weighed the benefits and costs of suggested modifications. This report summarizes our findings. Our goal here is to represent all of the ideas we have heard. More detail on our discussions can be found in the ASC meeting minutes of January 18, February 1, February 15, and March 1, 2006.

Background

A previous round of discussions on the course schedule system took place in the period 1998-2001. The discussions began with the ASC during the spring of 1998 in response to concerns brought by a faculty member. In its annual report for 1998-99, the ASC recommended that it be charged with further examining the course schedule system. In September 1998, the Senate charged the ASC to “re-examine issues of class scheduling, with attention to creation of a common hour or hours during which students and faculty would be free, and with concern for providing time for co-curricular activities.” The ASC took up this charge in Fall 1998 with discussions that resulted in a report to the Senate proposing three possible times for a common hour.

In February 1999, the Senate issued a more detailed charge, summarized as “The Faculty Senate therefore charges the Academic Standards Committee with studying the question of course scheduling in depth and with bringing back to the Senate a proposal or proposals for a course scheduling framework that might reduce conflicts, allow a common meeting time, and permit an effective use of classroom resources. The Senate requests an interim report as part of the committee’s year-end report in May and a final report by fall semester 1999.” The full text of the charge was given in memo drafted by then Academic Vice President Terry Cooney. (A copy is attached here.)

The ASC took up the new charge during Spring 1999 and Fall 1999. These discussions resulted in a report, drafted by Associate Dean and University Registrar John Finney, comparing three models relative to the considerations and possibilities given in the detailed Senate charge. (This document is attached.) The report was forwarded to the Senate. The Senate did not explicitly address the report. It was discussed at chairs meeting held December 6, 2000.

In a memo dated April 3, 2001, Terry Cooney announced changes to the course schedule system that were to take effect for the 2002-03 academic year. (A copy is

attached here.) In response, the Senate held discussions in its meetings of April 2, April 16, and April 30, 2001. The Senate passed a motion urging “Acting President Cooney to suspend any and all changes in the schedule for classes, including but not limited to changes in the hours at which classes may start, end, and/or be offered, until such changes shall have been vetted by administrators, faculty, and students and the opinion of the faculty on the changes shall have been expressed in the Faculty Senate or in a vote at a faculty meeting or both, and the feedback from students shall have been expressed by the ASUPS Senate or by the general student body.”

Implementation of a new schedule system continued with some minor changes to the announced system in the Cooney memo. (In particular, Tuesday/Thursday time slots were changed from 75 minutes to 80 minutes following a suggestion raised in Senate discussions.) Since that time, a few other modifications have been made.

Courses scheduled for MW 3:00-4:20 are not included in the time slots described in the annual class schedule memo from John Finney to department chairs and school directors. However, scheduling of MW 3:00-4:20 courses has been allowed since the current system was implemented. The 2005-06 academic year brought a substantial increase in the number of courses scheduled for this time slot. In response, Dean Finney’s memo on the 2006-07 course schedule included the statement “The use of 3:00 MW courses meeting longer than fifty minutes has become excessive, affecting late-afternoon cocurricular events in a manner contrary to the goals of faculty when they created the current class schedule. The university operates on a MWF/TT course schedule. Please use these options.”

Some faculty members had strong reactions to this statement. One department was concerned that this represented the unilateral termination of an informal agreement with the deans to allow MW 3:00-4:20 courses. Others resented the implication that the current schedule system had been approved by the faculty. To be more accurate, the statement in Dean Finney’s memo could be rephrased as “in a manner contrary to the goals adopted by the faculty” to distinguish between the faculty goals expressed in the February 1999 Senate charge and the current course schedule system implemented by the academic deans.

Concerns with current schedule system

The concern that has received most attention in ASC discussions relates to the number of options for teaching courses that meet twice a week in 80-minute blocks. Some faculty have a pedagogical preference to teach their courses this way. (Departments that have expressed some preference for this model include Business, Communication Studies, Politics & Government, and Religion.) The only official options currently available for this are Tuesday/Thursday courses. A faculty member who uses only TT faces a very heavy teaching load two days a week. In departments where this model is favored, major students may end up with a heavy class load on these two days of the week. For a faculty member, the alternative is a mix of MWF and TT courses. This leaves no day free of teaching to devote to scholarship. Those who are asking for more options would like to spread teaching over four days and reserve one day free of teaching for faculty scholarship.

Others have expressed concern about the options available for teaching seminar

courses that meet once a week for two hours or more. Under current guidelines, a seminar course should be scheduled to begin no earlier than 3:00. Some faculty would like options to teach seminar courses that begin earlier in the day.

Use of the MW 3:00-4:20 slot raises various concerns. Courses scheduled in this period conflict with Music ensemble rehearsals, athletic practices, and faculty meetings. MW courses weight the weekly schedule away from Friday, resulting in greater potential for students beginning their weekend activities earlier than Friday afternoon/evening. Some – including colleagues in Student Affairs – are concerned about the possible negative consequences of this effect.

Data provided by the Office of the Registrar for Spring 2006 shows that almost all classrooms are in use in the MWF 11:00-11:50 and TT 9:30-10:50 time slots. In these hours, the available classrooms are either small (TR112), big (MC003), or “far away” (FH117A/B). In contrast, many classrooms are available during the TT 8:00-9:30 and TT 3:30-4:50 time slots. A very crude analysis of the data was done to measure course conflicts. (Non-academic courses and lab sections were not included.) A course meeting MWF 11:00-11:50 conflicts with about 12% of all other courses, a course meeting TT 9:30-10:50 also conflicts with about 12% of all other courses, and a course meeting four days a week (MTWF, MWTF, or MTTF) at either 10:00 or 11:00 conflicts with about 19% of all other courses. (For these courses, the MF time is 10:00 or 11:00 and the TT time is within one of the designated 80-minute blocks.)

Suggestions

The ASC has received and discussed various suggestions. Any change to the current schedule system includes benefits and costs. Among the factors to consider are

- the number of conflicts between classes for students
- the number of desirable class blocks
- the number of conflicts with rehearsals, athletic practices, and other co-curricular activities
- the preservation of a common meeting time for committee meetings, department meetings, student meetings, and the like
- classroom resource limitations

Some faculty would like to consider adding another factor to this list, namely preserving for each interested faculty member a “scholarship day” free of teaching.

The main suggestions we have considered are summarized here.

1. Make no changes.
2. Allow courses scheduled for MW 3:00-4:20. This might include a limit on the number of courses in this time slot (in addition to the natural limit imposed by available classroom resources.) Imposing a limit would require a mechanism for handling cases in which demand exceeds the limit.
3. Create new 80-minute blocks for MW, WF, and MF. Manage classroom resources by maintaining a balance in the number of MW, WF, and MF courses.

(In any one 80-minute block, three courses can be scheduled using two classrooms in the following way: Course 1 meets in Classroom A on MW, Course 2 meets in Classroom B on WF, Course 3 meets in Classroom B on M and in Classroom A on F.) There are many variations on how new 80-minute blocks can be created. Examples include

- (a) Add MW, WF, MF 8:30-9:50.

Comments: This increases conflicts for students and competition for classroom resources with courses scheduled for MWF 8:00-8:50 and 9:00-9:50.

- (b) Replace MWF 1:00-1:50, 2:00-2:50, 3:00-3:50 by MW, WF, MF 1:00-2:20, 2:30-3:50. Allow MWF 50-minute courses that stay within 1:00-2:20 and 2:30-3:50.

Comments: This effectively reduces the number of MWF 50-minute slots to seven from the current eight. Some departments currently use all eight available MWF slots.

- (c) Add MW, WF, MF 1:00-2:20, 2:30-3:50 and continue MWF 1:00-1:50, 2:00-2:50, 3:00-3:50.

Comments: This has more competition for students and classroom resources than the previous option.

4. Structure course offerings to minimize potential enrollment conflicts by identifying sets of courses that are likely to have fewer conflicts. For example, all first-year students take a seminar in each semester. No first-year student is enrolled in more than one seminar per semester. If most or all freshman seminars are scheduled for specific time blocks, the overall number of conflicts for first-year students is reduced. In similar fashion, most students enroll for at most one Connections course per semester so all or most Connections courses could be scheduled in the same time blocks to reduce conflicts. There should never be enrollment conflicts between freshman seminars and Connections courses so the same time blocks could be used for these.

Comments: This type of structuring requires coordination among many departments. It results in less choice for individual faculty members.

5. Build a new course schedule system from scratch.

Where to from here

1. The Academic Vice President could modify course schedule guidelines along lines suggested above. This could be done on a provisional basis with future discussions of observed impacts.
2. The Faculty Senate could charge the Academic Standards Committee to further study course schedule issues. This charge could include specific goals for further study.
3. The Academic Vice President and Faculty Senate could agree to form an ad hoc committee of administrators, staff, faculty, and students to study course schedule issues.

A Charge from the Faculty Senate to the Academic Standards Committee

Current patterns of course scheduling at the University of Puget Sound reflect an overlay of history, habit, adaptation, and convenience. Some twenty years ago, discussions of scheduling occurred around the move from a four-day-a-week norm (with no classes held on Wednesday) to a dominant pattern of MWF or TuTh classes. Since that time no serious or sustained discussion of scheduling has occurred among the faculty as a whole. Some classes have persisted on a four-day schedule, some meet five days; and requests have grown more frequent for scheduling classes on two days, or even one, claiming longer blocks of time on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays.

Several considerations coming together at this time suggest that a thorough review of scheduling would be appropriate:

1. For a number of years, different people have asked the question whether it might not be possible to reserve an hour or two during the week that might be kept free for committee meetings, department meetings, student meetings, and the like, to minimize the seemingly inevitable conflicts that now arise in attempting to get even relatively limited numbers of people together at a common time.
2. As the number of classes meeting in late afternoon has risen (in part but not entirely in response to classroom availability issues), student activities and organizations have found increasing conflicts with rehearsals, athletic practices, and the like. If we are to have a vibrant student life, we need to pay heed to this concern.
3. Individual faculty requests to schedule classes for blocks of time or on patterns of days that do not match the basic schedule outlines occur without much awareness of potential effects on the schedule as a whole and the possible difficulties for students. Such considerations can become especially important, for example, if a department schedules a course that majors must take at a time or in a fashion that creates multiple conflicts. A larger discussion of scheduling may help us bring a wider range of concerns to light as we seek the best balance of flexibility and predictability.
4. With the remodeling of existing buildings and the construction of a new academic building, our classroom inventory is about to change. Although the number of classrooms may not rise appreciably, the type and quality of classrooms will provide the basis for a more satisfactory match between the courses we are teaching and the rooms available. This is a propitious moment to ask how scheduling patterns might help us make the most out of our improved resources.
5. We need to ask whether in fact a different scheduling pattern could address current needs by making a greater number of desirable class blocks available or by helping reduce the number of conflicts between classes for students.

The Faculty Senate therefore charges the Academic Standards Committee with studying the question of course scheduling in depth and with bringing back to the Senate a proposal or proposals for a course scheduling framework that might reduce conflicts, allow a common meeting time, and permit an effective use of classroom resources. The Senate requests an interim report as part of the committee's year-end report in May and a final report by fall semester 1999.

We suggest an exploration of the following possibilities, not with the assumption that these point toward encompassing solutions but simply as ideas that should be part of the process. The Academic Standards Committee will no doubt wish to add questions and options of its own.

1. Because longer classes, usually upper-division seminars, often conflict with more than one class period if scheduled on MWF, might we consider allowing only 50 minute classes during certain parts of the day while defining another part as available for longer seminars?
2. Tuesday-Thursday classes are intended to last approximately 75 minutes when two TuTh class meetings are seen as parallel to three MWF class meetings, yet the schedule allows two-hour blocks on TuTh. Might we consider time blocks of 90 minutes (75 minutes plus time between classes) rather than 120 on TuTh and thereby gain additional time blocks in the schedule?
3. Might we consider defining at what hours four-day-a-week classes can be scheduled to minimize the elimination of whole sets of other classes from a student's range of selection because of the fourth day? Might current four day a week classes be scheduled with three MWF days and a fourth hour at a different time (compare lab or discussion section scheduling) rather than in a fixed TuTh time slot? Currently, for example, a four day a week class scheduled at 10:00 a.m. eliminates a large number of other possible courses for any student enrolling. Can that situation be improved?
4. Can we define more clearly when and under what circumstances faculty may propose courses meeting in time blocks that run counter to the dominant patterns?
5. Should we consider evening scheduling (assuming faculty and student interest) for courses seeking extended time for a single long seminar meeting?

**University of Puget Sound
Academic Standards Committee
Class Scheduling Models**

[1] The Current Schedule Situation

<p>MWF</p> <p>8:00 - 8:50 9:00 - 9:50 10:00 - 10:50 11:00 - 11:50 12:00 - 12:50 1:00 - 1:50 2:00 - 2:50 3:00 - 3:50 4:00 - 4:50</p> <p>9 Periods No Free Hour for Committee Meetings</p>	<p>TT</p> <p>8:00 - 9:50 10:00 - 11:50 12:00 - 1:50 2:00 - 3:50</p> <p>4 Periods</p> <p>Courses meet 150, 160, 180, 210, or 220 minutes per week</p>
<p>MTTF/MTWT/MTWF/MWTF/TWTF</p> <p>These 4-day courses lock up a classroom both on MWF <i>and</i> on TT , leaving room empty one hour</p>	

[2] A Model Mixing MWF/TT 150-Minute Courses With Courses Meeting 4 Times (200 Minutes) or 5 Times (250 Minutes) Per Week

MWF	TT
<p>8:00 - 8:50 9:00 - 9:50 10:00 - 10:50 11:00 - 11:50 12:00 - 12:50 1:00 - 1:50 2:00 - 2:50 3:00 - 3:50</p> <p>8 Periods 4:00 Free Hour for Committee Meetings</p>	<p>8:00 - 9:15 9:30 - 10:45 11:00 - 12:15 12:30 - 1:45 2:00 - 3:15 3:30 - 4:45</p> <p>6 Periods</p>
<p>MTTF/MTWT/MTWF/MWTF/TWTF</p> <p>These 4-day courses become MWF courses with a 4th session scheduled for Tu or Th. MWF/TT meeting times dissociated for 9:00, 12:00, and 3:00 classes and perhaps others as well</p>	<p>MTWTF</p> <p>MWF/TT meeting times dissociated for 9:00, 12:00, and 3:00 classes and perhaps others as well</p>

[3] A Model Mixing MWF 150-Minute Courses, TT 180-Minute Courses, and Courses Meeting 4 Times (200 Minutes) or 5 Times (250 Minutes) Per Week

MWF	TT
<p>8:00 - 8:50 9:00 - 9:50 10:00 - 10:50 11:00 - 11:50 12:00 - 12:50 1:00 - 1:50 2:00 - 2:50 3:00 - 3:50</p> <p>8 Periods 4:00 Free Hour for Committee Meetings</p>	<p>8:00 - 9:30 9:40 - 11:10 11:20 - 12:50 1:00 - 2:30 2:40 - 4:10</p> <p>5 Periods</p>
<p>MTTF/MTWT/MTWF/MWTF/TWTF</p> <p>These 4-day courses become MWF courses with a 4th session scheduled for Tu or Th. MWF/TT meeting times dissociated for 9:00, 11:00, and 2:00 classes and perhaps others as well</p>	<p>MTWTF</p> <p>MWF/TT meeting times dissociated for 9:00, 11:00, and 2:00 classes and perhaps others as well</p>

How Do the Three Models Address the Considerations and Possibilities Identified in the Faculty Senate's February 22, 1999 Charge?

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Consideration 1: Create a free hour or two	No Free Hour	4:00 MWF	4:00 MWF
Consideration 2: Minimize late afternoon conflicts with co-curricular events	Conflicts maximized	No classes after 3:50 p.m. MWF; 4:45 p.m. TT; evening classes start at 6:00 p.m.	No classes after 3:50 p.m. MWF; 4:10 p.m. TT; evening classes start at 6:00 p.m.
Consideration 3: Avoid multiple scheduling conflicts for students		Department heads meet before submitting schedule	
Consideration 4: Make the most of improved classroom resources	Carries forward old inefficiencies	Increases the number of TT class periods between 8:00 a.m. and 4:45 p.m. from four to six; by increasing class periods, increases number of courses that can be taught in electronic and new, highly desirable classrooms	Increases the number of TT class periods between 8:00 a.m. and 4:10 p.m. from four to five
Consideration 5: Increase number of scheduling blocks and reduce conflicts for students		More TT blocks; dissociates MWF from TT class meeting times for 4 and 5-day per week courses	
Possibility 1: When to schedule longer classes and seminars	Beginning at 3:00 p.m.	Evenings beginning at 6:00 p.m.	
Possibility 2: Shorter TT blocks		75 minutes; increases number of blocks from 4 to 6	90 minutes; increases number of blocks from 4 to 5
Possibility 3: How to handle four-day-per-week courses	Retaining constant meeting times requires 2-hour TT blocks	TT classes meet at different times than MWF classes; permits more flexible TT meeting times; more blocks	
Possibility 4: How to handle requests for scheduling exceptions	Registrar wings it/dukes it out one-on-one	Curriculum Committee, or <i>ad hoc</i> advisory committee to the Registrar	
Possibility 5: Evening scheduling for longer classes/seminars		Longer classes and seminars scheduled at 6:00 p.m. or later to eliminate conflicts with regular blocks during the day	

DATE: April 3, 2001
TO: Faculty
FROM: Terry Cooney
SUBJECT: Class Schedule Effective 2002-2003

Beginning with the 2002-2003 academic year, the University will rationalize its class schedule to make better use of classroom facilities for the benefit of students, bringing it more nearly in line with academic schedules typical of semester institutions.

Between 1969 and 1984 the University operated a 4-1-4 academic calendar, with two shortened "semesters" and a one-month January "Winterim" term. Most regular courses during the shortened "semesters" met four days each week, MTTF. There were few regularly scheduled classes on Wednesdays.

In 1984 the University returned to a semester calendar without addressing class scheduling issues in any comprehensive way. Some MTTF classes became MWF classes and others did not. Since then many classes have come to be taught on TT, but because of the overlap between MTTF and MWF classes, two hour blocks had to be set aside for TT courses in order to minimize empty classroom space. As it was, each MTTF class caused a classroom to remain vacant for one hour on Tuesday and one hour on Thursday. That's the situation we have today. With the continuing increase in TT courses there is no longer any flexibility in the schedule. We have in effect a traditional semester calendar overlaid on the old 4-1-4 calendar.

As a result we have an inefficient calendar that limits scheduling unnecessarily and denies students options in selecting courses. As we began discussing the addition of new faculty, it also became apparent that we were more likely to accomplish this goal if we could avoid building additional classrooms as a result. Even with the opening of Wyatt Hall, the number of classrooms in regular use remains about the same.

In 1998-1999 the Faculty Senate charged the Academic Standards Committee with studying the problem and proposing solutions. After examining a number of alternatives, the Committee concluded that a semester schedule that accommodates MTTF courses was preferable to eliminating MTTF courses altogether. Eliminating MTTF courses would have a serious negative impact on a number of departments. The Academic Standards Committee reported the models it had developed to the Faculty Senate in 1999-2000, where there was additional discussion of their relative advantages, with attention concentrating on a shift in the Tuesday-Thursday schedule. In the fall of 2000, there was additional discussion with departmental chairs, as a result of which an explicit effort to reserve MWF at 4:00 as a meeting time was set aside based on the number of conflicts likely to occur. This time should continue to be avoided as a time to begin a class although it is recognized some classes and laboratories may continue into this hour. The attached table summarizes the new schedule we will adopt beginning in 2002-2003, perhaps as a new core also goes into effect. The new schedule introduces flexibility by (1) dissociating TT meeting times from MWF meeting times for four and five-day-per week courses, (2) increasing the number of TT time blocks, (3) scheduling longer

seminars in the evening, and (4) reducing the number of late afternoon classes that conflict with co-curricular activities.

Please begin to plan for these changes because you will submit your department's 2002-2003 schedule to the Registrar's Office next fall, and there may need to be some adjustments, particularly with regard to the shorter TT time blocks.

Class Schedule Effective 2002-2003

MWF	TT
8:00 - 8:50 9:00 - 9:50 10:00 - 10:50 11:00 - 11:50 12:00 - 12:50 1:00 - 1:50 2:00 - 2:50 3:00 - 3:50 8 Periods 4:00 Hour Not Used as Starting Time on MWF	8:00 - 9:20 9:30 - 10:50 11:00 - 12:20 12:30 - 1:50 2:00 - 3:20 3:30 - 4:50 6 Periods
MTTF/MTWT/MTWF/MWTF/TWTF	MTWTF
These 4-day courses become MWF courses with a 4 th session scheduled for Tu or Th. MWF/TT meeting times likely to be the same at 8:00, 11:00, and 2:00	MWF/TT meeting times likely to be the same at 8:00, 11:00, and 2:00

Courses may be scheduled for longer periods with the approval of the Curriculum Committee. Seminars scheduled for two hours or more should generally occur after 2:00 in the afternoon or in the evening. Laboratory sections and studio courses currently scheduled for blocks of three hours or more would continue to be scheduled as they are at present.