

Faculty meeting minutes for September 19, 2016

Respectfully submitted by Amy Spivey (Secretary of the Faculty, 2016-2017)

I. Call to order (Alisa Kessel, Chair of the Faculty Senate)

Alisa called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. She introduced herself and explained that in May the Board of Trustees approved the Faculty Bylaws amendment passed last spring that changed the faculty meeting procedures. Under the change, from now on the Faculty Senate Chair will chair the faculty meetings, instead of the President of the university.

II. Approval of the minutes of April 12, 2016

M/S/P to approve the minutes without changes or amendments.

III. Announcements

1. Lynette Claire spoke on behalf of Renee Houston in the Experiential Learning office. The summer interns will give a presentation from 4-5:20 p.m. on Thursday this week in the Rotunda. She talked about the new “Linc & Loggers” program that will pair Puget Sound students with Lincoln High School students, for two-year commitments. It’s a mentorship program for college readiness. Students can express interest by applying.

2. The faculty visitor from the University of Passau will give a talk on Wednesday, Sept. 28, at 4 p.m. in Murray Boardroom, about European perceptions of candidate Barack Obama during the 2008 United States presidential campaign.

3. Dexter Gordon announced that African American Studies is launching its major this fall. They will have a ceremonial program on September 29 from 6-8:45 p.m. in Thomas Hall to raise funds. A number of prominent guests will be speaking.

4. Keith Ward – This Friday, in Schneebeck Concert Hall, the “Collage” concert will take place at 7:30 p.m. The entire hall will be converted to performance space, and about 100 faculty members and students will participate.

IV. Greeting / report from President Isiaah Crawford

(The President’s report was distributed ahead of the meeting and is included in Appendix B of these minutes.)

“Hello, everyone. It is great to be here and to be with you. I have been asked to offer a few comments and share some of my initial impressions, and if there is time, we’ll engage in some Q & A.

Again, it is great to be here. It’s hard to believe it has been 2 ½ months. Since my arrival, I have been very warmly embraced, along with my other half, Kent. People have been introducing themselves to me, and I have been able to meet with a number of groups on campus and off. We have a roster of about 145 people that I am supposed to meet this academic year, for example. I have toured some of our facilities, but this is the first time I have been in this space. It reminds me of a classroom at St. Louis University during my undergraduate days. I have also been meeting with a variety of offices across campus, and I want to meet with faculty, staff, and students as we move forward. I want to meet with all elements of the college community during the year. I have been reading all kinds of briefing books, policies, and so forth, to learn about the campus. I am also meeting with a number of community leaders and members in Tacoma and the South Sound.

Thank you for helping get the semester up and running. It seems that the fall term is off to a good start, and I have been able to talk with students. They seem happy and engaged and glad to be here. We are “off to the races.”

In terms of initial impressions, it has been good to be here. It’s good to see how dedicated this community is to the liberal arts tradition. It has been consistent with what I read during the “period of courtship” that started about a year ago. It’s been great to see that. The dedication that permeates every aspect of engagement here (faculty, staff, and alumni) and the focus on students has been gratifying. The staff members seem very dedicated. I have also been struck by the students themselves. They seem so composed and mature, but also I have noticed that the students seem very grateful to be here and have a sense of how fortunate they are to be here. Some of them feel like they have so many choices that they might miss out some opportunities because they can’t do it all. There is an abundance of opportunity here.

I have also been drilling down into how the university functions as an operation. I have been impressed with how well-run and organized the university is. I haven’t discovered anything that looks really wrong and in need of fixing, for example.

I am a big fan of George Kuh’s work on elements of deep learning and student engagement, and those elements and practices seem to be here. It’s part of our culture, and I hope we can keep doing that. I conceptualize it from a dosage framework. The more high-impact experiences students can have, the better. We will talk more about that as the year goes on.

Plans for this year: I am looking forward to this being a year in which I am listening and learning about our community, get a sense of everyone’s hopes and aspirations about the university, where we are in relation to our Northwest peers, where we are in terms of the higher education landscape, and what our aspirations are for the future. We want to look forward to the development of a new strategic plan. The old plan has run out of time in terms of the span of years that it was intended to cover. A new plan is going to be needed, and that will provide the framework for the next capital campaign. What does planning look like historically here? I want to learn about that. In my experience, it can be broadly collaborative. So, we want the faculty, staff, students, and alumni, as well as the Tacoma community to have a strong voice. We want community leaders in Tacoma to tell us some about what they hope the university will be and become, and then we will set goals for how to do that.

I also want to know about the past processes of bringing in outside people who can help us with development of a new strategic plan. I want to learn about what the culture is at UPS with regard to that. The goal is to develop a new strategic plan to present to the Board of Trustees in 2017-2018 and possibly in the fall of 2018. I want your thoughts about that time line. Is it too long? Too short?

This will be a year of learning. I have told the students I am a “freshman president”, but I don’t want you to have a sense that we will be on “pause”. We will continue to move forward with the momentum that you already have. We will have a strong focus on our students. We want to create an open and inclusive environment for our students, faculty, and staff. We want to focus on student retention and persistence. We are under way in the search for a new Vice President for Enrollment, and Christine Mica is our interim Vice President for Enrollment. We hope to invite our finalists for the search toward the end of September and beginning of October. That is a very important search.

I have been very excited to learn about the experiential learning opportunities that are developing. I am also looking forward to the eventual roll-out of the Diversity Strategic Plan. We continue to keep our eyes on issues of access and affordability. That will be ongoing.

Those are my initial comments as an initial greeting and welcome. But I will take advantage of chances to meet with people in the coming year.”

Questions?

1. Ariela Tubert – Thank you for telling us and asking us about planning for the new strategic plan. I have a couple of thoughts. One obvious way to solicit input is to provide various open forums where people can provide feedback and comments. But sometimes that doesn't lead to much that is productive. Perhaps the trick is to get people who have those suggestions to get involved in implementing them.

President Crawford – It is still important for people to have a chance to offer their comments.

2. John Lear – Can you elaborate about inviting someone from outside to help with development of the strategic plan?

President Crawford – I have experience with bringing someone in to help develop the structures for the process of developing the new strategic plan. Then, someone from Puget Sound would be tasked with helping us follow through with that plan and do that work. It helps to have someone who is in charge of it to make sure that we make headway on it, as well as to be in charge of communicating activity with the Board of Trustees, with faculty, etc.

3. Dexter Gordon – Can you talk about different frameworks for that? We could have the campus set the framework and someone come in and help us have the conversations. We could bring in someone at the beginning, or at the end. There are different ways to do it.

President Crawford – All of those options are on the table. I am not wedded to any particular method. I am open to what people want to do. I have been through it a few times, though, and have some sense of some ways that it can work.

4. Lynnette Claire – Are there ways we can help you get to know us better?

President Crawford – (joking) Well, I don't want you to all wear nametags. I am starting to get out and about. One idea I have is to have breakfast or lunch with groups of faculty and groups of staff around no more than just getting to know each other, as people who have something in common. Over the course of 8 years at a previous institution, I really got to know people well in that way. I am talking with Kris Bartanen and others about how that might work, in addition to maybe bringing together faculty members who are already in groups.

5. Sara Protasi – For some of us, it might be harder for us to give input and advice. Maybe we are shy, lower in rank, etc.

President Crawford – Yes. Perhaps someone from outside would have ideas about how to incorporate input from different groups of faculty, including non-tenured faculty, visiting faculty, etc., in a non-threatening way. I am sensitive to how important that part of the process is, so that won't get lost.

Closing comments from President Crawford –

“Thank you for all of the work you have done to get us started this year. It is truly an honor to be here with you and support you in all of the good work you are doing. I also want to be attentive

to your experience and continuing work we need to do around work-life balance, shared governance, etc. Thank you.”

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

There were no questions about the Academic Vice President’s report (shown in Appendix C).

Alisa Kessel offered one minor correction to the Faculty Senate Chair’s report that was distributed ahead of the meeting. The corrected report is found in Appendix D of these minutes. There were no further questions or comments about the Senate Chair’s report.

VI. Continued discussion of the Common Period

(Information about the proposed Common Period can be found in the Frequently Asked Questions document distributed ahead of the meeting and included in Appendix E of these minutes.)

Kessel gave Eric Scharrer the floor.

Eric Scharrer – My reason for raising this issue was because at the last faculty meeting we were moving very quickly toward implementing this Common Period without having a full discussion. I wanted to have a discussion about this before we implement it. Here are some of my issues:

- a) In Chemistry, our students are taking classes at 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12, and doing labs in the afternoon. I am concerned about losing that 12:00 time slot.
- b) Could we have more creative permutations, such as inservice days or move the common period around, etc.?
- c) One of my colleagues, Steven Neshyba, mentioned that as it stands the Common Period is slotted for noon to 1:30 because of the historical length of faculty meetings. However, Steven suggested that we just have an extra faculty meeting and make them all 50 minutes instead of 1 and a half hours.

Robin Jacobsen – I would like to hear a bit more about the background of this proposal and how it has been vetted so far.

Ariela Tubert – During the past two years, I have been Senate Chair, and I was on the Senate before that. Three years ago, the Academic Standards Committee was charged with finding a time for a common period, but they weren’t able to complete that work due to the PeopleSoft transition. Academic Standards had been charged with that task before that, as well, I think. During the 2 years I was Senate Chair, we were trying to get data, and we discussed it some. Last year, the Senate discussed it 5-7 times, and I outlined that in my last report to the faculty. You can look at that at the Senate web site. The issue was discussed at a faculty meeting last year, as well.

Jo Crane – Could we see enrollment numbers for courses at that time (Wednesday noon – 1:30)? Kessel showed numbers from the Registrar for classes in session and students in classes for different time slots on Wednesdays (see Appendix F).

Megan Gessel – I have a question about those numbers. Are those numbers the same students?

Brad Tomhave – They can be the same students.

Keith Ward – Because the Senate has looked at the hour and a half, could we do it on a Tuesday or Thursday instead? That would only cover one time slot, instead of covering two time slots.

Suzanne Holland – I think we looked at all of the days of the week last year.

Jo Crane – We did look at it, but it was hard to interpret the data. I think the new numbers show that the noon hour is a little less populated than the 11:00 hour or 1:00 hour. But as we go into the 1:00 hour, we are going into prime real estate. I like the idea having a common hour of one hour, and just having more faculty meetings. That way, we wouldn't be changing the scheduling grid as much.

The other question I asked Brad was about whether the classes impacted where MWF only. Could they just be Monday, Friday at noon and just have an alternate time for that Wednesday session? That would have a different impact on the classes.

Keith Ward - I appreciate the information, but it still feels incomplete. It would be interesting to see the numbers for Tuesday and Thursday.

Suzanne Holland – Peter Sullivan ran models including Monday through Thursday classes. But I don't remember what happened.

Alyce Demarais – I think the idea was that we would lose a time slot that was even more popular than the Wednesday 12-1:30 slot. There are some classes that meet four days a week, for example.

Bill Breitenbach – The impact is not just in the number of classes, but it has to do with helping students avoid time conflicts between courses.

Barry Goldstein – This definitely will have unintended consequences. I ask – Were all of the models answering the question about having a common period that is open every week of the semester? I thought the original intention was for a time for the faculty meeting? What about a one-time or extra time one time per month, rather than every week?

Faculty meetings used to be much better attended, and this is one way to address that. I am afraid that we would fill up those times. How could we do this affecting only one day per month?

Robin Jacobsen – I have heard about the desire for the Common Period to provide a way for people to get together as a whole campus. Students have expressed a strong interest in this, as well. We need to acknowledge that we will have to change our schedules. I caution us against trying to hang onto our current schedule and just tweak it.

Eric Orlin – I dug up the Academic Standards records. The data they had showed 25 classes in session at noon on Wednesday, 50 on Tuesday and Thursday, and 45 on Monday and Friday.

I also want to comment on the Student Senate's reaction to this proposal, and they are overwhelmingly supportive.

Bill Barry – Did any groups consider making the Common Period the 4 p.m. hour on Monday or Tuesday?

Jo Crane – The original proposal that went to the Senate suggested a Common Period of Wednesday at either 8 a.m. or 4 p.m.

Alisa Kessel – The ASC reported those two options, and the Senate expressed concern that those times were not good for colleagues with children. So, the Senate asked them to go back to possible midday slots.

Barry Goldstein – The reason Wednesday is low might be because lots of classes meet on M TuThF, for example.

Also, we could do lots of other things with that time. We seem to be unclear about what we really want. Let's be coherent with what we want. Maybe we should just blow up the present schedule.

Jo Crane – To address some of that, when Academic Standards was charged with this, we asked the question about the purpose? We kept being told it was about the meetings. We talked about whether different weeks could look different. Academic Standards looked at it in the stance of the academic program, so we looked at it in terms of the current class-scheduling grid. We looked at it in terms of how to do it [create a Common Period] with the smallest impact on the academic program.

Jennifer Utrata – I was on the Senate, and we talked about not systematically disadvantaging faculty members with parental responsibilities. Younger faculty members will be challenged in attending meetings at some times more than some others. It's important to keep that in mind.

Dexter Gordon – Two things. In response to Barry, in our Chair's meeting, we started having conversations [about using the Common Period] in relation to the socializing process of faculty. We could have seminars, etc.. There is no shared hour that faculty can meet on a range of issues. Second, using the schedule, we are missing a point. Students occupy these classes because they are at these hours. If there are no classes at these hours, then students won't take classes then.

Brad Dillman – Last year, I couldn't attend any faculty meetings because of the times when I taught. We need to be careful not to exclude faculty members. We could also use it as a time to have external speakers. We could also use it as a time for committee meetings, for example, maybe one of the slots each month. It would simplify the task of bringing faculty together. I think this hour will be put to good use.

Suzanne Holland – Point of information. In last year's ASC, we kept asking why we were being asked to do this. We were told it was because of wanting faculty to participate in shared governance.

Lynnette Claire – I am happy to hear a bigger vision, because I don't know if there is any data that supports the idea that more people will come [to faculty meetings] if we create a common hour.

Kessel pointed to the faculty survey data on governance in the FAQ document (Appendix E), in which "49% indicated they would be more likely to attend if meeting times didn't conflict with their teaching schedules".

John Lear – I am wondering where those students might go? Are they going to crowd the Diner during that time? I like the idea of common conversations. Why was the Student Senate so enthusiastic?

Alisa Kessel – The Diner director and staff do not anticipate a problem. Several students cited an opportunity for the entire student body to convene as a positive. The only concern from students was about whether the course schedule would get pushed later into the day.

John Hansen – What is the strong argument for the hour and a half versus the hour slot?

Ariela Tubert – I may not have an exact answer, but the Faculty Bylaws say we can't exceed 90 minutes for faculty meetings.

Suzanne Holland – An argument for the longer period is logistical in that we can't have an hour. We can only have 50 minutes. So, we would have 40 minutes to discuss things, and that really doesn't lend itself to the richness of shared governance.

Sunil Kukreja – I want to echo Suzanne's point. The ASC did evaluate the merits of an hour option compared to an hour and a half, and they came up with the same points. After their conversations, they recommended 90 minutes.

Nancy Bristow – I wanted to echo Robin's thank you to everyone's work on this sustained effort. Even though we started with this as something for faculty governance, I hope we will think about opportunities we can take advantage of, and think about our aspirations for the future. The course-scheduling grid is something we have thought about needing tinkering, so I want us to be led by our aspirations.

Andy Rex – I assume that this table [of number of courses taught at different times] will be sent out in the minutes? Can I ask that 8 a.m., 9 a.m., and 4 p.m. be added?

Amy Spivey – My undergraduate college had a common period for an hour three days a week, and for students that time was used to bring in outside speakers. So, every week the entire campus got to hear the same speaker, and it really led to a high level of intellectual discussion among the students on campus. Over four years, that had a major impact on me as a student.

Jo Crane – We did ask about what in the academic program could be done. But the ASC was tasked with working with the existing grid. Maybe we can think about this in the long term. We would love to have a common period, but right now we want to put this in place for next year. We need to turn in course schedules soon. I don't know if we are ready for that.

Motion (Suzanne Holland) – I move that we endorse the original Faculty Senate change to the scheduling guidelines [which is shown on page 1 of the FAQ document]. The motion was seconded.

From page 1 of the FAQ document –

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."

Discussion of the motion

Sarah Freeman – I have been tracking this. We haven't left many stones unturned. I do know that we need time together. I am in favor of this motion.

Jo Crane – The ASC did due diligence for two other time slots, but not this one. I am in support of a common period, but not in this time slot for 90 minutes.

Rich Anderson-Connolly – I am in support of the idea in general, but I would vote NO on this. I don't feel like I have all of the information. I would vote NO now because I still have more questions.

Keith Ward – Thanks for raising that, Rich. We are still leaving out Tuesday and Thursday, although I appreciate the information that Eric [Orlin] found.

Motion (Bill Haltom) – I move that we postpone indefinitely the discussion on this motion. If we approve this motion, the motion made by Prof. Holland will go away at the end of this meeting. (I did that intentionally so that we can work out the wording of the motion and bring a new one later.) Haltom's motion was seconded.

VII. Adjournment - The meeting adjourned because time expired at 5:30 p.m.. Two motions remain on the floor (the motion to endorse Senate's original decision, and the motion to postpone discussion indefinitely).

Appendix A – Attendance record (recorded by Martin Jackson)

Attending

Rich Anderson-Connolly
Bill Barry
Kris Bartanen
Bill Beardsley
Bill Breitenbach
Nancy Bristow
Gwynne Brown
Derek Buescher
Alva Butcher
Lynnette Claire
Alia Clark
Jo Crane
Isiaah Crawford
Monica DeHart
Alyce DeMarais
Brad Dillman
Sara Freeman
Megan Gessel
Barry Goldstein
Dexter Gordon
Jeff Grinstead
Bill Haltom
John Hanson
Mark Harpring
Suzanne Holland
Zaixin Hong
Martin Jackson
Robin Jacobson
Diane Kelley
Alisa Kessel
Kriszta Kotsis
Sunil Kukreja
Brendan Lanctot
John Lear
Sam Liao
Grace Livingston
Pierre Ly
Gary McCall
Amanda Mifflin
Eric Orlin
Susan Owen
Sara Protasi

Andy Rex
Elise Richman
Amy Ryken
Eric Scharrer
Mike Segawa
Renee Simms
Jess Smith
Amy Spivey
Jonathan Stockdale
George Tomlin
Ariela Tubert
Jennifer Utrata
Keith Ward
Stacey Weiss
Linda Williams
Peter Wimberger
John Woodward

Guests

Michael Benitez
Ellen Peters
Brad Tomhave
Landon Wade



President's Report to the Faculty

September 12, 2016

The academic year is off to a strong start. I am pleased to have had the opportunity to meet many faculty colleagues since my arrival on campus in July and look forward to the upcoming faculty meeting on September 19.

As indicated in my address at the President's Welcome for faculty and staff, there are three broad themes that I am interesting in pursuing during this year as I listen and learn more about the history, culture, and aspirations held by our community for Puget Sound: supporting our students, engaging our community, and carrying forward Puget Sound's positive momentum. Toward these ends, here are a few initiatives currently underway and issues that will require our collective attention in the coming year.

Enrollment

Strengthening student retention, satisfaction, and persistence to graduation are key objectives. We continue on a positive trend of increasing interest in a Puget Sound education, with freshman applications rising 43 percent over the last five years (and graduate applications increasing 18 percent over the same time period). We have also met many of our most important objectives for the class, increasing minority representation, maintaining high academic quality, and meeting our headcount.

As noted in the President's Welcome, the impact of our Fall 2016 enrollment – meeting our first-year student enrollment goal, with a modestly higher discount rate – will have a preliminary budget impact upwards of a half million dollars. While this is within the budgeted

enrollment contingency plan, it requires close attention as we continue our work in recruiting the Class of 2021 and deciding how to best leverage need- and merit-based financial aid to meet our enrollment objectives. Our budget estimate for the Class of 2020 will be revised as we get 10th day census data later this week and complete updates of enrollment and financial projections in the long-range budget model for Puget Sound.

A few key indicators of the incoming class appear below; please note that the figures for fall 2016 will not be final until later in the week.

	FY14	FY15	FY16*
First-year headcount	663	652	674
First-year high school GPA	3.51	3.53	3.55
First-year average SAT (math and critical reading)	1215	1209	1232**
First-year % minoritized (students of color)	24.1	20.4	28.0
First-year % underrepresented minoritized (students of color)	8.7	8.3	12.0
Transfer FTE	59	54	56
Undergraduate FTE	2536	2466	2500
Graduate FTE	232	255	260
Total FTE	2768	2720	2760

*preliminary data to be finalized after 10th day of the fall semester **first year of test-optional admission option

Vice President for Enrollment Search

Christine Mica joined us last month in the role of interim vice president for enrollment while we conduct our national search for ongoing leadership in this role. The search committee, including representatives of the faculty (Alyce DeMarais and Dexter Gordon), staff, and students, has met three times over the past several weeks to identify and vet candidates. Finalists will be on campus in late September and early October for open sessions with the campus community; I hope that you will be able to attend these sessions and provide your feedback. We look to appoint a person to the position who can join us in January 2017.

Campus Forums

It is among my highest priorities to ensure that we make needed space and time available to address, as a community, the most challenging issues of our times. Our academic and student affairs divisions have jointly developed the first in a series of open forums to address such issues. The first, confronting issues of violence in our society, will be held on September 15. I will provide a brief message of welcome and introduction, followed by remarks by Michael Benitez, dean of Diversity and Inclusion; Dexter Gordon, director of the Race and Pedagogy Institute and African American Studies; Noah Lumbantobing '17, ASUPS president; and Vivie Nguyen, director of Intercultural Engagement.

The Cabinet and I will meet soon with representatives from Advocates for Institutional Change to discuss progress made over the past year toward our shared goals to make Puget Sound the welcoming and inclusive environment we aspire for it to be. I hope you will all take time to stop by the newly renovated and expanded Student Diversity Center, which was completed over the summer months. This is a short-term but greatly enhanced space for student clubs to meet while we continue to build on the longer-term objectives of our campus master plan.

Engaging our Community

Over the past few months I have enjoyed meeting with local civic leaders and others in Tacoma, and learning more about the university's commitment to interdisciplinary and experiential learning and civic engagement. In the months ahead I will embark on some travel on behalf of the university to meet with alumni, parents, and other friends of the college.

Here on campus I look forward to engaging in dialogue with our community to set the stage for us to step into a university-wide and collaborative process to develop a new strategic plan that will bring Puget Sound to its next level of excellence. I look forward to our ongoing conversations on these and other issues this year.

Isiaah Crawford

President

Appendix C - Report from Academic Vice President Kris Bartanen



September 12, 2016

TO: Faculty colleagues

FR: Kris Bartanen

RE: Academic Vice President's Report to the September 19, 2016 Faculty Meeting

Thanks and Congratulations: To all, for advising and teaching work to open the Fall semester. Robin Jacobson, Politics & Government: National Endowment for the Humanities Grant to research immigration. Geoff Proehl, Theatre Arts: Career Achievement Award from the Literary Managers and Dramaturgs of the Americas. 103 students named 2015-16 Scholar-Athletes by the Northwest Conference; 20 student-athletes named to the 2015-16 Northwest Conference All-Sportsmanship Team.

Goals:

An update on 2015-16 academic goals and 2016-17 academic goals are posted [here](#). My convocation and matriculation speeches for new students are posted at the same location.

Searches:

Tenure-line to-date: Biology-Plant Ecology (Kirkpatrick), Business and Leadership-Marketing (Woodruff), Economics (Mann), English-Writing, New Media and Digital Literacies (Sandler), Psychology, Religion-Gender and Queer Studies/Islam (Ingalls), Religious Studies-Bioethics (Kay).

Non-tenure-line: Race and Pedagogy post-doctoral fellow or visiting assistant professor, to begin January 2017 (one-time funding, up to three-year appointment).

Academic staff:

Assistant Dean for Operations and Technology: E. Kate Cohn, effective October 1.

Associate Director of Fellowships: Preferred consideration date, September 9.

Institutional Research position to replace Kate: TBA.

Faculty Development

Sabbaticals: All applications for leaves are due October 12. We anticipate being able to award a maximum of ten junior and senior fellowships, with a likely breakdown of three senior (Lantz) and seven junior (Nelson, Hall, Paccar).

Experiential learning: Check out the faculty portion of the [experiential learning website](#) to learn about how to apply for program assistants, curriculum development grants, release time, as well as information about the Civic Scholarship Initiative. Stay tuned for an “open house” for new experiential learning and student testing accommodation spaces in Howarth 005 and 003!

Northwest Five Colleges Consortium: For those (~50 faculty) who have been a part of NW5C annual meetings at Skamania Lodge over the past four Septembers, there will not be an annual meeting this year as we are close to the end of the NW5C Mellon grant. The steering committee is actively working on a second-round proposal and hopes to return to Skamania next year at this time.

Working Groups

Dean’s designees for Faculty Senate Committees:

Michael Benitez: Committee on Diversity; Kate Cohn: Library, Media & Information Services; Renee Houston: Student Life Committee; Martin Jackson: Curriculum Committee; Sunil Kukreja: Academic Standards, International Education, and University Enrichment. I will continue with Faculty Advancement and Professional Standards, and join Institutional Review Board (as needed) for 2016-17.

Budget Task Force: Change in FAFSA provisions by the White House to allow students, beginning October 2016, to use “prior prior year” (i.e., 2015 tax returns, rather than 2016 returns, for 2017-18) will accelerate market expectations for the timing of publishing tuition and issuing financial aid awards. In order to be prepared for this adjustment, we will ask the Board of Trustees to pre-approve a range of 2017-18 tuition increases in October to guide the work of the Budget Task Force (BTF) since a February board approval of tuition comes too late. This adjustment will enable the president to confirm the exact tuition rate after considering the budget recommendation from the BTF later in the fall. The impact of a 2% higher discount rate for the incoming Class of 2020 and future classes, among other factors, will make for a challenging BTF season. Faculty members of the BTF are Eric Orlin and Ariela Tubert.

Race and Pedagogy Institute Work Group will begin its work once membership is confirmed. The purposes of the work group are to formulate an updated mission statement, strategic plan, and funding plan to promote the success the Race and Pedagogy Institute.

Study Abroad Work Group will begin its work soon. Faculty representatives are Gareth Barkin, John Lear (both members of International Education Committee) and Peter Wimberger, Senate liaison to IEC. Charges:

1. Based in a comprehensive and representative environmental scan of peer institutions (e.g., institutional peer group, Northwest Five Colleges, Annapolis Group, regional overlap institutions) and of any relevant literature, recommend potential study abroad financial aid policies within (a) existing institutional discount rate and (b) existing instructional budget for study abroad. In short, are there other possible financial models? What are their advantages and disadvantages relative to Puget Sound’s approach?

2. Based in a comprehensive review of Puget Sound’s various faculty-led study abroad and study away pilot projects, recommend a budget model that accounts for (a) cost of faculty replacement on campus, if applicable; (b) FTE students per faculty member; (c) program travel costs; (d) supplementary staffing (e.g., additional faculty member(s) from campus, additional teachers hired in the field, staff member(s), course assistants); (e) risk review; and (f) other expenses, as applicable.
3. Are there recommended curricular changes for Puget Sound that would reduce students’ articulated fear of “falling behind” in their academic programs if they study abroad?
4. Based in a thorough understanding of benefits and risks of exchange programs, what is a reasonable number of study abroad exchange programs for Puget Sound? What are the requisite provisions for a feasible exchange?
5. What potential study abroad and study away collaborations are possible among Northwest Five Colleges? What steps are needed to move forward toward greater collaboration and potential cost-efficiency?

Policy Review

I encourage you to read the [Faculty Medical and Family Leave and Disability Policies](#), for which requested revisions for clarity were completed this summer – including the Request for Leave Form. We are addressing the Tacoma Paid Leave Ordinance with this provision for faculty:

When personal medical or family circumstances prevent a full-time faculty member from meeting his or her essential job functions and are likely to be of short duration – two weeks or less – the department chair, program director, or school dean should assist the faculty member in making arrangements with other department members to carry out the faculty member’s immediate commitments. Faculty members’ support of their colleagues during such periods reflects the values of the campus community and contributes to a faculty member’s record of service.

If you supervise staff members, please read up on the City of Tacoma [Paid Leave Ordinance](#).

Also, as you think ahead to open enrollment for benefits for calendar 2017, I encourage you to look closely at the optional [Short-term Disability Insurance](#) as enrollment may enable you to have more income during a personal medical leave, including maternity (you cannot be pregnant at the time of application for coverage). Contact Benefits Specialist Kenni Simons if you have questions.

The [Part-time Teaching Policy for Retired Faculty](#), which allows tenure-line faculty members who take regular (rather than early) retirement to teach two or more courses at one-sixth pay for up to five years following retirement, needs to be updated – without diminishing the five-year time period – to provide for a 26-week break between retirement date and additional teaching. The revision should address recent wrinkles with TIAA and align with provisions of the Affordable Care Act. I have asked the Faculty Salary Committee to review a draft before seeking Board approval in October.

Appendix D – Report to Faculty from Faculty Senate Chair Alisa Kessel, 12 September 2016

Broad goals for the 2016-7 academic year:

- support opportunities for communication between the President and the faculty
- identify the priorities of the faculty in anticipation of a Strategic Planning Process
- continue to create opportunities to energize faculty governance and expand faculty voice in conversations about the future of the University and the future of the liberal arts
- continue to work to foster an inclusive and supportive campus community for all students, faculty, and staff

Faculty Service Assignments

During the summer months, the Executive Committee of the Senate (Kessel, Lanctot, Ly) collaborated with the Dean and Associate Deans to assign faculty to service roles. We aimed to do so judiciously, with a mind toward ensuring that committee members were not overburdened with work (due to understaffing) and that faculty members were not assigned to committees just for the sake of assigning them.

Faculty Senate Retreat, August 25, 2016

The Faculty Senate Retreat was divided into three sessions:

Session One: Faculty Senate Priorities

I asked the members of the Senate to consider three questions:

- 1) What do you think should be the top 2-3 priorities for the Faculty Senate this year?
- 2) What do you think should be the top priority for the faculty in the next 5 years?
- 3) What do you think should be the top priority for the University in the next 10 years?

We were able to use the answers to these questions (written on post-it notes and then clustered on the wall) to see useful patterns about our shared goals and the connections between them. The appended document is a summary of that exercise. *If you believe that essential issues are missing from this document, and you believe they should have the attention of the Faculty Senate, please contact any senator or me.*

Session Two: Committee Charges

As a group, the Faculty Senate decided to continue to minimize the number of charges issued by the Senate and to empower committees to turn back to their standing charges to determine what work they need to complete. Each committee was assigned a liaison from the Senate:

- ASC: Kena Fox-Dobbs (fall)/David Chiu (spring)
- CoD: Gwynne Brown
- CC: Robin Jacobson
- IEC: Peter Wimberger
- IRB: Siddharth Ramakrishnan
- LMIS: Emelie Peine (fall)/Sara Freeman (spring)
- PSC: Nancy Bristow
- SLC: Kristin Johnson
- UEC: Bill Haltom

In groups of three or four, liaisons discussed possible charges for each committee.

Session Three: Continuing Conversations

The Faculty Senate discussed how best to continue conversations with the faculty about the common period, how to pursue a conversation about possible amendment of the Faculty Code with respect to language regarding promotion to (full) professor, and how best to support President Crawford and foster dialogue between the President and the faculty.

August 29, 2016 Faculty Senate Meeting

At the first Faculty Senate meeting, the Senate passed charges for ASC, UEC, and IRB. We also had fruitful conversations about the common period and about how best to invite discussion about the language regarding promotion to (full) professor.

Ad Hoc Committee on Educational Goals:

Last year, at its April 25, 2016 meeting, in response to a report created by Martin Jackson, Ellen Peters, Lisa Ferrari, Kate Cohn, and Sunil Kukreja regarding faculty perspectives on the University's educational goals, the Faculty Senate passed a motion "to establish an ad hoc committee to review the Report on Faculty Perspectives on Education Goals and if deemed appropriate, propose revisions to the university's educational goals. The committee shall be composed of at least three faculty members, including faculty representatives from the Student Life Committee, the Curriculum Committee, and the Faculty Senate. An Associate Dean and someone from Institutional Research will be non-voting members of the committee." At the time, Bill Beardsley (then a Senator) agreed to convene the group. The report cited in the motion is appended to the [minutes](#) of the April 11, 2016 Faculty Senate meeting.

Faculty members of this committee are:

Bill Beardsley (at large faculty member)

Robin Jacobson (Faculty Senate rep)

Alan Krause (Curriculum Committee rep)

Brad Reich (Student Life Committee rep)

Faculty Senate Priorities Fall 2016

What are the top 2-3 priorities for the Faculty Senate this year?

- 1) Inclusive and supportive campus community for all students, faculty, and staff**
 - a) campus climate: foster a culture (both a faculty culture and a broader culture) that is welcoming and supports the retention of students, staff, and faculty (especially in minoritized groups)
 - b) lead on issues related to inclusion (including Diversity Strategic Plan)
 - c) provide support and voice for adjunct and untenured faculty
 - d) respond to student demands (mindful of the long histories of some of them)
 - e) address impact of CHWS staffing on academic performance

- 2) Faculty support/balance/workload**
 - a) address bias in teaching evaluation
 - b) address ambiguity in Code language about promotion to (full) professor
 - c) improve quality of life for faculty: workload, family and medical leave support
 - d) increase and/or reconsider distribution logics of professional development support (financial)

- 3) Faculty governance and voice**
 - a) create a common period for faculty governance
 - b) support efforts to revitalize faculty participation in University governance
 - c) support President Crawford
 - d) prepare for the strategic planning process
 - e) continue to foster effective communication with the Board

- 4) Curriculum improvements**
 - a) strengthen the shared curriculum/revise the core curriculum
 - b) consider curricular changes in light of the liberating and inclusive possibilities of a liberal arts education
 - c) develop sustainable experiential and study abroad models

What should be the top priority for the faculty in the next 5 years?

- teaching our students
- defending the value of a liberal arts education
- reimagining teaching obligations to serve students and innovate our curriculum while also providing faculty an environment in which to flourish (e.g. unit flexibility, course load issues)
- improving the campus climate for current and future students
- undertaking curricular innovations, including core curriculum revision
- maintaining strong faculty voice in governance
- supporting the financial sustainability of Puget Sound

What should be the top priority for the University in the next 10 years?

- engaging our students and our communities (beyond campus) to foster inclusion and justice through higher education
- maintaining a commitment to the liberal arts as an essential means to cultivate informed and open-minded citizens
- being flexible and innovative while staying true to our identity (region, liberal arts)
- attracting a strong and diverse student body
- ensuring financial sustainability

Appendix E – Frequently Asked Questions about the Common Period, sent to faculty by Alisa Kessel on September 13 via the faculty governance listserv.

Date: Tue, 13 Sep 2016 21:25:51 +0000
From: Alisa Kessel <akessel@pugetsound.edu>
Subject: [Facultygovernanceforum] FAQ: Common period
To: facultygovernanceforum listserve - redirect
<facultygovernanceforum@listhost.ups.edu>
Message-ID: <C51082AF-D2FF-41C4-A4FA-1BA04E3CAA93@pugetsound.edu>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="utf-8"

Dear colleagues,

In anticipation of our continued discussion of the common period at Monday's faculty meeting, the Faculty Senate determined that it would be useful to distribute a document detailing the conversation to date regarding the proposed common period. The document is reproduced below and is attached as a .pdf.

This FAQ was generated by members of the 2016-7 Faculty Senate with input from individuals who were involved in last year's conversation. We anticipate getting feedback about the proposed common period from the Staff Senate (which meets tomorrow) and the ASUPS Senate (which meets Thursday) by Friday, September 16. I will send a revised document sometime after we receive that feedback.

Please contact me or any member of the Senate if you have questions that this document does not answer.

Kind regards,

Alisa Kessel
(Faculty Senate Chair)

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.)

Appendix F – Enrollment information for Wednesday classes, provided by the Registrar and presented in the meeting by Alisa Kessel

		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	11:00	18	233	73	1275	91	1508
Fall 2015	12:00	16	202	38	655	54	857
Fall 2015	13:00	18	339	65	896	83	1235
Spring 2016	11:00	7	106	64	1157	71	1263
Spring 2016	12:00	2	30	44	774	46	804
Spring 2016	13:00	6	162	58	916	64	1078

Appendix G – Updated enrollment information for Wednesdays provided by the Registrar, including the 8 a.m., 9 a.m., and 4 p.m. slots, as requested by Andy Rex during the meeting

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

Appendix H – Information from the Staff Senate and ASUPS Senate regarding their discussions of the proposed Common Period (distributed via the faculty governance listserv by Faculty Senate Chair Alisa Kessel ahead of the meeting)

I. 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”.

II. Comments from Staff Senate

The following responses were presented by Staff Senators in various departments with various commitments to students and tasks on campus:

“Not only do I think the Common Hour is a wonderful idea, I think it’s necessary and long overdue. In addition to allowing the faculty much-needed time to discuss issues related to their department, it would also be a welcome break for those students who otherwise have heavy schedules throughout the day. Occasionally I will encounter a student who, due to a heavy course load plus internship/work, will not have any free time to take care of business matters on campus (e.g. stopping by [the] office to apply for graduation, visit Student Financial Services or Human Resources, etc.). As such, this would potentially be beneficial to students as well.

I also think it’s an excellent provision that if classes must be scheduled at 1:00, then those faculty scheduled during that time will be on a rotating basis from semester to semester.”

“I’d like to throw my enthusiastic support behind the common hour idea. It would be beneficial for departments that want to do programming with students, and for student clubs to have meetings. I also like knowing that the heavy demand in the diner might be reduced (at least one day per week) by having this time free.

Do you know if the schedule will change only on Wednesdays? I’m thinking of MWF classes – it would be weird to adjust only on Wednesday, rather than just clear that time on all three days. I’d like to see a common hour every day, but I may be dreaming.”

“I strongly endorse the idea of a Common Period because I think it will go far towards developing the sense of community on campus. It will be a time when faculty, staff, and students, separately or together, can organize meetings to discuss issues of importance to us all. At the moment, such events tend to be random, little advertised, and often poorly attended. With a Common Period, everyone will be alert to this being the time of week when community issues could be raised....or when they may wish to organize a meeting themselves, with a greater chance of attracting a good number of people.

On the governance side, this is of course important to allow democratic involvement. With luck it will also mean better communications and communion between faculty, staff, and students, and, through that communion, it could even serve in furthering the goals of the university itself.

I think the downside issues can be overcome and are outweighed by the upside.”

“[We] discussed this at our last department meeting last week. The general consensus was positive as it would allow a continued spot each week that could be used for various things (outside of regular faculty meetings). Thoughts that across campus this would be beneficial was clear to all. My only concern in my small little world is that my time will be over accounted for – meaning my position as a support staff often means I am involved with the faculty in [our] building, as well as the Emergency Response Committee, Safety issues, various focus groups and now Staff Senate. I foresee endless meetings.....however at least I know when they'll be!! :)

“From a staff members’ perspective, the common hour would also allow us to participate in the business of shared governance, community and support. I would hope that the staff are able to benefit from this proposal as well, being encouraged to participate in opportunities like staff senate, without having to sacrifice the mandated break and lunch times; but ensure that hourly employees receive those mandated break periods in addition to the service to the university outside of regular job descriptions.”