

Minutes of the Academic Senate

January 16, 2008

1. The meeting was called to order by Vice Chairperson Brother Charles Hilken at 9:00 a.m. on January 16, 2008. Roll was called and the following Senators were present: Vice Chair Brother Charles Hilken, Past Chair Ted Tsukahara, Zach Flanagan, Charles Hamaker, Deane Lamont, Lidia Luquet, Phil Perry, Martin Rokeach, and Ed Tywoniak. Absent were: Chair Carla Bossard, David Alvarez, David Bowen, Barbara Grant, and Parliamentarian Valerie Burke.

Also present were: CTO Ed Biglin, Dean Tom Carter, Joan Iva Cube, Emily Elliott, Debra Holtz, Annalee Lamoreaux, Steve Miller, Dean Frank Murray, and Ellen Rigsby.

2. Minutes of the December 6, 2007 meeting were approved as amended by voice vote.

REPORTS

3. Chairperson's Report – Vice Chair Brother Charles Hilken chaired the meeting in Chair Bossard's absence. A MOTION was made by Vice Chair Brother Charles and SECONDED by Senator Tywoniak to suspend the rule requiring documents to be submitted to the Senators 48 hours prior to a Senate meeting in order to entertain a recommendation regarding Community Time from the Admissions and Academic Regulations Committee (AARC). The recommendation is time sensitive in order to be considered for next year's academic calendar. The motion was approved; the recommendation to be discussed under New Business.

Vice Chair Brother Charles announced that an open forum for rank and tenure matters is scheduled for March 27, 2008 from 3:00 – 5:00 p.m.

4. Technology Advisory Committee (TAC) – Senator Tywoniak reported on the status of TAC where he serves as the Senate representative. He provided a 13 page written mid-year report. A full copy of the report can be accessed in the office of the Academic Senate. There are 20 members on the committee, of which there are seven faculty representatives. Five key initiatives are carried forward from academic year 2006-07 and they have become the primary agenda items for the 2007-08 committee: 1) Strategic Technology Plan, 2) outreach planning, 3) online learning, 4) business continuity and disaster recovery plan, 5) assessment of various technology-based initiatives including a new telephone system, Turnitin.com, etc.

Section 6.3 of the Building on Strengths (BOS) strategic plan stipulates that the President will charge TAC with providing a full evaluation of the College's current technology status and needs by May 2008. Chief Technology Office (CTO) Ed Biglin submitted a list of goals for his office for the 2007-08 year, summarized as follows: prioritize technology strategic plan in consultation with TAC and CaTS staff, consolidate and enhance CaTS services to the community (faculty development efforts and plan for future development of the web), create a CaTS Disaster Recovery Plan, create awareness and use of instructional technology, and produce a plan for future development of College web properties.

Strategic Plan for Technology – nine priorities, followed by six goals related to teaching and learning, with 15 specific objectives:

- Enhanced support for faculty in developing and using instructional technologies.
- Enhanced support for creation of multi-media materials

- Enhance technology advisory committee's awareness of curricular and user needs
- Enhance ability to support flexible tech need for teaching and learning modes
- Support opportunities for the web to enhance learning environment for digital systems
- Create a formal process to research and respond to campus needs for classroom equipment
- Enhance the digital library
- Create student collaboration spaces around campus using wireless
- Explore implementation of Turnitin.com
- Explore implementation of laptop/tablet PC standard for TUG, grad & adult students
- Create clear standards for information literacy and technology fluency
- Produce guidelines and policies regarding online education
- Enhance administrative reporting and data gathering to become a Learning Organization
- Implement campus-wide web surveying capability
- Create process for ongoing assessment of TAC's teaching and learning plan

Disaster Recovery and Business Continuity Plan – Senator Tywoniak reported that CTO Biglin presented a comprehensive document outlining the efforts underway for the creation of a plan for disaster recovery and business continuity. The report included detailed task management flow charts for various levels of disaster scenarios to include the identification of the systems infrastructure, critical backup staff, path prerequisites, advance preparation including costs and a description of basic steps. CTO Biglin showed samples of how UC Berkeley's academic departments have established an online disaster plan. Berkeley is willing to share their open-source-web-based planning tools.

CTO Biglin explained that the New Orleans disaster alerted institutions to the importance of online communication. Those institutions that had much of their operation online were able to return to business much more quickly. All colleges and universities shut down after the disaster, their revenues dropped to zero. Some were able to return to business after six months, others after one year. None were able to return to the same size they were prior to the disaster. Tulane University closed the medical school permanently. It is important to have a disaster plan to allow communication in a time of chaos in order to continue to have access to the school records and to contact pertinent personnel. Those institutions that had the capability for faculty to deliver materials online were able to return to business much sooner. The Berkeley tool will guide SMC through the process to develop the system.

Senator Luquet pointed out that the report contains the statement, "The Senate will continue to update the faculty as this initiative is developed further." She asked how the Senate will keep the faculty updated? She proposed sending a message from the Senate to the entire faculty alerting them to the report and providing a link to access the Technology Advisory Committee Report online. Senator Tywoniak agreed to take on the responsibility for keeping the faculty advised on this disaster plan as it progresses.

Other Initiatives and Reports – Senator Tywoniak reported that the Information Literacy Study was conducted in spring 2007 and the report has been published. Faculty Profiles can now be individually updated. The information will be used to establish a master list of scholarly accomplishments.

Results of the 2006 TAC Faculty Survey indicated that faculty are generally satisfied with most technology initiatives on campus. However, there is room for improvement in all areas.

Core Curriculum Task Force (CCTF) – Initiatives coming from the CCTF pertaining to educational technology will be addressed as appropriate.

Proposed Amendment Concerning Web Domain Names – TAC is responsible for “all domain names” for the college website as indicated in Faculty Handbook section 4.3.1. Such names should be registered with the College’s DNC server.

Digital Signage Initiation – Will install a campus-wide information dissemination system to be used for general announcements and community alert systems.

Academic Web Management Initiative – CaTS representatives and College Communication representatives are working with Senator Tywoniak to create a collection of links for all portions of the internal/external websites that pertain to faculty issues.

Learning Management Systems Initiative – Senator Tywoniak will be working with CaTS and Library staff to coordinate efforts to create personalized online profiles for each faculty member utilizing the College’s online learning management systems, the Library’s E-Res online reservation service and private vendor digital services used for the creation of course readers. The goal is that each faculty member customize an online course site to provide general course information and links to resources.

NEW BUSINESS

5. Senate Resolution regarding Provost Bethami Dobkin – Past Chair Tsukahara offered the following resolution:

Resolution of Welcome:

On behalf of the faculty of Saint Mary’s College, the Academic Senate would like to welcome Dr. Bethami Dobkin to our ranks and congratulate you on your appointment as Provost as of February 1, 2008. We look forward to your vision to lead us to new levels of academic excellence and continued growth as a Lasallian learning community.

A MOTION was made by Past Chair Tsukahara and SECONDED by Senator Hamaker to adopt the resolution. The motion was approved unanimously by voice vote.

6. Admissions and Academic Regulations Committee (AARC) Recommendation regarding Community Time (CT) – Vice Chair Brother Charles reported that two reports were forwarded to the Senate regarding Community Time. The first is a formal report from the Campus Deans Committee (attached), which was charged with conducting an assessment of CT from the administrative, staff, and student perspectives. The second is a recommendation from the AARC (attached), which was charged with assessing CT from the faculty perspective. The Campus Deans report recommended the continuation of community time as it currently exists with consideration given to the possibility of creating one “meeting” CT Wednesday per month. The AARC recommended that CT be extended for a year “as is” (Wednesdays, 12:40 to 2:10 p.m.) but with one Wednesday almost every month designated as a “meeting day” for faculty, staff, and student meetings. Meeting days would be designated in September, October, November, January, February, March, April and May. In establishing the Community Time calendar, dates for “meeting days” would be determined immediately after those for Shared Mission Events.

Annalee Lamoreaux summarized the assessment process conducted by the AARC and included in its report (attached). Two surveys were conducted, spring 2007 and November 2007. The surveys revealed that community time was being used heavily for department meetings and there were conflicts with too many scheduled events. There are issues with the Department of Biology regarding labs and student athletes missing too many Friday afternoon classes.

Dean Murray commented that one of the difficulties with CT has been reaching the students. There has been little feedback from commuter students. The staff responded strongly. The results indicated that overall many felt there was a genuine service being provided by CT, others recommended that it be expanded beyond one day per week. An additional consideration was the fact that a new Provost will begin on February 1st. Since the final decision regarding CT will be made by the Provost and the President, continuing the assessment for an additional year will allow the Provost an opportunity to experience CT.

The following MOTION was made by Vice Chair Brother Charles and SECONDED by Past Chair Tsukahara:

Based upon the reports prepared by the Dean for Academic Development and the Admissions and Academic Regulations Committee (AARC) the Academic Senate recommends that the administration continue Community Time in the academic year 2008-2009 as it is this year, but with one Wednesday every month except for December designated as a meeting day for faculty, staff and student meetings. Furthermore, the Senate recommends that all sectors of the College community work to increase student participation in Community Time events.

Past Chair Tsukahara asked what prompted the creation of community time and what were the expected goals. Dean Murray responded that over the years many faculty complained about the disruption of classes during the noon hour by student events being held in the quad. Faculty also expressed disruption of classes by community events, i.e. mass of the Holy Spirit and convocation. There was also a discussion about the need to bring the community together to address particular issues of importance to the college, and the opportunity to bring various speakers on campus. The Campus Deans and Directors Committee began the process to create community time, eventually bring a proposal through the various committees.

Past Chair Tsukahara said the original proposal did not include a time for meetings, yet this is what is being proposed along with the extension of the pilot program. Annalee Lamoreaux responded that the faculty surveys indicated that CT was indeed being used by departments for meetings, even though it was not part of the original proposal. The meetings conflict with the ability of faculty to attend other events.

Senator Flanagan asked how the Monday/Friday time frame is working for students and faculty? Did the AARC follow-up on this? Annalee Lamoreaux answered that the AARC sent a survey to the department chair, suggesting that the chair conduct the survey at a department meeting, or send it individually to all faculty. A follow-up was also sent to the departments and a message was sent to all faculty. The response was low. There was a response from athletes that Friday afternoon classes are difficult because of travel time. Dean Murray clarified that there have always been Friday afternoon classes, although the schedule has been changed to a 90 minute schedule.

Senator Luquet said she understands how CT will enhance the quality of life for staff because they are allowed to attend CT events without having to account for their time. Departments have been told they cannot hold department meetings during CT. As a consequence, department meetings are held after 4:00 p.m., which makes for a longer work day for faculty. In her opinion, CT overlooks fundamental academic needs by going against the center of the academic activity by having classes on Mondays and Fridays, allowing only 5 minutes between classes in the afternoon, and not allowing committees to meet during the noon hour. She stated that she does not welcome CT, she does not understand the purpose.

Dean Murray responded that when originally proposed, the question of holding meetings came up and was discussed by the Senate and the Campus Deans. The two-year trial period was to provide the opportunity to try things out. At the beginning the Campus Deans recommended that the time not be used for faculty meeting times because it would create the problem of restricting faculty from attending other community events. During the pilot period, the question arose as to whether departments would qualify as a “community.” The two recommending bodies have offered the designation of one Wednesday for meetings based on the need expressed from the community.

Past Chair Tsukahara said the objectives of the pilot proposal have not been explicitly addressed. In terms of the objectives, what impact has the change in class schedule had on faculty and students? He is uncomfortable with the fact that CT does not address the adult and graduate students; similar efforts and resources are needed to provide something for them. He encouraged the AARC to accept the charge to investigate how CT can be more broadly useable. Responding to the problem that surfaced from the surveys regarding athletes missing Friday afternoon class, Past Chair Tsukahara suggested that the Senate may wish to take up the question of the schedule for athletes.

Ellen Rigsby added that she would suggest that athletes be banned from Monday/Friday class and Senator Luquet suggested that there be a cap on the number of athletes from the same venue in a particular class.

The motion was accepted by a hand vote of 6-2-1.

7. The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cathe Michalosky
Faculty Governance Coordinator

To: Academic Senate members
From: Frank Murray, Dean for Academic Development
Re: Community Time Assessment by staff and students
Date: January 10, 2008

Colleagues:

In preparation for your discussion about Community Time on Weds., January 16th, I am providing you some background information that I hope will be helpful.

When the two-year Community Time pilot was initially approved by the President and Provost, the proposal had first gone through the EPB, the Senate, the Staff Council, and the ASSMC (Student Senate), all of whom gave recommendations. One of the recommendations was that there be no “czar” of Community Time, saying what events could or could not occur, with the exception of the six Shared Mission Events days, on which no other event could happen. As a result, the scheduling of community time events has occurred through the regular scheduling process—a request is made for that day and location, and if available, the event is scheduled. Often that led to several interesting events at the same time, but that is just like any other time/day of the week at Saint Mary’s: sometimes there are several valuable events happening at the same time.

The AARC (Admissions and Academic Regulations Committee) was charged with assessing Community Time from the faculty perspective, and they are making a separate report to you for the Weds. meeting. The Campus Deans Committee, which is chaired by the Vice Provost for Academics and the Vice Provost for Student Life, was charged with conducting the staff, faculty, and administrative assessment. Below you will find that assessment.

The Campus Deans conducted three forms of assessment. The members of the Deans Committee each submitted narrative reports about Community Time events in their own areas of responsibility. For example, offices that run campus-wide, student-centered events such as the Student Involvement Fair, the Career Fair, and the Study Abroad Fair, all report that the existence of Community Time has increased student participation in these events noticeably, and that vendors report that these event in the last two years have been “much better” than in previous years. The use of Community Time for important functions of campus-wide significance such as the 2006 Community time report on the Campus Climate survey, the President’s 2007 and planned 2008 “State of the College” address, the 2007 event on Diversity issues (which drew large numbers of students, faculty, and staff), the sponsoring of speakers on important topics of social justice-related issues, etc., have proven valuable for the community and provided the kind of use of Community Time originally envisioned. In addition, with Shared Mission events no longer disrupting classes, and with music events in the Quad no longer disrupting classes, the former concerns about these disruptions have gone away.

On the other hand, the Campus Deans recognize that the involvement of the community in Community Time has, for most events, been less vigorous than anticipated. The student survey (see below) indicates that large numbers of students still are not aware of or choose not to participate in CT events. Faculty have complained about there being “too many” events and yet at the same time want to use that time for department meetings. Staff complain that, with the exception of Shared Mission Events, they cannot attend other CT events because their offices remain open and they must work. Everyone agrees that “better communication” is an

issue, though the original decision not to “control” CT except for Shared Mission Event days means that conflicting events are inevitable.

The Campus Deans discussed the possibility of extending Community Time an additional day (Monday) which could be dedicated to meetings, leaving the Weds. time free for truly “campus-wide” events. There were strong advocates for this position, and strong dissenters. Taking classes out of the Mon-Fri 12:40-2:10 slot would mean more 8 a.m. classes and an increased impact on afternoon science labs. Others feared that students would be even more inclined to use the time for their own purposes. Staff who already feel that CT is “not for them,” would further be alienated by facing additional times they could not use. Finally, with the opening of the new academic building there are additional classrooms available for scheduling that make it technically possible to remove classes from the M-F timeslot, but there is no guarantee in future years that classrooms would not be taken away for renovation of other buildings (Galileo or Sichel, for example), thus creating a new space problem.

In balance, given the feedback from administrative offices, staff, and students, the Campus Deans recommends the continuation of Community Time as it currently exists, Weds. only, with consideration to be given to the possibility of creating one “meeting” CT Weds. per month, and no other meetings being allowed on other CT days. The Campus Deans agrees that better communication and scheduling efforts need to be made, but with the appointment of Bill Sullivan and the work he is doing, the Campus Deans believe that there will be improvement in this area. The community will need to understand that conflicts are inevitable, but also that not all events need to be scheduled during CT (as opposed to the later afternoon or evening, when many other events are now scheduled.) If facilities planning allows, and the President and Provost support the idea of extending Community Time to other days, the Campus Deans group would also support that option, but at present there seem to be more drawbacks to this option than benefits.

Staff assessment:

The Campus Deans surveyed the staff electronically. 122 staff responded. Here are the results:

1) Do you support Community Time as a concept, independent of logistics? 91% [111] “yes”

2) Do you feel supported by your supervisor when you want to attend?

Shared Mission Events 93.2% [117] “yes”

Regular Community Time 89.9% [109] “yes”

3) Please share some brief comments on the subject of your ability to attend events. [**See separate...]

4) What would make Community Time better? [**See separate file for comments]

5) If allowed, how many times per semester would you anticipate wanting to attend CT events, including Shared Mission events?

Occasionally (once or twice a semester) 84.6% [66 out of 78 answering]

Regularly (five or more times/semester) 62.3% [43 out of 69 answering]

As often as allowed 48.2% [27 out of 56 answering]

(There was clearly some confusion on this question, as some people answered only once, as we intended, and some answered all three, so the numbers are off—that is 122 total survey responses yet there are 203 responses to this question.)

6) Please indicate your support for each option: (about 8-10 % voted “no opinion” on each option)

Continue CT on Weds. only	74.1% [86 out of 116]	Support or strongly support
Extend CT to MWF	38.9 % [44 out of 113]	Support or strongly support
Discontinue CT	14.3% [14 out of 98]	Support or strongly support
	(74.5% [73 out of 98]	Do not support discontinuing)

In the second file attached are actual comments from the staff, grouped into “thematic areas.” The Campus Deans Committee realizes that there are some special issues for staff that students and faculty do not face and will try to address some of them (for example, a shuttle from Rheem to campus on Weds. at community time) if the decision is made to continue CT. As you will see, many staff objected to the idea of having a “dedicated meeting” use of Community Time once a month, though the faculty strongly supported that idea in their survey.

Student assessment:

The Office of Student Involvement and Leadership conducted a survey of students that got 172 responses. Of those, 70 were first-year students, 40 sophomores, 35 juniors, and 27 seniors; only 16 were commuters. Because the survey was distributed through Oliver, the dining facility, it is not surprising that the upper-class students and commuters are under-represented. Also, because the respondents were overwhelmingly first-year students, the way they are using their time and their suggestions for the kind of Community Times they were interested in are skewed to their brief semester’s experience.

Do you know what community time is? Yes (114) No (58)

What do you usually do between the hours of 12:40 and 2:10 on Wednesdays?

Eat (73) Study (58) Work (30) Hang Out (71) Sleep (13) Class (7)

(Some students gave several options, and there were a number of individual items with fewer than five not listed here.)

What prevents you from participating in CT events?

Don’t know much about the events/lack of publicity:	45
Work:	27
Homework/study:	27
Need a break:	14
Not interested:	12
Class	7
I try not to stay on campus after class	5
Takes too long to eat	
Distance from dorms	

What kinds of events/programs would you want to take place during CT?

Free food	32
Cultural events/music/outdoor activities	15
Fun stuff/games	15
Speakers—interesting ones	8
Athletic events	7
Faculty/staff/student gatherings	5
Talent show	3
Food drives or charity events	
More hands-on events	
Speakers that represent the celebrities of the month	

Of the Fall 2007 events actually held, students were asked to indicate what they knew about and what they attended:

	<u>Heard about it</u>	<u>Attended</u>
Student Involvement Fair (8/29)	73	54
Mass of the Holy Spirit (9/5)	63	25
Engagement Chat Room (9/12)	34	7
Latino Heritage speaker (9/19)	63	13
Study Abroad Fair (9/26)	87	47
Career and Internship Fair (10/3)	83	61
Campus Dialogues (10/10)	14	6
Ecotopia in Japan (10/17)	6	5
Science Student Presentations (10/24)	17	7
Performing Arts Student Showcase (10/24)	17	6
Organically-grown Lunch (11/7)	59	48
Justice/Injustice in California Prisons	19	5

These numbers represent the self-reporting of those surveyed. The actual attendance by students at the Latino Heritage speaker, for example, was over 100. For speakers, student report that the most effective way to publicize those events and get student attendance is through the teachers of classes, when they make it a requirement or give extra credit to attend. On the other hand, events like the Study Abroad Fair and Career Fair attract hundreds of students and go from approximately 11 in the morning until 2 in the afternoon.

To: Academic Senate members
From: Annalee Lamoreaux, Chair, Admissions & Academic Regulations Committee
Re: Community Time Assessment by Faculty
Date: January 14, 2008

Colleagues,

The AARC has conducted two surveys of faculty perspectives regarding Community Time. The first survey was conducted spring semester 2007. We sent surveys to department Chairs, requesting that they collect responses from the members of their departments. Ten academic departments, representing fifty-four faculty members, responded. Two program directors also responded. The survey found that seven out of ten departments were using Community Time for department meetings. All ten departments reported that designating certain Community Time dates for department meetings would help to reduce conflicts among scheduled events and department meetings. The consensus was that one such date per month would be appropriate.

The AARC conducted a second survey in November 2007. Again, we sent surveys to department Chairs, requesting that they collect responses from the members of their departments. Eight departments, representing sixty-five faculty members, responded. The survey focused on the decision to continue Community time as it is; discontinue Community Time; or to continue the pilot for one year while trying out a variation of Community Time.

Based on the results of the surveys, the AARC recommends that the Community Time be extended for a year "as is" (Wednesdays, 12:40 to 2:10pm) but with one Wednesday almost every month designated as a "meeting day" for faculty, staff, and student meetings. Meeting days would be designated in September, October, November, January, February, March, April, and May. In establishing the Community Time calendar for next year, dates for "meeting days" would be determined immediately after those for Shared Mission Events. (Meeting dates would not fall on the same Wednesday every month, since they would need to be scheduled around the first week of school, exam week, the weeks of Shared Mission Events, etc.) We expect that organizers of other events will avoid, if possible, scheduling events that would conflict with the "meeting day" schedule, since it is likely that many faculty members would be attending department meetings.

This recommendation is based on the results of the fall 2007 survey, which follow. Results that relate directly to continuing or discontinuing Community Time are detailed first, followed by results from open-ended questions.

In reaching our recommendation, we noted that 60% of the faculty (39) in the survey favored continuation of Community Time, either "as is" or with some variation, and 40% (26) favored ending Community time. Of the 26 responses to discontinue Community Time, 15 responses were reported by one department. If those 15 responses were not counted (and not added to the "pro" options), the percent favoring ending Community Time would be only 22% (11 out of 50).

Of the 30 faculty members who voted to extend the pilot in order to try out a variation, 8 (27%) voted to keep Community Time on Wednesdays as it is now (12:40-2:10pm)

but to designate one Wednesday as a meeting day. Twenty faculty members (67%) voted to extend Community Time to Mondays and Wednesdays but to reduce it to 60 minutes. Although more faculty members voted for this option, we did not recommend it for a number of reasons. Seventeen of the twenty votes represent a block vote from one department that stated it needed two to three departmental meetings a month during Community Time. This number of departmental meetings per month was not representative of the whole, nor was it consistent with the spring 2007 survey. In addition, six faculty (who chose other options for extending the pilot) spoke against extending Community time to Mondays and Wednesdays, and/or shortening the time 90 to 60 minutes.

The spring 2007 survey found that Community Time is being widely used for department meetings. Both the spring 2007 and fall 2007 surveys found that conflict between meetings and other events is a significant complaint by faculty about Community Time. There appears to be support by a majority of the faculty who completed the fall 2007 survey for extending the pilot to try designating some Wednesdays specifically for meetings.

Ben Davis
Craig Johnson
Annalee Lamoreaux
Joseph Lupino
Cynthia Van Gilder

Faculty Assessment – Fall 2007

Survey form was sent to Department Chairs in early November, with a request that they solicit responses from the faculty in their departments.

65 faculty representing 8 departments responded:

1. Do you support Community Time as a concept, independent of logistics?

Yes 74% [48 out of 65 answering]

No 26% [17 out of 65 answering; *Note: 15 of 17 represent a block vote from one dept.*]

Pro Comments:

- CT is doing a very good job serving its purpose thus far.
- CT has been a big success and I will be disappointed if it doesn't continue. Stimulating campus events are more available, department meetings are easier to arrange. The adjusted schedule of class meeting times seems fine. I find no downside to CT.
- CT has been very successful in vetting issues and moving many key areas of concern forward in both a collaborative & cooperative way.

Con Comments:

- CT has turned into a time for meetings.
- CT has been a very expensive experiment to promote special interests on campus. 'Forced' attendance of students leads to false evidence of support for many of the lectures
- I think there are better ways of fostering community than naming a 'time.'

2. **What would make Community Time better?** [see open-ended responses, p. 5]
3. **What would minimize conflict among events?** [see open-ended responses, p. 5]
4. **What would be indicators of success for Community Time?**
[see open-ended responses, p. 6]
5. **Please indicate how many faculty support each of the following decisions:**
 - a. **Continuing Community Time as it is now;**
14% [9 out of 65]
 - Many of my junior and senior students have never heard of community time. I didn't understand the concept. There needs to be more awareness.
 - b. **Discontinuing Community Time entirely;**
40% [26 out of 65; *Note: 15 of 26 represent a block vote from one dept.*]
 - Return to scheduling model that existed before CT
 - Loss of class slot on MWF terrible, perhaps too high a price to pay
 - The middle of the day is when most students want classes!
 - We like the idea of CT but we need to be mindful of our primary purpose which is education. To make scheduling so difficult, deprives students of the best instructors we could get
 - Designating particular Wednesdays for meetings can't be enforced
 - Professors don't like MF schedule.
 - Athletics really suffers
 - c. **Extend the Community Time pilot for one year, to try out some variations**
(see "6" below)
46% [30 out of 65]
6. **Please indicate how many department members support each option below.**
 - a. **Continue Community Time on Wednesdays, but designate one Wednesday per month for group meetings** (e.g. department meetings)

27% [8 out of 30 supporting extending pilot]
 - b. **To reduce conflicting events, extend Community Time to Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, 12:40-2pm, with Wednesdays designated for all-campus events, Monday for community/faculty meetings, and Fridays open or designated for staff events;**

3% [1 out of 30 supporting extending pilot]

Pro comment:
 - Make ALL meetings then

Con comment:

- Extending CT to MWF, 12:40-2pm, will not work in School of Science. Labs run in the afternoons.

c. Extend Community Time to MWF, but reduce it from 90 minutes to 60 minutes;

67% [20 out of 30 supporting extending pilot]

Pro Comments:

[Note: 17 of the 20 responses for this option came as a block vote from 1 department]

- CT is needed for 2-3 department meetings per month
 - Reserve 2 days each month for dept meetings;
 - Allows for more staff time in co-curricular events;
 - Change time to later in the day or stop scheduling classes for that time on MF

Con Comments:

- Do not extend to MWF
- Do not reduce time to 60 minutes. It's hard enough to get everything in.
- Do not shorten CT time; meetings take longer than 60 min;
- Moving CT to MWF is ridiculous in terms of class scheduling
- Extending CT to MWF but for only 60 minutes will be difficult but not impossible in the School of Science.
- Extending CT to MWF will work only if most or all obligations outside teaching and scholarship occur during these times, i.e. committee meetings, department meetings, community events, etc. There are only so many hours in the week.

d. Other suggestions:

Move CT to Friday – more convenient than Wednesday for those with Tu/Th schedule

3% [1 out of 30 supporting extending pilot]

7. Please provide any other comments about Community Time:

[see open-ended responses, p. 6]

Open-ended faculty responses, with categories

What would make Community Time better?

Planning & Scheduling

- Advertisement well in advance
- Better communication
- Vary times, dates, events, themes so more students are exposed to CT
- Make minutes of events public on SMC website – more transparency is always good
- Minimize conflict among events
- More organization of scheduled activities
- Limit number of events on a given CT
- Allow more flexible use of CT

Changes in Types or Frequency of Events for Particular Wednesdays

- 1 CT per month for departmental business
- Set aside 1 day/month for department business; no campus events on first Wednesday of month; leave 1 Wednesday completely open so faculty can connect with students or colleagues as needed
- CT should have only during weeks where there is an 'all school' event

Class Issues

- Less impact on class scheduling
- Avoid splitting a class between Monday and Friday
- Don't "mess up" class time

Other

- Don't close all of library during CT
- Change the dorky name

What would minimize conflict among events?

Planning & Scheduling Events

- Better planning
- Better communication
- A master schedule available to all
- A campus-wide calendar of events for scheduling, to help prevent conflicts. Departments, committees, event coordinators could look to the calendar for all the events scheduled that day and avoid scheduling a conflicting event unless the events don't overlap in intended audience.
- Maybe Dept Chairs and Dean having better coordination over events.
- Schedule fewer events and then accept conflict. People should be able to go to what interests them; if they aren't going, the events need changing.
- There will always be conflict. Accept that and go forward.

Changes in Types or Frequency of Events for Particular Wednesdays

- Reserve 2 days each month for department meetings
- Reserve 1 day per month for department, program, and regular group meetings
- Restrict campus-wide events to 2 days per month.
- Designate 1 Wed. per month for campus-wide events, 1 for School meetings/events, 1 for department meetings/events, and 1 open
- Limit the "official" programming to 2 major community slots per month. Reduce overall programming. Think of CT as a time to FORM communities, a time for students and colleagues to be available for discussion, planning, lunch dates, etc.
- Fewer meetings
- Shorter meetings

Other

- Increased voluntary attendance (not when teachers require or give extra credit)

What would be indicators of success for Community Time?

Attendance and Awareness

- Increased awareness & attendance;
- Attendance and use of CT for varied functions
- More faculty participation
- Attendance by students as well as faculty
- Greater awareness among students
- Seeing more than just the same students at events.
- Hearing students talk about events
- Increased attendance maybe; however, it is likely many faculty use CT to catch up on work, the alternative being taking more home to their families.
- Attendance is one criteria, but more important is whether the objective of specific event was fulfilled.

Types of Activities

- Variety of activities;
- Planning more student/faculty joint activities; how one would quantify these events as more successful is probably unclear

Sense of Community

- Increased sense of belonging, i.e. *community*
- If the campus felt more like a community that a 'knowledge shop,' then efforts to foster community could be deemed a success
- Develop some measure of 'enhanced community,' e.g. how well do faculty and staff from different areas of the College know one another or know about various programs outside their own. This depends not only on attendance, but also on the nature of the events scheduled during CT

Other

- Faculty feeling less stressed & pulled in multiple directions

Please provide any other comments about Community Time:

- Community events that have worked the best have incorporated a speaker with a BBQ in the quad. This seems to draw students, faculty and staff, and creates the feeling of a campus center
- I think we need to do a better job of getting our community together at events that already happen with some regularity (reading, lectures, films, etc.)
- I was disappointed that CT became another way to make us all busier. I am looking for breathing room in our calendar. I think we would have higher attendance if we had fewer large events competing for our limited discretionary time [*individual voted to extend pilot*]