

## Minutes of the Calendar Committee - Monday, October 30, 2006

Charlie Hurt*	Pam Katzman*	Jerry Waller
Miriam Huffman*	Katrina Larsen	
Douglas Johnson	Karl Peterson	
Rich Kathan	Nate Splett	

\* Absent

\*\* No member identified

() Substitute

**Call to order:** The meeting was called to order at 12:32pm.

**Seating of Substitutes:** None

**Guests:** None

### Approval of the Minutes for the October 16, 2006, meeting:

K. Larsen moved and R. Kathan seconded to approve the minutes from the meeting of September 25, 2006. The motion was approved unanimously.

### Chair's Report and/or others:

1. The Chair indicated that Miriam Huffman had sent him an e-mail regarding the editorial in the Student Voice that talked about fall break. She wondered if the Committee should respond with a letter to the editor explaining the reasons why a fall break is not feasible. The Committee authorized the Chair to write a letter to the editor explaining the key points from our Fall Break Feasibility report from earlier this semester.
2. Wes Chapin had contacted the Committee regarding the issue of our status as a Faculty Senate Committee. Currently the Calendar Committee is listed in Chapter 2 of the Faculty and Academic Staff Handbook as an administrative committee, but has been operating as a Faculty Senate committee for quite some time. There will be a motion forthcoming at the Faculty Senate that will seek to move the Calendar Committee to Chapter 3. Wes wanted the Committee to review its membership and charges to make sure they are current, with a special mind to scrutinizing the requirement for faculty representation from each College and the 4<sup>th</sup> Division. The Committee briefly discussed the charges and membership and decided that the updates made and approved by the Faculty Senate last year are still reflective of the Committee's feelings. The Committee also suggested that the Executive Committee perhaps find a way to ask the Colleges to identify which committees that they feel warrant specific representation and to also ask them to participate in the recruitment of faculty volunteers.
3. The Committee has been charged to investigate the possibility of moving to a 50-minute class period.

### Unfinished Business:

1. N. Splett moved and K. Larsen seconded to approve the Academic Calendar Comparison Report.

K. Peterson distributed a draft of the Academic Calendar Comparison Report and walked the Committee through the main features of the documents. The addition of the time of the standard class schedule for each institution was noted. The motion was approved unanimously.

D. Johnson expressed thanks to K. Peterson on behalf of the Committee for his work in putting together the calendar comparison spreadsheet and drafting the Academic Calendar Comparison report.

2. Discussion of the balanced calendar assessment.

K. Peterson restated that the Committee had been charged with investigating the possibility of moving to 50-minute class periods and this might be included as part of our assessment. C. Hurt had sent an e-mail to the Chair prior to the meeting indicating that he could not make it, but that that he and the Chancellor are very keen to move to 50-minute MWF and 75-minute TR class sessions. He also indicated that he had discussed the matter with the Registrar who said that he sees no problems with moving forward as rapidly as next fall.

K. Peterson said that he had replied to the Provost's message indicating that we would need to make a list of reasons for moving to 50-minute class periods and hold one or two open sessions for faculty/staff, students and administrators to voice their support and concerns. Other concerns were raised by the Committee including: 1) the time-frame for letting the Registrar's Office know about the change in order to get it done in time for fall registration 2007, 2) this is the first time that the Registrar's office was going to migrate a whole year of schedules over at once, which might be troublesome if it were coupled to changing the class schedule and 3) the process for converting the class schedule was quite time-intensive back when we adopted the balanced calendar. D. Johnson noted that we may, as an institution, have to begin looking more closely at how we define a credit of coursework.

The discussion was brought back around to the assessment issue. The Committee decided to seek input from the Senate when the Academic Calendar Comparison Document is presented and that we would take up the assessment issue again at the next meeting.

**New Business:**

1. The 2009-10 Academic Calendar was not discussed due to time constraints. It will be brought up again at the next meeting.
2. Miscellaneous Business
  - a. R. Kathan said that Yunge Dutton had asked the Committee to consider that the fall term is not balanced for ½ credit courses that meet for only seven weeks. The Committee thought that the issue was better solved between the Department and the Registrar's Office, rather than trying to propose a calendaring fix that might cause more problems than it solves. It was noted that this seems like a problem with the flow of days and that the fix for that type of problem is the renaming of days.
  - b. R. Kathan also said that Yunge Dutton had asked for the reason behind the five-week J-term the last couple of years. The Committee responded that this is the result of Martin Luther King Day being late and that the balanced calendar policy mandates that we start the Monday after MLK day.
  - c. 50-Minute class periods. The Committee recapped the discussion related to 50-minute class periods identifying the concerns with 1) the time-frame for letting the Registrar's Office know about the change in order, 2) the Registrar's office was going to migrate a whole year of schedules over at once and 3) the process for converting the class schedule was quite time-intensive. K. Peterson said that he would initiate discussion with C. Hurt to define the reasons for moving to the 50-minute class period and that he would share the contents of our discussion with AP&P Chair, Steve Kelm.

K. Larsen moved and K. Peterson seconded to adjourn at 1:27pm. The motion was approved unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Karl P. Peterson