

# Institutional Change Progress Reporting Form (Due October 11, 2010)

---

**Focus Area:** *Collegiality: Establish Open Time...* (See Cabinet Recommendation 4.1: <http://change/docs/cicFinalReport2Feb2010.pdf>)

**Responsible Person:** Colleen Mullery

**Report Submitted by:** Colleen Mullery

Committee: Romi Hitchcock Tinseth, Kelly Mathson, Jim Stemach

**Date Submitted:** October 11, 2010

---

Please provide a summary for each of the four report areas below.

Please provide links to, or files of major work that has been finished such as new policies, supplemental reports, or data used (such as surveys) in the accomplishment of your plans.

---

## **Summary of Progress Completed Since Last Report:**

In late September Institutional Research and Planning (IRP) administered a quick “Community Time Survey” to faculty, staff, and students (survey is attached to this report). All faculty, staff and students were sent an email invitation; it was not a random sample. Community members were included if they had elected to receive University notices. The survey was distributed through email, university notice announcements (original and follow-up notice) and the IRP webpage.

Please note that the survey instrument was designed with 90-minute time-slot preferences rather than either a 2 or 3-hour time slot preference. This decision is further explained in a later section of this report.

In summary, there was ‘overwhelming’ support for a community time. Respondents indicated that they would be most likely to attend a monthly rather than bi-weekly or weekly events. The top three preferences for time slots were:

#1 – Monday 3 – 4:30

#2 – Friday 2:30 – 4:00

#3 – Friday 1:00 – 2:30

Form Revised: 9/28/10

On the Ranking – 37.1% of faculty who rated the Monday 3:00-4:30 timeslot choose it as their 1<sup>st</sup> choice; 33.0% of the faculty who rated the Friday 1:00-2:30 timeslot choose it as their 1<sup>st</sup> choice and 33% of the faculty who rated the Friday 3:00-4:30 timeslot choose it as their 1<sup>st</sup> choice. In other words, for faculty it was pretty much a three-way tie for which choice they preferred 1<sup>st</sup>. When staff and student preference choices are included there becomes a much clearer 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> choice.

Many respondents commented on topics of interest to them for a community time, and also why some would not support a community time. The committee's review of the comments affirmed one of its challenges in addressing implementation issues associated with the CIC recommended community time. Specifically, we like many respondents, were unclear on the intent of a community time. For example, is it seen primarily as a time to schedule meetings, or attend special events (e.g., guest lectures), or attend workshops (e.g., professional development), or provide opportunity time for social activities to build community, etc.

If a primary intent is to provide professional development opportunities for both staff and faculty, then past practice on our campus tells us that Friday afternoon is least preferred for staff. HR data clearly indicate that Friday is the least preferred day for staff to participate in professional development opportunities.

If the primary intent is to find a common meeting time for business-related meetings that will have least impact on the instructional schedule, then based on readily available data Friday afternoon is the clear first-choice.

However, our survey results indicated that Monday 3 – 4:30 is preferred; yet that time slot would have serious adverse impact on the current instructional schedule (see attached Day by Day enrollment figures).

Some confusion regarding the intent of the community time is evident in reviewing comments posted on this topic on the CIC site. Many who posted comments advocated for a complete overhaul of our classroom scheduling such that classes would be offered 4 days of the week (e.g., MTWT), leaving the fifth day (Friday) set aside for all university business and special events. Such an approach, however, would have serious adverse impact on any future request to the CO for additional space, since a day with no classes scheduled would essentially signal the CO that we are underutilizing our instructional space. (See attached "Space Utilization in the CSU" and "Understanding Space" white paper).

**List of Key Milestones Achieved:**

Survey on community time preferences was distributed and analyzed.

**Comments on challenges, lessons learned, and/or resource needs:**

The ad-hoc committee set two principles that guided our discussion and review of "Open Friday."

Minimize impact on instructional schedule

Minimize adverse impact on work of all university employees.

We considered both the 3-hour recommendation from the CIC report, and the 2-hour recommendation from the CIC blog in discussing structure.

**We determined that the 3-hour recommendation ran counter to both of the above-cited principles.**

*Regarding the instructional schedule:*

During 2009/10, 426 courses (1,309 course units) were offered on Friday afternoon. By instructor type: 62% offered by tenure-line; 33% offered by Lecturers; 2% offered by TAs, and 3% offered by coaches.

Rick Vrem's December 18 analysis also noted reservations for a community time during which all classes would be cancelled. His analysis revealed that "the number of students taking classes on Friday is clearly less than on the other 4 days of the normal work week." Nonetheless, Rick identifies both space and faculty/student choice issues (e.g., classes would need to be made up in the evenings, labs would likely need to be reduced or eliminated, students would encounter more conflicts in scheduling, expansion of 4-unit time slots would place additional pressure on the reduced availability of Friday timeslots). Rick's analysis is attached.

A review of the Day-by-Day Enrollment for Fall 2008 provides further evidence of the impact to the instructional schedule if a Friday afternoon timeslot was designated as community time with no classes scheduled. It shows, in 30 minute increments, the number of students enrolled in classes for a given term. The numbers have been stable over time; therefore, Fall 2008 pattern provides a reasonable assessment of the class enrollment patterns in 2010. As expected, there is a significant drop in the number of students in classes on Friday afternoon from 3:00 on; nonetheless, some 950 students are reported to be in classes between 3 – 4:00 on Friday, the number drops to approximately 487 students in 4:00 Friday afternoon classes.

*Regarding adverse impact on employee work schedules:*

Staff do not want to give up their lunch hour for a community hour.

Union issue - lunch hour is an employee's designated time.

It would be difficult to close offices for a 3-hour block of time.

One time block will not work for all employees (e.g., plant ops staff or staff on flex time).

**We considered a 2-hour time block:**

Obviously 2- rather than 3-hour time block would reduce the adverse impact on the instructional schedule and employees' work schedule; however, the committee agreed that it too was not a preferred model given our guiding principles.

**The committee also discussed issues concerned with community time on Friday:**

Some faculty use Fridays for research and/or travel.

Based on HR data, Friday is the least popular day for staff/administration to sign up for professional development opportunities.

**We then considered breaking up the community time block over 2 blocks with no class cancellations. The more we discussed this approach, the more we recognized that it best satisfied our overarching principles:**

Two 90-minute time slots (with no class cancellations) designated as community time could have the following advantages:

- Eliminates the adverse impact on class schedule
- Provides two separate opportunities for faculty, staff, and students to participate in events
- Could be timed so that more employees might participate (plant ops, flex-time).
- Reduces the time offices would be closed.
- The university does not have one space available to accommodate all community members in any one event, so breaking up community time into 2 time slots may be necessary depending on the number of likely participants.
- Possibly Community time slots could be scheduled such that out-of-area speakers could present in afternoon (fly-in the morning) and present the subsequent morning (fly-out same day). It should be noted, however, that survey respondents least preferred the Tuesday 8 – 9:30 community time slot, which would have permitted scheduling speakers this way.

#### **AD-HOC COMMITTEE'S CONCLUSION**

The committee concluded that no good block for either a 3-hour or 2-hour community time could be designated that would align with our guiding principles. The committee further concluded that the best we could do is schedule two 90-minute time slots (with no class cancellations), for community time, and ask faculty to always keep one of the two time-slots open on their class schedules. The committee could do additional research to determine if it is likely that faculty would be teaching in both time slots. For example, preliminary research shows that during Fall 09 there were just 22 cases where the same faculty were scheduled for classes during Monday 3-4:30 and Tuesday 8-9:30.

#### **Forecast of Subsequent Plans for the Upcoming Months:**

We are surveying other CSU campuses to seek if they have identified a community time slot that works, and if so, what is it used for.