MINUTES
University College Committee
Meeting of Wednesday, December 01, 2010
10:00-11:30 AM
DMH 330

Attending: Professors Gerry Campbell (Chair) Rick De Witt, Dee Lippman, Amalia Rusu, Acting Dean of UC Robbin Crabtree; Anne Campbell, Associate Dean of UC Aaron Perkus(invited guest)

Absent: Ed Deak

1.Review of Minutes 11/3/10
        Add no in front of the word longer page 2, paragraph 3
        Approved by all as corrected, with 1 abstention

2. Updates

- The proposal to close the Associate of Arts degree is on agenda for AC 12/6/10

- Meeting with Sr.VPAA
    Professor G. Campbell provided notes on the 11/16/2010 meeting (see attached)
    Acting Dean Crabtree suggested we might want to have a meeting with administrator Julie Dolan, new VP of Finance has asked to meet with CUC (relates to financial constraints)
    What are the demographic characteristics of new UC students?   Associate Dean Perkus will pursue this.

- Joint Meeting of EPC/CUC/ACEC:
    Informal meeting notes from 11/18/10 were provided by Prof. G. Campbell (see attached)
    Comment by Acting Dean Crabtree: add enrollment management
    Comment by Professor G. Campbell: found the individuals in support of a distributed model rather than in opposition
    Comment Acting Dean Crabtree: a few of the questions seemed somewhat self focused relative to impact on faculty ie workload.   It also depends on the # of students enrolled, which can range from about 40 to 4.
    Comment- Professor Rusu did think there was some faculty concern about the unique teaching techniques that are often used with adult learners. CUC thought faculty could find workshops from Graduate Education would be helpful.
    Comment Acting Dean Crabtree –Wendy Kohli commented that the Graduate School of Education has expertise to offer.
    Comment Acting Dean Crabtree – there have already been adult learners in the UC classrooms and some faculty may not know that they have had them in the classroom.

3. Alternative Organizational Structures:

    Professor G. Campbell provided an overview of how other Jesuit institutions are structured (attached)

    Comment Professor G. Campbell: Column A = 14 schools and B & C= a total of 14
    Comment Associate Dean Perkus: thinks Fordham belongs in Column A

Comment Acting Dean Crabtree: thinks that SrVPAA Father Fitzgerald favors B & C Models. Marketing and Admissions closely allied. Vision is that the point of entry will be Admissions, then the students would go to separate school depending on the degree they are getting.
Comment Associate Dean Perkus: Of all schools, how many have only one path to follow? Associate Dean Perkus will look into this

He also noted that aligning academic policy with other academic units could cut the market in half. Leaving things the way they are, there is still have a declining population, and therefore don't believe this is financially possible.

University College can mean different things, thinking about an A&B model. If BC academic policies aligned with the AB academic policy If not aligned there is concern over re-imaging. We want a model that will be most productive for UC, enrollments every year for 5 years had gone up, but they are down the last two years.

Online offerings brought many students. There is a benefit to having an entrepreneurial focus.

Comment: Acting Dean Crabtree believes that if the Deans got revenue to the schools there would likely have an interest in BC model

Comment Professor G. Campbell noted that Patricia has moved to SOB. Acting Dean Crabtree noted that Patricia is still being paid by UC.

Thoughts:
Need to discuss a model that combines the BC models.

Meeting schedule for Spring 2011:

Jan 20, 2011 : 9-11am
Feb 10, 2011:9-11am
March 10, 2011: 9-11am
April 7, 2011: 9-11am

CUC Committee members will also attend the Feb meeting of EPC Feb 17th, 2011 :3:30-5pm

Topics for future CUC meetings:

Jan 20, 2011 meeting -- focus will be to bring new CUC members up to date
Work on proposals at Feb 10th meeting and bring to EPC 2/17/11
Core information
UC financial information
Bachelor of Professional Studies discussion

Committee Chair Professor G. Campbell and the CUC members all thanked Professor DeWitt and Professor Rusu for all their work on behalf of the CUC and Fairfield University.

A motion to adjourn was made by Professor Rusu, Seconded by Professor DeWitt
Passed unanimously. Meeting adjourned 11:30 am

Respectfully submitted,
Professor Lippman

Notes on 11/16/2010 Meeting with SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald, S.J.

Attendees: Robbin Crabtree, Gerry Campbell, Aaron Perkus, Paul Fitzgerald

-- Dean Crabtree summarized activities of the CUC.

-- Prof. Campbell described the committee's preference for discussing the "big picture" of UC's organizational structure before proceeding with a decision on the BPS program.

-- Prof. Campbell described three types of organizational structures that he has seen in looking at other Jesuit schools.

-- SVP Fitzgerald voiced his commitment to part-time students. He also discussed the value of a Fairfield University degree and not wanting to hurt that by offering a cut-rate version. He would like to eliminate differences in quality between day, evening and on-line offerings. Hiring of adjuncts is one issue, as is differences in the core. Quality of academic programs is a key concern, and this is consistent with enhanced alumni giving. Efficiency of management of part-time and full-time programs is also important.

-- SVP Fitzgerald noted that part-time students are already integrated in Engineering, Nursing and Grad Ed. Revenue streams from integration of part-time students into DSB and the College of Arts & Sciences could result in additional full-time faculty lines for those schools. Certificate/non-credit/non-degree programs could be enhanced within the schools in areas such as business ethics.

-- Prof. Campbell suggested that members of the administration might want to discuss the advantages of a distributed organizational structure at the 11/18 joint meeting of the EPC/CUC/ACEC.

Notes on 11/18/2010 Joint Meeting of EPC/CUC/ACEC

-- Formal minutes will be forthcoming – these are informal notes.

-- Prof. G. Campbell started by providing background and an update of what the CUC has been doing. He noted that half of the 28 Jesuit schools had something like UC, with a Dean and degree programs, and half did not. He said that he expected a proposal to dissolve UC would be brought before the CUC this academic year, and he asked for input on the kinds of things we should be looking at as we considered alternative organizational structures, and, if we were to recommend a change, what we would need to include with that.

-- SVPAA Fitzgerald then spoke about his vision, which includes no difference in quality between full-time and part-time programs, and enhanced educational prestige.

-- Concerns regarding potential restructuring mentioned by those in attendance included:

- Impact on the full-time faculty
    - to what extent are classes already taught in UC by full-time faculty
    - provide numbers describing use of resources
    - what will now be placed "on the backs" of the full-time faculty
    - what about advising, admissions, curriculum development
    - how would resources and funding streams come back to faculty
    - what responsibilities would be added
    - will quality of teaching come down as faculty become overburdened?

- How to absorb part-time students
    - which students/populations: three subsets
        - degree – seeking
        - lifelong learners
        - "course takers"
    - Are policy changes needed?
    - Provide projections in terms of numbers for three subsets
    - How do changes relate to faculty loads?

- May need some faculty development
    - Grad Ed may be able to help
    - May require a shift to create living & learning support for part-time students

- Students may have better experience under full-time faculty
    - Resources can be reallocated to where they can better service the students

- What would happen to students currently enrolled? Need transition plan.

- Show consequences for students / consequences for faculty

- Evaluate 2 or 3 alternatives rather than committing to one.

- What about Fairfield's community image if UC is closed?
    - Is there a plan to frame this or present this?
- Reallocations: Deans' offices, Office of Academic Advising, Marketing

A – University College Model (School or College)	B – Xavier Model (Offices, Centers or Division)	C – Santa Clara Model (Distributed to Schools)
Boston College (9100) Creighton (4100) Fordham (8000) Georgetown (6700) Gonzaga (4400) Loyola Chicago (9600) Marquette (7700) Regis (5600) Rockhurst (3000) St. Joseph's (5400) Saint Louis (7600) Saint Peter's (3100) Scranton (4000) Fairfield (4000)	Xavier has: -- Center for Adult & Part-time programs -- Xavier Leadership Center for non-credit/non-degree & consulting Canisius (3200) John Carroll (3000) Le Moyne (2800) Loyola New Orleans (2700) Detroit Mercy (3100) Spring Hill (1500) Wheeling Jesuit (1400) Xavier (3800)	Santa Clara does have a separate Institute for Living & Learning Holy Cross (2900) Loyola Maryland (3700) Loyola Marymount (5600) Santa Clara (5300) Seattle (4200) San Francisco (5500)
14 institutions average undergrad enrollment: (5400)	8 institutions average undergrad enrollment: (2700)	6 institutions average undergrad enrollment: (4500)

A – University College Model (School or College)	B – Xavier Model (Offices, Centers or Division)	C – Santa Clara Model (Distributed to Schools)
Advantages: -- Enables continuation of BPS -- May provide highest level of attention for part-time students -- role of CUC is clear	**Advantages:** -- Centralized marketing for non-credit / non-degree programs -- may offer greater motivation to increase revenues (e.g., online programs) -- Point person(s) for future CUC to work with	**Advantages:** -- Supported by Fairfield administration -- Already have part-time students in some schools -- No new hiring of administrators (?) -- Resources allocated to schools
Disadvantages: -- New Dean would be needed -- Costly administrative structure -- Not supported by Fairfield administration	**Disadvantages:** -- New administrator(s) may need to be hired	**Disadvantages:** -- Biggest change from current structure -- Role of future CUC not clear (no point person)