ACADEMIC COUNCIL
AGENDA
Monday, September 8, 2008
CNS 200
3:30 – 5:00 PM

0. Select a recording secretary. Elect a Chair and an Executive Secretary.
1. Presidential courtesy.
2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty.
   a. 2008-2009 Academic Council roster and meeting dates (attached)
   b. Guidelines for taking AC minutes (attached)
3. Report from the Executive Secretary.
   a. i. Approval of minutes of meeting of April 28, 2008 (attached)
   ii. Approval of minutes of meeting of June 9, 2008 (attached)
   iii. Approval of minutes of meeting of June 23, 2008 (attached)
   b. Correspondence
      i. Memo to Todd Pellazza re Jail and Bail Fundraiser (attached)
      ii. Letter from Paul Huston, Chair of BOT, re faculty representation on Board of Trustee committees
   c. Oral Reports
4. Council Committee Reports.
   a. Faculty representatives on University parking study (pending item G)
   b. Subcommittee on sunsetting of courses (pending item H)
5. Petitions for immediate hearing.
6. Old Business.
   a. Conflicts between Athletic events and final exams for S 08 (ongoing Item 1)
7. New business
   a. Elect faculty representatives to the Honorary Degree Committee
   b. Blue Ribbon Commission on Governance (attachments)
   c. Incident involving identity theft of faculty and related computer safety issues
   d. Discussion with Patricia Herzog, Ph.D., of Sage Search Partners re AVP Search
8. Adjournment

Attachments
For item 2.a: Roster and meeting dates for 2008-2009 Academic Council (page 3)
For item 2.b: Memo from the Faculty Secretary dated 9/8/2008 (pages 4-5)
For item 3.a.i: DRAFT minutes of the 4/28/2008 AC meeting (pages 6-14)
For item 3.a.ii: DRAFT minutes of the 6/9/2008 AC meeting (pages 15-17)
For item 3.a.iii: DRAFT minutes of the 6/23/2008 AC meeting (page 18)
For item 3.b.i: Memo to Todd Pellazza re Jail and Bail Fundraiser (page 19)
For item 3.b.ii: Letter from Paul Huston re BOT committees (pages 20 -23)
For item 6.a: Memo from AVP Grossman (page 23)
For item 7.b: Report of the BRC on governance (separately stapled); Memo from GFS to President and SVP dated 5/30/08 (pages 24-30); Memo from President to faculty and staff dated 6/12/08 (separately stapled)

PENDING ITEMS ON BACK
Pending Items

(Items just added in bold. Items to be removed shown with strikethrough.)

A. Recommendations in report in Spring 2002 from Faculty Athletics Committee concerning (i) amounts of time student-athletes are absent from classes for trips/athletic activities, (ii) demands placed on student athletes for year-round training, (iii) number of scheduled athletic events that conflict with the University’s final exam schedule, and (iv) amount of money spent on various athletic programs. (See agenda and attachments for 12/4/02 AC meeting, and item 6.b of 3/3/03 AC meeting.)

B. Issues raised at the 10/4/99 AC meeting concerning faculty participation on the finance/budget committee. (See minutes of AC meeting of 11/4/99; 10/29/99 letter from Phil Lane attached to 5/1/00 AC agenda; excerpt of GF minutes of 11/13/92 attached to AC 5/1/00 agenda; AC motion of 11/6/00.)

C. Distance learning issues. (See item 7 of AC minutes of 5/5/03.)

D. Report from the Educational Technologies Committee on security, long-term feasibility, potential for integration, ownership, accessibility, etc. of servers containing faculty data. (See AC minutes of 2/5/2007; AC 4/2/07 3b; AC 12/3/2007 7b).

E. Faculty Data Committee (AC 12/3/07).

F. Subcommittee (Nantz, Mulvey) to consider ways of ensuring that faculty policy is correctly stated in official documents. (See AC minutes 10/1/2007).

G. Issues related to parking on campus; faculty on University parking study (AC 2/5/07 7c; AC 3/5/07 6a; AC 4/2/07 6a; AC 9/10/07 3bi; AC 10/1/07 6c; AC 2/4/08 3bi).

H. Subcommittee on sunsetting of courses (AC 4/28/08)

I. MFA in Creative Writing, Five-Year-Review due in 12/2012 (AC 12/3/07).

Ongoing Items

1. Report by AVP to AC each semester to inform the council of any approved exceptions to the Athletic Department’s policy of not scheduling athletic events that conflict with final exams.

2. Report from the Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees after each meeting with board members. At the end of each academic year, discuss items for the Conference Committee to put on the agenda for their meetings with members of the board the following year.

3. Implementation of AC recommendations concerning issues raised by AHANA students.

ACADEMIC COUNCIL 2008-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department/Position</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jo Yarrington</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Thiel</td>
<td>Arts and Sciences at large</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Greenberg</td>
<td>Behavioral and Social Sciences</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johanna Garvey</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Bernhardt</td>
<td>Natural Science/Mathematics/Engineering</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathy Nantz</td>
<td>Behavioral and Social Sciences</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mousumi Bhattacharya*</td>
<td>Dolan School of Business</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Dallavalle</td>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carole Pomarico</td>
<td>School of Nursing</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jocelyn Boryczka</td>
<td>Arts and Sciences at large</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Dennin</td>
<td>Natural Science/Mathematics/Engineering</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betsy Bowen</td>
<td>Arts and Sciences at large</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Rakowitz</td>
<td>Arts and Sciences at large</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawn Massey</td>
<td>Dolan School of Business</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra Strauss</td>
<td>Dolan School of Business</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rona Preli</td>
<td>Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracey Robert</td>
<td>Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orin Grossman</td>
<td>Academic Vice President</td>
<td>ex officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbin Crabtree</td>
<td>Dean, College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>ex officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanne Novotny</td>
<td>Dean, School of Nursing</td>
<td>ex officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norman Solomon</td>
<td>Dean, Dolan School of Business</td>
<td>ex officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vagos Hadjimichael</td>
<td>Dean, School of Engineering</td>
<td>ex officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edna Farace Wilson</td>
<td>Dean, University College</td>
<td>ex officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Franzosa</td>
<td>Dean, Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions</td>
<td>ex officio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene Mulvey**</td>
<td>Secretary of the General Faculty</td>
<td>ex officio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fall 2007 replaced by
**Fall 2007 replaced by Rick DeWitt

Meeting Dates: all Mondays and all from 3:30-5:00, except the May 4 meeting. Location TBA.

- September 8
- October 6
- November 3
- December 1
- February 2
- March 9
- April 6
- May 4 from 2:30-4:00.

See also the Faculty Secretary’s website at http://www.faculty.fairfield.edu/gfs
MEMORANDUM
Fairfield University
Secretary of the General Faculty

TO: Member of the Academic Council
FROM: Irene Mulvey, Secretary of the General Faculty
DATE: September 8, 2008
RE: Academic Council minutes

These are guidelines to follow when preparing the minutes of Academic Council meetings.

1. The Faculty Handbook specifies that the Council minutes “indicate the votes of members (i.e., tally and roll calls) as well as the proponents of major suggestions.” Although we have occasionally neglected to record which members voted for a motion, which against, and which abstained in the voting, the practice should be maintained to conform to the Handbook.

2. The Handbook also specifies that committee records contain minority as well as majority opinion; the Council minutes have generally followed this practice and should continue to do so. The Academic Council is the executive arm of the General Faculty; as such it considers, makes decisions and makes recommendations on any matter of academic concern that falls within the purview of the General Faculty, except for matters specifically reserved to the General Faculty. The Council provides the opportunity for exchange of opinion between faculty and administration in the ordinary working of the University. The Academic Council minutes are the only way that faculty will know what the council has done on their behalf, and why it was done.

3. The Journal of Record (1/22/68) indicates that “the gist of all communications [to the Council] be published in the Council minutes.” The communications themselves, including reports circulated at meetings, documentation, etc. should be included in the file of the Council minutes maintained by the Faculty Secretary, but the Recording Secretary and the Executive Secretary should trust their judgment in deciding what to summarize and what to distribute verbatim to the faculty.

4. The council acts by voting on motions. To avoid misunderstandings at a later date, these motions should be reduced to writing before the Council votes; they should be transcribed verbatim in the Council minutes.

5. To facilitate consultations of the minutes:
   a. number the minutes exactly as the items for consideration are numbered on the agenda for that meeting.
   b. Write the complete date of the meeting on each page in a footer and number the pages.
   c. provide a separate underlined caption for each agenda item or topic
   d. place all motions in separate, indented, block paragraphs and indicate in boldface the result of any vote on any motion.
6. Minutes must be approved by the Executive Secretary before circulation. Send your transcript to the Executive Secretary (electronically is best) for approval and forwarding to the Faculty Secretary for distribution.

7. Minutes are the only way that most members of the General Faculty will learn what the Council is doing. To allow this to happen in a timely manner, minutes should be prepared for distribution as soon as possible after the meeting. These draft minutes should be labeled as “DRAFT minutes, not yet approved by the Academic Council.” Minutes are circulated to the General Faculty upon approval by the Council’s Executive Secretary, ideally before the Council’s next meeting; if there are any changes made at that time to the previous meeting’s minutes, those changes are noted in the current meeting minutes. The recording secretary should then prepare a copy of the minutes as approved by the Council and indicate on these that they were approved by the Council with the date of the approval.
DRAFT

Academic Council
Minutes of Meeting
April 28, 2008

Faculty members present: M. Bhattacharya, S. Brill, P. Caster, N. Dallavalle, J. Dennin, R. Epstein, J. Garvey (recording secretary), D. Greenberg (Chair), I. Mulvey (Secretary of the General Faculty), K. Nantz, M. Patton (Executive Secretary), R. Preli, T. Robert, J. Sergent, J. Thiel, M. Tucker, J. Yarrington

Administrative members present: AVP O. Grossman, VP E. Wilson, Deans E. Hadjimichael, R. Poincelot

Regrets: Deans Novotny, Solomon, Franzosa

Guests: Susan Rakovitz (item 6.a), Jessica Davis (item 7.a), Judy Primavera (item 7.b), Laura Nash (item 7.b)

1. Presidential courtesy
   none

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty
   Professor Mulvey thanked the faculty members on the Council, especially those who filled in as replacements, and the administrators. Reminders: May 1 meeting of the General Faculty 10-12 for committee elections; the FWC will sponsor a gala breakfast at 9:30.

   All items that the Council passed for the Journal of Record have been approved by the Administration for inclusion in the Journal.

   The final General Faculty meeting takes place on Wednesday, May 7, 4:30 p.m., the address by the President, followed by a reception for retiring faculty at 5:30. Fr. von Arx will discuss the report of the Blue Ribbon Commission. He will give the Council a preview before the General Faculty meeting. Council members agreed that midday on the 7th was the best time to meet with the President.

   a. Annual Reports
   Handbook committee reports are due by May to the Council and the archives. Prof. Mulvey suggested that the Council put the reports on the agenda for Fall.

   b. Slate for the Committee on Committees election
   The proposed ballot was presented by Professor Mulvey.
MOTION [Robert/Epstein] to approve the slate for the Committee on Committees.
MOTION PASSED: unanimous in favor 17-0-0.

c. Appointment of General Faculty Secretary for fall 2008
Prof. Mulvey informed the Council that two people had volunteered to replace her during her Fall 2008 sabbatical, but one withdrew, leaving Rick Dewitt as the sole nominee. Although there is no process for appointing a replacement for Faculty Secretary, she suggested that the Council formally approve this replacement.

MOTION [Tucker/Yarrington] that Rick Dewitt serve as Secretary of the General Faculty in Fall 2008.
MOTION PASSED: unanimous in favor 17-0-0.

3. Report from the Executive Secretary

a. Approval of Minutes
i. Draft minutes of AC meeting on 4/7/08
Prof. Castor noted that “Mulvey” was misspelled near the bottom of page 5.

MOTION [Castor/Dennin] to approve the minutes of 4/7/08 as corrected.
MOTION PASSED: unanimous in favor 17-0-0.

b. Correspondence
Prof. Patton and the Conference with the Board of Trustees had an exchange about a Handbook amendment “provisionally accepted” by the Board of Trustees; Fr. von Arx replied that the amendment has now been approved.

c. Oral Reports: Summer Meeting Dates 6/23 and 7/28, if necessary

4. Council committee reports

a. Faculty Representatives on University parking study
Prof. Castor said that there is no news from this group

b. Committee on Faculty Data
Prof. Castor said that this committee met every two weeks and started to draft a report for the Council, no final draft yet. The timetable is unclear as of now.

5. Petitions for Immediate Hearing
Presented by Prof. Mulvey, concerning the “Jail & Bail” fund-raising event for Special Olympics, held on Wednesday, April 23, 2008. Many classes were disrupted; faculty were “arrested” mid-class; students were taken out of classes. Prof. Greenberg suggested that this matter could be held over until Fall.

**MOTION** [Dennin/Preli] to accept this petition for Immediate Hearing and add Discussion of Jail and Bail Fundraiser to the agenda for today’s meeting.

Prof. Tucker questioned the meaning of “Immediate Hearing.” Prof. Mulvey explained that it allows the Council to vote to allow an item not on the previously distributed agenda to be put on today’s agenda. She reiterated the concern that many faculty complained that the event did disrupt classes. Todd Pelazza contacted her, by phone and by email, to apologize. Prof. Mulvey suggested that such events not be held on a class day in the future. Prof. Thiel asked who sponsored the event; Prof. Mulvey thinks it was the Office of Public Safety. Prof. Dalavalle asked about the urgency and said it seemed straightforward. Prof. Preli spoke in favor of discussing the issue.

**MOTION PASSED:** unanimous

**MOTION** [Patton/Preli] to place this petition for Immediate Hearing after item 7d on the agenda.

**MOTION PASSED:** unanimous in favor 17-0-0.

6. **Old Business**
   a. **Report from the FEAD Committee**

   Sue Rakovitz presented the report from this committee for a new Faculty Dining Room, outlining reasons for selecting this location in the BCC main mezzanine (about Jazzman’s Café), logistics, food quality and selection. See meeting packet report for details.

   Prof. Bhattacharya asked where the pool tables would go; Prof. Mulvey said they would be placed in some other location. The area will serve as overflow for students at dinner. Prof. Epstein asked about plans for BCC room 200 and suggested that room be preserved for other midday faculty functions. Prof. Yarrington asked whether the eating tables would be moveable, permanent? She expressed a concern about lunchroom functions for professional purposes such as entertaining candidates, conducting meeting, and spoke about special touches such as flowers and the need for quiet atmosphere.

   **MOTION** [Nantz/Tucker] to accept the proposal from FEAD Committee and respond to James Fitzpatrick that the Academic Council agrees with the proposal and appreciates the opportunity to consult with him on this issue.

Prof.’s Nantz, Yarrington, Mulvey, and Tucker all spoke in favor of the motion.
MOTION PASSED: unanimous in favor 17-0-0.

7. New business
   a. Proposal for a Major in Biochemistry

   Presented by Professor Jessica Davis, Chemistry Dept. She explained that this would be a B.S. degree in Biochemistry and would replace the current option. She said it would be housed in both Biology and Chemistry; it would increase the number of entering students and even out the fluctuations in chemistry. The proposed major is vigorous. The resources already exist, but the new major would require an increase in the lab budget and the addition of stipends. See meeting packet for full proposal.

   Prof. Nantz asked whether faculty would be hired into biochemistry; Prof. Davis said that they would be housed in either biology or chemistry; down the road, faculty might be hired into biochemistry. Prof. Nantz asked whether it was reasonable to expect faculty to agree to be in two departments and also asked about current numbers of majors.

   Prof. Davis: 14 seniors (chemistry majors), 7 of them taking the biochemistry option.

   Prof. Nantz addressed the size of the major (citing page 7 of the proposal), 39 courses, 132-136 credits. Prof. Davis noted that this is the same as the current biochemistry option.

   Dean Poinceleot said that most biology, chemistry, and physics majors already have that number of credits, and are not forced to take summer courses. Prof. Davis noted that many spend their summers doing research.

   Dean Hadjimichael said that engineering has the same number of required credits, 132-134; some semesters are heavy, 18-19 credits, but not all.

   Prof. Yarrington asked if students were forced to take core courses at other times such as intersession. She also asked about the rationale for the stipends, where there is a parallel situation in other departments. Prof. Davis said there is precedent but was not sure which department(s).

   Prof. Tucker asked about other schools in the area—is this major typical? Prof. Davis said yes. She also mentioned that biochemistry majors have excellent job prospects, e.g., in pharmacy.

   Prof. Epstein asked about the sequencing: how late can a student start? Prof. Davis said that they can enter as a biology or chemistry major and complete the new major. Chemistry majors can take biology sophomore, even junior year and complete the new major. It is more difficult for a student entering as biology major, who needs to start
biochemistry mid-sophomore year. In reply to another question from Prof. Epstein, she said that student do have interest in their first year.

Prof. Epstein expressed concern that a lot of the core is taken in the senior year (see proposal, page 7). Prof. Davis said that is typical for chemistry majors and premed students, because so many key science courses must be taken in sequence. Prof. Epstein asked about manipulating the sequencing in order for students to take more core courses sooner. Prof. Davis said that is not really feasible, that the pre-requisites are too stringent; the electives do offer some room for play. Prof. Epstein asked about biochemistry load junior and senior year—is it lighter? Prof. Davis said that these students have the most time to devote to core in their 3rd and 4th years, and that science courses are easier at that point.

Prof. Caster pointed out that in sophomore year, students take 19 credits per semester, while in senior year, second semester, they take only 12 credits, and noted a lack of balance in that schedule. He also asked whether three labs at once (year two) is doable. Prof. Davis replied that this schedule is typical of what chemistry and premed students now take.

The Council thanked Prof. Davis, who left the meeting.

MOTION [Tucker/Epstein] to approve the proposal for a major in biochemistry.

Prof. Nantz spoke in favor, but said we should think more carefully about the burden put on students when they must take more than 12 credits, and she emphasized that breadth and depth are important at Fairfield University. Dean Poincelot said that since 1977, no biology, chemistry, or physics major has taken only twelve credits per semester. He pointed to accreditation, graduate school, and medical school requirements. Prof. Nantz clarified that she meant twelve credits over the usual 120, which adds a semester. Dean Poincelot said that students do finish in four years.

Prof. Yarrington asked about the stipend for a Director and two Associate Directors for the proposed major, wondering why this program (and not others). She said stipends are a good idea, though. Dean Poincelot said that this is a request, that stipends are not guaranteed by the Dean and will be considered relative to other such requests. Prof. Nantz asked for clarification on whether the Council is approving budget items. Prof. Thiel said that the administration can object to anything that the Council approves.

MOTION [Tucker/Nantz] to call the question.
MOTION PASSED: unanimous in favor 17-0-0.
MAIN MOTION [SEE ABOVE] PASSED: unanimous in favor, 17-0-0.

7b. Changes from the Research Committee
Judy Primavera, Chair of the Research Committee, and Laura Nash, senior member of that committee, presented a proposal for changes in wording to the guidelines for summer research stipends and the senior summer research fellowship, to better reflect and have transparency on the decision-making process. [see meeting packet for the full proposal of changed wording].

Prof. Primavera said that the summer research stipends are highly competitive and that the committee follows an unwritten rule to “spread the wealth” (so that those who already have time off and/or funding that year are less likely to receive the stipend, too). She explained the four categories [see proposal] which include previous summer support, and said that the committee wants to make the language more specific.

Prof. Primavera said that for the senior fellowship, under eligibility, the committee proposes that the Robert Wall Award is parallel to a sabbatical leave and thus renders a person ineligible for the Senior Fellowship. She said that there are 7-10 applications each year for the one Senior Fellowship.

Prof. Bhattacharya asked what happens if there are not enough applicants once all those under the four categories are removed from consideration. Prof. Primavera said that happened only one, but for the $1000 research grant. The AVP gave extra money and funded one extra summer stipend. For the summer stipend there are never too few applicants. Prof. Tucker said that it is egregious that there is not more support in both money and numbers of stipends awarded. Prof. Primavera said that one stipend was recently added. Prof. Tucker said that we are upgrading the faculty and requiring research, so it is discouraging not to have more support. Prof. Primavera said that they were looking into a one-time endowment that would be fed and would grow, instead of the fixed and finite amount as now. Prof. Nash said that the committee has spoken to Stephanie Frost, about NEH, e.g.

Prof. Yarrington said that mid-career, senior faculty also need research funding. Prof. Nantz asked whether junior faculty are “privileged” and if so, should the committee be more transparent in that? Prof. Primavera replied that was not the case this year, that the funds were equally distributed among junior and senior faculty. The committee looks first at the strength of the individual argument and then considers how to spread the wealth.

Prof. Mulvey asked how many apply for each. Prof. Primavera said over 30 apply for the 10 summer stipends and 7 for the 1 senior fellowship. Prof. Brill asked if those numbers could be made public, to increase transparency. Prof. Mulvey noted it should be in the Research Committee’s annual report. Discussion ensued about applications for external support, the pending status of such applications as part of the deliberations by the Research committee, multiple-year projects, the availability of internal research grants to cover some of those years, and the possibility that internal grants can serve as feed money leading to larger external grants.

MOTION [Thiel/Yarrington] to accept the proposed changes to the guidelines for Summer Research Stipends and the Senior Faculty Summer Fellowship.
Prof. Tucker spoke reluctantly to the motion, calling it a triage situation. Prof. Patton seconded Prof. Tucker’s point, saying that these grants are a selling point to recruit faculty and it seems dishonest to candidates when funds are so limited. She suggested that the Board read the Council’s minutes and reallocate money from additional merit to support research.

Dean Pincelot said that new faculty are offered stipends for research, so we are not being dishonest. Discussion ensued. Prof. Yarrington said that if merit is intended to reinvigorate faculty, then knowing funds are available would be a positive sign.

**MOTION PASSED: unanimous in favor 17-0-0.**

7c. **Handbook change from the Student Life Committee**
Changes are being drafted by the Committee on Committees. This item will probably be at the Council in early fall.

7d. **Sunset provisions for courses listed in the catalog**
See meeting packet communications from the AVP, sue Rakowitz, and members of the Council, regarding policies on when a course should be removed from the catalog.

Prof. Nantz said there should be truth in advertising, but two years hiatus is too short to eliminate a course. Faculty are responsible for the core, introductory courses. Would we abandon those to keep upper-level courses on the books? Can we find a compromise between the two positions expressed in the exchange of communication?

Prof. Tucker said that five years is too long a hiatus and wondered about having a seminar course that listed past topics, with no sunset.

AVP Grossman made the distinction between 1) faculty decide when a course needs approval, and 2) the question of catalog listing. The latter should respect best interest of the students, NEASC, and the fact that the catalog serves as a legal document.

Prof. Preli asked whether this question applies also to graduate courses. AVP Grossman asked if the accreditation is different. Prof. Preli replied that it follows a 5-6-year cycle.

Prof. Mulvey asked about NEASC (2 or 3 years?) and said that the NEASC standard does not specifically refer to the catalog, only that students be clearly informed about what courses are currently offered. Our Course booklets do that properly. The faculty should have been involved earlier on in discussing how we would ensure adherence to the NEASC standard. The *Journal of Record* says five years for sunsetting. This issue should be worked out collaboratively. Prof. Epstein agreed with Prof. Mulvey and said we are addressing different things. There is a
discrepancy between the administration’s actions and the J of R. It is a matter of curriculum, and academic offerings, which is a matter for faculty, not solely administrative.

**MOTION [Nantz/Preli]** that the Academic Council form a subcommittee of faculty with representation from both undergraduate and graduate faculty, as well as administrators, to review current policies and to determine a policy on catalog listing and sunsetting of courses, and to report back to the Council in Fall 2008.

**MOTION PASSED:** unanimous in favor 17-0-0.

The Executive Committee will work out the membership.

### 7e. Immediate Hearing on “Jail and Bail” event

Prof. Mulvey said that it was a fabulous fundraiser, with great intentions, over $20,000 was raised, and Todd Pelazza offered a sincere apology. But it was a bad idea in that it disrupted a lot of classes and undermined our educational mission, and also seemed like extortion (people were required to raise bail in order to be released). It should not take place on a class day. She suggested that the Academic Council direct the Executive Secretary to draft a memo.

Prof. Preli asked if the Council should request collaboration from faculty affected. Prof. Caster said that when he heard the event was coming, he contacted Todd Pelazza, who said that faculty could opt out. Many faculty might opt out if notified ahead of time. Prof. Bhattacharya asked if fundraisers are allowed in the classroom. Prof. Patton said that opting out does not get around the overlap into class. Prof. Dennin asked whether students had the choice to opt out, and added that the event did not go as advertised.

VP Wilson commented that she was involved with student judicial at the time and that she found the image of arrest juxtaposed to real arrest troubling. She also said if it was not student-sponsored, why Public Safety? Does this event fit with the educational mission of the institution?

**MOTION [Nantz/Tucker]** that the executive committee draft a letter stating that some fundraisers are inappropriate and that a collaborative method should be used to come up with more appropriate fundraisers.

Dean Hadjimichael said that such events are done elsewhere. Prof. Dennin said that in CT, for Special Olympics, law enforcement is very involved. There is a long-standing tradition of law enforcement in this state supporting the Special Olympics.
Prof. Thiel wanted more specific language. Prof. Nantz withdrew the motion. Prof. Tucker suggested that the Executive Committee draft a letter asking that such events not take place on a class day and stressing the need for consultation with all parties. AVP Grossman emphasized the issue of class day and disruption of classes.

The Executive Committee will draft a letter and circulate to the Academic Council.

7f. Guidance for the Committee on Conference with the Board

The next meeting of the Board is in June in New York City. AVP Grossman indicated that the Committee on Conference was invited to this meeting. Prof. Mulvey asked if they could be reimbursed for their travel expenses.

Prof. Mulvey said that the Committee on Conference with the Board should make an attempt to share with the Board all of the good work of the Academic Council and the General Faculty for 2007-08. They should also share with the Board the faculty’s deep dissatisfaction with the under-funding of merit pay.

Prof. Yarrington said that they should share with the Board the Academic Council’s discussion on research funding.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Johanna X. K. Garvey
Faculty members present: Professors Chris Bernhardt, Nancy Dallavalle, Joe Dennin, Bob Epstein, Johanna Garvey, Irene Mulvey (Secretary of the General Faculty), Kathy Nantz, Marcie Patton (Executive Secretary, Acting Chair), Rona Preli, Tracey Robert, Michael Tucker.

Administrative members present:

Regrets: Professors Paul Caster, Don Greenberg, Jo Yarrington; Deans Susan Franzosa, Norm Solomon.

MOTION. That the Council elect faculty to serve on the AVP Search Committee with distribution as follows: 2 faculty members from the College of Arts and Sciences, 2 faculty members from different schools outside CAS, and 1 faculty member at large without restriction as to school or discipline.

Prof. Michael Tucker pointed out that the Dolan School of Business has a lot of students and a lot of faculty and suggested that there should be a designated representative from DSB.

Prof. Epstein pointed out that if the search committee were to be truly representative with regard to the number of faculty in each school, it would be 3 CAS, 1 DSB, and 1 GSEAP/SON/SOE.

Prof. Tracey Robert said that she would be concerned if GSEAP were not represented and that our adult learners should be represented.

Prof. Mulvey explained the motivation behind the Executive Committee’s proposed distribution in the motion under consideration. Specifically, the search committee should
not be and is not intended to be representative. The Council should elect the best people
to choose an Academic Vice President for the entire University; faculty representatives
on the search committee should be representing all faculty and not just their schools and
disciplines. With this in mind, the Council felt that the proposed distribution gave the
best chance of electing the best search committee. Given that the search committee will
only have 5 faculty members and the number of faculty in our schools is so varied, it’s
not reasonable to mandate representation from every school; it won’t guarantee the best
faculty for the search.

Prof. Dennin agreed that the faculty members on the search committee should not act as
representatives of their schools. The proposal in the motion gives a guarantee of wide
representation and guarantees the best and largest pool from which to elect since at least
3 and possibly 4 schools will be represented. Someone from DSB should be elected and
if good nominees are put forward, they will be. In fact, the proposal allows for 2 from
DSB. The proposal will encourage all schools to put forward good candidates.

Prof. Nancy Dallavalle suggested an alternative distribution: 3 from CAS, 1 from DSB,
and 1 from GSEAP/SON/SOE.

Prof. Chris Bernhardt said that different schools have different cultures and supported the
alternative distribution: 3 CAS, 1 DSB, 1 GSEAP/SON/SOE.

Prof. Johanna Garvey questioned the necessity of any restrictions at all. Why not an
open ballot?

Prof. Nantz spoke in favor of the motion. It is ill-advised to send people onto this search
committee with a mandate from a school. Faculty on the search committee should be
prepared to represent the University. With at least 2 faculty outside CAS and possibly 3,
the candidates for AVP will learn a lot about Fairfield.

Prof. Preli agreed that people shouldn’t feel they are representing their school, but that
there is a culture blindness about what goes on in GSEAP. Preli is OK with the motion,
but, with our election, we must make sure that diverse perspectives are adequately
represented.

Prof. Dallavalle spoke against the motion and in favor of the alternative proposal: 3
CAS, 1 DSB, 1 GSEAP/SON/SOE.

Prof. Dennin said that the alternative proposal is more restrictive with regard to
representation as it mandates at most 1 from DSB and only one from all 3 smaller
schools.

Prof. Nantz objected to the tenor of the discussion. All committees and all searches can
consult with anyone as needed. We should elect a good search committee and let them
decide what consultation is needed and how that consultation should happen. As a search
committee member, it is your responsibility to be well-informed and not narrowly
focused.
Prof. Mulvey suggested that the alternative proposal privileges CAS with 3 out of the 5 faculty from CAS. She predicted that the smaller schools, hearing of this distribution, would have a knee-jerk negative reaction. Also, with only at most one slot available from DSB, the DSB may only put forth one candidate, depriving the AC of a real choice. With the at-large slot, we will probably get a larger pool with multiple candidates from each school.

Several faculty members agreed that an at-large slot is beneficial. A motion [Dennin/Tucker] to call the question was made, seconded and passed with the required 2/3 vote.

**MOTION PASSED:** 8 in favor, none opposed, 1 abstaining. 8-0-1.

The Faculty Secretary was authorized to put out a call for nominations. The Council decided to meet to elect the faculty to the search committee on June 23 at 10:00, location TBD.

At 10:00, a **MOTION:** [Epstein/Robert] To adjourn was made, seconded and **PASSED** without objection.

Respectfully Submitted,
Irene Mulvey
Secretary pro tem
Faculty members present: Professors Chris Bernhardt, Paul Caster, Nancy Dallavalle, Joe Dennin, Bob Epstein, Johanna Garvey, Don Greenberg (Chair), Irene Mulvey (Secretary of the General Faculty), Kathy Nantz, Marcie Patton (Executive Secretary), Rona Preli, Tracey Robert, Michael Tucker, Jo Yarrington.

Faculty members present by proxy: Professor Mousumi Bhattacharya, John Thiel.

Administrative members present: Dean Susan Franzosa

Regrets: Dean Norm Solomon, Professor Carole Pomarico

The meeting was called to order by Professor Don Greenberg at 10:10 AM.

1. Select faculty representatives for the AVP search committee.

Chair Greenberg reviewed the information with the agenda for today’s meeting: the Handbook language charging the Academic Council with arranging for faculty membership on the AVP search committee, the structure of the AVP search committee as determined by the President, and the motion passed by the Academic Council at the last meeting on 6/9/2008 to elect to the search committee 2 faculty members from the College of Arts and Sciences, 2 faculty members from 2 different schools outside the CAS, and 1 faculty member at large without restriction as to school.

Chair Greenberg explained that, according to Robert’s Rules of Order, the Chair would vote in this election since the chair is a member of the body and the election is by secret ballot. He reminded the Council that the Executive Committee recommended that proxy votes be allowed since the meeting is at an irregular time and some members, teaching at this time, has asked to vote by proxy. As in the past, a majority is required to be elected. All three items are consistent with how the Academic Council elected faculty members to the Presidential search committee in 2003 and were accepted by the Council without objection.

For the 2 CAS slots, Professors Rick DeWitt and Irene Mulvey were elected on the first ballot.

For the 2 members from 2 different schools outside CAS, David Schmidt (DSB) was elected on the first ballot. On the second and third ballots, restricted to faculty outside DSB, no one received a majority. On the fourth ballot, David Zera (GSEAP) was elected.

All but the four elected faculty members were returned to the pool for the at-large slot. On the fifth ballot, Prof. Jo Yarrington was elected.

At 10:50 AM, a MOTION: To adjourn was made, seconded and PASSED without objection.

Respectfully Submitted, Irene Mulvey Secretary pro tem
MEMORANDUM
Academic Council Executive Committee
Fairfield University

TO: Todd A. Pelazza, Director, Public Safety Department
FROM: Academic Council Executive Committee (D. Greenberg, M. Patton, I. Mulvey)
DATE: August 31, 2008
RE: Jail and Bail Fundraiser

At its last meeting on April 28, 2008, the Academic Council asked its Executive Committee to write to you expressing concerns over the Jail and Bail Fundraiser last spring.

First of all, the Academic Council did understand and acknowledges that everyone involved in every aspect of this fundraiser had the best of intentions, and that a very large amount of money was raised for the Special Olympics. We appreciate the organizers intent to make the fundraiser “interactive” and “fun.”

However, the complaints that reached the Council were substantial, and the Council decided to pass on our concerns to you. Prof. Mulvey did convey to the Council the gist of your telephone conversation with her and that you apologized for the disruptions. The Council appreciated your apology but felt that a letter detailing the variety of concerns expressed at our meeting should be sent.

A number of issues were raised at the Council. We realize that some of these are glitches due to the fact that the event may not have gone on quite as advertised, but we list here the most relevant concerns:

- While it may be “fun” for some people to be thrown into pretend jail for awhile, Council members expressed concern that, for many people, the idea of jail is no joke and should never be a joking matter.
- A number of people were extremely concerned about the arbitrary nature of the amount of money required to “make bail”. We heard reports of people whose bail was much higher than they expected it to be and this smacked of extortion. People should decide on their own whether to donate to a charity and how much their donation will be.
- Although people were supposed to have agreed in advance to participate, we received reports of people not expecting to be jailed. No hint of coercion for a voluntary fundraiser is acceptable.
- The main complaint, though, was the disruption of classes. The sentiment expressed by an organizer in an article in the Fairfield Mirror sums up the concerns of the faculty: “It's really fun when you think about it. You're in the middle of class and suddenly Public Safety comes into your class and takes someone.” For faculty, this is totally unacceptable.
  - It was not made clear to many faculty members or individuals being arrested that consent was required. Even refusing to consent, though, disrupted the class.
  - Some faculty felt pressured by the officers to consent to the removal of a student.
  - Public Safety officers interrupting a class is not appropriate. Not all faculty members were aware of the event and public safety officers at the door in the middle of class indicate some kind of emergency.
  - Simply put, classes should never be disrupted unless there is a real emergency.

Essentially, it was the Council’s opinion that this fundraiser, by disrupting classes, undermines our educational mission and any such fundraiser is inappropriate. Going forward, the Council requests that whenever an event is planned that has the potential to disrupt classes or affect our educational mission, there should be collaboration with the academic division in order to avoid the kind of situation we had last spring. Perhaps, with ongoing conversations and collaboration, we can meet dual goals of raising money for worthy causes while advancing our educational mission.
Board of Trustees

August 25, 2008

Professor Richard DeWitt
67 Nashville Road Extension
Bethel, CT  06801

Dear Rick:

At his inaugural speech in 2004, Father von Arx outlined his vision of Fairfield in the future. Critical to this vision would be the development and implementation of the University’s first Long-Term Strategic Plan. He fully understood that the Plan’s ultimate success hinged upon gaining input from the entire university community. In inviting the participation of all, he always envisioned faculty representation at Trustee committee meetings.

The Board of Trustees has watched Father lead our institution through a truly collaborative strategic planning process. At the most recent Board of Trustees meeting in June, the Trustees fully embraced the University’s Strategic Plan. We are now approaching the critical implementation phase. Creating the linkage between vision and operational implementation will require a significant leap forward for Fairfield University in its culture of governance.

Therefore, I am pleased to invite faculty participation in Trustee committee meetings. The Board of Trustees believes that inviting faculty involvement in Trustee committee meetings is consistent with Father’s vision and is fully in accord with the Blue Ribbon Commission’s recommendation that “in addition to those with responsibility and authority for policy decisions, those involved in implementing them or affected by them should have access to policy deliberations and an appropriate voice in shaping them.” In this spirit, we extend this invitation as the beginning of a process that we hope will lead to greater collaboration and true shared governance.

Following the suggestion of the Blue Ribbon Commission, the Board of Trustees extends invitations to the chairs of the following faculty committees to participate in the deliberations of Board of Trustees committees, commencing with our meetings scheduled for October 2, 2008:

| Academic Affairs | Chair of the Educational Planning Committee |

Academic Council Meeting
September 8, 2008
Packet for Meeting
Page 20
Finance and Audit
University Budget Committee (faculty on the Budget Committee are invited to designate one of their number to attend)

Information Technology
Chair of the Educational Technologies Committee

Marketing and Communications
Chair of the Public Lectures and Events Committee

Student Affairs
Chair of the Student Life Committee

University Advancement
Chair of the University Advancement Committee

The Board agrees that faculty participation in Trustee committees will bring a unique and valued perspective on the work of the University. Your input will be an important resource for Trustee committees as we carry out our responsibilities.

Trustees focus on defining the vision and goals of the University, so relatively few formal decisions are made. Our job is oversight, not management. The President is responsible for the management of the institution. Trustees monitor and hold the President accountable for realizing University goals. As Trustees, we listen and provide guidance, keeping the well-being and direction of Fairfield as a whole in the forefront of our minds. It is this “whole institution” perspective that is necessary for our effectiveness.

The Board of Trustees will continue to work with the Committee on Conference, which is charged with representing the faculty and is answerable to the Academic Council. As it has in the past, this committee will meet with the Academic Affairs Committee and can present items for the consideration of the Academic Affairs Committee through the Academic Vice President and attend that portion of the meeting where they present their agenda. The faculty chair of the Educational Planning Committee will also attend the meetings of the Academic Affairs Committee.

The Board of Trustees has ultimate oversight responsibility for the institution, and we firmly believe our oversight will be enhanced by faculty involvement in our committee meetings. To be clear, this is an invitation to have a participative voice, not vote. As the Blue Ribbon Commission has noted, shared governance does not necessarily mean shared decision making. So that we may all realize the successful implementation of the Strategic Plan, the Board of Trustees welcomes the faculty as partners in a system of shared governance.

This is an important step in what we all hope will be a new era for governance at Fairfield University. If you have any questions about this, please direct them to Father von Arx.

Sincerely,
Mr. Paul J. Huston, Chair
Fairfield University Board of Trustees

PJH/dm

cc: Fairfield University Board of Trustees
To: Executive Committee, Academic Council

From: Orin Grossman

Re: Conflicts with Final Exams and Scheduled Athletic Contests, Spring 08

Date: August 26, 2008

As per our agreement, here is a list of spring 08 conflicts. All of the listed conflicts had my approval in advance.

Men’s Basketball- No Conflicts

Women’s Basketball- No Conflicts

Men’s Golf- No Conflicts

Women’s Golf- No Conflicts

Men’s Lacrosse- No Conflicts

Women’s Lacrosse- No Conflicts

Men’s Tennis- No Conflicts

Women’s Tennis- No Conflicts

Women’s Rowing- Thursday May 8th travel to the Dad Vail Regatta-Leave at 3:00 PM-Finals. Friday May 9th-Finals

Men’s Rowing- Thursday May 8th travel to the Dad Vail Regatta- Leave at 3:00 PM Finals. Friday May 9th-Finals

Men’s Rowing- Travel to New England Championships on Sunday May 4, 2008 instead of Saturday May 3, 2008. This is a Reading Day

Swimming No Conflicts

Baseball Saturday, May 3, home game versus LeMoyne @ 12:00 PM-Finals
Sunday, May 4, home game versus LeMoyne @ 12:00 PM-Reading Day

Softball Saturday May 3, home game versus Iona College @ 4:00 PM- Finals
Thursday May 8, and Friday May 9, to participate in the MAAC Tournament- Finals
MEMORANDUM
Secretary of the General Faculty
Fairfield University

TO: Jeffrey P. von Arx, S.J., President
    Billy Weitzer, Senior Vice President

FROM: Irene Mulvey, Secretary of the General Faculty

DATE: May 30, 2008

RE: Follow up to meeting on the Blue Ribbon Commission’s report

Thank you for meeting with me on May 21 to discuss the 5/2/2008 report of the Blue Ribbon Commission on Governance. Including the President’s report to the Academic Council on May 7 and his report to the General Faculty later in the afternoon on May 7, this was the third time I was involved in an official meeting to discuss the BRC’s report. Of course, by May 21 we had all had more time to read and reflect on the information in the report and I especially appreciated that the President was interested in hearing the Faculty Secretary’s reaction to the report early on as he sorts through the BRC’s recommendations. As I continue to understand and reflect on the BRC’s report, I am writing some specific thoughts on the recommendations (beginning on page 9) of the report. In short, I think there are some very good suggestions in the BRC report - also some serious misunderstandings - but overall I think the Commission and its recommendations are a valuable opportunity for the Fairfield community to have, as the BRC suggests, “a full and frank conversation among all concerned parties.” This is a golden opportunity to move toward better and more effective, collegial shared governance.

Characteristics of effective shared governance:
(1) Transparency
(2) Representation
(3) Clarity of Responsibility in Decision-Making
(4) Inclusiveness: Access to Decision-Making
(5) Accountability and Record-Keeping
(6) Adapting to Change

(3) Clarity of Responsibility in Decision-Making
Listing characteristics of effective shared governance is an excellent way to frame the discussion and the BRC’s list is thoughtfully compiled and complete. In my opinion, their third characteristic, Clarity of Responsibility in Decision-Making, overrides the others. The BRC notes in an earlier section that a “lack of clarity” that “has caused unnecessary friction in the ways in which policy is determined and how it is implemented and evaluated.” I would point out that there are other causes to our “friction” as well, but lack of clarity may be one contributing factor.
As I mentioned on 5/21, the role of the faculty at some places in the BRC report is too narrowly defined. On page 10, “faculty have primary responsibility for all curricular matters, developing or revising academic programs and aspects of student life relating to the educational process” leaves out the important faculty responsibilities dealing with hiring, tenure, promotion, and faculty status. I’d suggest moving forward that we consider the following two primary source items as guidance for the proper role of the faculty:

From the Fairfield University Faculty Handbook:

“Accordingly, while subject in major considerations to review by the President and Board of Trustees, the area of competence most appropriate to the General Faculty is educational policy. It is the General Faculty’s special role to be concerned with excellence in this area which includes admissions, curriculum, courses of study, degrees, permanent educational policies, and other matters pertaining to the academic life of the University.”

From the AAUP’s Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities:

“The faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process.”

Faculty are pleased to see this emphasis on clarifying areas of responsibility in the BRC’s report since the faculty have so many responsibilities (See the entire AAUP Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities). Essentially, anything academic falls under the purview of the faculty. Fairfield’s faculty take these academic responsibilities very seriously and we look forward to deciding these matters under our concern with appropriate input from other constituencies, in keeping with this statement from the AAUP’s Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities which follows immediately the one quoted above:

“On these matters the power of review or final decision lodged in the governing board or delegated by it to the president should be exercised adversely only in exceptional circumstances, and for reasons communicated to the faculty. It is desirable that the faculty should, following such communication, have opportunity for further consideration and further transmittal of its views to the president or board.”

But, as we discussed, the BRC report is silent on which constituency is primarily responsible for creating policy (see page 10). I would urge you to make sure that whatever recommendations are brought forward, the faculty continue to be given primary responsibility for anything academic, in consultation with other involved constituencies. With regard to the 5 major groups that constitute the Fairfield community and their roles (page 10), I would suggest that the Board’s fiduciary responsibility should be clarified to be more of a strategic fiduciary responsibility, by which I mean long-term and global

fiduciary responsibilities as opposed to getting involved in the details of particular budget items. Others, both administrators and faculty members, are properly involved in decisions that have financial implications, such as program development and the allocation of faculty lines.

With regard to the specific items discussed under characteristic (3), I have the following questions and comments:

Selection of department chairs. Would recommendations involving selection of department chairs be University wide or just to the College? Although I think the CAS faculty would prefer a scenario in which neither the Dean nor the department could appoint/elect a chair over the objections of the other, agreement on a new policy for the CAS governance document will clearly hinge on a mutual agreement as to the specifics for the language that the Dean may withhold ratification of a chair or remove a chair for “sufficiently substantive reasons”.

Delineating Areas of Responsibility in the Faculty Handbook. It is essential with regard to this matter that we proceed very carefully, understanding as much about the current Handbook as we can from faculty members who were responsible for its implementation, and getting meaningful advice and input from the national AAUP, and legal counsel when needed.

(4) Inclusiveness: Access to Decision-Making, and (2) Representation. Given the goals of our strategic plan on integrating the core curriculum, and living and learning objectives, this emphasis on inclusiveness, another form of integration, is most welcome.

Faculty participation on board committees and on administrative committees is an excellent idea. As it is now, faculty are largely isolated from these bodies and more integration with meaningful participation could create structures that encourage more collegial interaction.

Faculty Membership on Board Committees. If the Board wants faculty members that are truly representing the faculty on Board committees, then these individuals should be elected by the faculty for this purpose. If the Board wants to invite some kind of faculty participation on Board committees, then the proposal in the BRC report could be forwarded to the Conference Committee or the Academic Council for further study. I do think that simply having individual faculty representatives on Board committees would not be acceptable to the faculty since the faculty would still see the need for some kind of coherent Conference Committee structure that would include these individual faculty representatives. My only concern is that, in the recent past, the faculty were asked to come up with a proposal for some item or other and then told by the administration that their proposal was unacceptable. If you would like the faculty to work on such a proposal, I suggest you give them a very clear rationale for what it is you want to achieve to save time and avoid frustration.

Observers at General Faculty Meetings: With regard to the suggestion that all members of the University community be invited to attend GF meetings, there is a policy in the Journal of Record from 1984 on open meetings, “That the Academic Council affirm the
principles of making meetings of deliberative bodies and councils as open as possible to all members of the University Community, to the extent that logistics and time and space allow”, so this is already in place. With regard to the suggestion that agendas for all meetings should be available to the entire University community, this is already in place on the Faculty Secretary’s website at www.faculty.fairfield.edu/gfs. Faculty deliberations are open and accessible. Deliberations of other constituencies are neither open nor accessible, to the best of my knowledge. I would urge to you recommend that administrative committees and other bodies post agendas and keep and post minutes on a website accessible to the University community. My understanding is that some non-faculty bodies don’t vote and don’t keep minutes, and this is completely counter to the BRC’s suggestions of transparency and accountability. Faculty participation on these bodies will be a step forward but agendas in advance and minutes available to all are equally important.

Reconstituting the Academic Council.

When I read this section of the BRC report, I was reminded of a speech given by AAUP past president Jane Buck in March 2006 at Howard University (and available on her website www.janebuck.org). Much of the speech is particular to Howard University on the occasion of a faculty retreat, but the suggestion in the BRC report reminded me of the following paragraph,

“...I have outlined some of the problems. Now I shall offer some possible solutions, not all of them achievable in the short term, I realize. Make sure that your faculty senate is truly a faculty senate and not a hybrid. Although other constituents of the university should have a voice in its governance, they should exercise it in other bodies. If they are included in the senate, its name should reflect that fact and be called something other than the faculty senate. Administrators should not be voting members of the faculty senate and should be allowed to participate only upon invitation. Committees dealing with issues that are properly in the domain of the faculty—curricula, methods of instruction, grading policies, faculty status, and requirements for degrees—should be composed of faculty members elected by the faculty, not appointed by administrators.”

Our Academic Council is the executive arm of the General Faculty. According to the Handbook, the Academic Council is empowered to consider, make decisions, and make recommendations on any matter of academic concern that falls within the purview of the faculty, except for matters specifically reserved to the General Faculty.

The view espoused by AAUP President Jane Buck is at odds with the suggestions in the BRC report, but Fairfield’s Academic Council, as currently constituted, is actually an ideal compromise between these two diametrically opposed viewpoints. In our Academic Council, the Academic Vice President, the 6 academic deans, and the Secretary of the General Faculty are non-voting, _ex officio_ members. In the not-so-recent past, there was always a good exchange of ideas and input from all members before decisions were made. We should strive to return to the ideal stated in the Handbook that “[the Academic Council] shall also provide the opportunity for exchange of opinion between faculty and administration in the ordinary working of the University.” In our
Academic Council, items that fall under faculty purview are debated and discussed by faculty and administration, then these items are decide by faculty vote. And, before they are placed in our archive of faculty/administration agreements, the administration is asked to either approve or reject in writing. Given our set-up, decisions of the AC should be acceptable to all and, truth be told, this is almost always the case. Giving votes to the 8 ex officio members on the AC (in a body that proportionally represents the schools and disciplines) would fundamentally change it in ways that would probably not be acceptable to the faculty.

There needs to be a body in which the faculty are free to make decisions on issues that fall under their purview, and the current Academic Council is set up to do just that. If the Council does get turned into the “University Council” envisioned by the BRC, I suspect that the faculty will probably form another body to take place of the faculty-decision-making body they will have lost, and this is a recipe for more isolation and further distance from constituencies that should be working together collaboratively. I would urge you to wait and see how governance fares under a new Academic Vice President before suggesting drastic changes to the makeup of the Council.

Another item to discuss is the suggestion to add administrators to the Executive Committee. I think that the BRC had an incorrect understanding of the Executive Committee. The Executive Committee, described in the Handbook and elected annually by the voting members of the Council, functions in a very, very low-level administrative capacity – receiving agenda items from all sources, gathering material for meetings, preparing the agenda and packet, arranging for a recording secretary, distributing minutes, etc. They do not act as gatekeepers for AC business and exercise absolutely no power. All power resides with the AC – faculty elected by their peers and ex officio members. Certainly, an enlarged executive committee can be discussed (and would require a Handbook change), but I think any administrator attending any of the Executive Committee meetings I have been a part of would consider it an enormous waste of his or her time.

One more item to discuss is representation of part-time faculty. Clearly, our part-time and adjunct faculty are completely left out of governance and this should be remedied. But, there are important concerns here that will be difficult to work out. Full-time and part-time faculty should insist that any adjunct representation must be truly representative, which would involve organizing the adjuncts so that meetings can take place and official elections can be held. I truly appreciate the BRC’s inclination to get adjuncts more involved in governance and I am in complete agreement that there should be some representation, but we’ll need to do a lot of careful work to make it happen.

(5) Accountability and Record-Keeping

Issues being decided in the appropriate body, by the appropriate people, with the appropriate input from other constituencies is crucial, but the correct implementation, and monitoring of that correct implementation, is also very important and requires excellent record-keeping and appropriate accountability. I agree with the BRC that revisiting past transgressions at this time is not productive; I do believe that a significant cause of our governance problems is individuals either not knowing or not caring or deliberately
ignoring jointly-approved policies and procedures. Careful record-keeping and accountability can diminish these transgressions and go a long way to minimizing friction.

Use of the Journal of Record.
The following sentence from this section in the BRC report jumped out at me as needing clarification at least, and probably correction, “Policy is contained in Trustee-approved documents such as the Faculty Handbook, the University Catalogue or other documents governing administrative procedures.” I do not believe the University Catalogue is approved by the trustees and I have no idea what is meant by “other documents governing administrative procedures”. In any event, to define policy by where it resides seems strange. Had I been asked as Secretary of the General Faculty, I would point out that the Faculty Handbook contains items that have been jointly agreed to by the faculty and the trustees; the governance documents of the schools contain items agreed to by the faculty of a school and the trustees; the Journal of Record contains items that have been jointly agreed to by the faculty and the administration. Most policy statements that appear in the catalogue are (properly) archived in the Journal of Record.

To elaborate, the BRC is incorrect in its understanding of the Journal of Record. They may have been unanimous in their understanding, but their understanding is incomplete and/or incorrect. Professor Vin Rosivach was instrumental in helping me enhance my understanding of the origin and history of the Journal of Record, as I composed this memo, and this history should be taken into account as the recommendations in the BRC report are clarified and sent to appropriate bodies for consideration.

Suffice it to say here, that every single item in the Journal of Record received the active approval of the AVP. To describe the Journal as a list of faculty votes is incomplete (at best) and very misleading since the Journal includes only those items approved as policy by the administration in the person of the AVP. In keeping with the BRC’s characteristic of record-keeping and accountability, it is essential to have an accurate list of jointly-agreed upon items and that’s exactly what we have in the Journal of Record. If we reach agreement on an item for inclusion in the Journal of Record (as we just did with the language for Clinical Faculty), and that item is not treated as a binding agreement (unless and until changed by mutual agreement), then I don’t even know what the original agreement means anymore.

We could surely go through and have items clarified, updated or removed, per the AC and the AVP. We could agree that administrative approval must come from the President in the future; having agreement from the AVP is a legacy of our previous president. But, to minimize the standing of the Journal would, in my opinion, create a lot more confusion and bad feeling if disagreements arise. In any event, faculty will insist that we need (1) some agreed-upon procedure for the faculty to carry out their responsibilities stated in the third paragraph of the Handbook and, (2) for practical reasons, a central record of all jointly-approved policy decisions.

I suspect that the BRC did not understand the origin, history, or processes behind the Journal of Record, which is completely understandable given their short time frame. I am not aware of any contact re the Journal of Record with any of the 5 current and
former Faculty Secretaries still on the faculty. It will be useful for both the faculty and
the administration to, as the BRC suggests, “reconsider the Journal’s effectiveness and
clarify their understanding of its purpose.” Once faculty and administration understand
how the Journal of Record came to be and how it is maintained, I expect that they will
realize it is more important than ever. I hope we can have more conversations on this as
the recommendations from the BRC report are sorted out.

(1) Transparency
As I hope I made clear in our meeting on 5/21 and in this memo, faculty are all for
transparency. The Faculty Secretary is required to distribute AC and GF materials to all
members of the General Faculty, but in addition, agendas for AC meetings and GF
meetings are posted on the Faculty Secretary’s website and accessible to all. Minutes
and all other material from these meetings are posted. Annual reports from all Handbook
committees are posted. Ideally, agendas and minutes of other deliberative bodies
(administrative and trustee) should be posted and accessible to the University
community.

(6) Adapting to Change
We all appreciate the work of the Blue Ribbon Commission and their thoughtful report.
It is useful to get a fresh look at governance and they have some very good ideas. I’m
especially grateful that they seemed to clearly understood the basic concept of “shared
governance” as a “mode of decision-making specially adapted to the multiple
components and strengths of American universities and colleges”. My own take is that
the BRC report is pretty balanced but may tend a bit toward an administrative point of
view. I look forward to further discussions with the faculty and all other interested
constituencies since I do believe that the Fairfield community is eminently capable of
moving beyond the past toward a better form of shared governance that will enable us to
adapt to the inevitable changes in our future. The key will be engaging with each other in
honest dialogue on shared goals and interests as well as working through competing
goals and interests with the ultimate goal of a better Fairfield. Speaking on behalf of the
faculty, we are ready to get to work.