ACADEMIC COUNCIL
AGENDA
Monday, October 3, 2011
CNS 200
3:30 – 5:00 PM

1. Presidential courtesy

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty

3. Report from the Executive Secretary
   a. Approval of minutes for meeting on 9/12/2011 (attached)
   b. Correspondence
      i. Memo from Coordinator of Programs for Student-Athletes to SVPAA dated 9/14/2011 re: Fall 2011 athletic conflicts with final exams (ongoing Item 1)
      ii. Memo from GFS to AC dated 9/26/2011 re: unapproved JoR language
   c. Oral reports

4. Council Subcommittee Reports
   a. Subcommittee on voting rights
   b. Subcommittee for considering remaining items from ad hoc JOR committee recommendations
   c. Subcommittee to consider proposing IDEA form for administrators
   d. Subcommittee on University College matters

5. Petitions for immediate hearing

6. Old Business
   a. Proposal from UCC re core credit approval for courses outside a particular core area (attachments)

7. New business
   a. Election of faculty to the Honorary Degree Committee (attachment)
   b. Report from Committee on Conference re June 2011 Board of Trustees’ meeting and discussion of faculty views in preparation for upcoming meeting of the Committee on Conference with the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees (ongoing Item 2)
   c. Request to reconsider the Workers’ Bill of Rights (attachment)
   d. Proposal from UCC re policy on incompletes (attachment)
   e. Two proposed motions from the Rank and Tenure Committee (attachment)
   f. Recommendations from ACEC re Pending Items (see materials in the packet for the 9/12/11 AC meeting)

• Lists of Attachments, Pending, and Ongoing Items are on page 2
List of Attachments:
For item 3.a.i Minutes from AC meeting of 9/12/11 (pages 3-11)
For item 3.b.i Memo from Coordinator of Programs for Student-Athletes to SVPAA dated 9/14/2011 re: Fall 2011 athletic conflicts with final exams (page 12)
For item 3.b.ii Memo from GFS to AC dated 9/26/2011 re: unapproved JoR language (pages 13-16)
For item 6.a Memo of 2/22/11, UCC to AC re core credit approval (pages 17-20); Core Course Review Guidelines (pages 21-22); Core Course Review Form (page 23); Core Course Recommendation Form (page 24); CAS Mission of the Core statement (pages 25-30); UCC minutes of 2/8/11 (pages 31-33)
For item 7.a Memo of 9/22/11 from GFS re: Honorary Degree Committee (page 34)
For item 7.c Memo of 4/6/11, 14 faculty to AC re Workers’ Bill of Rights (pages 35-36)
For item 7.d Memo of 3/14/11, UCC to AC re incomplete policy (pages 37-38); Memo of 11/12/10, ACEC to UCC (pages 39-40); Excerpt of UCC minutes of 3/1/11 re incomplete policy (page 41)
For item 7.e Memo of 9/12/11 from R&T re: Proposed motions from the Rank and Tenure Committee (pages 42-44)

Pending Items:
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; item 6.b of 3/3/03 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. 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 3b); AC 10/1/07 6c; AC 2/4/08 3bi).
G. MFA in Creative Writing, Five-Year-Review due in 12/2012 (AC 12/3/07).
H. AC investigation whether to switch to all-online, all-hardcopy or continue with both options for IDEA forms. Due in spring 2012. (AC 4/19/10)
I. AC investigation whether to continue use of “yellow sheet” qualitative evaluations after spring 2012. Begin fall 2011, Due by spring 2012. (AC 4/19/10)
J. AC revisits the accessibility of teaching evaluation data, Due spring 2012. (AC 4/19/10)
K. AC three year review of Merit Appeals Policy, fall 2013. (AC 11/1/10)
L. AC three year review of Intellectual Properties Policy, spring 2014. (AC 3/7/11)

Ongoing Items:
1. Report by SVPAA 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.
**Academic Council**  
**CNS 200**  
**Draft Minutes**  
**Monday, September 12, 2011**

**Attendance**  
**Faculty:** Steven Bayne, Jocelyn Boryczka, Joe Dennin, Don Greenberg, Dennis Keenan, Phil Lane, Irene Mulvey (General Faculty Secretary), Elizabeth Petrino, Rona Preli, Susan Rakowitz, Joyce Shea, Debra Strauss, Cheryl Tromley, Brian Walker, David Zera. (There are 2 CAS At Large vacancies and 1 DSB vacancy to be filled.)

**Administrators:** Senior VP for Academic Affairs Paul Fitzgerald, S.J., Deans Jack Beal, Suzanne Campbell, Robbin Crabtree, Susan D. Franzosa, Don Gibson.

**Invited Guests:** President von Arx, S.J., Professors Gerry Campbell, Ryan Munden, Associate UC Dean Aaron Perkus

**FUSA Representative:** Not yet appointed

**Observer:** Rick DeWitt

0. **Select a recording secretary. Election of Executive Secretary. Election of Chair.**

David Zera's name was randomly drawn by Pres. von Arx to be the first Recording Secretary of the year. Secretary of the General Faculty Irene Mulvey announced that the next order of business was to elect a Chair. Dennis Keenan nominated Rona Preli. Brian Walker nominated Phil Lane. Ballots were distributed and Rona Preli was elected (14 votes in favor of Rona Preli and 2 votes in favor of Phil Lane.)

Chair Preli nominated Susan Rakowitz as Executive Secretary, and she was unanimously elected to serve in that position.

Introductions were made by all in attendance.

1. **Presidential courtesy**

President von Arx, S.J., briefly discussed the restructuring of senior management as announced to the University community a few weeks ago. He made three points: (1) the intent was to enable the Vice Presidents to focus on their core responsibilities and, as a result, some reporting responsibilities would change. (2) the new position of SVP for Strategic Initiatives would enable us to focus our attention on key priorities of the institution – enrollment management, marketing and communications and business initiatives – in order to take advantage of the synergies and close connections among these priorities. (3) that it is the President’s intention that this restructuring would be budget neutral.

He explained that the Executive Vice President’s request for a sabbatical was the opportunity for
undertaking this administrative restructuring; that the proposal the EVP had presented to him for his sabbatical, viz., a study of the comparative advantage of masters level comprehensive universities in the current economic environment, was very advantageous to Fairfield; and that the EVP would continue to advise the President on issues having to do with strategic planning, as he had advised regarding the administrative restructuring.

President von Arx shared that the Senior Vice-President for Strategic Initiatives will be hired by the end of the first semester to get into place for the beginning of the second semester. He also noted that the U.S. News ranks Fairfield University as #2 in the northeast region of comprehensive universities.

The floor was opened for questions or comments.

Prof. Lane referred to the letter sent by three faculty members to the Academic Council (see agenda item 3.b.vii) regarding the EVP’s unprecedented sabbatical and commented that people return to work after a sabbatical.

President von Arx responded by saying that the EVP is welcome to return to Fairfield following his sabbatical, but he explained that the EVP would like to move on to be a University President and was a finalist in two searches last year. His present position is being restructured. He further commented that EVP Weitzer’s sabbatical is not unprecedented, and is in the best interest of the university.

With regard to budget neutral, Prof. Lane said that he would like to see numbers regarding the EVP’s sabbatical. The President said that the EVP is not being paid his full salary.

Prof. Rakowitz acknowledged the logic of linking admissions to marketing given that recruitment is largely a marketing issue, but asked whether decisions about admissions standards and the appropriate balance between need and merit based aid would still be made in the academic division. Pres. von Arx responded that the new SVPSI would work in close coordination with the SVPAA on these decisions, and that’s why the SVPAA was going to be on the interview committee for the SVPSI.

Dean Robbin Crabtree wondered about the creation of a second SVP position and asked for clarification of the relative rank of the two SVP’s, wondering if other positions should be in deference to Academic Affairs. Her concern is that Academic Affairs is now just part of the system and that it is worrisome that it is now 1 of 8 vice presidents. She asked if there might be a Provost some day?

President von Arx said that the primacy of academics is paramount but that with two VPs reporting to him or her, this new person had to be called a Senior VP. The relations between the SVPAA and the new SVPSI through academic initiatives is critical. The new SVP must understand nonprofits, but will have a background in business.

Prof. Lane asked who will take over the 5th year NEASC accreditation. The President said that the EVP will advise him and that Associate VP Mary Frances Malone will author the report.
Prof. Rick DeWitt, in attendance as an observer, asked if he could be given speaking privileges.

**MOTION** [Lane/Bayne]: To give Prof. DeWitt speaking privileges for this agenda item.

**MOTION PASSED**: 14 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention.

Prof. DeWitt queried President von Arx about the Board of Trustees’ feelings regarding the EVP being welcomed back after his sabbatical to which President von Arx responded that the matter never came up with the Board; it was the President’s decision.

Prof. DeWitt queried again about the reorganization being budget neutral since there is a net gain in administrators. The President affirmed that the reorganization is budget neutral, stating that he made that commitment to the Budget Committee. He went on to explain that: those moving up generally start at a lower level than an outgoing person; there have been minimal raises, and several hundred thousand dollars has been saved by others who have left their positions in administration.

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty

Professor Irene Mulvey reported that:

a. A number of people emailed President von Arx regarding the awarding of a sabbatical to the EVP to which he responded cc’ing GFS Mulvey. She intended to explain the situation today but since the President had already done so, she would skip over this.

b. The Board passed the latest 2 Handbook amendments regarding a Faculty Committee on Sustainability and terms for faculty on the Student Life Committee at their June meeting. Irene asked to be designated by the AC to review the inserts to be prepared by the SVPAA and distributed to the faculty electronically, and there were no objections.

c. Since the Academic Council is the executive arm of the faculty, faculty need to be kept informed as soon as possible as to the decisions of the AC. There were no objections to her request for unanimous consent to distribute draft minutes (approved by the Recording Secretary and the AC Executive Committee) prior to Academic Council’s final approval.

d. The Committee on Committees will, in a thoughtful and contextual way, fill the available openings for handbook committees. She asked for the Council to authorize the Committee on Committees to appoint members to the Faculty Committee on Sustainability at this time with staggered terms so that this committee can have its new members elected routinely with all other HB committees beginning in May 2012.

**MOTION** [Lane/Keenan]: For the Academic Council to authorize the Committee on Committees to appoint members with staggered terms to the Faculty Committee on Sustainability.

**MOTION PASSED**: 15 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

The Journal of Record states that members are to be elected to the Faculty Panel for Student Conduct Board and the Student Academic Grievance Board at the GF meeting in May. It was stated that doing so essentially elevates these boards to Handbook
Committee-level status, and Irene Mulvey asked that members be appointed to these committees by the Committee on Committees in anticipation of changes being proposed to the JoR regarding how members are selected for these boards. Each Board is composed of nine people with three-year staggered terms, and so there are three vacancies each year as three individuals cycle off. Prof. Greenberg queried if we are violating the handbook for convenience by doing so to which Prof. Mulvey responded that it is not entirely for convenience.

MOTION [Lane/Second]: The Academic Council authorizes the Committee on Committees to appoint 3 new members each to the Faculty Panel for Student Conduct Board and the Student Academic Grievance Board at this time in anticipation of proposed Journal of Record changes for how faculty are selected for these boards.

Prof. Greenberg stated that he was not in favor of this and believes that the Council should do what the Journal of Record says should be done. Prof. Dennin noted that what the JoR calls for is elections in May.

MOTION PASSED: 10 in favor, 4 opposed, 1 abstention

3. Report from the Executive Secretary
   a. Approval of minutes
      i. Minutes of AC meeting of 5/2/11 (attachment)

         MOTION [Walker/Shea]: For the Academic Council to approve the minutes.

         Chair Preli asked if there were any corrections to which Prof. Bayne stated that he was not in attendance and thus could not have made the comment attributed to him on page 4. On p. 10 the minutes should read “what are” as opposed to “what of.”

         MOTION PASSED: 10 in favor, 0 opposed, 5 abstentions.

      ii. Minutes of AC meeting of 5/9/11; reconvened from 5/2/11 meeting (attachment)

         MOTION [Bayne/Walker]: For the Academic Council to approve the minutes.

         MOTION PASSED: 9 in favor, 0 opposed, 5 abstentions

   b. Correspondence
      i. Memo from ACEC with roster and meeting dates (attachment)
MOTION [Mulvey/Boryczka]: The Academic Council approves meeting dates for the 2011-2012 academic year [on page 21 of the packet for today’s meeting] with April 16th to be used only if necessary.

MOTION PASSED: 14 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention

4. Council Subcommittee Reports
Irene Mulvey stated that none were ready to report at today’s meeting.

5. Petitions for immediate hearing
There were no petitions for immediate hearing.

6. Old Business
   a. Proposal from CUC to close University College (attachments)
   Prof. Gerry Campbell (out-going CUC Chair), Ryan Munden (incoming CUC Chair), Associate UC Dean Aaron Perkus, and UC Dean Crabtree presented the proposal.

   Prof. G. Campbell stated that work was done during the summer, and he briefly reviewed the 6-part motion presented to the AC last spring. Associate Dean Perkus referenced page 47 and noted that research found that UC is “adrift” in its mission: there are younger students, taking more daytime courses, and the students no longer look like the target group. The rolling open admissions process has been questioned. Students are getting good advising and education, but full-time faculty need to be more involved in curriculum and advising. Prof. G. Campbell summarized the events/timeline on page 50-52. He emphasized that this is a faculty-driven proposal; joint meetings took place with EPC and the AC Executive Committee and the proposal has been through the JoR routing to its final stop, the Council.

   Dean Crabtree discussed the information in Appendix A, noting that the list of issues to be resolved was generated through conversations with administrative offices that handle these matters. She said we need the policy issues resolved before we close UC but that we can’t move forward with proposals for resolving policy issues unless we decide that we intend to close UC. The decision to either close or not close UC must be made, then appropriate policies need to be clarified or established.

   An extensive conversation ensued regarding the sequence of events that should occur to address all concerns regarding UC and its potential closing. The quandary that existed and was discussed was the concern about which should occur first: close UC and then approve policy changes and recommendations, or approve policy changes and recommendations prior to closing UC.

   Prof. G. Campbell referenced the new Memorandum on p. 93, stating that General Faculty Secretary Mulvey was the primary author and noted that it was discussed at last week’s CUC meeting. Prof. Ryan Munden, 2011-12 CUC Chair, affirmed that the memo
was discussed at the CUC meeting, that there was unanimous support for the memo and for its presentation to the Academic Council.

GFS Mulvey explained that Dean Crabtree, Associate Dean Perkus and she had worked over the summer via email and in one meeting and that the memo was a result of their work (which Dean Crabtree shared with Prof. Campbell and got his approval) She stated how important it is that “to resolve issues, we need to know where we’re going.” She further commented that, in her opinion, a “compelling case to close University College” is made in the documents and that the memo (page 94) suggests ways for the AC to proceed. As on page 94, the AC could agree, in principle, to close UC and set up two subcommittees to propose policies to move us forward.

The floor was opened up for informational questions.

Prof. Bayne asked if keeping UC open was seriously considered. Were options to keep UC intact but restructure it considered? Prof. Campbell said that a thorough consideration of all options, pros and cons was undertaken. The CUC moved slowly and was even criticized for that.

Prof. Walker referenced p. 68 and asked why we are proposing closing University College which generates 3 to 4 million dollars annually.
Dean Crabtree commented that the calculation of expenditures and the interfacing with other colleges is not reflected in the revenues; the cost of administration, managing programs, costs borne by DSB and CAS are not included and that the revenues look better than they actually are.
Prof. Walker countered that page 68 indicated that faculty and administrative salaries and expenditures were included in the revenues and asked about the truthfulness of the statement on page 68 to which Dean Crabtree, supported by Dean Franzosa, commented that “it’s unclear the degree to which that statement is wholly accurate.”

Phil Lane commented that he is opposed to closing University College and is concerned about the views of the outside/wider community and serving them.
SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald stated that print ads, advertising, etc. signal to the community that we are continuing to serve part-time students. We do plan to continue in this market and must continue to market this.

Robbin Crabtree noted that during the summer of 2010, the University College staff was hit hard with the fallout from a proposed UC closure and worked with then current students and aggressively supported their matriculation, got new enrollments and centralized the advertising budget.

SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald said there is one major matter to be resolved by the faculty: what is the core requirement for these degree-seeking students? Until we settle this and make that public, we are in limbo.
MOTION [Mulvey/Rakowitz]: The Academic Council in principle agrees to close University College.

Dean Franzosa asked what does “in principle” mean? Prof. Mulvey responded that it means it is our intent to do so. Joe Dennin said it means: we think it’s a good idea to close the school assuming all the practical details can be worked out.

Dean Franzosa suggested taking out “in principle” and putting in a date.

Prof. Tromley concisely summarized the quandary noting that the Academic Council cannot recommend closing the school without policies in place but can’t make policies until it has been decided to close the school.

Debra Strauss wondered if the words “in principle” can be removed and replaced by language such as “subject to approval of final report and the development of policies.”

MOTION TO AMEND: [Strauss/Petrino]: To amend the main motion by substitution to read, “The Academic Council will recommend to the General Faculty that University College be closed subject to approval of final reports [from subcommittees to be formed] and development of policies.”

Discussion ensued on the motion to amend.

Prof. Shea wonders how students might experience this and commented on the importance of developing a plan and then determining the details, not the other way around.

Chair Preli asked if she is speaking in favor of or opposed to the motion to amend to which Prof. Shea said that she might be speaking against the motion.

Robbin Crabtree spoke in favor of the amended motion commenting that more direction makes it easier to develop the policies.

Dennis Keenan spoke in favor of the amended motion.

MOTION [Greenberg/Walker] To call the question.
MOTION to call the question PASSED: 11 in favor, 2 opposed, 1 abstention.

MOTION TO AMEND PASSED: 14 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention

MAIN MOTION: The Academic Council will recommend to the General Faculty that University College be closed subject to approval of final reports [from subcommittees to be formed] and development of policies.

Further discussion on the main motion ensued.
SVPAF Fitzgerald spoke in favor of the motion and the importance of students being reassured.

Prof. Walker spoke against the motion. He is opposed to closing a school that has a rich history and was profitable.

Steven Bayne spoke against the motion because he is not sure if enough time has been spent on the issue, and his concern is wondering if closing the school is the best course of action for our students.

**MOTION [Greenberg/Dennin] To call the question**  
**MOTION to call the question FAILED: 4 in favor, 12 opposed, 0 abstentions**

Dean Crabtree made a clarifying point. We have a Director of Lifelong Learning and that noncredit programs are served; we may not have talked about that aspect here. She spoke in favor of the motion.

Prof. Tromley spoke in favor of the motion and stated that she believes that we must trust the committees who have explored this issue over many months, that we trust our colleagues, and that they were the experts to make these recommendations.

Prof. Petrino noted that she first saw this some time ago in UCC and that it has been carefully thought through. She shared Tromley’s perspective, spoke in favor of the motion and commented on the advantage of reviewing a final report regarding the policy issues and keeping UC open in the interim. This provides us with more time and information.

Prof. Greenberg was strongly in favor of the motion. He commented that a variety of committees have reviewed the closing of University College, that Academic Council is not the final decision, and that the Academic Council will review the final report to make a recommendation to the General Faculty who will make the final decision. We’ve had 2.5 years of thought and effort, and this is where we’ve come. Are we going to be obstructionist or move it along?

**MOTION PASSED: 12 in favor, 3 opposed, 0 abstentions**

**MOTION [Mulvey/Tromley]: That the Academic Council authorize the Executive Committee to set up the subcommittees as recommended on p. 94.  
MOTION PASSED: 13 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstention**

Prof. Mulvey noted that the School of Nursing Dean’s Search is critical to discuss and asked for unanimous consent to address agenda item #7f.

7.f. Faculty Representatives for the SON Dean Search.
Prof. Mulvey noted the names of the nominees so far and suggested that voting be done via campus mail secret ballot on Wednesday after the Tuesday deadline for volunteers passes. There were no objections.

Joyce Shea informed the AC that the SON faculty would like as many nurses on the search as possible, to which Prof. Mulvey noted that a member of the School of Nursing may be elected in the at-large slot.

SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald stated that an outside firm will help with the search.

**MOTION [Lane/Boryczka]: To adjourn**

MOTION PASSED: Unanimous.

Respectfully submitted,
David Aloyzy Zera
Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions
To: Fr. Paul Fitzgerald, Senior Academic Vice President  
From: Mary Ann Palazzi, Coordinator of Programs for Student-Athletes  
Re: 2011 Fall Semester Conflicts with Final Exams and Scheduled Athletic Contests  
Date: Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Men’s Soccer- @ MAAC Tournament, November 3-6th in Orlando, Florida- Not during Finals, will leave on Wednesday, November 2nd for the Tournament.

Women’s Basketball-Tuesday December, 13, 2011@ St. Francis, NY- READING DAY
MEMORANDUM
Secretary of the General Faculty
Fairfield University

TO: Academic Council

FROM: Irene Mulvey, Secretary of the General Faculty

DATE: September 26, 2011

RE: Non-approved Journal of Record language

I am writing to bring to the Council’s attention a situation I learned about by email on September 16. At that time, I was forwarded a chain of emails involving the incoming Chair of the US Diversity Committee, the incoming UCC Chair and the out-going UCC Chair about language regarding US Diversity courses for the Journal of Record.

From the emails, it is my understanding that the UCC approved changes to Journal of Record language on US Diversity courses at its last meeting in the spring 2011 semester. To the best of my knowledge the changes were not forwarded to the Academic Council for approval. This fall, in response to her queries trying to find out the status of the approval of the language, the incoming US Diversity Chair was advised by the outgoing UCC Chair to use the JoR language that had been approved by the UCC but not approved by the AC. The incoming UCC Chair concurred in this advice. With time pressure due to an upcoming UCC meeting and deadlines by which courses need to be approved, the US Diversity Chair used the unapproved language in the call for US Diversity courses. When things had settled down, she contacted me to ask how it should have been handled and we sorted things out.

My intent in bringing this to the Council’s attention is twofold: (1) to inform the Council that Journal of Record language approved by UCC but not approved by AC was used in the call US Diversity courses, and (2) to seek the Council’s input on whether the Faculty Secretary should be more pro-active in trying to avoid things like this in the future. To this end, I am attaching at the end of this memo the three-page memo that I sent to the incoming chairs of all Handbook committees last fall. My own opinion is that the memo is enough and that this problem is a singular event that does not require any followup.
MEMORANDUM
Fairfield University
Secretary of the General Faculty

TO: 2010-2011 Handbook Committee Chairs
FROM: Irene Mulvey, Secretary of the General Faculty
DATE: September 16, 2010
RE: Information on chairing a Handbook committee

Congratulations on being elected as chairperson of a standing Faculty Handbook committee for 2010-2011. This memo contains advice and hints from previous committee chairs and previous faculty secretaries. I pass this advice along to you with the hope that it will make your job as chair a little easier.

Most importantly, if there is anything that I can do to help you this coming year, do not hesitate to get in touch with me by email to mulvey@fairfield.edu, by phone at extension 2199, by campus mail to Mathematics and Computer Science Department/BNW or drop by my office, BNW GR-17.

The purpose of your committee.
At your earliest convenience, check the Faculty Handbook for your committee’s precise mandate. (If you need a Handbook, let me know.) Make sure that everyone on the committee is aware of this mandate and discuss, if necessary, your interpretations of it.

Meeting times.
Attendance at meetings is likely to be better if the committee meets periodically on the same day of the week, at the same hour, and in the same place. If at all possible a tentative schedule for meetings should be established at the start of each semester so that committee members can take their committee obligations into account in their long range planning. Meetings can always be canceled if there is insufficient business, and additional meetings can be scheduled if the need arises.

Larger committees should consider the possibility of evening or late afternoon meetings to be sure that all members are able to attend. Rotating meetings does insure that all members can make at least some meetings, but with larger committees it almost guarantees that some members will also miss some of the meetings. Continuity of discussion is difficult to maintain when different groups attend successive meetings. Scheduling in a way that some people are sure to miss a meeting also makes it more difficult to obtain a quorum for that meeting.

Agendas and supporting documentation.
It is usually helpful for committees to work from fixed agendas distributed by their chairpersons to all members in advance of the meeting. As chairperson you should also
RE: Information on chairing a *Handbook* committee

circulate in advance to your committee all substantive proposals, supporting documentation, etc., so that the committee members can review them before the meeting. With this sort of advance preparation meetings tend to be more efficient, and faculty decisions more intelligent. Similarly, if other members of the committee or invited guests intend to distribute materials to the committee, you should have them get these materials to you for circulation before the meeting, or you should have them see to the circulation themselves.

**Membership on your committee.**

*Your committee consists only of those individuals named in the list of committee members published and updated by the Faculty Secretary in the Directory of the General Faculty for 2010-2011.* The Committee may vote to invite guests to any or all of its meetings, but any standing invitations must be renewed annually, preferably at the first meeting of the year.

If a vacancy develops on your committee, inform me and I will arrange for the Committee on Committees to elect a replacement.

Occasionally faculty members drop off committees without informing anyone. You may wish to contact any member who has missed two consecutive meetings to see if he or she still wishes to continue as a member of the committee. There is a procedure described in the Journal of Record dealing with nonfeasance to follow when a committee member misses three consecutive meetings. Contact me if this is a problem.

**Responsibility for communication from and to your committee.**

As committee chairperson, you are responsible for all communications from and to your committee. Here we should distinguish between the operational and the policy activities of committees (e.g., operational: the research Committee’s actions on specific requests for sabbatical leaves; policy: development of guidelines for sabbatical submissions). Under certain circumstances it may be helpful to delegate certain operational procedures to an administrator (e.g., the collection of Rank and Tenure Committee dossiers), but it should always be clear that this is a delegation of the committee’s authority. Matters connected with the policy activities of the committee should always remain within the committee itself. To keep lines of responsibility and communication clear, all correspondence related to the policy activities of your committee should come from you as its chairperson. Do not hesitate to contact chairs of other committees if you need to. I would be glad to facilitate sharing of information among committees as needed.

**The role of the Academic Council in the governance process.**

*All matters of policy must be submitted to the Academic Council.* Policy statements passed by the Academic Council are included in the Journal of Record. Proposals that are directed only to the appropriate administrator have the status of advice given by the committee. *It is important that your committee members understand that passing things to the Academic Council for its endorsement or consideration is an essential step in the governance process.*
In communicating with the Academic Council, it is best if you provide a brief memo containing (1) the exact text of your committee’s recommendation as it would appear in the Journal of Record and (2) a summary of the committee’s reasons for this recommendation. This memo will then be circulated to the General Faculty with the Academic Council’s minutes. If you feel it is useful, you may also submit supplementary materials that the Council’s executive committee will make available to the members of Academic Council.

**Distribution to the General Faculty and Incidental Expenses.**
If you have material to be circulated to the General Faculty, please contact me and I will arrange to have it printed and distributed. Materials (with clear instructions) may be left in my mailbox in BNW GR-21 or with the Mathematics and Computer Science department secretary. Mass printing to the faculty should be paid for from the Faculty Secretary’s budget, not from the budgets of individual departments or schools.

If there are any other expenses incidental to the running of your committee please bring them to my attention. I will arrange for payment from the Faculty Secretary’s budget.

**Reporting to the Academic Council and the General Faculty.**
Your committee’s work survives in the form of specific decisions (promotions, sabbaticals, etc.), policy statements included in the Journal of Record, and your annual report.

The Faculty Handbook mandates that all faculty committees are to **submit an annual written report to the Academic Council by May 1.** Following past practice, oral reports will also be called for at the election meeting in the spring. Such reports should deal with the policy (as opposed to operational) activities of the committee, as distinguished above. It would therefore be helpful to schedule the committee’s policy activities so that they are completed by the May 1 reporting date. According to the Journal of Record, annual committee reports are to include the following items:

1. name of committee chairperson
2. committee membership
3. number of meetings attended by each committee member
4. dates of meetings
5. list of principal topics considered by the committee
6. list of the decisions taken by the committee
7. anticipated effects of these decisions
8. unfinished business
9. future agenda items

**Thank you.**
On behalf of the General Faculty, thank you for taking on this task. Please contact me with any questions or concerns.
TO: Academic Council

FROM: Manyul Im, UCC Chair &
The UCC Core Credit Subcommittee
Members: Katsiaryna (Katya) Salavei (chair of subcommittee), Finance
Giovanni Ruffini, History
Jerelyn Johnson, Modern Languages
Elizabeth Petrino, English

DATE: February 22, 2011

RE: Core Credit Approval for courses outside a particular core area

The Core Credit Subcommittee was formed on September 14, 2010 and charged with the
development of a process by which a course in a discipline outside of a particular core area is
approved for core credit in that area. After consulting with chairs of all departments offering core
courses, the subcommittee recommends adopting a process similar to that in place in the Natural
Science Core Area.\(^1\) Motion as stated on pages 3 to 4 of this document is an amended version
of an earlier motion sent to Academic Council on November 2, 2010. To summarize, the
amendment removes from the earlier motion ‘Applied Ethics’ from the list of core reviewing
units (and throughout the accompanying documents). This change will address the following
concerns of the AC that were passed along to UCC by Elizabeth Petrino, who was the UCC
Chairperson last semester:

“The AC Executive Committee met on 1/24/11 and discussed the proposal and in doing
so noticed two problems: (i) at various places the proposal mistakenly references Applied
Ethics as an area of the core, and (ii) the proposal includes a process for approval for core
credit of Applied Ethics courses that is inconsistent with policies in the Journal of
Record.”

Since area III (3) of the core, under which Applied Ethics falls, needs to be approved by
either Religious Studies or Philosophy Departments as per Journal of Record, it is
sufficient to have only Religious Studies and Philosophy Departments as reviewing
units.”

The amended motion has been approved by a vote of 15 in favor, zero against or abstaining, at
the UCC meeting of February 8, 2011 (see attached minutes). In outline, the motion proposes the
following procedure:

1. **Faculty** submits to the respective core reviewing unit a **Core Credit Application**
   consisting of:
   - 1) Syllabus
   - 2) Core Course Review Form

2. **Core reviewing unit** reviews the **Core Credit Application** and submits **Core Course
   Recommendation Form** to the **UCC**.

3. **UCC** reviews the **Core Credit Application and Core Course
   Recommendation Form** and votes “Accept” or “Reject”.

---

\(^{1}\) Please see Core Course Review Guidelines for details.
Step 1: Faculty or department submits *Core Credit Application* to either the department currently offering core courses in the area or the relevant UCC subcommittee (core reviewing unit). The *Core Credit Application* will consist of 1) syllabus and 2) *Core Course Review Form*, which will require a detailed description of how the course fulfills the learning outcomes of the relevant core area.

Step 2: Core Department or relevant UCC subcommittee reviews *Core Credit Application* and submits *Core Course Recommendation Form* to the UCC, in which it describes why or why not the course should be granted Core designation in a specific area.

Step 3: UCC reviews both the *Core Credit Application* and the *Core Course Recommendation Form* and makes a final recommendation by voting to either “Accept” or “Reject” the recommendation stated in *Core Course Recommendation Form*. In the event of a negative outcome the department in question will work with faculty/department proposing a new course towards a successful outcome, if possible.

**Motion**

- to approve the process described in the Core Course Review Guidelines by which a course in a discipline outside of a particular core area counts for core credit in that area;

- to form a UCC Core Social Science Subcommittee of faculty from the respective disciplines (Politics, Economics, Psychology, Sociology and Anthropology, and Communication) and one outside faculty member to review which courses should be designated for social-science core credit. Each department will nominate at least one individual to serve on the UCC Core Social Science Subcommittee who will then stand for election at the UCC. An election will be held in the Spring of 2011 to elect all members. Committee members may serve consecutive terms; members are elected for a three year term. One member will agree to serve only a two year term for the first term. New committee members will be elected at the beginning of the Fall semester of each year;

- to request respective core learning outcomes from the following core area reviewing units:
  - Classical & Modern Languages
  - English
  - History
  - Mathematics
  - Philosophy
  - Religious Studies
  - Visual & Performing Arts
  - UCC Core Social Science Subcommittee, once its members are elected
and amend Journal of Record as follows:

In *Journal of Record*, Appendix 2 (pp. 64-65) “Routing for Approval of Undergraduate Course/Program Revisions in the Undergraduate Divisions,” item 6 (Changes where underlined):

6. Changes in Core Requirements

Included here also are those situations where groups of students are to be excused from some part of the Core requirements, and those situations where courses are offered by one curriculum area but receive Core credit in another curriculum area.

[Note: Individual student exceptions to the Core requirements would continue to be made upon the advice of the Faculty Advisor to the Dean of the appropriate School.]

1. Curriculum Area Chair(s) Core Reviewing Unit (see Table 1) to
2. UCC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Areas</th>
<th>Core Reviewing Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classical studies and Modern Languages</td>
<td>Either Classical Studies Program or Modern Languages Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Area V)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English (Area IV)</td>
<td>English Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History (Area II)</td>
<td>History Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics (Area I)</td>
<td>Mathematics Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy (Area III)</td>
<td>Philosophy Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Studies (Area III)</td>
<td>Religious Studies Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual and Performing Arts (Area IV)</td>
<td>Visual and Performing Arts Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Science (Area I)</td>
<td>UCC subcommittee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science (Area II)</td>
<td>UCC subcommittee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<<<<<<<<<<< END OF MOTION >>>>>>>>>>
proposals with learning outcomes, and thus make the process more objective. However, as discussed at the May 4, 2010 meeting of the UCC, learning outcomes articulated in the Mission of the Core might not be current (see attached; also available on line at http://www.fairfield.edu/academic/aca_core_mission.html). For example, it was noted that the English department reviewed learning outcomes as part of the curriculum review. Motions 2a and 2b will ensure that learning outcomes used to evaluate courses are current.
CORE COURSE REVIEW GUIDELINES

I. Background

This document establishes a process by which a department or faculty member can seek approval for core credit in a discipline outside of a particular area of the Core Curriculum. As undergraduate education and faculty training becomes increasingly more interdisciplinary, it is imperative to review courses and insure that core learning objectives across disciplines are met. This process formalizes a procedure that is already in place in some core areas and insures consistency, transparency and collegiality regarding approving courses for core credit.

This process does not affect courses currently taught in the core but is to be used for courses currently unapproved for core credit. The course that receives a core credit needs to fulfill the leaning objectives for the respective core area as stated in the Mission of the Core Statement. Each goal need not be addressed to the same degree in every course, although it is important that all goals be addressed in some meaningful way.

II. Procedure for reviewing courses

A. Instructions to proposing department or faculty member

To have a course considered for core credit, a department or a faculty has to submit Core Credit Application consisting of 1) Course Syllabus; 2) Core Course Review Form via e-mail to the respective core area reviewing unit as defined in Table 1 and to the chair of the UCC. The Core Course Review Form should describe in detail how proposed course fulfill the leaning objectives for the respective core area as stated in the Mission of the Core Statement.

Table 1: Reviewing units for each of the core areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Area</th>
<th>Core Reviewing Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classical studies and Modern Languages (Area V)</td>
<td>Either Classical Studies Program or Modern Languages Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English (Area IV)</td>
<td>English Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History (Area II)</td>
<td>History Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics (Area I)</td>
<td>Mathematics Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy (Area III)</td>
<td>Philosophy Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Studies (Area III)</td>
<td>Religious Studies Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual and Performing Arts (Area IV)</td>
<td>Visual and Performing Arts Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Science (Area I)</td>
<td>UCC subcommittee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Science (Area II)</td>
<td>UCC subcommittee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Deadlines:
Fall semester application – October 1

2 Please see Appendix A.
Spring semester application – February 15

B. Instructions to core reviewing unit

Core reviewing unit reviews Core Credit Application and submits Core Course Recommendation Form and relevant minutes of a meeting of faculty of a core reviewing unit to the UCC, in which it describes why the course should or should not be granted core credit.

Deadlines:
Fall semester application – November 25
Spring semester application – April 25

C. Approval Process

UCC reviews both the Core Credit Application and the Core Course Recommendation Form and makes final recommendation by voting to either “Accept” or “Reject” the recommendation stated in Core Course Recommendation Form for all core areas except Philosophy and Religious Studies. In the event of a negative outcome core reviewing unit will be working with faculty/department proposing a new course towards a successful outcome whenever possible.

When reviewing courses for core credit in Philosophy and Religious Studies, the UCC will work with Philosophy and Religious Studies to achieve a compromise and will accept departmental recommendation.\(^3\)

---

\(^3\) See “Restrictions on Courses in Area III of the Core” in the Journal of Record (November 2009, page 10).
CORE COURSE REVIEW FORM

Course Number and Title: ________________________________

Proposing Department or Faculty: __________________________

Core Credit Area: ______________________________________

Date: ____________________________________________________

1. Please consider each of the stated Goals and Expected Outcomes and respond with reference to your course. Please attach a current or proposed syllabus and other material you believe will clarify any points you wish to make. Each goal need not be addressed to the same degree although it is important that all be addressed in some meaningful way.

<<< Insert Core Area Goals >>>

2. Describe how proposed course enhances core curriculum area and differs from other courses currently offered in this core area.
CORE COURSE RECOMMENDATION FORM

Please refer to Core Course Review Guidelines for instructions.

Core Review Unit: ___________________________________________________________

Course Number and Title: _____________________________________________________

Proposing Department or Faculty: __________________________________________

Core Credit Area: ___________________________________________________________

Date: _____________________________________________________________________

Recommendation (circle one): Accept         Reject

Please describe in detail why 1) the course meets (does not meet) learning outcomes of your core area as listed in Core Course Review Form and/or 2) the course complements (is too similar to) current core offerings in your core area.

Please supply a copy of the minutes of faculty of a core reviewing unit.
Fairfield University

The Mission of the Core

The Core Curriculum of Fairfield University is the foundation upon which rests the education of each of our undergraduate students. Through the selection of liberal arts courses from across the curriculum that constitute the Core, the student is made acquainted with a body of knowledge, trained in a series of specific skills, and introduced to the values that guide the conduct of the search for wisdom.

The Mission of the Core Curriculum is twofold: to nurture the formation of the undergraduate student as a thinking and caring citizen of the world of today; and to provide the general educational background against which the student can put into relief the more advanced intellectual or technical attainment of a “major” field of study.

This twofold Mission dictates the shape of the Core Curriculum. Given the Mission of the Core, the knowledge that it highlights is that which enables students to know and assess the world in which they live, to appreciate the many forces that have played a part in its shaping, and to be sensitive to the different critical perspectives that are brought to bear upon it. The skills taught through the Core are those which facilitate the task of living constructively in the world—objectivity, critical acumen, oral and written communication, dexterity with symbols and symbol-systems, aesthetic appreciation and sensitivity to difference, familiarity with new and developing methodologies and technologies. The values are those which distinguish the life of someone who dwells constructively within the world—moral and intellectual integrity, compassion, commitment, a thirst for justice. While these values are given particular shape and texture in the Christian story that indelibly marks the history and identity of Fairfield University, they are universal ideals which, as the University Mission Statement suggests, are “the obligation of all educated, mature human beings.”
Behavioral and Social Sciences
The mission of the behavioral and social science core is to engage students actively in scientific approaches to the understanding of both individual and social behavior, so that they can better understand the world in which they live. While unique in their discipline-specific approaches, the behavioral and social sciences—Anthropology, Economics, Politics, Psychology and Sociology—are based on knowledge of behavior that is collected through systematic observation and subject to empirical verification. Students of these sciences are presented with alternative paradigms of behavior. They are challenged to think in new ways to understand and solve the problems of individuals and societies.

Through their study of the behavioral and social sciences, students will:
• develop an understanding of alternative models of individual and social behavior;
• develop the ability to interpret a variety of forms of empirical data;
• be able to address behavioral and social science issues in a systematic fashion and use discipline-specific tools to formulate and test solutions to problems.

Classical and Modern Languages
The study of languages, both classical and modern, is a key element in working and learning across cultures and geographic boundaries. Language in the Core Curriculum focuses on the acquisition of the skills of reading, listening, speaking and writing, though the emphasis varies according to the chosen language. Students in core language study acquire knowledge about other cultures, literatures and historical periods. It is expected that students will use the skills and knowledge acquired in language courses in practical and intellectual pursuits.

Through their study of foreign languages, students will:
• be able to read a passage of moderate difficulty in their chosen language and, in the case of modern languages, will be able to communicate with a native speaker;
• learn grammatical and syntactical rules which will facilitate oral and written expression in the language;
• become acquainted with the life, customs and cultural traditions where the language is or was spoken.
English
The English core teaches students to write the English language clearly and to read literature thoughtfully, critically, and with enjoyment. The study of composition fosters students’ growth as writers by emphasizing clarity, focus, development and organization of ideas. The study of literature introduces students to imaginative works from a variety of genres and periods so as to foster students’ critical and aesthetic skills. In studying literature students consider both creative work of the individual writer and the social and cultural context in which that work was created. Faculty work with the Library staff to introduce students systematically to bibliographic research and the electronic technology, including CD-ROM databases and websites.

Through their study of composition and literature, students will:
• learn to organize ideas and express them clearly in writing for a range of audiences and a variety of purposes;
• read literature with an understanding informed by a knowledge of genre, the literary background of the era in which it was written, and of the various critical approaches that illuminate the text;
• be able to write a research paper with competence in grammar, organization, clarity, and the integration and acknowledgement of sources.

History
The mission of the history core is to foster an understanding of history as a continuous process in which a variety of forces (economic, geographical, political, social, cultural, intellectual, religious, technological) interact dynamically with one another. The history core fosters an understanding of the foundations of the modern world.

Through their study of history students will:
• come to understand historiographical debates, embodied in the conflicting interpretations of the past and reflective of particular historical contexts and the background and circumstances of particular authors;
• develop written, oral and research skills to support their ability to undertake critical analyses of any era or area of the globe, and that will be of enduring value in their life and work;
• develop the historical imagination that enables them to understand the role that socio-economic factors (for example, class divisions and conflict) play in shaping culture and politics;
• develop a sense of the debt that human societies, now and in the past, owe to the willing and unwilling labor and sacrifices of countless men and women who remain nameless and forgotten.
Mathematics
Mathematics has been an integral part of a liberal education from the days of Plato’s Academy, through the Jesuit Ratio Studiorum, into the intellectual life of the modern world. The revolutionary ideas of calculus occupy a unique place in Western intellectual history and make calculus well suited for study at the university level. Fairfield’s mathematics core requirement is aimed at presenting this deep mathematical subject as both an object of abstract beauty and a model of deductive reasoning. The calculus is studied as an art and a science. Although an abstract subject, the calculus draws its motivation from and provides applications to a variety of problems both from inside and outside mathematics. The theory is illustrated through applications to problems from geometry, optimization, physics, economics, business, and/or the life sciences.

Through their study of mathematics, students will:
• develop an appreciation of the calculus as a model of analytical thinking and as an object of art, illustrating the abstract beauty of mathematics in general;
• come to understand the basic concepts of the calculus--function, limit derivative, and integral;
• develop problem-solving ability and a knowledge of the calculus as a tool, applicable to problems from a wide variety of disciplines.

Natural Sciences
The primary mission of study in the natural sciences is to help students develop an understanding of and respect for the scientific method, and the knowledge of the physical world that it has produced. The natural sciences, broadly categorized as biology, chemistry and physics, are united by their common methodology. To recognize the breadth and increasingly interdisciplinary nature of the sciences, as well as the diversity of student interests, students may elect in-depth study of one natural science or a distribution across several. In their exposure to the scientific method, students learn the importance of critically questioning empirical truth claims and the value of scientific reasoning in assessing such claims.

Through their study of the natural sciences, students will:
• learn about the importance of empirical observation, replicability of experiments, falsifiability of scientific theories and hypotheses and the circumstances under which causal inferences can be drawn;
• gain some competence with the common tools of scientific explanation; mathematical, computational and/or explanatory models;
• learn the value of scientific integrity and, through their own experience of data collection and/or analysis, develop an understanding of the role of impartiality, objectivity and honesty in the scientific method.
Philosophy, Religious Studies, Applied Ethics
The mission of this area of the core is to lead students to reflect on the perennial questions that all cultures have posed—what does it mean to be a person? does life have a destiny? is there an absolute truth? how does one distinguish knowledge from opinion? how does one act ethically for the good of oneself and for the good of society? why is evil so prevalent in human history? Students explore these questions philosophically by appealing to the power of rationality and the evidence of common human experience. They investigate how the world’s religions wrestle with the same kinds of questions by drawing on experiences of sacred fulfillment expressed in texts, traditions and rituals. Through a close study of primary texts, they will also learn to use philosophical and religious insight to consider how persons are obliged to act in the often complicated circumstances of their personal and professional lives. The prominent place of the “wisdom disciplines” in the core curriculum will help students learn the importance of the Jesuit and Catholic tradition at Fairfield University and this tradition’s concern for the education of the entire person.

Through their study of these disciplines, students will:
• be able to engage the enduring issues of ancient and medieval philosophy;
• become familiar with the aims of religion and its meaning for individuals and communities;
• be able to use the methods of philosophical analysis to understand the links between moral reasoning and the issues that arise in professional fields like business, medicine and nursing.

Visual and Performing Arts
The visual and performing arts weave together knowledge, skills, and personal and cultural values. Through studying the visual and performing arts students learn about the interaction of art, society and the self, and the ways in which that interaction has been influenced by history, [social] context, and theory. Study of the visual and performing arts also encourages students to develop empathy, discernment and respect for the expressions of individuals and groups and their visions of the world. As they engage in creative work, students develop intuitive, creative, expressive and aesthetic faculties, and learn to connect these faculties to reasoning skills.

Through their study of the visual and performing arts, students will:
• know the major artistic and cultural achievements of Western and non-Western civilizations;
• examine notions of quality and excellence in the visual and performing arts and the ways in which these aesthetic value judgments have been made historically;
• acquire competence to produce, interpret, analyze, speak and write about the visual and performing arts.

Diversity Requirements
Prominent among the educational priorities particular to our times are the need to address the pluralistic character of our own society on the one hand, and on the other to become aware of the significant differences which mark societies whose history and cultural patterns do not conform to those of the West. To address these needs, as a graduation requirement students must normally select one course identified as a U.S. Diversity course and one identified as a World Diversity course, or may in some cases satisfy this requirement through study abroad or other approved educational experiences. These courses may be part of the Core Curriculum, Major or Minor courses, or electives.

Through their completion of these requirements, students will:
• come to an appreciation of connections between race, class and gender;
• become acquainted with the roles of privilege and difference in U.S. society;
• acquire a sense of the extent of difference and similarity between Western and non-western societies and cultures.

Approved by:
The College of Arts and Sciences Faculty
December 1, 1999
**Undergraduate Curriculum Committee**
Minutes of meeting, February 8, 2011. Library Conference Room 233.
In attendance: Bose Godbole, Epstein, He, Im, Johnson, Kris, Miecznikowski, Perkus, Petrino, Ruffini, Salavei, Schaffer, Walker-Canton, Xie, Zhang.
Also attending: Crabtree (CAS Dean, UC Acting Dean)

**Order of Business**
1. Appointment of Secretary pro tempore: Ruffini.
2. Approval of Minutes of 12/7/10:

Johnson moves and Miecznikowski seconds the motion to approve the minutes of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee’s meeting of 12/7/10. Minor typographical errors raised by Zhang and Miecznikowski are entered into the draft copy by Im. The motion passes unanimously with two abstentions.

3. Announcements: Im announces that Tommy Xie is attending for Janet Striuli this semester.

4. University College update from Crabtree and Perkus

Dean Crabtree reports on the progress by the Committee on the University College in response to direction from the SVPAA to close the University College. The meeting of that committee tomorrow will propose a transition plan in which the UC fully functions in this academic year, but moves towards the closure of the school next academic year. This will be a process of committee implementation, drawdown of marketing for students, etc. Issues regarding part-time programs and part-time students will be brought to the UCC in this period. UC’s alternative core curriculum and its relationship to the standard core curriculum will also be brought to this committee. A number of issues regarding part-time students, their registration and requirement needs, and their market, will be addressed at a number of levels during this transition. Where some of these programs will reside and where their revenue will go are also questions up for consideration. After tomorrow’s meeting, proposals will ultimately come to the UCC, the Academic Council and the General Faculty. The ASCC and the School of Business have been assured by the SVPAA that they will have the revenue appropriate to absorbing the staff and other financial needs arising from this transition. We anticipate taking up these issues at the UCC by the April meeting.

Petrino asks whether the $1.3M budget shortfall announced at the most recent faculty meeting is related to retention issues with UC. Crabtree and Perkus confirm that UC was under enrollment projection for summer, fall and winter, but exceeded projection for the spring. Miecznikowski, sitting on the Faculty Salary Committee, reports that the shortfall is a combination of low sophomore retention, seniors graduating in their seventh semester, and a higher than expected number of students going abroad. Zhang asks whether CAS students switching to part-time will receive a UC degree; Crabtree confirms that they will receive CAS degrees. Epstein asks whether there is a policy of requiring a certain number of final senior-year credits be taken full-time. Crabtree responds that this sort of policy would be good for the UCC to consider; it would help address the revenue shortfall. Perkus notes that a lot of the problems uncovered by the CUC have been driven by students taking advantage of loopholes allowing them to step down to part-time status to save money.

5. Updates from chair (Im) about UCC business in progress
   a. Assessment Plan for WD and US Diversity Requirements
The chairs of those subcommittees report that they are developing outcomes for their respective diversity requirements, and will then work with Curt Naser to collect syllabi of designated courses to develop assessment tools to determine if the outcomes are being met. Petrino asks about their timetable. Im reports that he expects it to be done this year. Petrino responds that it was originally supposed to be done by the past fall. Crabtree notes that she hopes there will be more indirect assessment as well, considering the diversity requirements as they are spread throughout the curriculum, and the nature of those requirements more generally. Are these requirements “ghettoized” in designated courses, or are students encountering globally and domestically diverse perspectives throughout the curriculum? Epstein reports that the relevant Core Pathway – being led by Renee White – has this as its global intent, and has university-wide assessment as part of its goal. Crabtree suggests that the subcommittees could meet with White on this pathway. Perkus notes that official communication from e.g. the Academic Council continues to omit reference to the core pathways; NEASC requires us to consider learning outcomes, which is an issue that UCC will continue to face. Epstein responds that expecting outcomes to be reflected in official matters at this point is premature, because the core pathway process is still so young. Im will convey relevant aspects of this conversation to the subcommittees.

b. Proposal for petitioning for Core Credit (see forwarded response from Academic Council)

The proposed process approved by the UCC has been returned by the Academic Council with an objection over the wording in that process about the role of Applied Ethics. The authority for that relevant core group (Area 3) is restricted to Philosophy and Religious Studies; Applied Ethics should not be listed as one of the governing authorities in this area. Perkus notes that a number of Applied Ethics courses have probably not been approved for core credit by any relevant governing authority. General discussion follows on the fact that all AE courses may have to be assessed by Philosophy or Religious Studies to count for core credit. This would require revising catalog and registration information for relevant classes. Perkus notes that AE should have the opportunity to work with Philosophy and Religious Studies on learning outcomes to ensure that the re-assessment is a collaborative effort. Salavei notes that our proposed process includes a request for the core areas to develop their respective learning outcomes. Johnson and Crabtree discuss the possibility of having Philosophy and Religious Studies form a subcommittee to review core courses as part of UCC’s core approval process. Salavei brings forward revised language of the process deleting relevant references to Applied Ethics. Salavei moves and Petrino seconds the motion to adopt these revisions as given below.

“Delete ‘applied ethics’ from motion and Table 1 in memo to the AC as of November 2, 2010. Delete ‘applied ethics’ from ‘Core Course Review Guidelines’.”

Perkus speaks in favor of the motion as addressing the complaints of the Academic Council. Crabtree speaks in favor of the motion: this is an example of the university process of assessing and managing the core running successfully. Motion carries unanimously.

Perkus moves that all Applied Ethics courses currently offered at this university be brought before Religious Studies and Philosophy in order to continue to receive core credit pursuant to the Journal of Record as of Fall 2012. Johnson seconds the motion. Motion carries unanimously.
c. Revised Incomplete Policy (see forwarded response from Academic Council)

The Academic Council has responded to UCC’s motions on the incomplete policy by stating that they saw no rationale for the proposed changes. Im and Schaffer are drafting a rationale.

d. Supplemental Fees

Outgoing UCC chair Petrino sent a memo to relevant administrators regarding the burden caused to students by supplemental fees. She received little response, except regarding specific photography classes in VPA, and fees incurred by nursing students. Crabtree confirms that biology and chemistry are also concerned about this issue, because their lab budgets can fail to grow despite growing student populations. She also points out that lab fees do not necessarily correspond to student use of resources each semester, but correspond instead to the university’s expenses for the relevant programs. She suggests that there are finance issues at stake here that are not necessarily under the purview of the UCC. Perkus notes that one concern during the last discussion was over transparency, so that students would know about fees ahead of time. Im suggests that he have a conversation with the SVPAA. Walker-Canton asks whether some of the camera expenses can be addressed through the same funding process for the Media Center’s equipment.

6. New business:
   a. Course Repeat Policy
   b. Special Course Designations
   c. Core Outcomes
   d. Review of Online Courses

Im briefly summarizes conversations on these items to be raised via the UCC this semester. Salavei moves and Miecznikowski seconds the motion to adjourn.
TO: Susan Rakowitz, AC Executive Secretary

FROM: Irene Mulvey, Committee on Committees Chair

DATE: September 22, 2011

RE: Faculty Representatives to the Honorary Degree Committee

The Academic Council elects three faculty representatives to the Honorary Degree Committee for one-year terms. To expedite this, the Committee on Committees received nominations for these positions and solicited additional volunteers. The nominees and volunteers are:

Rajasree Rajamma (Marketing/DSB)

Evelyn Lolis (Psychological and Educational Consultation/GSEAP)

Anibal Torres (Marriage and Family Therapy/GSEAP)
To:      Academic Council
From:   Steve Bayne, Al Benney, Ed Dew, Rick DeWitt, Dina Franceschi, Joy Gordon,
        Francis Hannafey, Dennis Keenan, Mark LeClair, Curt Naser, Marcie Patton, Rose
        Rodrigues, Vincent Rosivach, Margaret Wills
Date:   April 6, 2011
Subject: Workers’ Bill of Rights
cc:     FWC/AAUP Executive Committee

Our purpose in writing is to encourage the Academic Council to reconsider the recent motion
involving the Workers’ Bill of Rights. Our reasons are given below.

Not that many years ago concerned faculty worked hard to formulate and gain faculty and
administrative approval of a Workers’ Bill of Rights. The Bill of Rights stated that workers on
campus shall be accorded certain basic rights, including the right to safe working conditions, the
right to a living wage, the right to organize, and others.

We understand that the Academic Council voted at its April 4 2011 meeting to eliminate the
Workers’ Bill of Rights from the Journal of Record, that is, to remove it as a Fairfield policy. In
the materials presented to the Council, the Workers’ Bill of Rights was included under items that
were “either outdated or not policy statements,” and this was given in those materials as the
rationale for eliminating the Bill of Rights.

With all due respect, we think the Council made a mistake. The statement is not outdated—we
currently have a large number of workers employed under subcontracting agreements. And this
key statement concerning the Workers’ Bill of Rights, “All campus workers employed under
subcontracting (or ‘outsourcing’) agreements shall be accorded these same rights,” seems
clearly to be a statement of policy.

In short, neither of the reasons given—being outdated or not a policy statement—justifies the
removal of the Workers’ Bill of Rights. Moreover, at a time when we are seeing workers’ rights
under attack around the country, it seems especially inappropriate for Fairfield to be eliminating
a policy assuring basic rights to campus workers.

Fairfield, according to our mission statement, is an institution that is “Catholic in both tradition
and spirit” and one that “celebrates the God-given dignity of every human person.” We
encourage the Academic Council to reconsider the elimination of the Workers’ Bill of Rights.
Workers' Bill of Rights:
The General Faculty endorses the statement of the Workers' Bill of Rights:

Workers' Bill of Rights

We the members of the Fairfield University Community, recognizing that "Fairfield is Catholic in both tradition and spirit," and that Fairfield "celebrates the God-given dignity of every human person" (Fairfield University Mission Statement), affirm that all workers at Fairfield University have the following inalienable rights as defined by Catholic Social Teaching:

- The Right to a Living Wage
- The Right to Working Conditions Suitable to Health Safety, and Human Dignity
- The Right to Benefits Suitable to Human Dignity
- The Right to Organize

All campus workers employed under subcontracting (or "outsourcing") agreements shall be accorded these same rights.

GF: 04/17/1998
MEMORANDUM
University Curriculum Committee
Fairfield University

TO: Rick DeWitt, Executive Secretary of Academic Council

FROM: Manyul Im, University Curriculum Committee Chair

DATE: March 14, 2011

RE: Response to your memo of November 12, 2010 (see attachment of AC memo below)

This memo responds to the Academic Council’s decision on May 25, 2010 not to approve the the UCC’s proposed Incomplete Policy. Thank you for your clarification memo provided on November 12, 2010. **The UCC has discussed your memo and moved on March 1, 2011 to request Academic Council to reconsider of the same policy based on the following clarifications of the specific reasons for adopting it.**

First and foremost, the proposed Incomplete Policy addresses both

A. A pedagogically problematic asymmetry within the current policy as set forth in the University Catalog; and

B. A lacuna in the Journal of Record regarding Incompletes.

Regarding A: The proposed Policy seeks to amend that policy so that the completion of the course requirements occurs 30 days after the end of the semester in which the Incomplete is given, rather than “30 days after the beginning of the next regular semester” as stated in the Journal of Record and the Catalog. As it stands, the 3 months of Summer intervene for Incompletes that are granted in Spring term. That is a pedagogical problem because of the unreasonable length of time in between the end of Spring and the time by which the course work must be completed. It is unreasonable because of the potential effects on retention and cogency of the material for the student; it is also unreasonable because of the unfair disparity between it and the length of time afforded to students who require an Incomplete at the end of the Fall term.

Regarding B: The only policy regarding Incompletes in the JOR is this stipulation regarding the completion of the course work, with no language about the appropriate circumstances or procedures for giving a student the grade:

Completion of "Incomplete": All course work must be completed within 30 days after the beginning of the next regular semester. Any requests to extend the 30 day time period for completing an ‘Incomplete’ requires approval by the appropriate Dean. CR: 03/28/1988 amended AC: 05/17/2000

The proposed Policy would actually create a policy and formalize the procedure for
administering the Incomplete grade, neither of which currently exists in the JOR, but only in University catalog copy. The current catalog states:

A grade of “I” is issued when, due to an emergency situation such as illness, a student prearranges with the professor to complete some of the course requirements after the semester ends. All course work must be completed within 30 days after the beginning of the next regular semester. Any incomplete grades still outstanding after the 30-day extension will become Fs. [emphasis added]

The proposed Policy aims to formalize the existing policy stated only in the catalog by making the procedure for the required prearrangement between student and faculty member uniform and consistent across the University.

In summary, the proposed Policy and Form for administration of Incompletes both improves the existing practice and clarifies grading procedure with respect to Incompletes.

As to the Academic Council’s worries about increase in burden to faculty members, the UCC believes the new Policy merely formalizes and ensures execution of the existing responsibility for prearranging with the student completion of the course requirements. Furthermore, the new Policy empowers faculty by providing a Journal of Record policy that requires prearrangement by the student in legitimate cases.

Finally, to address the last of the AC members’ concerns, the UCC does not believe that complete loss of contact with the student constitutes a legitimate case for issuing an Incomplete – that has never been warranted by the policy as stated in the Catalog, nor is it a sound general principle for issuing a grade that is meant to be temporary and for the benefit of students who have legitimate difficulties in completing a course on time.
MEMORANDUM
Academic Council Executive Committee
Fairfield University

TO: Elizabeth Petrino, UCC Chair

FROM: Academic Council Executive Committee

DATE: November 12, 2010

RE: Response to your email of 9/24/2010

This memo is in response to your email of 9/24 asking the AC Chair for clarification about the Council’s decision to not approve the proposal from the UCC about the Incomplete Policy and a new form for Incompletes. The Council took up this matter at a meeting on May 25, but you note that the reasoning behind the Council’s decisions was not immediately apparent from the minutes. The Executive Committee discussed your request (three members of the current Executive Committee were in attendance at the 5/25 Council meeting) and, although the minutes are the official record of the meeting, in this memo we will provide our thoughts on this matter.

The motions sent to the AC by the UCC was as follows:

Motion 2A: To require faculty to submit an Application for an Incomplete form in consultation with students seeking an incomplete for the course. The form will include course information, a policy statement about incompletes, the reason for granting an incomplete a list of assignments to be completed, dates for completion of assignments, and the method by which the work will be submitted. The form will also include the grade to be submitted if the student fails to complete the work by the deadline.

Motion 2B:
To remove language about incompletes in the Journal of Record and replace it with the following:
Incompletes: An incomplete is issued when, due to an emergency situation such as a documented illness, a student prearranges with the course instructor to complete some of the course requirements after the semester ends. Before an Incomplete grade can be issued for a student, the Instructor for the course must submit a completed “Application form for an Incomplete” to the student, the Dean of the student’s school and the registrar. The form includes the reasons for granting an incomplete, as well as a list of outstanding assignments and the grade to be submitted if the student fails to submit the required assignments. All coursework must be completed within the time frame specified by the Course Instructor, but no later than 30 days after the last day of the term. Any requests to extend the time period for completing an Incomplete requires submission of an additional Application form for an Incomplete.
The motion actually put on the floor at the Council meeting was modified:

**MOTION.** An incomplete is issued when, due to an emergency situation such as a documented illness, a student arranges with the course instructor to complete some of the course requirements after the term ends. Before an Incomplete grade can be issued for a student, the Instructor and the student must agree on the reasons for granting an Incomplete, as well as a list of outstanding assignments and the grade to be submitted if the student fails to submit the required assignments. All course work must be completed within the time frame specified by the Course Instructor, but no later than 30 days after the last day of the term. Any requests to extend the time period for completing an Incomplete requires submission of an additional Application form for an Incomplete.

As you know, the preceding motion failed by a vote of 5 in favor, 8 opposed and 1 abstaining.

It is not clear that the Council recognized that there was a problem to address in this regard. The documents that reached AC with the proposal outlined a couple of issues:

- 1/3 of all Incompletes turn into Fs,
- Students with 3 Incompletes return to campus, perhaps inappropriately.

There was no rationale for why “Incompletes turning into Fs” is a problem that the faculty on the Council needed to address. Council members did not indicate any concern with the current setup and there was no faculty concerns with this brought to our attention.

We understand that a student with 3 Fs would not be allowed to return to campus and we acknowledge that a student with 3 Incompletes who returns to campus before the Incompletes turn into Fs may, in fact, be exploiting a loophole that should probably be closed. However, this problem might better be addressed by a policy whereby the record of a student with 3 Incompletes is reviewed by the appropriate Dean’s office to see if returning to campus is appropriate. In other words, there is probably a better way to address the need to close this loophole than by imposing a more burdensome Incomplete policy on the faculty.

Council members did comment on the fact that the policies proposed by the UCC put an inordinate burden on the faculty member – mandating that the student and the instructor agree on terms and conditions, mandating the filing of forms, etc. Council members commented that many times an Incomplete is granted because a student has disappeared from class and is not in contact with the Instructor. In such a case, faculty members appreciate the opportunity to give an Incomplete, since a grade of F may not be warranted.

If the UCC wishes to take up this matter again, we propose that the Council will want to understand exactly what is the problem that needs to be addressed by the faculty and how the proposed policy would address that problem. In your previous proposal to the AC, it is the opinion of the ACEC that any problems that result from the current Incomplete Policy are not really problems with the Incomplete Policy per se and should be addressed some other way.
Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Meeting  
March 1, 2011  
3:30-5:00 p.m.  
Dimenna-Nyselius Library Conference Room  
Minutes

Present: Robbin Crabtree, Dean of College of A&S and UC interim Dean, Mousumi Bose Godbole, Bob Epstein, SVPA Paul Fitzgerald, S.J., Manyul Im (Chair), Jerelyn Johnson, Alison Kris, Scott Lacy, John Miecznikowski, Aaron Perkus, Elizabeth Petrino, Katsiaryna (Katya) Salavei, Les Schaffer, Tommy Xie, Qin Zhang  
Called to order at 3:31 p.m.

1. Appointment of Secretary. Chair appointed Elizabeth Petrino to be Secretary pro temp

…

9. Response to Academic Council Regarding Incompletes Policy Proposal:

The Chair explained the rationale for the response written to Academic Council (AC) by the subcommittee, on which he and Les Schaffer served. AC wanted two things: a specific reason for the change and an explanation of the extra burden placed on faculty members with the proposed changes to the Incomplete Policy. The subcommittee stressed, among other features, the lack of an Incomplete Policy in the JOR. Dean Crabtree noted that, in preparing a response to AC, including mention of the lacuna in the JOR should be influential – we are also empowering faculty members through this revised policy to determine how the incomplete will be issued, since we didn’t consider the circumstances under which an incomplete could be negotiated. Salavei noted we did have a discussion and there should be information on the form regarding negotiating an incomplete. Other discussion related to the actual form used to operationalize the policy and the need to digitize forms to avoid forgery. Salavei added that the UCC’s response to the AC addresses only the first of their points. The second relates to the burden to the faculty members, which needs to be addressed. Perhaps we need to add some information to respond to the AC belief that faculty members use incompletes to deal with students who disappear at the end of the term. Im and Schaffer agreed to modify the response accordingly prior to sending it.

**Motion to approve the UCC response to AC:** Perkus; second, Lacy.

Chair called the question.

**Vote:** 12 in favor, none opposed.

…
To: Susan Rakowitz, Executive Secretary of the Academic Council
From: Rank and Tenure Committee, AY 2010-2011 (Patricia Behre, Don Gibson, Dennis Keenan, Matt Kubasik, Paul Lakeland, Jean Lange, and Tracey Robert)
Date: September 12, 2011
Subject: Proposed Motions for the Academic Council

I. Proposed Formation of a Sub-Committee of the Academic Council on Community-Engaged Scholarship

Motion:

That the Academic Council form a subcommittee to consider the inclusion of language in the Faculty Handbook and/or Guidelines and Timetable for Applications for Tenure and Promotion that recognizes the importance of community-engaged scholarship.

Rationale:

There is growing national attention within higher education on the issue of community-engaged scholarship and its relationship to academic reward systems. Studies of faculty involvement in community engagement show that academic reward systems that do not change to assess and recognize engaged scholarship stand as a barrier to the careers of engaged scholars and campuses truly institutionalizing the work at their core. The Carnegie Classification of Community Engagement, an elective classification that began in 2008, has been a key driving force for change. In 2010, Fairfield University was one of just under 200 institutions of higher education in the U.S. to receive the Carnegie Classification of Community Engagement. Fairfield will need to reapply in 2015 and we will not be able to maintain this honor without showing progress in better aligning faculty rewards with community engaged teaching and scholarship.

To this end, in Fall 2010 Deans Robbin Crabtree and Beth Boquet attended an institute hosted by the Eastern Region Campus Compacts on the topic of the Institutionalization of Community Engagement. In Spring 2011, the Center for Academic Excellence, Office of Service Learning, and Office of Academic Engagement hosted a series of events and workshops on community-engagement as scholarship that raised a campus-wide conversation on the topic. These events highlighted the need to address the issue through policy changes as well as professional development. In Fall 2011, we have the opportunity to send a faculty team to the “Eastern Region Campus Compact Faculty Institute, Making it Count: Strategies for Rewarding Engaged Scholarship in Promotion and Tenure” where we will have the opportunity to work on goals specific to Fairfield while learning from the successes and challenges of other institutions and leaders in the field.
II. Proposed Amendments to the *Faculty Handbook*:

**Motion:**

That the following changes be made to the *Faculty Handbook* (additions in **bold**; deletions in *strikethrough*):

II.A.3.b.(3)  
That **at the time of submitting the dossier**, the candidate for tenure shall have *normally completed* served a probationary period of not less than five *consecutive* years in a **tenure-track position in** the academic profession, not less than two of which years shall have been served at Fairfield University. **No one can be a candidate for tenure at Fairfield more than once.**

II.A.1.b.(3)  
The normal requirements for appointment to the rank of Associate Professor are: […] (b) five six years experience in the rank of Assistant Professor. **An extraordinary petition for an early consideration of a tenure petition would require the support of two-thirds of the candidate’s tenured departmental colleagues.**

II.A.3.c.(1)  
The normal maximum probationary period shall be seven years. Included in the maximum probationary period shall *normally be only consecutive* years in a **tenure-track position in the academic profession** spent in full-time teaching at Fairfield prior to the receipt of the doctorate or the terminal degree in the candidate's field and/or years spent in full-time teaching at Fairfield on a temporary contract or with an appointment for a fixed term.

**Rationale:**

For whatever reason, it has become the practice at Fairfield University to allow an Assistant Professor, if necessary, to be a candidate for tenure two times. There is no basis for this in the *Faculty Handbook*. As such (and because of an ambiguity in the *Faculty Handbook* regarding the normal probationary period of a candidate for tenure), it has become common at Fairfield University for Assistant Professors to apply for tenure in their fifth year. The rationale is that if one is not successful in one’s fifth year, one will have *another opportunity* to apply the following year.

The Rank and Tenure Committee would like to have faculty members serve the full probationary period allowed by AAUP guidelines and only come up for tenure once because coming up for tenure two years in a row puts the Rank and Tenure Committee in the awkward position of providing negative feedback without giving the candidate sufficient time to remedy the situation.

Also, according to the *Faculty Handbook*, tenure is granted “not merely when a candidate meets minimum qualifications for rank, but only when there is reasonable confidence that the candidate will continue to develop as an outstanding teacher, a practicing scholar or artist, and a
contributing member of the campus community” (II.A.3). The whole idea of a consistent record of performance over the probationary period coupled with the promise of continued development seems to belie the likelihood that someone can remedy insufficiencies in a few months.

As it currently reads, the Faculty Handbook is ambiguous:

II.A.3.b.(3)
That the candidate for tenure shall have served a probationary period of not less than five years in the academic profession, not less than two of which years shall have been served at Fairfield University.

Whether one assumes (a) that a “candidate” for tenure is one who applies for tenure, or (b) one remains a “candidate” for tenure until one is actually tenured (i.e., at the time they receive their letter from the President in April), this statement implies that one cannot be appointed to the rank of Associate Professor until the beginning of their seventh year.

II.A.1. b.(3)
The normal requirements for appointment to the rank of Associate Professor are: […] (b) five years experience in the rank of Assistant Professor.

This statement implies that one can be appointed to the rank of Associate Professor at the beginning of their sixth year.

The Rank and Tenure Committee would like to clarify this ambiguity by having faculty members serve the maximum probationary period allowed by AAUP guidelines before applying for tenure; that is, faculty members would normally apply for tenure in their sixth year and (if successful) be appointed to the rank of Associate Professor at the beginning of their seventh year.

In extraordinary circumstances, these amendments would not preclude one from being a candidate for tenure having completed a probationary period of less than five years. Nor would they preclude one from being a candidate for tenure having completed a probationary period of less than two years at Fairfield University (this will take into account a more senior scholar coming to Fairfield with a leave from tenure somewhere else, where that tenure can usually only be guaranteed for two years).