ACADEMIC COUNCIL
AGENDA
Monday, November 7, 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 10/3/11 (attached)
   b. Correspondence
      i. Reports presented to the Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees on June 2, 2011 (separately stapled)
      ii. Information for AC to consider re: Portal (separately stapled)
   c. Oral reports

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

5. Petitions for immediate hearing

6. Old Business
   a. Proposed JOR and other language to implement AC-approved UCC proposal re core credit approval for courses outside a particular core area

7. New business
   a. Report from Committee on Conference re October 2011 Board of Trustees’ meeting and discussion of faculty views in preparation for upcoming meeting (December) of the Committee on Conference with the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees (ongoing Item 2)
   b. Request to reconsider the Workers’ Bill of Rights (attachment)
   c. Two proposed motions from the Rank and Tenure Committee (attachment)
   d. Proposal from UCC re policy on incompletes (attachments)
   e. Recommendations from ACEC re Pending Items (attachment)
   f. Proposal for minor in Anthropology (attachments)
   g. Proposals regarding Early Childhood Education (attachments)
   h. 5-Year Review of New Media Program (attachments)
   i. Registration proposal from Faculty Athletics Committee (attachment)

• Lists of Attachments, Pending, and Ongoing Items are on page 2
List of Attachments:
For item 3.a Minutes from AC meeting of 10/3/11 (pages 3-8)
For item 3.b.i Reports presented to the Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees on June 2, 2011 (separately stapled)
For item 3.b.ii Information for AC to consider re Portal (separately stapled)
For item 4.a Report from the AC Subcommittee on Voting Rights (pages 9-16)
For item 4.b Report from the AC Subcommittee to consider remaining items from review of the JOR (pages 17-44)
For item 6.a Proposed JOR and other language to implement AC-approved UCC proposal re core credit approval for courses outside a particular core area (text will not be ready until Dec. meeting)
For item 7.b Memo of 4/6/11, 14 faculty to AC re Workers’ Bill of Rights (pages 45-46)
For item 7.c Memo of 9/12/11 from R&T re: Proposed motions from the Rank and Tenure Committee (pages 47-49)
For item 7.d Memo of 3/14/11, UCC to AC re incomplete policy (pages 50-51); Memo of 11/12/10, ACEC to UCC (pages 52-53); Excerpt of UCC minutes of 3/1/11 re incomplete policy (page 54)
For item 7.e Recommendations from ACEC re pending items (page 55); see also AC 9/12/11 packet
For item 7.f Proposal for minor in anthropology and supporting materials (pages 56-62)
For item 7.e Proposals regarding Early Childhood Education and supporting materials (pages 63-77)
For item 7.h 5-Year Review of New Media Program and supporting materials (pages 78-96); original program proposal is with the materials for this meeting at www.faculty.fairfield.edu/gfs
For item 7.i Registration proposal from Faculty Athletics Committee (pages 97-98)

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.
Present: Professors Steven Bayne, Jocelyn Boryczka, Joe Dennin, Don Greenberg, Dennis Keenan, Phil Lane, Irene Mulvey (General Faculty Secretary), Kathy Nantz, Elizabeth Petrino, Rona Preli (Chair), Susan Rakowitz (Executive Secretary), Joyce Shea, Debra Strauss, Cheryl Tromley, Vishnu Vinekar, Brian Walker, David Zera.

Administrators: SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald, S.J.

Invited Presenters: Professors Betsy Bowen, Giovanni Ruffini.

Regrets: Deans Jack Beal, Robbin Crabtree, Suzanne Campbell, Don Gibson, Professor David Sapp

Absent: Dean Susan Franzosa

1. Presidential courtesy.

SVPAA Fitzgerald reported that they are working hard to close the 4.3 million dollar gap in the budget. The academic affairs division has trimmed some operating budgets, is delaying a few capital purchases for a year, has had eight or nine retirements (not all of which will be filled), and has some unallocated faculty salary money. SVPAA Fitzgerald said he would be happy to receive any additional suggestions for savings.

This summer the university will institute a program for rising high school seniors and will hope to attract them to coming to Fairfield. Additionally this summer there will be more online courses.

The Faculty Salary Committee met on Friday with SVPAA Fitzgerald and the Vice President of Finance Julie Dolan. According to SVPAA Fitzgerald, VPF Dolan mentioned that the university could possibly find savings by looking into whether the tuition remission benefit could be means tested. SVPAA Fitzgerald stressed that she is not talking about eliminating the benefit. The possible means testing for tuition remission will be discussed this year with the FSC, and any decision would need to be voted on by the General Faculty.

Chair Preli asked if there were any questions for SVPAA Fitzgerald.

Professor Mulvey asked who is on the administrative salary team this year, and SVPAA Fitzgerald replied that it was himself, VPF Dolan, and Director of Human Resources Mark Guglielmoni. Professor Mulvey noted that given the giant budget gap, the talk of the administration lowering the university’s contribution to retirement accounts, and with the health insurance increase cap expiring, she is concerned with the administration’s commitment to maintain the 95th percentile in faculty compensation. She said that faculty were willing to make changes to our benefits over the last few years only because of the administration’s commitment to the 95th percentile, but if that commitment is not maintained, the administration will have committed a “bait and switch”.

Professor Nantz asked about whether the 8 to 9 retirements came from faculty lines. SVPAA Fitzgerald replied that they did not come from faculty lines, but from staff in the academic division.
Professor Lane asked about the reason for all of this reshuffling, and SVPAA Fitzgerald said it was a combination of our enrolling only 910 instead of the 950 students that the budget was based on, the fact that some members of the junior and senior class simply have not returned, and shortfalls in some graduate enrollments.

2. **Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty.**

As chair of the Committee on Committees, Professor Mulvey reported that three new members had been appointed to the AC, Vishnu Vinekar, Kathy Nantz, and David Sapp (who was unable to attend today), and she welcomed them to the AC. She also noted that all other committee vacancies have been filled and that all but one Handbook committee has elected a chair.

Professor Mulvey gave an update on the SON dean search committee composition. The faculty members elected to the search committee by the Academic Council are Brian Walker, Dee Lippman, Kate Wheeler, Rona Preli, and Sally Gerard.

Professor Mulvey drew our attention to page 13 of the AC packet, and noted that in her opinion the situation does not require any follow up. Council agreed.

Professor Mulvey discussed the new portal for the university. This new portal will replace and update stagweb, and C&NS is looking for faculty input as to what should be included in the portal. Professor Mulvey wants the AC to be involved with this process and would like our input via email.

SVPAA Fitzgerald mentioned that this is taking the place of stagweb without the overcrowding of stagweb. Professor Vinekar asked about the timeline for this new portal, and SVPAA Fitzgerald replied at the end of this semester or early next semester.

3. **Report from the Executive Secretary.**

**MOTION** [Tromley/Walker]: To approve the minutes of the Academic Council meeting of 9/12/2011.

**MOTION PASSED:** 14 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstentions.

Professor Rakowitz directed our attention to the correspondence included in the AC packet.

Professor Rakowitz noted that after soliciting volunteers, the ACEC had formed the subcommittee they were charged with forming at the 9/12/2011 AC meeting to propose policies and procedures for part-time undergraduate students in the College of Arts and Sciences and the Dolan School of Business, and to consult with the College of Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee and the Dolan School of Business Undergraduate Committee to consider the wisdom of continuing the Bachelor of Professional Studies degree. The subcommittee consists of Professors Mulvey, Preli, Godbole, Ruffini, Munden, Campbell, and Deans Crabtree and Perkus.

4. **Council Subcommittee Reports.**

Professor Mulvey reported that all subcommittees are working, but none are ready to report at this meeting.
5. **Petitions for immediate hearing.**

   None

6. **Old Business.**

   a. **Proposal from UCC re core credit approval for courses outside a particular core area.**

   Professor Ruffini, a member of the UCC, briefly reminded the council of the background of this proposal. He reported that there has been an occasional problem for faculty that want to offer courses for core credit in areas outside their own departments. In the past faculty have petitioned UCC, which then consulted with the appropriate chairs and made a decision on an ad hoc basis. The motivation for formalizing a process is that sometimes some courses fell through the cracks, and some faculty thought it was unfair because there was not a clear process with a process of appeal.

   The floor was opened for questions.

   Professor Nantz wondered whether this was the best mechanism for carrying out this task. Isn’t there a check box for this purpose on the A&SCC New Course Proposal Form? Professor Ruffini noted that would apply only to new courses not pre-existing ones.

   Professor Petrino mentioned that with new course proposals, it is clear cut when a new course within a core area is proposed, but we need a mechanism for approving core credit for new courses from outside a particular core area.

   Professor Greenberg asked whether we have a set of criteria for determining whether a course meets the objectives necessary to merit core credit in a particular area? Professor Ruffini answered that the proposal calls for core areas to formulate appropriate learning objectives and to submit them to UCC.

   Professor Mulvey asked how often does this situation come up? She stated that it seems like a lot of structure for something so rare. Professor Ruffini mentioned that the process is really to account for that one professor who falls through the cracks.

   SVPAA Fitzgerald mentioned that the case of courses in Applied Ethics are examples of courses for which the core approval process is an issue, and these courses need a clear path to approval for core credit.

   Professor Bayne asked whether this core approval would be on a per course basis or on a per course and instructor basis. He pointed out that a core area may be willing to approve a particular course taught by a particular professor, but if the new process grants approval to any course with the same number regardless of who teaches it, then this takes too much control away from the core area. The core area should have the right and responsibility of determining the instructors qualified to teach the courses that receive core credit its area. Professor Ruffini said the process would just be on a per course basis.

   Professor Rakowitz stated that is how things work now with the core science committee.

   Chair Preli asked Professor Ruffini to speak about the motions.
Professor Ruffini outlined the three-step process found on page 18 of the AC packet. Chair Preli asked the Council what they would like to do?

**MOTION [Fitzgerald/Nantz]: that the Academic Council adopt the motions on page 18 and 19 of the October 3, 2011 AC Packet.**

Professor Rakowitz spoke against the motion because it is an incredibly burdensome process. She noted that the proposal for social science courses seems to be based on the core science process, but that process was developed by the science departments working with national organizations on science education, whereas this one would be imposed on social science departments.

Professor Greenberg voiced his agreement with professor Rakowitz.

Professor Lane supports motion and thinks it is a good vetting process.

Professor Mulvey said that she is grateful for the work of the UCC, but she thinks the proposal is too burdensome, so she is against it, but hopes to be able to suggest a less burdensome procedure later in the meeting.

Professor Shea was in favor of the motion. She said that this would allow UCC members to make an informed judgment based on the input of the appropriate core area.

Professor Nantz is in favor of the motion. She thought that one of the problems is that core areas are trying to protect their turf, so when someone from outside that area wants to teach a course for credit in that area, there is resistance. As a result this process will make things more accessible for people outside a particular core area.

**MOTION [Walker/Lane]: to call the question.**
**MOTION FAILED: 4 in favor, 11 opposed.**

Professor Greenberg said he thought this does not add anything to the vetting process of courses and it will be a burdensome Rube Goldberg contraption.

**MOTION [Rakowitz/Dennin]: to amend the motion by striking the last four sentences of bullet point two on page 18 of the AC packet and amending the end of the first sentence of bullet point two to read "...to review which courses from outside the social and behavioral sciences should be designated for social-science core credit..."**

**MOTION [Nantz/Lane]: to call the question.**
**MOTION to call the question PASSED unanimously**

**MOTION to amend PASSED: 13 in favor, 1 opposed, and 1 abstention.**

**MOTION [Nantz/Lane]: to call the question on the amended motion.**
**MOTION to call the question PASSED: 12 in favor, 2 opposed, and 2 abstentions.**

**MOTION as amended PASSED: 9 in favor, 6 opposed, and 1 abstention.**

7. **New business.**
a. Election of faculty to the Honorary Degree Committee.

MOTION [Tromley/Dennin]: that the slate of candidates provided by the Committee on Committees (Rajasree Rajamma, Evelyn Lolis, and Anibal Torres) be elected to serve as the faculty representatives on the Honorary Degree Committee.

MOTION PASSED: 17 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.

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).

Professor Bowen, Chair of Committee on Conference, reported on the last meeting with the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees on June 2, 2011. She said that she, and Professors Bernhardt and McFadden met with the committee in NY. They were told that the BOT would be voting on the proposed Handbook Committee on Sustainability, they were also instructed by the AC to inform the Board of the problems the faculty see with merit pay. At the meeting, there was a presentation concerning the first year of the use of the IDEA form, and she will forward the report to the AC Executive Committee. There was also a presentation from a consultant with Invision, which is a marketing firm working with focus groups of students on campus to get their impressions of what is happening on campus. The firm reported that students’ satisfaction with their academic experience at Fairfield was high and that this was a difference between Fairfield and other universities. On the other hand, only 71 percent of students would recommend Fairfield to other students. It was also reported that among students who reported not being happy at Fairfield, this unhappiness set in early in their careers.

Professor Bowen reported that the next meetings of the BOT are 10/6, 12/1, 3/29, and 6/7.

The floor was opened for questions about the last meeting.

Professor Lane commented that it sounds like you did not have a lot of time in the meeting. You should have more time in the meeting to express faculty concerns rather than devoting so much time to consultants.

Professor Bowen agreed that the Committee on Conference would like to be able to take a bigger role in presenting faculty concerns to the BOT.

Professor Nantz asked whether there was an agenda for the next meeting, and Professor Bowen reported not yet.

Professor Mulvey said that is part of this agenda item: to give instructions to the Committee on Conference for the next meeting with the Academic Affairs Committee of the BOT.

Professor Nantz said it just seems as if the timing is off, the meeting is on Thursday, how would the committee have time to prepare?

Professor Bown responded that this item had been on the September AC agenda but that there wasn’t sufficient time to get to it.
A discussion ensued with regard to the Conference Committee’s upcoming meeting with the board followed by

**MOTION: [Strauss/Tromley]:** that the AC ask the Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees to request information on how they are focusing their efforts on fund raising and generating other sources of revenue.

**MOTION PASSED:** 13 in favor, 2 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

**MOTION [Dennin/Walker]:** to adjourn

**MOTION PASSED:** 17 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven M. Bayne
Report from the Academic Council Subcommittee on Voting Rights
October 25, 2011
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Formation of and Charge to the Subcommittee

At the 3/7/11 Academic Council meeting, the Council passed the following motion:

MOTION: That the AC Executive Committee send out a call for volunteers and determine the makeup of a subcommittee that will investigate the language in the governance documents related to voting rights for faculty serving in administrative positions and administrators with faculty status, and will report back to the AC with recommendations.

Following its 4/14/11 meeting the Council’s Executive Committee put out a call for volunteers and subsequently formed the AC Subcommittee on Voting Rights. The subcommittee consisted of Professors Steve Bayne, Rick DeWitt, and Doug Lyon. At its first meeting on 4/5/11 the subcommittee elected Professor DeWitt chair. Additional meetings were held on 4/13/11, 4/27/11, and 5/11/11. The more difficult issues were discussed at these meetings, whereas more straightforward issues were discussed in numerous email exchanges.

Background Information

At the subcommittee’s early meetings we reviewed and discussed existing language related to voting rights as found in our governance documents, including the governance documents for each of the schools, the Faculty Handbook, and the Journal of Record. In reviewing this language, we identified three general items relevant to the charge to the subcommittee: basic issues, the variety of faculty bodies for which the issue of voting rights might be relevant, and an apparent constraint on the subcommittee’s work stemming from existing language in the Faculty Handbook.

Basic Issues

Early in our discussions these issues stood out:

(i) The consensus of the subcommittee was that many of our governance documents are not clear on the issue of voting rights.

(ii) In school governance documents, existing language on voting rights often restricts
such rights to full-time faculty. However, often there is not a clear definition of who qualifies as a full-time faculty member, and the consensus of the subcommittee is that this contributes to the unclarity noted in (i) above.

(iii) Unlike the other schools, the vast majority (over 90%) of faculty in the School of Engineering are part time adjunct faculty, and thus voting rights for the School of Engineering may need to be treated differently from other schools.

Given these issues, the consensus of the committee was that our recommendations to the Council would need to include a clearer policy on voting rights, a clearer definition of who qualifies as a full-time faculty member, and a mechanism for approving exceptions for unusual situations.

The Variety of Faculty Bodies for which Voting Rights are an Issue

In addition to the basic issues noted above, early on the subcommittee catalogued a variety of different types of faculty bodies for which the issue of voting rights might be relevant. These faculty bodies include the following.

a. The General Faculty
b. The Academic Council
c. General Faculty Standing (i.e. Handbook) Committees
d. School Faculty, e.g. as when the entire faculty of a school meets in a school faculty meeting
e. Standing (i.e. ongoing) faculty committees of the schools, for example, the CAS Curriculum Committee and the analogous curriculum committees of the other schools.
f. Faculty of a department or curriculum area, e.g., as when all department members meet in a department meeting
g. Departmental faculty committees, e.g., a departmental search committee
h. Program advisory boards, e.g., the advisory board for the Honors Program or for the Program in Applied Ethics

Voting rights concerning (a), (b) and (c) are specified in the Faculty Handbook, whereas voting rights for (d), (e), (f), (g) and (h) are or should be specified in the respective school governance documents. The consensus of the subcommittee is that voting rights for the Academic Council, the General Faculty, and General Faculty Standing Committees are clear and generally reasonable; thus the recommendations below focus on bodies such as (d) through (h).
An Apparent Constraint Stemming from Existing Language in the Faculty Handbook

The *Faculty Handbook* contains the following passage, amended in December 2009, concerning governance structures within schools:

> Each School’s faculty shall determine its own structure of governance, subject to the approval of the University President. The faculty of a School or the University President may propose amendments to a School’s initial governance document. All amendments must be accepted by both the University President and the faculty of the School in question.

Initially, the subcommittee thought it likely that we would be recommending a policy on voting rights in the form of proposed language for the Journal of Record. However, the consensus of the subcommittee is that voting rights are a key component of a school’s structure of governance, so in light of the *Faculty Handbook* passage above, voting rights in a school must ultimately be determined by the faculty of each school. Thus, any proposed policy for the Journal of Record on voting rights within a school would be inconsistent with the passage above. In short, the consensus of the subcommittee is that the *Handbook* policy above precludes the subcommittee from proposing a policy for the Journal of Record.

The subcommittee’s options, then, were to propose a *Faculty Handbook* amendment specifying a general policy on voting rights, or else recommend the Academic Council endorse a statement of basic principles involving voting rights and recommend the Council encourage each school to modify their governance documents accordingly. The latter route would have the form of a Council-endorsed recommendation but not policy, and would not be the sort of language suitable for the Journal of Record.

We discussed these options over the course of several meetings, eventually coming to a consensus that the latter option was preferable. The primary reason had to do with there being sufficient differences among the schools so as to make a single *Handbook* policy that would be applicable and appropriate for all schools difficult to formulate. Instead, the consensus of the subcommittee is that a better route is for the Council to endorse a general recommendation on voting rights, with the understanding that the faculty of the various schools can decide how best to implement the recommendation given the situation within those schools.

In keeping with the issues and constraints noted above, the subcommittee recommends the Council endorse the following four recommendations.
Recommendation One

The Academic Council recommends all schools review their governance documents to ensure that the document incorporates the following principle:

Each school’s governance document should clearly define a full time faculty member as a member of the General Faculty who is under a full time faculty contract with the rank of Instructor or above.

Rationale:

This language fixes the problem noted above involving the lack of clarity in many school governance documents as to who qualifies as a full time faculty member, and does so in a way consistent with the language in the Faculty Handbook.

Recommendation Two

The Academic Council recommends all schools review their governance documents to ensure that the document incorporates the following policy:

Only full time faculty members who devote more than seventy five percent of their academic year’s duties to teaching and/or research have voting rights at faculty meetings of the school, standing faculty committees of the school (for example, school Curriculum Committees), departmental meetings or meetings of faculty in a curriculum area, departmental faculty committees (for example, search committees), and other faculty bodies within the school or department.

Exceptions:

General exceptions to this policy may be made within school governance documents in accordance with the emendation procedure specified in the school governance document.

Individual exceptions to this policy, such as exceptions for a faculty committee within a school, department, or curriculum area, may be approved by a vote of the faculty body that formed the committee.

Rationale:

The consensus of the subcommittee is that this constitutes a reasonable policy on voting rights on faculty bodies, restricting such rights to faculty who are performing the usual duties associated with faculty such as teaching and research, while allowing for appropriate bodies to make general and individual exceptions where such exceptions would be desirable.
Recommendation Three

The Academic Council recommends that all current exceptions to the principles and policies in Recommendations One and Two within school governance documents be reviewed and voted on by the full time faculty members of the school.

Rationale:

This recommendation addresses the need to review existing language in school governance documents that may be inconsistent with the principles and policies above.

Recommendation Four

The Academic Council directs the AC Executive Committee in fall of 2012 to inquire of the Deans of each school as to changes made to the school’s governance documents in light of the above recommendations, review the governance documents of the schools, and report back to the Academic Council.

Rationale:

This recommendation provides a mechanism for assessing the status of the recommended changes to schools’ governance documents.
Appendix A: Relevant Excerpts from the *Faculty Handbook* and the *Journal of Record*

---

[Handbook, page 1.]

2. General Faculty

The General Faculty of the University is composed of all full-time University faculty members with the rank of Instructor or above, the President of the University, the Academic Vice President, the Academic Deans, and the University Librarian. Other persons may be appointed as members of the General Faculty by the President upon the recommendation of the Academic Council. All members of the faculty as described above have the right of vote at meetings of the General Faculty.

---

[Handbook, page 5, re AC.]

2. Membership

The Academic Council shall be composed of faculty, elected by their colleagues, from the undergraduate and graduate schools and of *ex officio* members. Only faculty who are full-time and who devote more than seventy-five percent of their academic year’s duties to teaching and/or research may be members of the Council. The term of a faculty member is two academic years. No more than two consecutive terms may be served.

---

[Handbook, amendment passed on 11/20/09.]

*Ex officio* members of the Council are the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Deans of the Schools and the Secretary of the General Faculty. The Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Secretary of the General Faculty are *ex officio* voting members. Additional *ex officio* positions may be accorded membership on the Council by appointment of the President and the Council. Faculty members of the Council are elected to represent the interest and orientations of the various Schools of the University. The right to vote and/or to make and second motions is limited to faculty members elected to the Council and those *ex officio* members designated above as voting members. Other *ex officio* members do not have these rights. All Council members have the right and privilege of discussion. Additionally, the opportunity for direct communication from the
President of the University to the members of the Council is afforded at all meetings in the Order of Business.

[Handbook, amendment passed March 2007.]

Academic administrators who have held faculty rank at other institutions may be granted the same rank in an appropriate curriculum area upon the request of the President and approval of the faculty in the curriculum area. Such rank does not imply tenure nor does time spent in rank as an administrator count as part of a probationary period toward tenure. An appointment at a higher rank may be granted upon the request of the President, approval of the faculty in the curriculum area and the Committee on Rank and Tenure. Academic administrators granted the rank of Instructor or above are voting members of the General Faculty.

[Handbook, amendment passed December 2009 re governance structures in the schools.]  
3. Governance

Each School’s faculty shall determine its own structure of governance, subject to the approval of the University President. The faculty of a School or the University President may propose amendments to a School’s initial governance document. All amendments must be accepted by both the University President and the faculty of the School in question.

[JOR, page 48.]

Professor of the Practice:

The professor of the practice would be appointed based on the procedures and qualifications set forth in the Faculty Handbook (II.A.1). These positions normally would require a 4-4 teaching load and university service, though not the peer-reviewed scholarship expected of faculty in tenure-track or tenured positions.
Professors of the practice would be members of the General Faculty and so have full voting privileges within departments, schools, and at meetings of the General Faculty. They would be eligible to serve on any standing committee of the General Faculty, with the exceptions of the Committee on Rank and Tenure and the Research Committee. They would be expected to perform all of the “Faculty Duties” listed in the Faculty Handbook (II.C.1). Professors of the practice would be eligible for merit pay, but not for promotion in rank. In any school, professors of the practice would normally constitute no more than 10% of the full-time faculty. The appointment of any professor of the practice will never diminish the number or the growth of tenured faculty lines in departments, curriculum areas, programs, schools, or in the University as a whole.

AC: 03/09/2009

[JOR, amendment passed 11/1/11, re merit appeals.]

Appeal process

1. A university merit appeals committee will be chaired by the SVPAA, and consist of four voting faculty, no more than one per school, elected to staggered two year terms, and three voting Deans, appointed annually by the SVPAA to one-year terms. A Dean whose decision is being appealed shall not be involved in the deliberations for that appeal, does not vote on that appeal, and is not replaced on the committee for that appeal.
MEMORANDUM
Academic Council
Fairfield University

TO: Academic Council

FROM: Subcommittee to consider remaining items from review of the Journal of Record

DATE: October 25, 2011

RE: Recommendations for the nine remaining Journal of Record items

At a number of meetings in academic year 2010-2011, the Academic Council considered a report from the Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Journal of Record. Our subcommittee was formed in spring 2011 by the Council and charged “to consider all the items under bullet 4 [on page 4 of the Report from the Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Journal of Record dated 11/10/2010] and items #22 and #44 [in the document Journal of Record with 55 changes shown for the AC, dated 11/10/2010].”

Specifically, the items we were charged to consider are numbered 16, 19, 22, 23, 36, 44, 50, 51, and 52 from the Journal of Record with 55 changes shown for the AC and the Ad Hoc JOR committee report. Our recommendations for each of the nine items are in this report. All relevant documents can be found with the materials for the Council’s December 6, 2010 meeting.

Item 16.
The current entry in the Journal of Record is:

Rank and Tenure Applications by Committee Members:
It is the sense of the General Faculty that, if an individual faculty member should wish to apply for tenure or promotion while serving a term on the Faculty Committee for Rank and Tenure, that faculty member should relinquish committee membership for the academic year during which his application is being considered.

GF: 03/22/1985

Recommendation and Rationale: The Subcommittee recommends that this item be removed from the Journal of Record because this matter is covered in the Handbook as follows, “No member of the Committee may apply for promotion during his/her tenure on the Committee.” [I.C.b.2, paragraph 2]. Furthermore, only tenured faculty members are allowed to serve on the Rank and Tenure Committee.

Item 19.
The current entry in the Journal of Record is:

Research Applications by Research Committee Members:
It is the sense of the General Faculty that, if an individual faculty member should wish to apply for sabbatical leave, summer faculty stipend or research grant while serving a term on the faculty Research Committee, that faculty member should absent himself/herself from committee deliberations during the meeting(s) in which his/her application is being considered.

GF: 03/22/1985

The Research Committee is responsible for making decisions on applications in five different categories: Summer Stipends, Research Grants, Senior Summer Fellowships, Sabbaticals, and Pre-Tenure Research Leaves. The application guidelines for each category are in a separate appendix in the Journal of Record. For the first three, the application guidelines in the Journal of Record stipulate “Members of the Faculty Research Committee are not eligible to apply during their term in order to avoid a conflict of interest”. In addition, the *Handbook* states “No member of the [Research] Committee may apply for research grants and/or summer stipend awards during his/her tenure on the Committee; however, members may apply for sabbatical leaves and/or extraordinary research leaves concurrent with a term on the Committee.” [I.C.b.3, page 12.]

Recommendation: The Subcommittee recommends that this item be revised as follows:

**Sabbatical and Pre-Tenure Research Leaves by members of the Research Committee:**
If an individual faculty member applies for Sabbatical or Pre-Tenure Research Leave while serving a term on the Research Committee, that faculty member shall absent him or herself from committee deliberations during the meeting(s) in which his or her application is being considered.

GF: 3/22/1985
AC: Date of Approval

Rationale: The prohibition for Research Committee members applying for Summer Stipends, Research Grants or Senior Summer Fellowships is clearly stated in the application guidelines for each award in the Journal of Record and does not need to be addressed elsewhere in the Journal of Record. The revised entry is consistent with what is already in the *Handbook* and the Journal of Record. Even though it is unlikely that an untenured faculty member would be serving on the Research Committee and applying for a Pre-Tenure Research Leave, it is the position of the Subcommittee that Pre-Tenure Research Leaves should be treated in the same way as sabbaticals.

**Item 22.**
The current entry in the Journal of Record with changes suggested by the Ad Hoc Committee to review the Journal of Record is as follows:

**Missed Classes:**
"All instructors should begin and end their classes on time as a courtesy to their students and fellow instructors. When, for any valid reason, they are unable to meet their classes, they should notify the appropriate Dean and, if possible, make arrangements for conducting the class." (from the Faculty Handbook, II.C.1.a)
When faculty members are unable to meet their classes, they should notify the appropriate Dean, and, if possible, the students as soon as they know that they will not meet their classes.

In the event of unusual or inclement weather, when the University remains open, faculty members should make every reasonable effort to meet their regularly scheduled classes; the final judgment on what is reasonable effort resides with the individual faculty member.

Faculty members who are unable for any reason to meet with their classes should, if possible, make arrangements with a colleague to conduct class, or otherwise endeavor to cover missed class material through e.g. additional assignments or lengthened class meetings.

Similarly, when class time is lost through frequent school closings due to weather or other emergencies, faculty members should endeavor to cover missed class material through e.g. additional assignments or lengthened class meetings.

AC: 09/12/1994

Recommendation: The Subcommittee recommends that this item be revised as follows:

Canceling classes in inclement weather:
In the event of inclement weather, when the University remains open, faculty members should make every reasonable effort to meet their regularly scheduled classes. The final judgment on what is reasonable effort, and therefore whether to hold class, resides with the individual faculty member. Faculty members should try to notify their students of a decision to cancel class in a timely manner.

AC: 09/12/1994
AC: Date of Approval

Rationale: It is the position of the Subcommittee that only the information in the third paragraph is necessary and should remain in the Journal of Record; specifically, that faculty members need to understand that they are not required to travel to the University in dangerous conditions, even if the University is open.

Item 23.
The text from the Journal of Record with 55 changes shown for the AC is as follows:

23. Entry that needs to be revised

Make-ups for Missed Exams:
The Dean of the student’s school and not the Office of Student Services should certify that a student was eligible to receive an absentee examination.
Recommendation: The AC should modify this entry as it may be too directive. The text should reflect the combination of policies in the catalog and the Student Handbook.

The subcommittee recommends that the current entry be deleted and the following entry be included:

**Class Attendance.**
All students are expected to attend every regularly scheduled class session. The impact of attendance on grading is specified in the syllabus for each course. Unexcused absences may be reported to the appropriate academic dean.

Faculty members should have a policy for dealing with student absence on the syllabus for each course. If a student will miss a class due to an illness/injury, the professor should be notified according to the policy on the syllabus. If a student will miss an exam, quiz or in-class presentation due to illness/injury or another type of emergency, the professor should be contacted beforehand. A faculty member may request that the student provide verification of the absence from a health care provider. It is the purview of the faculty member to determine when or if a student absence will be excused.

AC: Date of Approval

Rationale: Given that the matter of student absences had been considered by the Council through a Council subcommittee during the 2010-11 academic year, the present subcommittee took the opportunity to look at this entry in a broad context. The present subcommittee considered the text in the 2010-11 undergraduate catalog (pages 39-40), the 2010-11 Student Handbook (pages 30-31 and pages 46-47), the Instructional Policy Handbook (pages 7-8 and pages 19-20) and the report to the Academic Council from the Subcommittee on Student Absences Related to Health Issues (dated 4/8/2011) and considered by the Council at its meeting on 5/2/2011. Upon reflection, the subcommittee’s position is that a distinction must be drawn between absence from a class versus absence from an exam, quiz, or other graded work that takes place during a class session. The proposed entry for the Journal of Record indicates, in paragraph one, the expectation that students attend every class. In paragraph two, the faculty member’s license to dictate class policy in this area is indicated, as well as the faculty member’s authority to request from the student official verification of absence. Ultimate authority for excusing a student’s absence resides with the faculty member.

**Item 36.**
The text from the Journal of Record with 55 changes shown for the AC is as follows:

36. An entry that needs to be reviewed

Tutorials:
Students may be permitted to enroll in a course listed in the university catalogue on a tutorial basis with approval of the Area Coordinator/Chair and by arrangement with the faculty member.
offering the tutorial.

1. To register, students must obtain the appropriate form from the Office of the Registrar and have it completed by the faculty member offering the tutorial.

2. The tutorial appears on the transcript with appropriate notation as a tutorial under the equivalent number, e.g., EN 11(t), PY 15(t).

Recommendation: The AC should revisit this entry to see if it is still relevant, or if it should be reconciled with the entry above on Independent Studies. Process language is inappropriate for the *Journal of Record*.

The subcommittee recommends that this item be revised as follows:

```
Tutorials.
In rare circumstances, students may be permitted to enroll in a course listed in the University catalog on a tutorial basis with the approval of the Area Coordinator/Chair and the faculty member offering the tutorial.
```

Rationale. Occasionally, a student needs a specific course to satisfy core or major requirements. In such cases, the student is allowed to register for that course as a tutorial. The revised entry allows a student to have the appropriate information appear on the transcript (as opposed to the course number for an Independent Study), does not include the process language, and indicates that this should happen only in rare circumstances.

**Item 44.**
The current entry in the *Journal of Record* is:

```
Consideration of prior service for promotion and tenure:
Evaluation for promotion or tenure should be based on a faculty member's performance in the academic career starting with his/her initial appointment at the rank of full-time instructor higher at an institution of higher learning. While promotion and tenure is based on performance in the academic career, the committee may seek to convince itself that such performance will continue at Fairfield University.
```

AC: 11/05/1991

The revision proposed by the Ad Hoc Committee to review the *Journal of Record* is:

```
Consideration of prior service for promotion and tenure:
While promotion and tenure are based on the candidate’s performance in the entire academic career, the Rank and Tenure Committee must also judge that the candidate’s performance at Fairfield University has met the requirements for rank and tenure.
```

AC: 11/05/1991
Recommendation: The Subcommittee recommends that the entry be revised differently, as follows:

Consideration of prior service for promotion and tenure:
Evaluation for promotion or tenure should be based on a faculty member’s performance in the academic career starting with his/her initial appointment at the rank of full-time instructor or higher at an institution of higher learning. While promotion and tenure are based on performance in the academic career, the committee shall not recommend tenure unless it has reasonable confidence that such performance will continue at Fairfield University.

AC: 11/05/1991
AC: Date of approval

Rationale: Apparently, the language proposed by the Ad Hoc Committee did not convey what it was intended to convey. The original entry was not stated in the language of policy and was not clearly consistent with the Handbook. The revision makes it clear that all work must count towards tenure and promotion, and is consistent with the Handbook language [II.A.3], “…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.”

**Item 50.**
The current entry in the Journal of Record is:

Faculty Admission to University Courses:
I. Tuition is remitted for full time faculty when they wish to take courses sponsored in whole or part by the University. In some cases, tuition remission is governed by conditions, as follows:

1. For most courses offered by the University, the only condition is the completion of the proper tuition remission and registration forms.

2. For courses in which there are limitations on enrollment based on physical requirements (e.g., limited number of lab stations), faculty may enroll on a space available basis after regular full time and part time students.

3. For courses offered under a "contract" fee structure, faculty participation is contingent upon funding from some source; faculty will then have access to the course on an equal basis with anyone else.

II. Fees others than tuition are the responsibility of the faculty member.

III. Funding for "contract" courses (I.3 above) is to come from University sources.

AC: 05/16/1988
Recommendation and Rationale: See recommendation and rationale for Item 51.

Item 51.
The text from the Journal of Record with 55 changes shown for the AC is as follows:

51. Recommend that the location for this entry be reviewed

**Illness/Disability Policy:**
The University will provide full salary and benefits for up to six (6) months of absence due to disabling illness, injury, pregnancy, childbirth or related conditions. Any faculty member who anticipates an extended disability absence will inform his/her Dean as soon as possible indicating the anticipated commencement and, whenever possible, the anticipated duration of the period of absence. The University may require medical certification in cases of recurring absences, or for absences lasting longer than a month.

The period of recovery due to a normal childbirth is presumed to be six weeks. The University may require medical certification for absences in excess of six weeks.

The University's total Disability Plan provides benefits for serious and long-term illness/injury after six months, subject to the terms of the Plan. Faculty members are expected to apply for and avail themselves of the Plan where appropriate.

Work-related injuries are covered by Worker's Compensation.

AC: 09/09/1991

Recommendation: that the AC consider whether the information in this entry belongs in the Journal of Record or the Benefit Plans Overview.

Recommendation and rationale for items 50 & 51: Items 50 and 51 deal with particular benefits for faculty. The Journal of Record may not be an appropriate place for entries on benefits for faculty as most benefits for faculty are now delineated in the Faculty Handbook and the Benefits Plan Overview. The subcommittee’s concern is that any statement of an individual faculty benefit should be complete, up-to-date, and protected from being changed unilaterally by the administration or trustees; Item 51, in particular, is not up-to-date. Before making any recommendation to move the information in either of these two entries to the Benefit Plans Overview, the subcommittee’s position is that it is incumbent upon the faculty to reach agreement with the administration on language that items in the Benefit Plans Overview cannot be unilaterally changed. The subcommittee recommends that the Council ask the Faculty Salary Committee to work with the administration to reach agreement on language for the Journal of Record and/or the Faculty Handbook that will protect benefits in the Benefits Plan Overview from unilateral change by the administration or trustees. Draft language should be vetted by the Faculty Welfare Committee/AAUP. For the time being, the subcommittee recommends no change to either Item 50 or Item 51.
Proposed Motion. The Academic Council asks the Faculty Salary Committee to work with the administration to reach agreement on language for the Journal of Record and/or the Faculty Handbook that would protect benefits in the Benefit Plans Overview from unilateral change. Draft language should be vetted by the Faculty Welfare Committee/AAUP.

Item 52.

Item 52 involves a Journal of Record entry entitled Computer Usage Guidelines, approved by the Academic Council on 2/1/1993 (see Appendix I). The recommendation from the Ad Hoc Committee to Review the Journal of Record was “that the AC review this entry since the information may be outdated.” The present subcommittee found the following policies:

I. The Computer Usage Guidelines in the 11/2009 Journal of Record, approved by the Council 2/1/1993 (see Appendix I)
II. Fairfield University Computer Systems Acceptable Use Policy (AUP 2000), approved by the Council on 11/6/2000 (see Appendix II)
IV. Fairfield University Computer Systems Acceptable Use Policy (AUP 2004), found on the CNS website and dated November 13, 2000/Updated June 30, 2004/© 2011 (see Appendix IV)
V. Procedures in Support of Fairfield University’s Computer Systems Acceptable Use Policy (Procedures 2004), found on the CNS website, undated with © 2011 (see Appendix V)

The policy in the Journal of Record (Appendix I) is outdated. AUP 2000 and Procedures 2000 were approved by the Academic Council but, apparently, never entered into the Journal of Record. AUP 2004 and Procedures 2004 do not appear to have been approved by the Academic Council. There do not appear to be any substantive differences between the documents approved by the Council in 2000 and the updated 2004 documents.

Recommendation. That the Academic Council review and approve AUP 2004 (Appendix IV) and Procedures 2004 (Appendix V) and have these two documents replace the current entry in the Journal of Record, Computer Usage Guidelines (Appendix I).
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Appendix I:

Computer Usage Guidelines:
Only members of the Fairfield University community are eligible to use the computing resources available on campus.

Resources are available solely for:

* students needing resources for course-related work
* faculty engaged in research, instructional development, and other professional activities

The computer resources of Fairfield University are limited and should be used wisely and carefully. To assist in the most efficient uses of all computer resources on campus, the following guidelines have been established by the Educational Technologies Committee:

1. Each user must use the computing resources for the purpose(s) for which they are intended. Resources should be used for research, instructional, or administrative activities and must not be used for primarily commercial purposes.

2. Users may not engage in unauthorized duplication, alteration, or destruction of data, programs, or software belonging to other members of the University community. Users may not transmit or disclose data, programs or software belonging to others. Further, users may not copy materials protected by copyright or licensing agreement.

3. Users may not encroach on others' use of computer resources. This includes, but is not limited to, such activities as typing up computer resources for game playing; sending frivolous or excessive messages; spreading computer viruses; using excess amounts of storage; printing excessive copies; or running inappropriate programs that utilize inordinate amounts of computer time when more efficient programs are available.

4. Users must not attempt to modify computer system(s) facilities on the University's mainframe, networks, microcomputer, and external network links.

5. Users shall abide by the security policies set forth by the System Manager.

Identified violations will be reported to the appropriate office or Student Judicial Board for action as described in the Faculty Handbook or the Student Handbook.

AC: 02/01/1993
Appendix II:
Fairfield University Computer Systems Acceptable Use Policy (AUP 2000)

Fairfield University Computer Systems Acceptable Use Policy

This policy is designed to guide students, faculty, staff, and other authorized users in the acceptable use of computer and information systems and networks provided by Fairfield University according to the mission of the University. It is meant as an application of the principles of respect and reverence for every person, the development of community and the ideals of liberal education that are at the core of Fairfield’s Catholic, Jesuit identity. This policy supersedes the “Acceptable Use Policy” (number 610) adopted 1/1/94. This policy does not supersede any other University policies, including the student grievances, sexual harassment, and personal conduct.

Guiding Principles:

The Fairfield University community is encouraged to make innovative and creative use of information technologies in support of education and research. Access to information representing a multitude of views on current and historical issues should be allowed for the interest, information and enlightenment of the University community. Consistent with other University policies, this policy is intended to respect the rights and obligations of Academic Freedom, and recognizes that the educational mission of the University is served in a variety of ways.

The University recognizes that the purpose of copyright is to protect the rights of the creators of intellectual property and to prevent the unauthorized use or sale of works available in the private sector. Publication, distribution, or broadcast of copyright protected materials without permission is prohibited (See Policy on Copyright, attached). Also consistent with other University policies, an individual’s right of access to computer materials should not be denied or abridged because of race, creed color, age, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, or disability.

The University cannot protect individuals against the existence or receipt of material that may be offensive to them. As such, those who make use of electronic communications are warned that they may come across or be recipients of material they find offensive. Those who use e-mail and/or make information about themselves available on the Internet should be forewarned that the University cannot protect them from invasions of privacy and other possible dangers that could result from the individual’s distribution of personal information.

In the interests of promoting the free exchange of ideas, Fairfield University does not exercise prior review of electronic documents available on its network and accessible locally or through the internet. Individuals who access materials available on the Fairfield University network should understand these materials, unless otherwise posted, do not necessarily reflect the views of Fairfield University. Individuals who feel that particular materials posted on the Fairfield University network are inappropriate or otherwise objectionable, may lodge a formal complaint through the office of Computing and Network Services.
F airfield University computing and network resources are to be used for University-related research, instruction, learning, enrichment, dissemination of scholarly information, and administrative activities. The computing and network facilities of the University are limited and should be used wisely and carefully with consideration for the needs of others. Computers and network systems offer powerful tools for communication among members of the community and of communities outside the University. When used appropriately, these tools can enhance dialog and communication. When used unlawfully or inappropriately, however, these tools can infringe on the rights of others.

Responsibilities:
The following examples, though not covering every situation, specify some of the responsibilities that accompany computer use at Fairfield and/or on networks to which Fairfield is connected.

1. Users may not attempt to modify the University system or network facilities or attempt to crash systems. They should not tamper with any software protections or restrictions placed on computer applications or files.

2. All users must obtain authorized computing accounts and may only use their own user names and passwords to access University computing and network systems. Users may not supply false or misleading data nor improperly obtain another's password in order to gain access to computers or network systems, data or information. The negligence or naïveté of another user in revealing an account name or password is not considered authorized use. Convenience of file or printer sharing is not sufficient reason for sharing a computer account. Users should not attempt to subvert the restrictions associated with their computer accounts.

3. Users are responsible for all use of their computer account(s). They should make appropriate use of the system and network-provided protection features and take precautions against others obtaining access to their computer resources. Individual password security is the responsibility of each user.

4. Users may not encroach on others’ use of computer resources. Such activities would include, but are not limited to, tying up computer resources for excessive game playing or other trivial applications; sending harassing messages; sending frivolous or excessive messages, including chain letters, junk mail, and other types of broadcast messages, either locally or over the Internet; using excessive amounts of storage (as determined by Computing and Network Service policies); intentionally introducing any computer viruses, worms, Trojan Horses, or other rogue programs to Fairfield University hardware or software; physically damaging systems; or running grossly inefficient programs when efficient ones are available.

5. Users are responsible for making use of software and electronic materials in accordance with copyright and licensing restrictions and applicable university policies. Fairfield University equipment and software may not be used to violate copyright or the terms of any license agreement. No one may inspect, modify, distribute, or copy proprietary data, directories, programs, files, disks or other software without proper authorization.

6. Users must remember that information distributed through the University's computing and networking facilities is a form of publishing, and some of the same standards apply. For example, anything generated at Fairfield that is available on the Internet through the University’s network represents the University and not just an individual. Even with disclaimers, the
University is represented by its students, faculty and staff, and appropriate content, language and behavior is warranted.

7. Users may not transmit any material that is unlawful, libelous, or encourages conduct that would constitute a criminal offense, give rise to civil liability, or otherwise violate any federal, state, or local laws. Materials made available or transmitted on University Computer systems must comply with all University policies governing conduct of students, faculty and staff.

**Administration:**

The University encourages all members of its community to use electronic communications in a manner that is respectful to others. While respecting users’ confidentiality and privacy, the University reserves the right to examine computer files and monitor electronic activity within the limits of other applicable University policies. The University may exercise this right in order to enforce its policies regarding harassment and the safety of individuals; to prevent the posting of proprietary software or electronic copies of electronic texts or images in disregard of copyright restrictions or contractual obligations; to safeguard the integrity of computers, networks, and data either at the University or elsewhere; and to protect the University against seriously damaging consequences. The University may restrict the use of its computers and network systems for electronic communications when faced with evidence of violation of University policies, or federal, state or local laws. The University reserves the right to limit access to its networks through University-owned or other computers, and to remove or limit access to material posted on University-owned computers.

All users are expected to conduct themselves consistent with these responsibilities and all other applicable University policies. Abuse of computing privileges will subject the user to disciplinary action according to established University procedures. Abuse of networks or computers at other sites through the use of Fairfield University resources will be treated as an abuse of computing privileges at the University. When appropriate, temporary restrictive actions will be taken by system or network administrators pending further disciplinary action; the loss of computing privileges may result.

The University and users recognize that all members of the University community are bound by federal, state and local laws relating to civil rights, harassment, copyright, security and other statutes relating to electronic media. It should be understood that this policy does not preclude enforcement under the laws and regulations of the United States of America nor the State of Connecticut.

This policy may be amended or changed by the University Vice-Presidents, and in matters affecting the Academic Division, with the mutual consent of the Academic Council.

The undersigned acknowledges that they have reviewed and understand *Fairfield University's Acceptable Use Policy* noted above and that failure to adhere to these principles and policies may result in the revocation of authorized access to electronic networks and computer systems at Fairfield University. A signed statement is required to gain access to Fairfield University’s network(s) and computer systems. Please return the lower portion of this form to the Help Desk (Bannow Science Center, Room GR-33) in order to obtain your e-mail account.

Name (Printed)  Date:

Signature
Appendix III:
Procedures in Support of Fairfield University’s Computer Systems Acceptable Use Policy
(Procedures 2000)

Procedures in Support of Fairfield University’s Computer Systems Acceptable Use Policy
November 1, 2000

Preface
These procedures have been designated to complement rather than supercede existing university procedures, guidelines, and policies relating to computer use by faculty, staff and students. For this reason, final authority for the resolution of complaints, including any penalties rests with the appropriate chief administrator.

For the purposes of this policy, “appropriate chief administrator” shall be defined as the senior administrator who has jurisdiction over the alleged offender of the Fairfield University Computer Systems Acceptable Use Policy (hereafter cited as the Acceptable Use Policy). The “appropriate Chief administrator” for faculty is the Academic Vice President. The “appropriate chief administrator” for students will either be the Academic Vice President if the offense is related to academics, or the Vice President for Student Services in non-academic affairs. In circumstances where the jurisdictional lines are not clearly demarcated, authority will rest with both Vice Presidents, disputes being resolved by the President. In the case of non-faculty staff, the Associate Vice President of Human Resources is the chief administrator.

Guiding Principles: These procedures were designed to balance seven interests:
1) respecting the rights and responsibilities of academic freedom as defined in applicable policies for faculty and for students engaged in academic work
2) protecting the rights of the university;
3) protecting users’ privacy;
4) protecting the System or network Administrator (SNA) in the performance of his or her job;
5) allowing routine administrative actions that might affect users’ files;
6) providing a mechanism to allow non-routine, non-emergency access to users’ files when it can be justified;
7) providing guidelines for the occasional need to take immediate action. The ability of an SNA to read a user’s files does not imply that he or she may do so without obtaining the approval required by these procedures.

Balancing Rights
“Incidental personal use” of computing systems is an accepted and appropriate benefit of being associated with Fairfield University. However, “incidental personal use” must still adhere to all university policies, and must never have an adverse impact on the use of technology and information resources in support of the University’s mission. Examples of “adverse impact” are described in the section entitled “Responsibilities” in the Acceptable Use Policy. The respective chief administrator of the Academic Division, Student Services, Human Resources, and Information Services share the responsibility to interpret the Acceptable Use Policy along with...
existing university policies relating to personal use of computers and to establish procedures to
assist them in the investigation and enforcement of these procedures. For example, in accordance
with existing university procedures an employee’s supervisor may also decide that personal
activities are affecting the abilities of the employee or colleagues to perform job functions and it
is their right to ask the employee to cease those activities. Ultimately, the office of Human
Resources will arbitrate disagreements concerning the interpretation of the Acceptable Use
Policy relating to non-faculty staff.

Privacy
This policy defines “private” either as physically or technically not accessible to the general
public or accessible only through non-obvious password protection or other security schemes
designed to limit access to known or identified individuals. Network system logs which may
record an individual’s network activity shall be considered private.

Routine Operations
During routine administration SNAs may need to archive or delete privacy user files or messages
from the system; for example, this usually is due to physical data storage limits or an individual’s
departure from the University. In this situation, it is not necessary for an SNA to read or view
user files; all work is done using system utilities, machine to machine. Given that these situations
are foreseeable, each organization responsible for a computer or network system on which these
actions will take place must define how and when they will occur. Reasonable efforts must then
be made to ensure that system users understand the policy.

Violations, Investigations and Due Process
Non-routine situations may occur where it is necessary to examine a user’s private files without
being able to obtain his/her specific permission or authorization. Such situations may include the
investigation of violations of this policy or other University policies. The intent of these
procedures is to separate the authority to read private user files or messages from the technical
ability to do so. This separation attempts to protect both the user and the SNA.

1. Scope. The procedures outlined in this section shall apply to the investigation of University
policy violations, including violations of the Acceptable Use Policy, which involve University
computing resources or which require access to the private computer activities or files of
students or faculty.

2. Reporting of complaints. Any member of the University community may bring a complaint
of unacceptable use of computing resources. It is also conceivable that individuals or agencies
outside the University may bring such complaints. Complaints shall be brought to the Vice
President for Information Services or his/her designee who will be responsible for coordinating
the presentation of complaints to the “appropriate chief administrator” as follows:

A. The Vice President for Information Services is charged with making judgments of
whether a given activity, use, or publication involving Fairfield University computing resources
(including but not limited to the use of the campus network and internet gateway, use of server-
e-mail, web, file, mainframes, etc.-desktop computers, public terminals, etc.) requires further
investigation and/or referral to the appropriate chief administrator.
B. For alleged violations of the AUP by faculty members or by students engaged in academic work, complaints that merit investigation will be referred to the Academic Vice President. Before any action is taken the Academic Vice President will refer the matter to an Acceptable Use Policy Committee (AUPC) composed of two tenured faculty appointed by the Educational Technologies Committee and one tenured faculty appointed by the Academic Vice President to investigate and make a recommendation.

C. Students whose conduct is alleged to violate the AUP may appeal to the Academic Vice President on the grounds that their activity is course related and within the scope of academic freedom. The Academic Vice President will refer the matter to AUPC. Student activities that are related to course work and found in violation of the AUP may be sanctioned by the Academic Vice President and the matter referred back to the Vice President of Student Services.

D. For Non-Academic Violations the Vice President for Information Services may make recommendations regarding suspension of computer privileges or other punitive or remedial action to the respective chief administrator.

For the disposition of computing privileges, the due process procedures outlined in this document shall be sufficient, on the authority of the appropriate chief administrator, to revoke or limit computing privileges of an individual found in violation of acceptable use. However, this policy does not limit any further disciplinary action the appropriate chief administrator may seek to bring according to established disciplinary procedures for faculty, staff and students.

3. Authorization for Investigative Action. This policy makes a distinction between electronic files and activities that take place on common University computing equipment (file and e-mail servers, the network and internet gateway) and files and activities that take place on a personal computer belonging to or assigned to an individual. Private electronic files that reside on, or activities that take place on, common University computing equipment (file servers, etc.) and private computing activities that take place over the University network and internet gateway are covered by this policy and may be searched according to the procedures set out in Sections 3a and 3b below. Electronic files residing on personal computers belonging or assigned to individuals may only be searched according to the procedures set forth in Section 3b below. Electronic files that have been made publicly available (that is, not protected through the use of non-obvious passwords or other security measures), either on common University file server equipment or through the use of “sharing” or other forms of file server programs on equipment owned by or assigned to a user are not considered private according to this policy. Computing equipment that resides off campus is not covered under this policy, though all activity of such equipment by authorized Fairfield users that takes place through the University network and computing systems is covered by this policy.

a. Searching private computer files or monitoring electronic activities that do not violate the Acceptable Use Policy. Situations may arise in which the conduct of a computer user is under investigation for violations of other University policies. In such cases, authorization to access private electronic files or monitor electronic activity must be made in writing by the appropriate chief administrator to the Vice President for Information Resources and Services, who in turn must authorize the System or Network Administrator (SNA) in writing to perform the requested search. Any attempt to access private electronic files or other private electronic activities must conform to all applicable operating procedures of the University.
b. Searching faculty offices and student dorm room. Different policies govern the privacy of student dorm rooms and faculty office space:

i) Student Dorm Rooms and Personal Computers Owned by Students. Under the authority of the Room Entry and Room Search sections of the Student Handbook (pp. 118-119), the Vice President of Student Services may authorize that a search be conducted on a personal computer. Entry to the student room shall be conducted in accordance with the Room Entry and Room Search clauses in the Student Handbook. The SNA may be authorized to assist the staff of student services by accompanying them and conducting the search of student computer in accordance with Section 4a of this policy.

ii) Faculty Desktop Computers. This policy recognizes that files stored on a desktop computer are part of the faculty office, unless made publicly available (i.e., not password protected) through networking programs such as file sharing, web, or other such server software. Entry to a faculty desktop computer shall occur only when authorized by the Academic Vice President, in accordance with existing policies.

All users of computing resources at the University should be aware that this policy does not limit any applicable State and Federal search and seizure procedures.

4. Emergency Situations. Situations will occur that pose immediate threats to the operations or security of computer or network systems. Because of the immediacy, the SNA will need to intervene without obtaining the written permission usually required before taking actions that may affect user files, messages or system access privileges. The intent of these procedures is to allow SNAs to take appropriate, timely action when protecting University computer systems while ensuring that the user and appropriate University officials will be made aware of the situation as soon as possible.

a. If an SNA determines that user files or messages pose a significant threat to the operation or security of a University computer or network system, he or she will take appropriate action to correct the problem only upon the authorization of the Vice President for Information Services. If the Vice President for Information Services is not available, the SNA may take such action as is necessary to resolve the emergency. Such action may include, but is not limited to disabling user privileges, deleting or disabling a user file, or disconnecting a network connection. SNAs are not authorized to enter a private office or dorm room on an emergency basis, but may temporarily disable network connections until proper authorization is obtained to inspect computing equipment in these areas. The SNA will not perform any action on user files or messages that are not relevant to the current problem and will not take any technical action, a this point, that would permanently deprive the user of access to the computer or network system.

b. As soon as possible after action is taken, but no later than the next business day, the SNA will make a written report to the Vice President for Information Services and the appropriate chief administrator outlining the nature of the threat; protective actions taken; the user(s) involved; and the user file or messages that were affected.
5. Sanctions. For nonacademic violations the appropriate chief administrator will review the recommendations of the Vice President for Information Services and make the final decision concerning any penalty or sanctions to be imposed on the offending party. Under this policy, those sanctions or penalties may consist of limitation or suspension of any or all computing privileges. Imposition of such penalties does not preclude further disciplinary action according to established policies for faculty, students and staff.

Guidelines for Systems and Network Administrators.
Computer systems and network administrators (SNA’s), by the nature of their work, have privileges and responsibilities that other users of technology generally do not have. Without system privileges, SNAs would not be able to do their jobs. The use of these privileges must be wise and thoughtful. These guidelines were developed to articulate responsibilities SNAs have in addition to those outlined in Fairfield University’s Acceptable Use Policy.

1. SNAs are bound by the Acceptable Use Policy and the procedures set forth in Sections I and II of this policy. Further, SNAs have a responsibility to educate users about all applicable computing policies.
2. All SNAs have an additional responsibility to assure the operation, security and integrity of Fairfield University's computers, networks, and data.
3. Consistent with the other obligations imposed on them under the Acceptable Use Policy, other applicable University policies, and the law, SNAs will treat as confidential any private and/or confidential information obtained during system administration.
4. SNAs must not disclose privileged and confidential information about Fairfield University’s systems or any other information that could prove detrimental to operations or compromise system security.
5. It is against University policy for an SNA to read a user’s files. However, SNAs in the course of routine system administration, may need to delete or archive user files or messages. In order to do this, SNAs must first promulgate a clear policy to the users describing how and when delete or archive actions will be taken. These policies may vary by department. This section does not, however, grant SNAs authority to read user files or messages during routine system administration. Procedures for obtaining authorization to read user files or messages in routine, non-emergency and emergency situations are provided in Section II of this policy.
6. When reacting to or preventing actions by users that may violate the Acceptable Use Policy or other actions by users that may have significantly detrimental effects on system or network operation, SNAs may need to read, modify or delete user files or messages. These actions will take place in accordance with the procedures outlined in this policy and the SNA will document any access to user files or messages.
7. SNAs will take all practical measures to ensure that all hardware and software license agreements are faithfully executed on all systems, network, servers, and computers for which he or she has responsibility.

Violations of these Guidelines for SNAs will be handled following the administrative and disciplinary processes outlined in the applicable operating policies and procedures of the University.
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Fairfield University Computer Systems Acceptable Use Policy

November 13, 2000,
Updated June 30, 2004

This policy is designed to guide students, faculty, staff, and other authorized users in the acceptable use of computer and information systems and networks provided by Fairfield University according to the mission of the University. It is meant as an application of the principles of respect and reverence for every person, the development of community and the ideals of liberal education that are at the core of Fairfield's Catholic, Jesuit identity. This policy supersedes the "Acceptable Use Policy" (number 610) adopted 1/1/94. This policy does not supersede any other University policies, including those pertaining to student grievances, sexual harassment, and personal conduct (Policy No. 480, Item #27).

Guiding Principles:

The Fairfield University community is encouraged to make innovative and creative use of information technologies in support of education and research. Access to information representing a multitude of views on current and historical issues should be allowed for the interest, information and enlightenment of the University community. Consistent with other University policies, this policy is intended to respect the rights and obligations of Academic Freedom, and recognizes that the educational mission of the University is served in a variety of ways.

The University recognizes that the purpose of copyright is to protect the rights of the creators of intellectual property and to prevent the unauthorized use or sale of works available in the private sector. Publication, distribution, or broadcast of copyright protected materials without permission is prohibited. Also consistent with other University policies, an individual's right of access to computer materials should not be denied or abridged because of race, creed, color, age, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, or disability.

The University cannot protect individuals against the existence or receipt of material that may be offensive to them. As such, those who make use of electronic communications are warned that they may come across or be recipients of material they find offensive. Those who use e-mail and/or make information about themselves available on the Internet should be forewarned that the University cannot protect them from invasions of privacy and other possible dangers that could result from the individual's distribution of personal information.
In the interests of promoting the free exchange of ideas, Fairfield University does not exercise prior review of electronic documents available on its network and accessible locally or through the internet. Individuals who access materials available on the Fairfield University network should understand that these materials, unless otherwise posted, do not necessarily reflect the views of Fairfield University. Individuals who feel that particular materials posted on the Fairfield University network are inappropriate or otherwise objectionable, may lodge a formal complaint through the office of Computing and Network Services.

Fairfield University computing and network resources are to be used for University-related research, instruction, learning, enrichment, dissemination of scholarly information, and administrative activities. The computing and network facilities of the University are limited and should be used wisely and carefully with consideration for the needs of others. Computers and network systems offer powerful tools for communication among members of the community and of communities outside the University. When used appropriately, these tools can enhance dialog and communication. When used unlawfully or inappropriately, however, these tools can infringe on the rights of others.

**Responsibilities:**

The following examples, though not covering every situation, specify some of the responsibilities that accompany computer use at Fairfield and/or on networks to which Fairfield is connected.

1. Users may not attempt to modify the University system or network facilities or attempt to crash systems. They should not tamper with any software protections or restrictions placed on computer applications or files.
2. All users must obtain authorized computing accounts and may only use their own user names and passwords to access University computing and network systems. Users may not supply false or misleading data or improperly obtain another's password in order to gain access to computers or network systems, data or information. The negligence or naiveté of another user in revealing an account name or password is not considered authorized use. Convenience of file or printer sharing is not sufficient reason for sharing a computer account. Users should not attempt to subvert the restrictions associated with their computer accounts.
3. Users are responsible for all use of their computer account(s). They should make appropriate use of the system and network-provided protection features and take precautions against others obtaining access to their computer resources. Individual password security is the responsibility of each user.
4. Users may not encroach on others' use of computer resources. Such activities would include, but are not limited to, tying up computer resources for excessive game playing or other trivial applications; sending harassing messages; sending frivolous or excessive messages, including chain letters, junk mail, and other types of broadcast messages, either locally or over the Internet; using excessive amounts of storage (as determined by Computing and Network Services policies); intentionally introducing any computer viruses, worms, Trojan Horses, or other rogue programs to Fairfield University hardware.
or software; physically damaging systems; or running grossly inefficient programs when efficient ones are available.

5. Users are responsible for making use of software and electronic materials in accordance with copyright and licensing restrictions and applicable university policies. Fairfield University equipment and software may not be used to violate copyright or the terms of any license agreement. No one may inspect, modify, distribute, or copy proprietary data, directories, programs, files, disks or other software without proper authorization.

6. Users must remember that information distributed through the University's computing and networking facilities is a form of publishing, and some of the same standards apply. For example, anything generated at Fairfield that is available on the Internet through the University's network represents the University and not just an individual. Even with disclaimers, the University is represented by its students, faculty and staff, and appropriate content, language and behavior is warranted.

7. Users may not transmit any material that is unlawful, libelous, or encourages conduct that would constitute a criminal offense, give rise to civil liability, or otherwise violate any federal, state, or local laws. Materials made available or transmitted on University Computer systems must comply with all University policies governing conduct of students, faculty and staff.

Administration:

The University encourages all members of its community to use electronic communications in a manner that is respectful to others. While respecting users' confidentiality and privacy, the University reserves the right to examine computer files and monitor electronic activity within the limits of other applicable University policies. The University may exercise this right in order to enforce its policies regarding harassment and the safety of individuals; to prevent the posting of proprietary software or electronic copies of electronic texts or images in disregard of copyright restrictions or contractual obligations; to safeguard the integrity of computers, networks, and data either at the University or elsewhere; and to protect the University against seriously damaging consequences. The University may restrict the use of its computers and network systems for electronic communications when faced with evidence of violation of University policies, or federal, state or local laws. The University reserves the right to limit access to its networks through University-owned or other computers, and to remove or limit access to material posted on University-owned computers.

All users are expected to conduct themselves consistent with these responsibilities and all other applicable University policies. Abuse of computing privileges will subject the user to disciplinary action according to established University procedures. Abuse of networks or computers at other sites through the use of Fairfield University resources will be treated as an abuse of computing privileges at the University. When appropriate, temporary restrictive actions will be taken by system or network administrators pending further disciplinary action; the loss of computing privileges may result.

The University and users recognize that all members of the University community are bound by federal, state and local laws relating to civil rights, harassment, copyright, security and other statutes relating to electronic media. It should be understood that this policy does not preclude...
enforcement under the laws and regulations of the United States of America nor the State of Connecticut.

This policy may be amended or changed by the University Vice-Presidents, and in matters affecting the Academic Division, with the mutual consent of the Academic Council.
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Procedures in Support of Fairfield University's Computer Systems Acceptable Use Policy

These procedures have been designated to complement rather than supercede existing University procedures, guidelines, and policies relating to computer use by faculty, staff and students. For this reason, final authority for the resolution of complaints, including any penalties rests with the appropriate chief administrator.

For the purposes of this policy, "appropriate chief administrator" shall be defined as the senior administrator who has jurisdiction over the alleged offender of the Fairfield University Computer Systems Acceptable Use Policy (hereafter cited as the "Acceptable Use Policy"). The "appropriate Chief administrator" for faculty is the Academic Vice President. The "appropriate chief administrator" for students will either be the Academic Vice President if the offense is related to academics, or the Vice President for Student Affairs in non-academic affairs. In circumstances where the jurisdictional lines are not clearly demarcated, authority will rest with both Vice Presidents, disputes being resolved by the President. In the case of non-faculty staff, the Associate Vice President of Human Resources is the chief administrator.

Guiding Principles

These procedures were designed to balance seven interests:

- respecting the rights and responsibilities of academic freedom as defined in applicable policies for faculty, and students engaged in academic work;
- protecting the rights of the university;
- protecting users' privacy;
- protecting the System or network Administrator (SNA) in the performance of his or her job;
- allowing routine administrative actions that might affect users' files;
- providing a mechanism to allow non-routine, non-emergency access to users' files when it can be justified;
- providing guidelines for the occasional need to take immediate action. The ability of an SNA to read a user's files does not imply that he or she may do so without obtaining the approval required by these procedures.

Balancing Rights

"Incidental personal use" of computing systems is an accepted and appropriate benefit of being associated with Fairfield University. However, "incidental personal use" must still adhere to all
university policies, and must never have an adverse impact on the use of technology and information resources in support of the University's mission. Examples of "adverse impact" are described in the section entitled "Responsibilities" in the Acceptable Use Policy. The respective chief administrator of the Academic Division, Student Services, and Human Resources share the responsibility to interpret the Acceptable Use Policy along with existing university policies relating to personal use of computers and to establish procedures to assist them in the investigation and enforcement of these procedures. For example, in accordance with existing university procedures an employee's supervisor may also decide that personal activities are affecting the abilities of the employee or colleagues to perform job functions and it is their right to ask the employee to cease those activities. Ultimately, the Office of Human Resources will arbitrate disagreements concerning the interpretation of the Acceptable Use Policy relating to non-faculty staff.

Privacy

This policy defines "private" either as physically or technically not accessible to the general public or accessible only through non-obvious password protection or other security schemes designed to limit access to known or identified individuals. Network system logs which may record an individual's network activity shall be considered private.

Routine Operations

During routine administration SNAs may need to archive or delete privacy user files or messages from the system; for example, this usually is due to physical data storage limits or an individual's departure from the University. In this situation, it is not necessary for an SNA to read or view user files; all work is done using system utilities, machine to machine. Given that these situations are foreseeable, each organization responsible for a computer or network system on which these actions will take place must define how and when they will occur. Reasonable efforts must then be made to ensure that system users understand the policy.

Violations, Investigations and Due Process

Non-routine situations may occur where it is necessary to examine a user's private files without being able to obtain his/her specific permission or authorization. Such situations may include the investigation of violations of this policy or other University policies. The intent of these procedures is to separate the authority to read private user files or messages from the technical ability to do so. This separation attempts to protect both the user and the SNA.

Scope

- The procedures outlined in this section shall apply to the investigation of University policy violations, including violations of the Acceptable Use Policy, which involve University computing resources or which require access to the private computer activities or files of students or faculty.
- Reporting of complaints
  Any member of the University community may bring a complaint of unacceptable use of
computing resources. It is also conceivable that individuals or agencies outside the University may bring such complaints. Complaints shall be brought to the Director of Computing & Network Services or his/her designee who will be responsible for coordinating the presentation of complaints to the “appropriate chief administrator” as follows:

• A. The Director of Computing & Network Services is charged with making judgments of whether a given activity, use, or publication involving Fairfield University computing resources (including but not limited to the use of the campus network and internet gateway, use of servers-e-mail, web, file, mainframes, etc.-desktop computers, public terminals, etc.) requires further investigation and/or referral to the appropriate chief administrator.

• B. For alleged violations of the AUP by faculty members or by students engaged in academic work, complaints that merit investigation will be referred to the Academic Vice President. Before any action is taken the Academic Vice President will refer the matter to an Acceptable Use Policy Committee (AUPC) composed of two tenured faculty appointed by the Educational Technologies Committee and one tenured faculty appointed by the Academic Vice President to investigate and make a recommendation.

• C. Students whose conduct is alleged to violate the AUP may appeal to the Academic Vice President on the grounds that their activity is course related and within the scope of academic freedom. The Academic Vice President will refer the matter to AUPC. Student activities that are related to course work and found in violation of the AUP may be sanctioned by the Academic Vice President and the matter referred back to the Vice President of Student Affairs.

• D. For Non-Academic Violations the Director of Computing & Network Services may make recommendations regarding suspension of computer privileges or other punitive or remedial action to the respective chief administrator.

• For the disposition of computing privileges, the due process procedures outlined in this document shall be sufficient, on the authority of the appropriate chief administrator, to revoke or limit computing privileges of an individual found in violation of acceptable use. However, this policy does not limit any further disciplinary action the appropriate chief administrator may seek to bring according to established disciplinary procedures for faculty, staff and students.

Authorization for Investigative Action

This policy makes a distinction between electronic files and activities that take place on common University computing equipment (file and e-mail servers, the network and internet gateway) and files and activities that take place on a personal computer belonging to or assigned to an individual. Private electronic files that reside on, or activities that take place on, common University computing equipment (file servers, etc.) and private computing activities that take place over the University network and internet gateway are covered by this policy and may be searched according to the procedures set out in Sections 3a and 3b below. Electronic files residing on personal computers belonging or assigned to individuals may only be searched according to the procedures set forth in Section 3b below. Electronic files that have been made publicly available (that is, not protected through the use of non-obvious passwords or other security measures), either on common University file server equipment or through the use of
"sharing" or other forms of file server programs on equipment owned by or assigned to a user are not considered private according to this policy. Computing equipment that resides off campus is not covered under this policy, though all activity of such equipment by authorized Fairfield users that takes place through the University network and computing systems is covered by this policy.

- a. Searching private computer files or monitoring electronic activities that do not violate the Acceptable Use Policy. Situations may arise in which the conduct of a computer user is under investigation for violations of other University policies. In such cases, authorization to access private electronic files or monitor electronic activity must be made in writing by the appropriate chief administrator to the Director of Computing & Network Services, who in turn must authorize the System or Network Administrator (SNA) in writing to perform the requested search. Any attempt to access private electronic files or other private electronic activities must conform to all applicable operating procedures of the University.

- b. Searching faculty offices and student dorm room. Different policies govern the privacy of student dorm rooms and faculty office space:

  - i) Student Dorm Rooms and Personal Computers Owned by Students. Under the authority of the Room Entry and Room Search sections of the Student Handbook, the Vice President of Student Affairs may authorize that a search be conducted on a personal computer. Entry to the student room shall be conducted in accordance with the Room Entry and Room Search clauses in the Student Handbook. The SNA may be authorized to assist the staff of student services by accompanying them and conducting the search of student computer in accordance with Section 4a of this policy.

  - ii) Faculty Desktop Computers. This policy recognizes that files stored on a desktop computer are part of the faculty office, unless made publicly available (i.e., not password protected) through networking programs such as file sharing, web, or other such server software. Entry to a faculty desktop computer shall occur only when authorized by the Academic Vice President, in accordance with existing policies.

All users of computing resources at the University should be aware that this policy does not limit any applicable State and Federal search and seizure procedures.

**Emergency Situations.** Situations will occur that pose immediate threats to the operations or security of computer or network systems. Because of the immediacy, the SNA will need to intervene without obtaining the written permission usually required before taking actions that may affect user files, messages or system access privileges. The intent of these procedures is to allow SNAs to take appropriate, timely action when protecting University computer systems while ensuring that the user and appropriate University officials will be made aware of the situation as soon as possible.

- a. If an SNA determines that user files or messages pose a significant threat to the operation or security of a University computer or network system, he or she will take appropriate action to correct the problem only upon the authorization of the Vice President for Information Services. If the Director of Computing & Network Services is not available, the SNA may take such action as is necessary to resolve the emergency. Such action may include, but is not limited to disabling user privileges, deleting or
disabling a user file, or disconnecting a network connection. SNAs are not authorized to enter a private office or dorm room on an emergency basis, but may temporarily disable network connections until proper authorization is obtained to inspect computing equipment in these areas. The SNA will not perform any action on user files or messages that are not relevant to the current problem and will not take any technical action, a this point, that would permanently deprive the user of access to the computer or network system.

- As soon as possible after action is taken, but no later than the next business day, the SNA will make a written report to the Director of Computing & Network Services and the appropriate chief administrator outlining the nature of the threat; protective actions taken; the user(s) involved; and the user file or messages that were affected.

**Sanctions.** For nonacademic violations the appropriate chief administrator will review the recommendations of the Director of Computing & Network Services and make the final decision concerning any penalty or actions to be imposed on the offending party. Under this policy, those sanctions or penalties may consist of limitation or suspension of any or all computing privileges. Imposition of such penalties does not preclude further disciplinary action according to established policies for faculty, students and staff.

**Guidelines for Systems and Network Administrators**

Computer systems and network administrators (SNAs), by the nature of their work, have privileges and responsibilities that other users of technology generally do not have. Without system privileges, SNAs would not be able to do their jobs. The use of these privileges must be wise and thoughtful. These guidelines were developed to articulate responsibilities SNAs have in addition to those outlined in Fairfield University's Acceptable Use Policy.

1. SNAs are bound by the Acceptable Use Policy and the procedures set forth in Sections I and II of this policy. Further, SNAs have a responsibility to educate users about all applicable computing policies.
2. All SNAs have an additional responsibility to assure the operation, security and integrity of Fairfield University's computers, networks, and data.
3. Consistent with the other obligations imposed on them under the Acceptable Use Policy, other applicable University policies, and the law, SNAs will treat as confidential any private and/or confidential information obtained during system administration.
4. SNAs must not disclose privileged and confidential information about Fairfield University's systems or any other information that could prove detrimental to operations or compromise system security.
5. It is against University policy for an SNA to read a user's files. However, SNAs in the course of routine system administration, may need to delete or archive user files or messages. In order to do this, SNAs must first promulgate a clear policy to the users describing how and when delete or archive actions will be taken. These policies may vary by department. This section does not, however, grant SNAs authority to read user files or messages during routine system administration. Procedures for obtaining authorization to read user files or messages in routine, non-emergency and emergency situations are provided in Section II of this policy.
6. When reacting to or preventing actions by users that may violate the Acceptable Use Policy or other actions by users that may have significantly detrimental effects on system or network operation, SNAs may need to read, modify or delete user files or messages. These actions will take place in accordance with the procedures outlined in this policy and the SNA will document any access to user files or messages.

7. SNAs will take all practical measures to ensure that all hardware and software license agreements are faithfully executed on all systems, network, servers, and computers for which he or she has responsibility.

Violations of these Guidelines for SNAs will be handled following the administrative and disciplinary processes outlined in the applicable operating policies and procedures of the University.
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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
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 contiguous 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 contiguous 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).
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 "Incompletes": 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:
Incomplete: 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, SVPAA 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.

…
Recommendations from the AC Executive Committee
October 31, 2011
RE: AC 11/7/2011 agenda item 7.e.

The Executive Committee proposes to the AC for its consideration four items to deal with the list of Pending Items (as it appears on the agenda for the 11/7/2011 AC meeting).

I. MOTION. That items A, C, D, and F be removed from the list of Pending Items on the Academic Council agenda.

- Item A: All outstanding tasks concerned with this item have been completed.
- Item C: The relevant motion is from 5/5/2003 and was not followed up on. If the Council wishes to consider issues related to distance learning, it should take up the matter anew.
- Item D: The Ed Tech Committee completed the charge.
- Item F: The AC subcommittee completed its charge.

II. Pending item B concerns the following motions passed by the General Faculty on 11/13/1992.

MOTION. The faculty members on the Finance Committee shall coordinate their efforts with the Salary Committee, Academic Council, FWC/AAUP, and any other committee of the General Faculty whose mission will be influenced by particular budget decisions. They shall further take advantage of internal and external consultants in analyzing budget and financial data.

MOTION. The faculty members of the Finance Committee shall not consent to a final budget or setting of tuition rates until the Salary Committee has completed successful negotiations on the salary and benefit portions of the next year’s contract.

The decision for the Council is whether to drop item B from the list of Pending Items or to continue to consider the matter.

III. Pending Item E concerns a report of a Faculty Data Committee. The only two remaining items are these recommendations from that committee’s report:

- Institution-wide policies should be formulated to cover questions such as who has access to career data, such as the files stored in Chairs’, Deans’, and AVP’s offices.
- Issues concerning merit reviews: Different schools have different policies (some have no policies) on issues such as where merit reviews are stored, for how long, and who has access to them. The committee recommends each school formulate a policy addressing such questions. (The committee recognizes that policies may vary from school to school, for example, depending on issues such as accreditation requirements.)

The decision for the Council is whether to drop item E from the list of Pending Items or to continue to consider the matter.

IV. Pending Items G through L all are relevant and should remain on the Pending List.
Proposed Minor in Anthropology
Department of Sociology and Anthropology
March 2, 2011

1. **Description, overview, and summary** of proposed new program, major, minor, or concentration.

The proposed anthropology minor consists of two required anthropology courses and three electives. The required courses are *Introduction to Four-Field Anthropology* and a choice of either *Cultural Anthropology* or *Physical Anthropology*. Minors may fulfill one of their electives with a sociology course offering unless they are a sociology major. (This is because we anticipate creating a joint Sociology / Anthropology major next and we need to distinguish this new joint major from a Sociology major minoring in Anthropology.

2. **Need.** Explain why the new program is needed at Fairfield University, e.g. student driven, faculty driven, special interest.

A number of students request to minor in anthropology every year. At present, students can take anthropology courses for *all* of their sociology electives; with the new minor we are changing this. Having a minor will allow students to more easily demonstrate competence in anthropology on their transcript without having to major in sociology. Majors in sociology who wish to minor in anthropology must take the full complement of both sets of requirements (30 units of sociology and 15 units of anthropology with no double counting).

3. **Rationale.** Discuss the reasons for the program, rationale how it meets the mission of Fairfield, and its particular place in the curriculum.

**Fit of the Anthropology Minor with “The Core”**

Anthropology is a social science with one foot in the humanities and the other in the natural sciences. As a discipline that seeks to explore our common humanity through its cross-cultural, biological, and historical variation, anthropologists explore everything from the physiology of Neanderthals to the cosmology of Catholics. Our Anthropology minor at Fairfield demands that students take a “four field” introductory course – which includes linguistics, biological anthropology, archeology, and cultural anthropology. After this, students explore either cultural anthropology or biological anthropology, depending on a student's particular interest and career goals. They then take three electives. The breadth of the Anthropology minor at Fairfield is fundamentally aligned with the University core and its mission to develop “rigorous open minds.”

**Fit of Anthropology Minor with the University Mission**

The Anthropology Minor at Fairfield is inextricably bound to the mission of Fairfield University, from “academic rigor” to “embracing difference” and “examining social systems critically...
[while] becoming directly involved with those who are underprivileged” and understudied. As
the discipline traditionally focused on cultural diversity in all its glorious, global profusion,
anthropology lies at the heart of the Jesuit educational mission.

4. Objectives. What does the program seek to accomplish?

The three Sociology and Anthropology program goals (outlined below) serve as the goals for the
proposed Anthropology Minor.

Goal 1: Quantitative Reasoning
Objective 1: Understand basic statistical analysis
Objective 2: Properly interpret charts and tables

Goal 2: Critically examine society
Objective 1: Become aware of the major social problems faced by societies, our
own and others
Objective 2: Analyze a social problem from more than one perspective

Goal 3: Work to improve self, community and world
Objective: Demonstrate three activities of social engagement through volunteer
activities or courses.

5. Impact. What program(s) if any, will this replace? How will it impact current programs in
your discipline or other disciplines? How will it impact the core curriculum? How will it overlap
other programs?

We do not envisage this minor replacing anything. It would complement the current curriculum
in sociology, and might prove an attractive minor to International Studies majors and others
seeking a methodologically and theoretically rigorous engagement with non-Western societies.
All Anthropology Minor courses will count for the social science component of the core
curriculum.

6. Program Detail. List approved courses required or recommended, discuss course sequence
and reasons for including courses. Include other programmatic detail not specifically course-
related, such as internships, special university events, etc. Any new courses proposed must be
fully detailed, including description, rationale, draft syllabus.

Anthropology Course Catalogue
AY 100 Introduction to Four-Field Anthropology (will be changed to AY10)
AY 110 Physical Anthropology & Archaeology (will be changed to Biological
Anthropology)
AY 111 Introduction to Cultural Anthropology
AY 130 Societies & Cultures of Africa
AY 152 Islamic Societies and Cultures
AY 163 Culture & Inequality
AY 168 Women & Men: Anthropology of Gender
AY 175  Sustainable Development: Anthropological Perspectives
AY 180  Practicum in International Research (Grant Writing)
AY 189  Ethnographic Knowledge and Practice
AY 190  Societies & Cultures of North Africa
AY 200  Ethnographic Research Methods (NEW COURSE, draft syllabus attached.)

7. **Administrative Structure and Governance.** What faculty grouping has control over curriculum and course development? What individuals have administrative authority? What is the proposed "chain of command"?

The Sociology and Anthropology Department will have administrative authority over the minor. There is no “chain of command.” We have a nominal chair, but all decisions are made by the department as a whole.

8. **Resources.** List personnel, space, resources; Library -- both in terms of resources AVAILABLE and resources NEEDED. Prepare a proposed draft yearly budget. Also consider OPPORTUNITY COST. What other programs would the university, or your curricular area, have to sacrifice or delay in order to implement this program?

We have two full time anthropologists in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology: David Crawford and Scott Lacy. All other resources for this minor are already in place. We do not perceive any opportunity costs whatsoever. The yearly budget would be part of the general Sociology and Anthropology budget.

9. **Projections for the Future.** What are your anticipated plans for this program down the line: two years? five years? When and how will you evaluate its effectiveness?

We expect this minor to grow modestly along with the existing sociology minor. In addition to the two professors in our department, there are several other anthropologists in the Fairfield University community (three in Graduate Education and one in Nursing). Our students may benefit from anthropology-oriented electives across disciplines. The current course catalogue lists over 20 classes that might be ideal candidates for cross-listing with Anthropology. Alternatively, the Department could consider giving “anthropology elective” status to appropriate courses outside of Sociology and Anthropology.

The assessment process for the anthropology minor will be based on a system of three tracking surveys: an entry survey when the student declares her anthropology minor, an exit survey for all graduating anthropology minors, and the alumni survey developed and administered by the University Office of Institutional Research. The entrance and exit surveys for anthropology minors will be developed and administered by the Sociology and Anthropology Department. Department faculty will develop the entrance and exit surveys based on the three program goals and their corresponding learning objectives described above. Declaring minors will complete the survey as part of their standard paperwork. Graduating seniors with anthropology minors will complete their survey as part of their paperwork required of graduating department seniors.
Excerpts from minutes of meetings of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology

April 9, 2010

Present: Professors Crawford, Hodgson, Jones, Lacy, Mielants, Penczer, Rodrigues (Chair), Schlichting, White

Anthropology Minor update: Discussion centered on the possibility of starting the minor in fall of 2011 because state review would not be required.

a) Professor Schlichting moved to accept report, seconded by Professor Jones. Unanimous vote.

Jan. 18, 2010

Present Profs: Crawford, Hodgson, Lacy, Mielants, Rodrigues, Schlichting, White

Absent Profs: Jones

Questions from Curriculum Committee about proposal for Anthropology minor

A. The Committee raised the question about the use of Sociology courses taken to complete the major also used for the Anthropology minor. The concern focused on the number of courses that would “double count” for both the major and the Anthropology minor for a Sociology major who also completes an Anthropology minor.

The Department discussed, at length, the issue and Prof. Hodgson proposed and Prof. White seconded the following rule:

For a Sociology major, 1 sociology course taken to complete the major (total of 10 courses) can counted toward the 5 course Anthropology minor. The four other courses must be Anthropology courses and none of those course can be used to complete the elective requirements for the major.

A Sociology major/Anthropology minor will complete 14 courses for the major & minor – 10 Sociology courses and 4 Anthropology courses.

B. The curriculum committee also asked for an explanation for the two required course for the Anthropology minor: Introduction to Four Fields Anthropology and either Cultural or Physical Anthropology.

Prof. Lacy explained that Anthropology is a discipline with clearly delineated subfields and an Anthropology minor needed to be exposed to those subfields in an introductory course. Two of the major subfields are cultural and physical/ biological Anthropology and that is the rationale for having minors choose between Cultural and Physical for their second required course.
Minutes of Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee Meeting (Excerpts)
March 8, 2011 – BCC 204

Present: Robbin Crabtree (CAS Dean), Robert Epstein, Manyul Im, Scott Lacy, John Miecznikowski, Elizabeth Petrino, Giovanni Ruffini, Leslie Schaffer, Roxana Walker-Canton, Joan Weiss (CAS Associate Dean), Lei Xie, Qin Zhang (Chair)

Regrets: Jerelyn Johnson

Consideration of revised Anthropology new minor program proposal – Zhang noted that this was a reconsideration of a modified proposal and gave Lacy the floor to provide information about the Sociology department’s responses to the ASCC’s concerns about the initial proposal. Lacy stated that the department had met to approve changes to the proposal in order to address the concern that Sociology majors would be able to double-count too many courses in getting an Anthropology minor. Lacy pointed out the change in the proposal that allows only one overlapping course allowed for a Sociology major – Anthropology minor program of study. Weiss pointed out an inconsistency in the number of required courses in the description of the minor. Lacy indicated that he would have the chair of Sociology, David Crawford, bring the description into line with the second description on the proposal as the department had intended. Lacy addressed the other ASCC concern in the initial proposal about why the two required courses in the minor are Biological or Cultural Anthropology courses rather than courses that cover all four areas of the field. Lacy explained that the two tracks reflected by the courses reflect the state of the field for most Anthropology programs. Zhang wondered which course provides training in quantitative methods. Lacy replied that both of the required courses would provide it. Epstein wondered whether Biological Anthropology would be cross-listed with the Biology program. Crabtree offered that an important related consideration is the Anthropology course having to apply for core credit for sciences core credit if it is designed as a science course rather than a social science course. Lacy concurred with Crabtree. Epstein wondered whether all four fields of Anthropology would be offered in one way or another. Lacy affirmed that they would be, because the two required courses could not plausibly be taught without including important elements of the remaining two fields, such as Linguistic Anthropology. Crabtree stated that program chairs or directors should always think about cross-departmental cooperation in designing courses that may have significant overlaps across disciplines, for the sake of resource optimization.

Motion to approve the new Anthropology minor program by Im, seconded by Miecznikowski.
Vote: Unanimous in favor of approving the Anthropology minor
Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Meeting  
April 5, 2011 
3:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.  
Dimenna-Nyselius Library Conference Room  
Minutes (Excerpts)

Present:  Robbin Crabtree, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences and UC interim Dean, Mousumi Bose Godbole, Bob Epstein, Manyul Im (Chair), Jerelyn Johnson, Alison Kris, Scott Lacy, John Miecznikowski, Aaron Perkus, Elizabeth Petrino, Katsiaryna (Katya) Salavei, Les Schaffer, Roxana Walker-Canton, Tommy Xie, Qin Zhang, Gerry Campbell (Guest), Maggie Wills (Guest), Kathy Nantz (Guest)

Excused:  Giovanni Ruffini

6. Approve New Anthropology Minor

Lacy outlined a 5 course minor. There are two required courses: Four-field Anthropology and either Biological Anthropology or Cultural Anthropology. Originally, it was decided that a student could count one course in sociology for the minor in anthropology. Now, students can only take courses in anthropology for the minor.

Johnson moved to approve the new minor in Anthropology, seconded by Kris.

Crabtree noted that the Department has undergone program review. The Anthropology minor will be subject to 5 year program review in the 2016-2017 academic year and the guidelines are available on the College of Arts and Sciences website.

The Chair called for a vote on the motion. There was unanimous approval of the new minor in Anthropology.
Educational Planning Committee Meeting  
September 22, 2011  
Minutes (Excerpts)

Present: Professors Steven Bachelor, Peter Bayers, Dean Suzanne Campbell, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs (SVPAA) Paul Fitzgerald, S.J., Dean Don Gibson, Professors Cathy Giapponi, Sheila Grossman, Olivia Harriott, Michael Pagano, Carl Scheraga (Chair), Chris Staecker Barbara Welles-Nystrom

Visiting: Professors David Crawford, Jennifer Goldberg, Emily Smith

Discussion of Anthropology Minor Proposal

Members of the EPC welcomed Prof. Crawford to discuss the proposed minor in Anthropology. He explained how students have previously been able to major Sociology and take all their electives in Anthropology. Prof. Giapponi asked about the specific number of courses required for the minor. Prof. Crawford responded that the proposed minor is a five-course minor; students will be permitted to double-count one Sociology course. Sociology majors are required to complete ten courses. Prof. Harriott inquired into fieldwork expectations. Prof. Crawford answered that he tends to talk about the nature of fieldwork, whereas Prof. Lacy tends to require fieldwork. Prof. Harriott asked about science Core courses that align with the minor. Prof. Crawford responded that the biological anthropology course, taught by an actual biological anthropologist, nicely aligns and is a good course for nursing and pre-med students.

Prof. Welles-Nystrom moved to approve the proposal. Prof. Pagano seconded. Prof. Grossman congratulated Profs. Crawford and Lacy on producing a model proposal. Prof. Bayer expressed support for the proposal, noting how it put no strain on current resources. Prof. Giapponi praised the proposal for the interdisciplinarity it will promote. The motion passed unanimously, with no abstentions.
Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions  
Department of Educational Studies & Teacher Preparation

Proposals:  
1. Certification track in Early Childhood Education, housed within the Childhood Education Degree and Program.  
2. Masters degree name change from Masters in Elementary Education to Masters in Childhood Education

Faculty Contacts:  
Jen Goldberg, Director, Childhood Education  
Emily Smith, Chair, Department of Educational Studies & Teacher Preparation

Program Title:  
Degree Name: Masters in Childhood Education with Initial Certification  
Certification Track: Early Childhood Education prek-3

Proposed Credits:  
Masters in Childhood Education with ECE Certification = 54 credits

Documents Included:

1. Proposal for addition of Early Childhood Education Certification Track (p. 1)  
2. Proposal for Change in Masters Degree name from Elementary Education to Childhood Education (p. 7)  
3. Minutes from Department Meeting: initial approval February 23, 2011 (p. 9)  
4. Minutes from Department Meeting: approval of revised proposals, March 31, 2011 (p. 11)  
5. Minutes from GSEAP Curriculum Committee Meeting: March 15, 2011 (p. 16)  
6. Minutes from GSEAP Curriculum Committee Meeting: April 6, 2011 (p. 19)  
7. Minutes from EPC Meeting, September 22, 2011 (p. 21)  
8. Appendix 1: Childhood Education Chart is attached separately.

Brief Overview of Proposals

The following proposals describe a certification track in Early Childhood Education and a degree name change. The certification track would be housed under the program and degree Childhood Education. Degree candidates in Childhood Education could earn their certification in either Elementary Education (K-6) or Early Childhood Education (prek-3). Currently, candidates can only earn certification in Elementary Education. This proposal seeks to add an additional certification option in Early Childhood Education. The companion proposal (Program Degree Name Change) requests a change in the degree name from Elementary Education to Childhood Education. (See Appendix I: Childhood Education Chart for visual explanation of the certification tracks and degree).

Proposal for Certification Track in Early Childhood Education

1. Rationale & Need

---

1 Please note that the Department of Curriculum & Instruction changed its name to Educational Studies & Teacher Preparation in late Spring, which is why you see reference to both names throughout the proposal.  
2 This proposal is for a new certification track in ECE to be housed under the (proposed) newly named Masters in Childhood Education degree (see other proposal).
**Why Early Childhood Education?**

A growing body of research demonstrates the critical role high-quality early childhood education plays in students’ success, not only in the elementary grades but throughout their lives. The decisions we make now about the ways in which today’s preschool and early elementary students are taught will affect our society for many years to come. (Chauncey, 2010).

Research on the importance of quality education for young children is both prolific and unwavering. “We have long known that interactions with parents, caregivers, and other adults are important in a child’s life, but new evidence shows that these relationships actually shape brain circuits and lay the foundation for later developmental outcomes, from academic performance and interpersonal skills to physical and mental health. Furthermore, early childhood program evaluation studies indicate that it is possible to improve outcomes for vulnerable children as well as to generate positive social and economic benefits to society through well-designed, and evidence based research programs that respond to the needs of diverse communities” (National Science Council on the Developing Child, 2004).

**Why Early Childhood Education in Fairfield County?**

*Local Needs.* There is an overwhelming need for advancement in Early Childhood Education (ECE) in Fairfield County, a county that serves many young children who live in poverty. Fairfield University is an ideal setting for a teacher preparation program in ECE due to its proximity to urban settings such as Bridgeport and Norwalk, CT. One issue facing the Bridgeport system is the high turnover of early childhood education teachers and the quality of education of the teachers that remain in the system. During 2008, teacher turnover among early education and child care programs was much higher in Bridgeport than turnover among teachers in public school preschool programs throughout the rest of Connecticut. Additionally, state-funded early care and education programs in Bridgeport have fewer teachers with an associates or a bachelor’s degree than similar programs in Hartford, New Haven or statewide. As such, recruitment to the Early Childhood Education Certification Program will especially be targeted towards under-represented groups and the urban centers that our teacher education programs serve, because there is such an overwhelming need for advancement in Early Childhood Education in Fairfield County.

A market analysis for an ECE program was completed in October 2009. This analysis indicated a potential increase in employment opportunities for EC educators due to mass retirements of many current teachers and a slight increase in day care center openings. While the report indicates that most preschool teachers and childcare providers need experience, not an advanced degree (BA or MA), the proposed ECE certification program is designed, in part, to change the current culture and practice around the preparation of early childhood educators (i.e., underprepared) so that our youngest children receive high-quality education by well-prepared/trained educators. What’s more, the proposed program prepares candidates to teach up to grade 3, for which they most definitely need an advanced training.

*Promotion of University Mission.* Fairfield University’s Jesuit mission further encourages the establishment of an Early Childhood Education Program. As an institution educating “men and women for others,” Fairfield University strives to promote social justice, particularly in our work with neighboring communities. Bridgeport’s ECE centers, as well as other neighboring ECE centers, are in great need of support staff with a strong foundation for educating children. Given the importance of early childhood education to children’s future success or failure in school, Fairfield University should take a leading role in preparing high-quality educators for young children.

---

3 Thanks to Dr. Welles-Nystrom for providing a substantial amount of text for the program rationale.
Why Early Childhood Education at Fairfield University?

Currently, Fairfield University provides preparation for candidates interested in teaching elementary grades K-6 or secondary subjects in grades 7-12. There is no certification program at Fairfield University in early childhood education for teachers or for students interested in the field of Early Childhood Education at the undergraduate or graduate level. The proposed Certification track in Early Childhood Education with the Masters in Childhood Education aims to fill this gap in our program offerings and brings attention to Fairfield University as a site for ECE in the state.

In addition, the recent addition of the Early Learning Center on campus can provide an ideal site for collaboration and observation. The faculty and candidates in the proposed ECE program could partner with the ELC to provide training and research opportunities for the graduate students as well as the undergraduates on campus interested in working with young children. This work can be facilitated by the ELC liaison, who is houses in the C&I department.

Accreditation and Proficiency Alignment

The proposed program has been designed to align with GSEAP’s unit proficiencies, the early childhood education professional standards (NAEYC), and the 2015 CT Certification standards (which are awaiting final approval). Please see ECE Program Alignment Chart.

2. Description (including program goals, program detail, course requirements, etc.)

Program Goals

The proposed Certification track in Early Childhood Education prepares aspiring teachers of young children, or currently certified teachers (e.g. elementary education teachers seeking cross-endorsement) to understand the social, cultural and cognitive development of the young child and to design and implement developmentally and culturally appropriate curriculum and instruction for all young children in various childcare settings (home, community and child care programs). Furthermore, candidates will learn how knowledge of leadership, policy and research can provide tools and content for the advocacy of young children and their families.

The proposed ECE program will prepare candidates to teach in grades Pre-Kindergarten to Grade 3 (as is designated by the state certification). The primary focus of the Early Childhood Education Program is on the younger child, whose major frame of reference for learning is within the family. The program aims to educate candidates to have the skills, commitment, and passion to set up learning environments, with the collaboration of families, that provide all children, regardless of race, class, religion, gender, or learning and language needs, the opportunity to learn and grow. As such, the program draws on interdisciplinary collection of courses from elementary education (ED), early childhood education (ER) special education (SE), bilingual education (SL), and family studies (FT) to prepare candidates.

Catalog Description

The M.A. in Childhood Education with Certification in Early Childhood Education prepares aspiring teachers of young children to understand the social, cultural and cognitive development of the young child and to design and implement developmentally and culturally appropriate curriculum and instruction for all young children.
Admission Requirements and Prerequisites for Initial Certification:

a. Matriculation in the Childhood Education M.A. program, following review of all application materials, academic credentials, and an interview with faculty. Admission requirements will parallel those already established for Elementary Education.

b. Minimum academic credentials for certification include:

1. An earned bachelor’s degree from an approved institution in any one subject area or 39-semester-hours-credit interdisciplinary major consisting of 9 semester hours of credit in reading and language arts, 9 semester hours of credit in math, 9 semester hours of credit in science, and 6 semester hours of social studies.
2. A survey course in U.S. history covering at least 50 years 4
3. A minimum undergraduate GPA of 2.67
4. Passing score on or waiver from the PRAXIS I exam
5. Completion of all required program courses
6. Passing scores on the appropriate required PRAXIS II tests and additional tests as specified by the state (e.g., Foundations of Reading Test)
7. Successful completion of all program expectations and recommendation by program faculty for certification.

Degree requirements for M.A. in Childhood Education leading to Initial preK-3 Certification

1. Complete a minimum of 54 credits

2. Complete Childhood Education Core Courses (27 credits) 5:
   a. ED 405 Contexts of Education in the Primary Grades
   b. ED 429 Philosophical Foundations of Education
   c. ED 437 Developing Literacy in the Elementary School: Primary Grades
   d. ED 447 Learning Mathematics in the Elementary Classroom
   e. ED 497 Supporting Science and Health-Based Inquiry and Action by Elementary Students
   f. MD 400 Introduction to Educational Technology
   g. Literacy – struggling learners (SE 429 Developmental and Remedial Reading or ED 559 Empowering Struggling Readers and Writers in the Elementary Grades)
   h. Human Development course (ER 402 Infant & Child Development or ED 522 Learning and the Child’s Experience or ED 442 Educational Psychology)
   i. Special Education (SE 465 Early Childhood Special Education or SE 405/430 Exceptional Learners in the Mainstream)

3. Complete Early Childhood Education Courses (21 credits):
   a. ED 414 Assessment & Observation in ECE

---

44 Note: This will disappear if the 2015 regs pass.
5 All courses are 3 credits unless noted
b. FT 430 Contemporary Families OR ED 512 Contemporary Schooling in Society

c. Early Literacy (SL 5XX Emergent Literacy in Bilingual ECE)

d. ED 413 Differentiating Learning in Pre-K and K Environments

e. ER 497 Practicum in ECE

f. ED 581 Directed Observation & Supervised Student Teaching (6 cr.)

4. Complete Childhood Education Integrated Inquiry/Advocacy Sequence (6 credits):

   a. ED 499 Introduction to Educational Research (prerequisites: 12 credits towards MA)
      
   b. ED 511 Educating for Social Responsibility and Civic Engagement: A Capstone Seminar (prerequisites: completion of all course requirements)

3. **Impact.** What program(s) if any, will this replace? How will it impact current programs in your discipline or other disciplines? Will it overlap or replicate other programs?

   The proposed ECE program will not replace any program in the department. Rather, it is designed to enhance our current program offerings by offering preparation for certification at the pre-K level. Our current Masters with certification program in Elementary Education prepares candidates beginning at the kindergarten grade level. Candidates who might normally have enrolled in our Elementary Education program might now decide to focus on ECE certification, but this would not detract from the El Ed program since these the two certification tracks share a core body of courses under one degree. After taking the core courses, the candidates would simply take either the ECE or Elementary Education clusters of courses.

   The proposed certification track also complements (and helps to support) two existing curriculum options for our advanced candidates in the TEFO MA and CAS programs. We recently approved a 12-credit Cluster/Concentration option for candidates in the Teaching and Foundation (TEFO) Master’s Degree as well as a 15-credit concentration to the Certificate of Advanced Studies (CAS) for those students who have already completed a Master level degree and are seeking professional development and courses. In addition, we have a Certificate of Completion in ECE, which provides specific educational opportunities in the field of Early Childhood Studies for students who are not registered in a regular university graduate program. These three courses (9 credits) would culminate in an official document recognizing that the student had fulfilled the requirements of a Certificate of Completion in ECE. The proposed certification track in ECE would not duplicate these options, as it focuses largely on certification, while the other options focus on professional development for experiencededucators.

   As a few of the program courses are offered by DMFT and DPEC, this program could impact these departments by adding students to the courses offered by these departments. That said, if those courses are overpopulated, the ECE candidates can take the ‘OR’ option in their program (i.e., SE 405 instead of SE 465 or ED 512 instead of FT 430).
4. **Structure and Governance.** Where will the program be housed? Who will make decisions about curriculum and staffing?

The ECE program will be housed in the newly formed (pending CC approval 3/15/11) Childhood Education Program along with the Elementary Education program. There will be a faculty director for the Childhood Education Program (appointed by the dean in consultation with the chair) who, in consultation with the chair and department faculty, will be responsible for overseeing the curriculum and staffing of the program courses. Given the interdisciplinary nature of this program, with courses included from MFT and PEC, the program director will also consult with the chairs of these two departments about when the courses from those programs will be offered.

5. **Resources.** Describe available and needed resources (e.g., personnel, space, fiscal, library holdings)

The program will not require an additional program director or faculty member. We already have a tenured faculty member with expertise in ECE (Welles-Nystrom). The program will be housed within the Childhood Education Program, with a single director. Most of the courses in the program will be taught by full-time faculty in GSEAP, with an occasional course taught by an adjunct. No additional space will be needed. We will look to expand the library’s holdings of materials related to ECE. This would come out of our departmental allocation of library funds.

6. **Projections for the Future.** What are your anticipated plans for this program in two years? five years? When and how will you evaluate its effectiveness?

We anticipate that this program will attract candidates from local ECE centers/schools and from our undergraduate student population (once the 5-year track is approved—future item). We also anticipate that some of our Elementary Education candidates may decide to earn a cross-endorsement in ECE while pursuing their certification in Elementary Education. Our next step, once this program has been approved at the graduate level, is to add to the 5—year integrated B.A./M.A. program to really draw on our undergraduate population, some of whom have expressed interest in early childhood development and education. This program will be evaluated annually by the department and with documentation procedures used for our existing accreditation reporting systems.

6. **Approval of Program within Department & School.**

Under the direction of Barbara Welles-Nystrom, the ECE program has been under development and discussion by the department of Curriculum & Instruction for the past two and a half years. Parts of it have been discussed at several different department meetings each semester since the Fall 2008 (too many dates to list). The various courses and program components were also discussed regularly in the ECE task force, led by Barbara Welles-Nystrom, which met in addition to the department meetings to develop and discuss courses and program requirements.

The developing ECE program was also discussed over time with faculty from both the Department of Marriage and Family Therapy and the Department of Psychological and Educational Consultation. Courses from these two programs are included in the ECE program (FT 430, SE 465, SE 429); thus, there have been several conversations about the development and inclusion of these courses in the program. Some of these discussions occurred during the ECE task force meetings, which intentionally included faculty members from the DPEC. These meetings have been documented, both through application for course approval at the Curriculum Committee meetings, and in regular departmental meetings as they occurred. Documentation is available upon request.
Approval of the version of the program presented to CC on March 1, 2011 occurred at the February 23rd, 2011 department meeting. The proposal was reviewed by the GSEAP Curriculum Committee on March 15, 2011. The Committee asked for more information about how the proposed certification track addressed issues of diversity. They also suggested that the program contain a science methods course. We prepared a detailed response, showing program alignment with diversity standards and our decision to add a science methods course (ED 497). Discussions of revisions to the proposal based on CC feedback (e.g., adding ED 497, diversity alignment) occurred during the March 31, 2011 department meeting and re-submitted to CC. The proposal was approved by the GSEAP CC on April 6th, 2011.
Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions
PROPOSED CHANGES TO AN EXISTING PROGRAM FORM:
Change in Degree Name from Elementary Education to Childhood Education

1. Initiator of the proposed changes __Jen Goldberg & Emily Smith________________________

2. Department __Curriculum & Instruction___________________________________________

3. What changes are you proposing? (Please check all that apply.)
☑ Program name & Degree Name Change
   Program requirements:
   □ credits
   □ courses
   □ prerequisites
   other: __________________________________________________________________________

4. Provide the current name or requirement(s) and the corresponding proposed changes:

   Current Program Name: Elementary Education

   Current Degree Name: Masters in Elementary Education with Initial Elementary Education Certification

   Proposed Program Name: Childhood Education

   Proposed Degree Name: Masters in Childhood Education with Initial Certification

5. Provide a brief rationale that delineates (1) compliance with appropriate accreditation guidelines, and (2) impact (positive or negative) on the department and the GSEAP community.

   With the (proposed) addition of a certification track in Early Childhood Education to the department’s offerings, the department would like to rename our current program in Elementary Education to Childhood Education and change the name of the degree to Masters in Childhood with Initial Certification. The change to Childhood Education for both the program name and the degree name allows us to house both the Early Childhood Education and the Elementary Education certification tracks under one program and degree with a more inclusive title to capture the focus on both early and elementary education.

   The name childhood education is one that is used by one of the key accrediting organizations in the field: ACEI-Association for Childhood Education International. As stated in ACEI’s missions statement, childhood education focuses on the education of children from birth through early adolescence:
Our mission is to promote and support in the global community the optimal education and development of children, from birth through early adolescence, and to influence the professional growth of educators and the efforts of others who are committed to the needs of children in a changing society. (http://acei.org/about)

Thus, childhood education captures the focus and age range of the two certification tracks (Elementary Education and ECE) that would be pursued as part of the Childhood Education Masters and housed in the Childhood Education program. In addition, Childhood Education is a name that is used in the field by other programs and thus will be familiar and clear to both applicants and other institutions.

We think this program and degree name change will have a positive impact overall. Candidates in either the ECE or El ED certification programs will have a common “home” and shared identity in their joint pursuit of becoming educators for young children. With respect to resources, this program and degree name change allows us to consolidate the administrative work of overseeing these two certification programs under one program, with one director. One possible negative impact is that applicants who are seeking a program in elementary education might not at first interpret Childhood Education as a program aimed at elementary education, but the certification tracks listed in the program will clearly specify ECE or Elementary Education tracks.

6. How will this change impact current and future candidates in the program?

This change will not significantly impact current or future candidates. The name of the program and degree in no way affects their degree requirements. It simply changes the name of the program where their degree program is housed, and the name of their degree. As the proposed ECE program would be a new certification track, this will not be a change for any incoming/new candidates.

7. How will this change impact current and future candidates in other GSEAP programs?

This change will not affect current or future candidates in other GSEAP programs. Candidates from other programs who might elect to take a course from Childhood Education could still do so; changing the name of the program or degree in no way impacts the courses or faculty available to them.

8. Has this proposal been approved by faculty in your department? ☒ yes  no

Provide a detailed description of the vetting and approval process.

These proposed changes were proposed to the department faculty during a department meeting on 1/27/11. It was discussed via email and Skype with Dr. Welles-Nystrom on two different occasions, as she is on sabbatical in Sweden. It was then discussed at the next department meeting on 2/3/11, where the department agreed to the proposal to have the ECE and El Ed
certification tracks housed under one program and degree. Then, on 2/23/11, the department agreed to the name Childhood Education.

9. Has this proposal been discussed with faculty in other departments? yes ☒ no

Provide a detailed description of your discussion(s) with other programs or departments

The proposed name change for the Elementary Education program and degree does not directly affect other departments.
b. Program Proposal for Early Childhood Education

(BWN is with us via SKPE) we are following up on previous agreement to house ECE & EL ED in same program

- JG walks us through the configuration of the tracks (see appendix 2). Notes the common foundational core (24 credits) and the inquiry/advocacy sequence (6) credits
- Notes that the tracks diverge in the specialized courses (21 credits)

Discussion

SB inquires about multicultural ed/culturally responsive ed- there is not a single, free-standing course currently in the el ed track; the focus is woven through the program; there were multiple examples offered of courses that address. JG notes that we’ve had to make some sacrifices across the tracks to keep the credit load manageable. Further discuss notes ways to increase explicitness & visibility; our curriculum mapping will help guide us; our work to put together our composite readings, etc. to make this visible. WK notes that we also now are revising the catalogs, so that we can make our commitments more explicit.

- WK notes the simplicity and coherence of the organization of the tracks. Clarification of the supervised teaching experiences; we’ll make sure that the credits are listed.
- ES explains that the credits required (51) is in accord with the credits required for MA with certifications – we are including all the human development courses in the planned program.

Consensus to move the program forward with the suggested revisions.

Discussion moves to the title of the umbrella program. WK notes that trends are toward focusing on the child, rather than the grade level. Consensus is to use Childhood Education: Early Childhood & Elementary Education Certification as the umbrella name for the program.

Department of Curriculum & Instruction

March 31st, 2011, 11-2, CNS 102 (Excerpts)
Minutes of the GSEAP Curriculum Committee (Excerpts)

March 15, 2011

Members present: Stephanie Burrell, Elizabeth Langran, Christine Siegel, Bogusia Skudrzyk, Anibal Torres (chair)

**MA in Early Childhood Education with Initial prek-3 Certification: New program proposal.** The proposal to combine the early childhood education and elementary education into one program makes sense, particularly when there are not enough resources and candidates to support 2 separate programs and there is sufficient overlap. Also appears to have consistency with accreditation. Special marketing attention will need to be paid to redirect people seeking elementary education program. The committee voiced a concern that Multicultural Education coursework is missing from the Early Childhood Education (ECE) proposal, particularly seeing that this is a very important age where children develop a sense of racial identity, discovering what is oppression and racism at this age, constructing identity. A map of how the program identifies the multicultural dimension infused explicitly throughout the courses would be helpful. Infusion implies that everyone has that expertise. While it is enticing for students to see multiculturalism throughout their program, they should learn the knowledge base in a specific course, and have it presented at the expert level.

Additional questions were raised regarding the capstone course, which in the TEFO program had a prerequisite not required in the ECE program. Additionally, there is a foundational course in mathematics, but none in science or social studies. Are these areas addressed in ED 405? ED 413?

E. Smith and J. Goldberg joined the meeting to answer the committee’s questions. For multicultural ed., the approach is similar to what is currently in the elementary ed program, where it is addressed theoretically and practically – the majority of fieldwork is done with underserved populations. J. Goldberg stated that all ECE courses must address multicultural ed, and all instructors have expertise in this area. Advocacy is infused throughout many of the Curriculum & Instruction programs.

The committee questioned how they would develop a knowledge base around multicultural education, beyond appreciating diversity. When infused in courses, is it merely introduced, taught at the intermediate level, or at the expertise level? J. Goldberg: It depends on who is teaching it.
The committee questioned why there was a separate course for multicultural education in the secondary ed program, but not in ECE and elementary ed. E. Smith explained that in secondary ed there is only 1 methods course, so there are fewer opportunities to infuse. It is already a packed program at 51 credits, with graduates in this field not paid very well, so there is concern about adding more.

Regarding the science & social studies coursework: Science is currently in ED 413 for pre- and kindergarten. ED 405 covers K-2. More emphasis on social studies is in ED 405. There is no consensus in the field about integrated vs. content-specific pedagogy.

The committee would like to see where and how each of these elements are addressed, and how it can be ensured that no matter which instructor teaches the courses that multiculturalism is addressed. How are the NCATE standard 4 and related multicultural SPA standards met throughout the program? How is the GSEAP conceptual framework addressed? The committee would like further clarification on how multicultural education is infused by seeing a mapping of the courses with the multicultural standards related to NCATE, SPA, and GSEAP conceptual framework, as well as the syllabi for ED 413 and 405 that address social studies and science, as several current members of the committee were not present for last year’s submission of those courses. A further meeting is needed to revisit this proposal.

Minutes of the GSEAP Curriculum Committee

April 6, 2011

Members present: Stephanie Burrell, Elizabeth Langran, Christine Siegel,

Anibal Torres (chair)

Members absent: Bogusia Skudrzyk

MA in Early Childhood Education with Initial Pre-K Certification: New program proposal

This proposal had been sent back in the previous committee meeting to the curriculum and instruction department to address the lack of science education and to clarify how multicultural education was infused throughout the program. The proposal was approved by consensus. In addition, the committee recommended that the curriculum and instruction department continue to discuss the quality and quantity of multicultural education infused into the new Early Childhood Education program.
Educational Planning Committee Meeting
September 22, 2011
Minutes (Excerpts)

Present: Professors Steven Bachelor, Peter Bayers, Dean Suzanne Campbell, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs (SVPAA) Paul Fitzgerald, S.J., Dean Don Gibson, Professors Cathy Giapponi, Sheila Grossman, Olivia Harriott, Michael Pagano, Carl Scheraga (Chair), Chris Staecker Barbara Welles-Nystrom

Visiting: Professors David Crawford, Jennifer Goldberg, Emily Smith

I. Discussion of Early Childhood Learning Proposal.

EPC members welcomed Professors Goldberg and Smith from the Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions to discuss their proposal to establish a certification track in Early Childhood Education, to be housed within the Childhood Education Degree and Program, and to change the name of the Masters in Elementary Education to Masters in Childhood Education. Prof. Smith provided an overview of the rationale for the new certification track, which would cover PreK-3rd grade. Prof. Smith explained the pivotal importance that early childhood education plays in students’ success. She also noted that market research indicates demand for specialization in early childhood education. Prof. Scheraga asked whether the courses included in the specialized track already exist. Prof. Smith explained they do, but that some had yet to be taught. Prof. Grossman inquired into the current availability of resources necessary for the new track. Prof. Smith answered that the resources already exist. SVPAA Fitzgerald inquired into whether students may pursue both the PreK-3rd and K-6 track simultaneously. Prof. Goldberg responded that yes and that she assumes that many will pursue both tracks as a means to maximize their marketability. SVPAA Fitzgerald asked whether a student who has previously completed one track could return to complete the second. Prof. Smith answered that yes, cross-endorsements will be possible. SVPAA inquired into the specific number of courses that would be required for cross-endorsement. Prof. Smith responded that the specific number of required courses for cross-endorsement will be up to the state of Connecticut. Prof. Barbara Welles-Nystrom asked how many total credits will be required for certification. Prof. Smith answered fifty-four. Dean Gibson asked about market demand for such a program in early childhood education. Prof. Smith pointed to market research previously done that indicated a definite demand in Fairfield County. Prof. Pagano asked whether ED 499 and ED 511 would be taken independently or consecutively. Prof. Goldberg indicated that most students take ED 499 first. Prof. Pagano explained that, if students are not enrolled for a sufficient number of units, their student loans might begin coming do. He wondered whether simultaneous enrollment in both courses might alleviate this potential problem. Prof. Goldberg said that simultaneous enrollment is a possibility and pledged to look into this issue. Prof. Giapponi and Scheraga both thanked Profs. Goldberg and Smith for providing such a well-constructed proposal.

Prof. Bayers moved to approve the proposal. Prof. Giapponi seconded. SVPAA Fitzgerald reiterated that there is a real need for this program and that, if approved, the University administration intends to roll out the new program carefully with appropriate marketing to attract candidates. The proposal passed unanimously with no abstentions.
Appendix 1

Masters in Childhood Education with Initial Certification
(Certification in Elementary or Early Childhood Education)

Core Childhood Education Certification Courses:
ED 405 Contexts of Education in the Primary Grades
ED 429 Philosophical Foundations of Education
ED 437 Developing Literacy in the Elementary School: Primary Grades
ED 447 Learning Mathematics in the Elementary Classroom
ED 497 Supporting Science and Health-Based Inquiry and Action by Elementary Students
MD 400 Introduction to Educational Technology
Literacy – struggling learners (SE 429 or ED 559)
Development course (ER 402 or ED 522 or ED 442)
Special Education (SE 465 or SE 405/430)

Early Childhood Education Certification:
FT 430 Contemporary Families or ED 512 Contemporary Schooling in Society
Early Literacy (SL 5XX Teaching Literacy in Bilingual ECE)
ED 413 Differentiating Learning in Pre-K and K Environments (include science and other subject areas not included in other coursework)
ED 414 Assessment & Observation in ECE
ER 497 Practicum in ECE
ED 581 Directed Observation & Supervised Student Teaching (6 cr.)

Elementary Education Certification:
ED 512 Contemporary Schooling in Society
ED 531 Extending Literacy in the Elementary School: Grades 3-6
ED 545 Developing Integrated Curriculum for Elementary Students: Inquiry and Action
ED 583/584 Student Teaching: Immersion in a Community of Practice and Reflective Practice Seminar: Elementary Education (9 cr.)

Childhood Education Integrated Inquiry/Advocacy Sequence:
ED 499 Introduction to Educational Research
ED 511 Educating for Social Responsibility and Civic Engagement: A Capstone Seminar
5-Year Review of the New Media Program

Submitted by: Elizabeth Haas; James Mayzik, SJ; Mark Scalese, SJ; and Roxana Walker-Canton

Begun as a minor program concentration in 1997 with 11 students, the New Media Film, Television & Radio program was approved as a major during fall of 2004 and inaugurated in 2005, and now has approximately 100 majors and minors. A detailed description of the major's original curriculum and its three tracks in film, television and radio can be found in the Program Proposal in Appendix A. What follow are a review of our program's history and a description of where we envision it moving in the future.

1. Changes.
   a. Since 2005. In 1997, the University approved the minor in Film and Television, so a body of courses already existed when the New Media major was launched in the spring of 2005. The following new courses were approved by the time of the major's inception:
      • FM 120 Beginning Screenwriting
      • FM 200 Film Genres
      • TL 102 Nonfiction Film and Television
      • TL 104 Sports Broadcasting.

Since 2005, several important changes have been made to bolster our curriculum within a liberal arts approach to teaching New Media. We have added courses or changed the focus of existing courses to integrate more writing, more analytical and critical thinking, and more directed instruction that emphasizes the artistic use of technology. The changes include the addition of the following courses:
   • NM 11 Lights, Camera, Audio
   • NM 90 Production Practicum
   • NM 310/311 Senior Capstone Seminar
   • FM 104 African American Film
   • FM 105 American Film Survey
   • TL 232 Documentary Production

   b. Rationale. The main objectives of the two new production courses, NM 11 Lights, Camera, Audio, and NM 90 Production Practicum, are (1) to provide instruction that makes students proficient in the technology used to produce creative media, (2) to provide students with a diverse exploration of the theoretical underpinnings of technology used to create artistic media and (3) to provide students greater opportunities to apply theory as they work collaboratively on media projects in the New Media Program. Both courses help students develop aesthetic vision and discernment while strengthening production skills. NM 11 and NM 90 are lower level production courses that prepare New Media majors to enter the NM 310/311 senior capstone sequence with both a developed philosophy of media production and aesthetics and the technical ability to express that philosophy through the production of creative media that matter.
The main objective of the Senior Capstone Seminar is to transform meaningful ideas into creative media using the theoretical, aesthetic and technical concepts learned in their major classes. When the New Media major was inaugurated in 2005, the capstone was not yet an approved course, so students took it as an elective independent study. NM 310 was approved in 2008 and in February 2010, NM 311 was approved as a second-semester continuation of that course. Currently, only one semester of the senior capstone seminar is required and the second semester is taken as an elective. The New Media faculty is in the process of securing approval to require seniors to take two semesters of the capstone seminar. This increase provides seniors the time and guidance to apply their acquired theoretical and technical knowledge and to develop more dynamic concepts from the pre-production stage through post-production.

In assessing our course offerings, the New Media faculty realized that our curriculum needed to broaden students' understanding of the historical and theoretical heritage of the entertainment industries that influence our culture as well as their own creative output in film, television or radio production. Currently, students are required to take any two history/theory courses in their respective program tracks. For example, our majors can take one course on the films of Clint Eastwood and another on the science fiction genre, or one course in Sports Broadcasting in addition to another in Television Comedy. Such an approach might yield a deep knowledge of a particular genre such as TV Drama or a particular director such as Alfred Hitchcock without exposing students to the broad range of styles and aesthetics found in canonical films or television programs considered essential for a well-grounded media education. It has been possible to graduate with a degree in New Media without knowing basic American film or television history and their international counterparts, in addition to their major figures, movements, and theories.

We have addressed and are addressing these issues in a number of ways. First, the faculty developed the curriculum for FM 105 American Film Survey, which was approved in 2010. Second, within the existing course category for FM 103 World Cinemas (which focuses on particular countries during given semesters), a new section has been developed to survey films from a broad spectrum of countries. Related to this, a course in African American Cinema was added in 2009. Furthermore, we are making changes in the curricula and sequencing of our film and television production courses that will direct students to make connections between media history and theory on the one hand and their own media creations on the other.

**c. Proposed Curricular Changes.** Currently, we are in the process of revising the required courses and their sequence in our curriculum. We are focusing particular attention on preparing students for upper level courses by building a foundation of film and television history and theory, through conceptualization and visualization, to screenwriting and basic technical skills. As of this writing, the following course sequence is still a work-in-progress and will be adjusted as we continue to revise our curriculum. We hope to have these revisions approved and in place within the next two years:

**First Year**
- Collate NM 10 Intro to New Media Arts and FM 11 Art and Language of Film or TL 11 Art and Language of Television into a single new course focusing on Film & Television
Analysis. This new course will be required of incoming freshmen as the gateway to our program.

- **NM 11 Lights, Camera, Audio.** Currently, this course is an elective; under the new curriculum it will be required for all majors.
- **FM 105 American Film Survey or US Television History/Theory.** FM 105 is currently an elective; under the new curriculum it will be required for film majors. We currently do not have a course in US television history, but it will be required for television majors under the new curriculum.
- **NM 90 Production Practicum (1 credit).** Currently, this course is an elective. Under the new curriculum, it will be required of all students for one semester in each of their freshman, sophomore and junior years.

Second Year

- **FM 120 Beginning Screenwriting for Film or Television.** This course is currently required for all majors and will remain so.
- **FM 130 Filmmaking I or TL 130 Studio Television Production.** Both of these courses are currently required for film or television majors respectively, and will remain so.
- **FM 131 Nonlinear Editing/Post Production for Film and TV.** This course is currently required for all majors and will remain so.
- **NM 90 Production Practicum (1 credit).**

Third Year

- **World Cinema or TL 102 Non-fiction Television History/Theory.** Currently, FM 103 World Cinema is an elective history/theory course that varies its country of focus from semester to semester. We plan to seek approval for a new course number that will specifically survey a broad range of national cinemas within a single semester and this new course will be required for all film majors. TL 102 is currently an elective and will be required for all television majors.
- **FM 132 Directing for Film and Television.** This course is currently required for all majors and will remain so.
- **FM 230 Filmmaking II or TL 230 Remote Television Production.** Currently, FM 230 is an elective but it will be required for film majors. TL 230 is currently required for television majors and will remain so.
- **NM 90 Production Practicum (1 credit).**

Fourth Year

- **Film or TV History/Theory Elective (200-level).** Currently, only FM 200 Film Genres is an upper level history/theory course offering. We plan to develop additional 200-level courses to offer for this new elective requirement.
- **NM 310 Senior Capstone Seminar I.** Currently, this course is required for one semester.
- **NM 311 Senior Capstone Seminar II.** This course is an elective under the current curriculum but will be required under the new.
At the submission of this report, the more profound structural change is the gradual phasing out of Radio as a concentration within the program and the long-term projected phasing in of Digital Media as a concentration. Although RA 103 Radio Production I has consistently had full enrollment, the other radio courses have not had the enrollment needed to sustain the concentration. During the past five years only 8 students have gone through our program as radio majors. As we phase out the Radio concentration, we are gradually phasing in a Digital Media concentration that will include the study and application of digital graphics, web design, and animation. We already offer one such course, TL 133 Digital Graphics, which has been offered 5 times and has had full enrollment each time. It should be noted, however, that due to the continuing importance of radio in the contemporary media environment (especially internationally), the New Media program will continue to offer several radio courses as electives, and our on-campus radio station, WVOF, will continue to be a vital extracurricular option for our students. In fact, the radio station has recently upgraded its offerings to include its own iPhone app for wireless streaming anywhere.

Within the next few years, the program also foresees adding upper level courses in screenwriting, film history/theory, directing, the history/theory of media technology, and web design.

2. Need.
After the program was established as a minor concentration in 1997, rising enrollments demanded increased course offerings, and the numbers of declared minors doubled almost every year—from 11 the first year to 74 in 2004. When the major was launched in January 2005, we had 7 students already “in the pipeline”—with enough New Media credits to graduate with the new major that May. In the following year, we had 12 graduating major students already “in the pipeline.” Then in the fall of 2006, we had our first class of freshmen New Media majors who applied to Fairfield specifically to participate in our major—and that class graduated this past May with 27 students. (Appendix B charts this progressive increase of seniors graduating with the New Media major along with the subsequent decrease in minors.) Each year since then, Fairfield has had 80-100 potential freshmen express interest in becoming New Media majors, of which approximately 40 are accepted to the university. In each of the last four years, 20-25 of those students chose to come to Fairfield to participate in our New Media program. As of this writing, we have approximately 100 New Media majors and minors, with roughly 25 students in each class. This total exceeds our original projection of 75 New Media students overall in our program proposal from 2003.

3. Objectives.
Appendix C lists the expected student outcomes and means of assessment outlined by the New Media Program when the Department of Visual & Performing Arts conducted a self-study in 2005 in order to articulate its overall learning objectives and assessment strategies as well as those within each of its individual programs.

The New Media Program is designed so that students learn the history, theory and collaborative practice of visual storytelling including writing, production design, producing, directing, cinematography, sound design, digital imaging, and editing. Our objective is to develop students’ understanding of the expressive power of media and encourage students to engage their imaginations and intellects with the tools of these crafts to produce media that matter. Many of
the program’s faculty members come from the ranks of working professionals, ensuring that information transmitted in the classroom is at the cutting edge of the field.

Students are assessed using traditional instruments such as class discussions, quizzes, exams and research papers. Of course, because much of the New Media Program is oriented toward teaching concrete skills in the actual production of film, television or radio content, media projects in those areas are important measures of student learning and progress. Our annual Cinefest student festival is an important venue for the exhibition of the best of our students' work.

As we work on the reconfiguration of the major and minor, the objectives of our courses and course sequencing will reflect the changes discussed in Section 1 "Changes." We also anticipate a certain standardization of objectives and means of assessment to emerge from this comprehensive review so that our classes may more effectively and efficiently build on the knowledge base gained from each course. The capstone sequence will serve as a culmination of a rigorously constructed major, allowing students to put artistic voice and pragmatic skills to full expression.

Further, the New Media program’s contribution to fulfilling the University’s overall mission includes the important ways media arts weave together knowledge, skill and personal as well as cultural values. All New Media classes teach students to appreciate the power of media to illuminate the human condition and affect change in our society. As generally with the Department of Visual & Performing Arts, New Media courses divide between those that cover material historically and theoretically with those that involve the use of applied skills to produce works of art. Both kinds of courses aim to help students develop the knowledge that artistic skill represents; both lead students to recognize and appreciate the personal values that shape artistic and aesthetic expression.

The New Media curriculum nurtures students’ intuitive, creative, expressive and aesthetic faculties and the ability to connect these with reasoning skills. In the Jesuit tradition, our courses aim to integrate advanced technical skills, critical thinking and aesthetic discernment so that students create original media.

4. Impact. The impact of the New Media program can best be assessed through its contributions to the university's enrollment strength, curricular vibrancy, and intellectual life, and through the professional opportunities New Media helps make available to students.

a. Enrollment Strength. During the past five years, the program in New Media has impacted positively the student enrollment of the Department of Visual & Performing Arts by attracting, recruiting, and retaining an increasing number of students as New Media majors. With 20-25 declared New Media students in each class, the program now numbers approximately 100—more than those majoring in the other VPA programs combined. In fall 2010, twenty students will arrive as declared New Media majors. On average, approximately 5 students graduate with a minor in New Media, and 20-25 with a major in New Media. In addition, more than half of the 25-30 students enrolled in film or television history/theory classes are non-majors seeking to fulfill their two Area IV CORE requirements. Furthermore, given the
fact that less than 40% of this year's freshman class is male, the consistent enrollment of young men as New Media majors is certainly a positive contribution to the gender balance of the university. Currently, there is approximately one female student for every two male students in our program, a ratio that reflects trends in the film and television industries. Nevertheless, the New Media program provides a stimulating and supportive environment where young women can explore their own creative possibilities within those fields. To the advantage of Fairfield and our program's contribution to its enrollment, the prominent role new media play in contemporary life ensures that the demand for academic training in the theory, history, consumption, and creation of these media will only continue.

b. Curricular Vibrancy. Within the rapidly morphing fields of film, television, and digital media studies and the even faster changing technologies that define them, the New Media program has carved a vibrant curricular path for students to master these technologies and to learn and critique their histories and the academic theories of their influence on human experience. Despite the popularity of films and other mediated images on university syllabi, no other department or program combines both the study and creation of media in the same way as the New Media program. Only New Media affords students the opportunity to make films, television, and other media art in a hands-on and technically advanced manner using cutting edge equipment. The unique relationship the program enjoys with the Media Center allows students to work with professionals in their field of interest and develop their artistic skills and vision.

c. Inter-Program and Departmental Collaboration. Within the Department of Visual & Performing Arts, New Media has shared majors and minors with the Studio Arts, Music, and Theater programs, and at the university level, with the Communication, Economics, Marketing, and Politics departments as well as the Journalism program within the English department. These synergies have proven beneficial to our students and opened up more diverse career possibilities than they would have had otherwise. Admittedly, the arrival of the New Media major has probably diverted some students from majoring in several of the above disciplines as they might have done previously, most notably in Communication or Theater Arts.

New Media currently accepts courses from the following programs and departments or offers joint courses with them:

- Art History
  - AH 11 Visual Culture
  - AH 152 Modern Art
  - AH 172 History of Photography
- Black Studies
  - FM 104 African American Cinema
- Communication
  - CO 130 Media and Society
  - CO 201 Persuasion
  - CO 202 Group Communication
  - CO 220 Introduction to Organizational Communication
  - CO 231 Media Institutions
  - CO 236 Gender, Sexuality, and Media
  - CO 335 Globalization, Media, and Culture
d. Intellectual Life. The New Media program sponsors and co-sponsors events open to the university and Fairfield community to help promote extra-curricular intellectual life. Among these efforts the following programs stand out:

- **Cinefest.** The New Media program sponsors a year-end showcase of student-directed and student-produced films known as Cinefest, an event that grows and attracts more and more student participants and audience members each year. Spring 2010 Cinefest filled four hours of programming and packed the Quick Center to capacity with 800 students, parents, faculty and members of the local community.

- **HAM Channel.** In addition to providing students with the chance to create, write, direct and produce their own television programming, the HAM channel (which is run primarily by New Media majors) broadcasts to the entire University...
community and serves the student body by broadcasting live university events such as the FUSA elections.

- **Reel Women.** In spring 2010, New Media launched the student-faculty group, Reel Women, to join New Media faculty and Media Center staff members with students from a variety of disciplines to examine films by, for and about women. It also explores more far-reaching topics such as the role of women in creating media and the representation of gender in media, especially film. Reel Women activities engage anyone in the Fairfield University community with interest in the creation, critique, history and theory of media. During spring semester 2010, Reel Women hosted a presentation by Amy Taubin, a nationally recognized film critic and contributing editor of *Sight and Sound* magazine. Her talk, “Who’s Looking? Women Direct Movies” drew approximately 80 people from across the campus and the larger Fairfield community and drew attention to the ground-breaking phenomenon of Kathryn Bigelow winning a best director Academy Award for her film, The Hurt Locker. So successful was her talk a co-chair of Women’s Studies suggested we bring Ms. Taubin back this year.

- **Film Club.** This student-run group explores its members' love of cinema and film studies through screenings of favorite movies, discussing them afterwards, and occasionally producing films of its own.

- **WVOF.** New Media supports radio station WVOF, an NPR affiliate. Complementing a roster of local announcers from the surrounding community, New Media majors and minors host a variety of live radio programs on-air or online, including live broadcasts of Fairfield University sporting events or emergency alerts.

- **Service Learning.** The New Media program actively engages students in service learning that takes them outside of the university setting and traditional classroom environment. The program provides great service to the Ignatian Residential College and new living/learning communities such as Creative Life by providing courses to their students. In classes such as TL 232 Documentary Production, and in projects coordinated through Campus Ministry or the Dolan School of Business in association with Media Center productions, New Media students participate in projects that involve them in the larger community by opening them to the lives and experiences of diverse communities. For example, recent documentary projects have taken students to places close to home such as the Saint Charles Food Pantry in Bridgeport as well as abroad to the Philippines and Nicaragua.

**e. Professional Opportunities.** New Media students enjoy multiple internship opportunities that have included positions at studios in Bristol, Stamford, New York, Los Angeles, and Boston. We have regularly sent students to intern at "Saturday Night Live," MTV, NBC Olympics, ESPN, NBC-Universal, the Weinstein Company, "Sesame Street," "Live with Regis and Kelly," and "The David Letterman Show." One recent graduate interned with Lin Productions in Hollywood during its releases of *Terminator: Salvation* and *Sherlock Holmes*. Through the New Media program’s association with the Media Center, Fairfield students work on remote and studio productions including sports and public affairs programming such as Fairfield basketball games, the award-winning "Stags Country," and live congressional debates.
New Media's association with the Media Center also provides students with work-study opportunities in the CAGE, where equipment is stored and lent out, as well as with AMES, which provides media equipment services to the Fairfield campus. Students have graduated from our program and accepted full-time employment at production companies and TV outlets such as A&E, MTV, MSNBC, News Channel 8, WWF and Fox News, and at broadcast and cable shows such as "Law & Order: SVU," "The David Letterman Show," "Sesame Street," "Deal or No Deal," and "The Jerry Springer Show."

5. Administrative Structure and Governance.
The New Media program is one of five programs that comprise the Department of Visual & Performing Arts. New Media faculty members regularly attend and participate in VPA department meetings and assist in the administration of department business. The program has expanded to one tenured faculty member, two full-time tenure-track faculty members, and one three-quarter-time non-tenure-track faculty member. One faculty member chairs the program and the four hold regular meetings twice each month to oversee administration of the program and to plan changes to the composition of the major and its curriculum as the program shifts and grows. Approximately eight adjunct faculty members regularly teach additional courses, several of whom are staff of the Media Center.

6. Resources.
The resources of the New Media program depend on its unique synergy with the Media Center. This relationship allows the New Media program to provide students access to state-of-the-art film, television, and digital image creation technology and equipment. These include: 2 television studios equipped with high-definition cameras and switching equipment; 2 Mac labs with nearly 25 computers for video editing, script writing, and digital image design; 2 screening classrooms with high-definition projectors and media consoles with access to the internet; a sound editing and sound effects lab; and a state-of-the-art mobile satellite uplink truck. In addition, the expertise of the Media Center staff in writing, directing, producing, editing, and cinematography is a valuable resource in itself for the New Media program and its students.

a. Budget. Recently, as a result of the economic downturn, the budget for the program has contracted from $6,000 to $5,000. The breakdown of last year's budget is as follows:
   - $1500 Cinefest
   - $3000 Production grants for student media projects
   - $500 Reel Women programming

As noted above, the university Media Center substantially subsidizes expenses for the New Media program, particularly with regard to support staff for classroom and lab activities and equipment rental and repair. The Media Center also provides production equipment such as portable lights, grip and audio equipment, and state-of-the-art cameras, as well as classroom facilities such as computers and high-definition projectors. Indeed, it would not be an exaggeration to say that our program could not function at its current capacity without its relationship to the Media Center. Since most of the equipment is used jointly between the two entities, it is difficult to separate out how much of the Media Center's budget underwrites the New Media program. However, between new purchases and upgrades as part of routine maintenance, approximately $50,000 of the Media Center's budget supports our program.
b. Library. Fairfield University's DiMenna-Nyselius Library owns an extensive collection of texts, DVDs, and other academic resources related to film, television, radio and digital media that the New Media program regularly uses for teaching and research purposes. These include database access to the latest scholarship, image galleries, and media archives.

c. Physical Space. The space utilized by the program increased when Cablevision vacated its switching station in Xavier Hall in 2006, but overall, the limited physical space of the program is a continuing problem that requires serious university-level attention. The New Media faculty cannot overstate how much we are hampered by our reliance on the single classroom, G-13, that can both screen films the way they are meant to be screened and provide flexible space for small group work and student presentations.

d. Full-time Faculty. The number of students New Media serves and the diversity of the curriculum New Media offers necessitate the hiring of additional full time, tenure-track faculty. During the 2010-11 academic year, the program will be down one full-time member each semester and as such will have to limit the number of courses it would normally offer and fill. Because of this shortage, New Media has had to withdraw from offering screenwriting courses in the new Creative Life Living and Learning Community in order to serve New Media majors, who are our first priority. Also, we are able to offer only one section of screenwriting in fall 2010 even though demand would, as usual, fill two sections. Looking forward, in order to implement the planned curricular shifts and additions, a fourth full-time member with creative and scholarly abilities and a fifth full-time faculty member to accommodate our new Digital Media concentration will be necessary.
Minutes, etc. of 5-Year Review Document of New Media Program

Minutes from New Media faculty meeting, Aug. 25, 2010:

- Mark will obtain the original proposal for the New Media program from Jim and append it to the document.
- Mark will also obtain our department assessment document and amend it to our review.
- We need to provide documentation as to the number of majors and minors who have graduated from the program. Mark will contact the registrar's office for this information.
- Looking through minutes from last year, Roxana observed that we began working on the 5-year review document in September 2009.
- The following changes were proposed:
  - add page numbers to the entire document
  - Under 4c - Inter-program and Departmental Collaboration, add "Black Studies" to the list of programs or departments
  - Under 4d - Intellectual Life:
    - add the word "student" to the bullet about Cinefest so that it reads: "The New Media program sponsors a showcase of student-directed and student-produced films..."
    - To the HAM Channel bullet, remove the words "and benefits" from the fourth line.
    - To the Service Learning bullet, remove the word "popular" from the fifth line. Amend the next sentence so that it reads, "In classes such as TL 232 Documentary Production, and in projects coordinated through Campus Ministry or the Dolan School of Business in association with Media Center productions, New Media students participate in projects that involve them in the larger community by opening them to the lives and experiences of diverse communities."
    - For the bullet labeled "Internships and post-graduate job opportunities," remove the bullet and make it a fifth sub-category labeled "e. Professional Opportunities." In the last sentence of that paragraph, amend, "Students have graduated from our program and gone on to full-time employment..." to "Students have graduated from our program and accepted full-time employment..."
  - Under 5, Administrative Structure and Governance:
    - add the words "member" or "members" wherever the word "faculty" is used.
  - Under 6, Resources:
    - Amend the first sentences so that they read: "The resources of the New Media program depend on its unique synergy with the Media Center. This relationship allows the New Media program to provide students access..."
    - under the Budget bullet, break down how we spent the $5000 last year.
    - under the bullet about Physical Space, make "Cablevision" one word. Amend the last sentence to read, "The New Media faculty cannot overstate how much we are hampered by our reliance on the single classroom, G-13,
that can both screen films the way they are meant to be screened..."

- A vote was taken to approve our 5-Year Review with the above amendments and it passed unanimously.

Minutes from VPACC meeting, Sept. 1, 2010:

- B. Torff asked whether the review was internal or whether it was going to the state for review. M. Scalese clarified that it was internal to the University for New Majors but does not have to go to the state. S. Chamlin proposed an ACTION ITEM: M. Scalese find out what the dates are for each of the steps so as to create a proper timeline.
- S. Chamlin suggested that page numbers be added to the document. M. Scalese explained that there is a more recent draft that has that correction made.
- S. Chamlin and K. Schwab suggested that coupling a PDF of an explanation of the major/minor as it stands and a description of each of the tracks coupled with the document would be helpful to the reviewer at every stage so that it can be easily referenced should the reader be unfamiliar with the program.
- B. Torff added that it is always better to provide more materials than they need in case they say “prove it.”
- S. Chamlin suggested a collation of syllabi/course descriptions be created for each of the classes referenced in a 3 ring binder to provide specific examples and further clarify. B. Torff added that it is better not to give someone reason to question, always be clear.
- K. Schwab suggested that a table of contents would probably suffice. S. Chamlin suggested asking for an example of a successful 5 Year Review packet to use as a model/structure.
- L. Nash suggested that under “Need #2” on Page 4 re: “80-100 applicants apply to be New Media majors and 40 are accepted. Clarify that people are applying to Fairfield University with a specific interest in the New Media program. Always good to tie a program to admissions/marketing and provide empirical data on how the program influences prospective students.
- K. Schwab suggested also clarifying the gender data on the next page. Point out that Fairfield encourages female students to enter the field while still maintaining the obvious draw that the program already has for male students.
- B. Torff commented on the Inter-program Collaboration piece that the courses that are interdepartmental have the course numbers and titles of the classes actually in the document. This emphasizes how the program fits in with the University philosophy on education. M. Scalese noted that when students try and veer from the liberal arts path in the program and turn it more towards a professional track program: “What’s the point of knowing all the craft if you don’t have anything to say.”
- K. Schwab noted that it would be valuable to include the self assessments and outcomes from within the VPA processes. Elaborate on why radio is being phased out while emphasizing the importance of the media historically and clarify that it will not be ignored entirely.
- B. Torff suggested that New Media clearly define the vision and explain the reason behind the shifts noted and define what all of those things mean.
Minutes from VPA faculty meeting, Sept. 8, 2010:

- Professor Torff introduced the 5 Year New Media Review as an internal document that would remain within the University.
- Father Scalese, S.J. mentioned that the 5 year new media document was enjoyable to produce and that the department benefitted from the process. Father Scalese S.J. clarified that the document had already passed through the VPACC (VPA Curriculum Committee) and that the department has incorporated the changes suggested by the VPACC before bringing it to the VPA Department meeting.
- Professor Yarrington suggested that on page 8 under “Intellectual Life” that adding small lecture series from outside the University would be beneficial and interesting to think about.
- Professor Porter mentioned that she supported the systematic phase out of the radio program, but that she is concerned about the resources it would take and personnel it would require to start, build and maintain a proper New Media/Graphic Design program as stated in the “vision” within the document. Professor Yarrington agreed that this issue of resources and personnel must be considered when discussing the realities of the limitations that will be in place.
- Professor Yarrington questioned how the department will vet who is accepted and who is not accepted to the department as the department is already running at capacity as far as interested students are concerned. Professor Yarrington also mentioned that the document was very clear and easy to read.
- Professor Torff motioned to approve the 5 Year New Media Review Document. Professor Porter seconded this motion. The vote passed unanimously at 15-0-0 in favor of approving the 5 Year New Media Review Document.

Comments from ASCC Chair Manyul Im sent on October 21, 2010:

Hello Mark,

ASCC was pleased to consider and discuss your program’s 5-year New Program Review. The committee voted unanimously to accept the Review. It should now be forwarded by you to the UCC for its consideration. I have copied the chair of UCC, Elizabeth Petrino.

I’d like to share some comments and suggestions for your program that our committee had during our discussion; these may be helpful to your program going forward.

First, let me say that everyone in the committee was very impressed with the rapid growth of NM in its first five years. This seemed to us to indicate that you are successfully fulfilling a real demand for a program such as yours in the University’s applicant demographic. Of course, as you point out in the report, that sort of growth brings with it a real need to adapt and grow at the instructional program level, so we had some thoughts about this:

- Your plan to restructure the major is commendable, particularly as it systematically integrates more scholarship and writing into the program’s requirements. There were some concerns in the committee that such integration is not reflected quite as well at the end of the program, in the capstone experience, as at the beginning. So we would urge
you to consider ways to integrate those components more thoroughly in the capstone, which is a year long.

- Another point about restructuring your program that some committee members had concerns about was coordination between it and other programs from which you draw some of your courses, either currently or in the future. As you move forward with the changes in your program, working closely with those other programs (for instance MLL, EN, and CO) may be beneficial both for keeping abreast of the recent and near-future changes in their programs, as well as for taking advantage of cross-program resources.

- There was some concern that the current arrangement for access to the bulk of your instructional resources—from the Media Center—was too contingent and should be solidified, perhaps through the SVPAA’s office. The happy coincidence of Jim Mayzik’s position as both NM faculty member and Director of the Media Center provides a working arrangement, but for the program’s own good, instructional access to the Media Center’s resources should be negotiated into something more permanent. The committee noted that since the Media Center has recently been restructured administratively to be part of the academic unit, this provides an opportunity to work with the SVPAA to ensure that the program does not stand to lose the bulk of its instructional resources to the whims of circumstance — not to mention further administrative restructuring in the future.

- The growth of the program, as you note, has created the need for more fulltime faculty. The committee fully agreed with this assessment. Some members pointed out that as you move forward with discussions within V&PA, the Dean, and the SVPAA, having data on hand for expectable numbers of students per course, in terms of expectable numbers of majors, minors, and students taking their V&PA core courses in NM would provide a more specific accounting of the demand for new fulltime faculty. It would enable you to say more specifically and accurately how many fulltime lines, or equivalents, are necessary to service your program and the University’s core requirements effectively.

- Growth also puts pressure on your instructional space resources, as you point out. Some members of the committee suggest exploring better use of scheduling for separate screening times for films discussed in classes, using available classrooms and lecture rooms (e.g. Library Multi-purpose Rm.) with the appropriate technology. In general, the NM program should explore ways to take advantage of Media Center resources while not being tied down to the limited space of Xavier Hall.

Just a couple of minor things about the Appendices, since you can probably expect to hear similar things again about them from subsequent levels of review: some of the data presented in them is opaque and at least in one instance, confusing. The status of Appendix C as part of a 2005, larger review done at the V&PA department level could be more obviously indicated, say, on the chart itself. Also, some of the numbers (of graduates) in Appendix B don’t seem to add up in any obvious way (see years 2005-6 and 2009-10). We realize these are numbers provided by OIR, but some “unpacking” of those might have been helpful for us.

I do hope you and your colleagues find these remarks helpful. The committee appreciates the
hard work your program has put into this review. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Yours,

Manyul

Memo sent by Mark Scalese on October 29, 2010 to Elizabeth Petrino of the UCC:

Dear Elizabeth:

Apropos our conversation Thursday, Oct. 28, I would like to respond to the comments and suggestions of the ASCC regarding our 5-Year Review process which Manyul Im passed on to us in the New Media Program:

- The committee commended us for integrating more scholarship and writing in our program but was concerned that we do so more thoroughly in the capstone project during senior year. In fact, we already do. Last year when Roxana Walker-Canton and I each taught a section of the capstone course, we required our students to read articles and books that discussed filmmaking on a theoretical level; we then discussed the readings during our class sessions seminar-style. For her part, Roxana even had her students include a research component to the pre-production stage of their filmmaking process -- something I plan to include the next time I teach the course. Finally, each semester, we required our students to submit a production binder that was a prominent part of their final grade. Besides collating all the documentation of their filmmaking process (scripts, actor head shots, budgets, storyboards, etc.) the last and most important part of their binder was a 6-8 page reflection paper on their experience. Points they were required to address included: what they hoped to accomplish in their project; their assessment of the final product; and what they learned from the experience with regard to the production process in general, their own strengths and weaknesses as filmmakers, what they would do differently, and how they envision their future career goals. I am not directly familiar with how Jim Mayzik is teaching the course this year, but I imagine he has similar components and requirements.

- The committee suggested that we work more closely with other departments such as Modern Languages, English, or Communication so that New Media students would be better informed about other courses that satisfy requirements in our program, and so that we could take advantage of cross-program resources. By way of information, as we continue with the revision of our curriculum, we are discovering that we need to expand the number of courses our students take. We are concerned that we don’t expand the total course load for our majors beyond what is done in most departments, so we have found the necessary “room” in our program by taking away several elective options from within our curriculum. The net result of this will be the reduction of opportunities for our students to take outside courses to fulfill our requirements, with the exception of an elective in film or television history/theory. We will, however, continue to advise our students to take courses in other departments or programs that will expand upon our own offerings and enrich our students’ experiences.

- We agree that it will be important to “institutionalize” the relationship between the New Media Program and the Media Center so that the mutual advantages of that relationship can perdure no matter who is in charge. The recent shift of the Media Center to the purview of the SVPAA is certainly a step in the right direction.
• There were several questions about the appendices that need to be addressed.  
  ◦ Appendix B contained a chart and graph of numbers of students who have graduated as majors or minors in New Media, but there were discrepancies in those numbers. That error came about when we cross-checked the names and numbers provided by the registrar, which proved to be incorrect in some places. When I sent that appendix to the ASCC, I adjusted the totals to reflect our own records, but then neglected to adjust the component numbers accordingly. I have since corrected that in the version sent to UCC.  
  ◦ Appendix C was very confusing to the members of the ASCC, so let me clarify. That document was the result of a department-wide process undertaken by VPA in 2005. Pages 1-5 list broad department goals that should apply to each and every sub-program within the department: Column 1 lists the general VPA goals; Column 2 lists how those goals apply to New Media; and Column 3 lists the assessment criteria we use to determine if we have met those goals. Pages 6-8 list goals that are specific to the New Media program: Column 1 lists the goals; Column 2 lists the types of courses or activities where those goals are being addressed; and Column 3 lists the assessment criteria we use to determine if we have met those goals.  
  ◦ FYI: with the help of the CAE, VPA just began a new assessment process at our October department meeting, so New Media will adjust and incorporate those results accordingly.

I think this should address some of the major issues touched upon in Manyul’s report. Elizabeth Haas will be available at your meeting on Tuesday to answer any other questions the committee might have.

Sincerely,
Mark Scalese, SJ

Feedback from A&S Dean Robbin Crabtree at a meeting on November 2, 2010, attended by James Mayzik, Mark Scalese, Brian Torff, and Roxana Walker-Canton

• As New Media curriculum review proceeds, here is the procedure for “tweaking” courses or the curriculum:
  o Discuss the changes at a Program meeting and write up the proposed changes in a memo. For changes to courses, include the course title, course number, and a description of the changes and the reasons for them.
  o Submit the memo to VPACC/VPA for comments and approval.
  o Forward the memo + program/department minutes to ASCC for approval.
• Robbin offered the following suggestions:
  o Go through our curriculum to determine exactly what’s been approved and what still needs approval, and secure the approval for implementation in the fall.
  o Go through the full approval process for new courses or substantial curriculum changes in the Program.
  o We can apply for a Humanities Grant to fund a few days of group work during summer 2011 for more sustained work on the curriculum revisions.
• In planning future course offerings, explore the possibility of cross-listing with courses taught by full-time Ph.D. faculty in other departments – or determine whether some of their courses could satisfy Program requirements.
• Place ads on the university website for adjuncts who have MAs or MFAs. This can be done to compile a pool of possible adjuncts even if we don’t have immediate needs for them.
• Go through the capstone course and determine appropriate opportunities for “writing moments.” This would be to address ASCC concerns that the capstones provide opportunities for research and reflective writing as well as for hands-on production work.
• Go through our proposed curriculum changes and map out when we would need to offer various courses and how often, which faculty could teach them and what targets we would want for enrollment in them. This could help us to determine if our proposed changes will be feasible given our current faculty pool. Furthermore, we could research courses in other departments that might fulfill our requirements and figure out what course-levels they would satisfy.

- Robbin inquired if there might be an entry-level course that would apply across-the-board to all VPA programs and whether such a course could be offered for Core credit as well.
- She also suggested we contact Ann Staney in the Office of Institutional Research to help us to devise and assess quantitative outcomes for our program.

Comments from UCC Chair Elizabeth Petrino on November 9, 2010:

Dear Mark,

As Chair of UCC, I am notifying you that the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee unanimously endorsed your Five Year Program Review in New Media and Film Studies. I would like to pass along to you several comments made in the discussion at our meeting on November 2, 2010 that might be of use as you move forward with curricular changes.

The Committee commends you and the other faculty members for the growth of this program and the substantial curricular changes that have already taken place. We support your efforts to refine and reduce further your many learning objectives, and we strongly suggest you develop an explicit assessment plan, including gathering, assessing, and creating repositories for artifacts. Although there are continuing challenges, particularly in the area of staffing and the Program’s relationship to the Media Center, we hope that our strong endorsement will encourage the administration to make a good faith commitment to allocating resources necessary for the Program’s continued growth.

Please feel free to forward your materials with these comments to the EPC. The current routing for this review is as follows:

1) School curriculum committee
2) UCC (If applicable)
3) EPC
4) Academic Council
Please let me know if I can be of further assistance.

With best wishes,
Elizabeth

---

Educational Planning Committee Meeting  
December 16, 2010  
Minutes  
(By Recording Secretary Wendy Kohli)

Present:  
Professors Steven Bachelor, Wendy Kohli, Michael Pagano, Shelley Phelan, Chris Staecker, Jo Yarrington (Chair);  
Deans: Susan Franzosa (GSEAP) and Norm Solomon (DSB); SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald;  
and Guest Presenter: Professor Mark Scalese.

Regrets:  
Professors Sheila Grossman, Carl Scheraga and Barbara Welles-Nystrom

RESPONSE TO FIVE YEAR REVIEW SEGMENT OF EPC MEETING:

3. Five Year Program Review in New Media and Film Studies with Guest Presenter,  
Professor Mark Scalese

EPC Chair Jo Yarrington introduced Professor Mark Scalese from the Program in New Media/Film/TV/Radio. He was here to present a general overview of the Five Year Review of the Program in New Media and Film Studies that the program faculty had conducted. He was also there to elicit comments and questions about the existing program and plans for the future.

Prior to the meeting, the EPC members had received copies of the 5 Year Program Review as well as other pertinent supporting documents. Given that the EPC had presumably read the documents, Professor Scalise offered some highlights of the program and its rapid growth. (In 1997 the Minor was approved. In 2004 the Major was approved. Presently they have nearly 100 majors and 6 minors.)

Once the overview of the Program Review was given, EPC Chair Jo Yarrington opened the floor for discussion. In her opening remarks, both as EPC member and Chair of the Department in which the New Media program is located, Yarrington noted the challenges entailed with the rapid development of a program within a relatively small department.
Professor Scalise agreed that it is a challenge to have enough qualified faculty to meet the needs of the major and also meet other interests of the students. They have maxed out on space in the Media Center and need more flexible space to really address classroom/pedagogical needs.

Yarrington validated Scalise on the quality of the Program Review but reiterated her concern about the implications of rapid growth for facilities and faculty.

Professor Scalise indicated that they do not want/plan to get much bigger than they already are. Perhaps 125 majors/minors, in total. They want to maintain the personal connection with students that now exists.

A lively discussion ensued, covering such issues as the ‘withering away’ of Radio and the continually changing field of “New Media.” It now involves a good deal of computer generated expertise and relates to new work in animation, motion graphics, and web-design.

Questions were raised about the need for new faculty, the potential cost of new facilities and equipment, the kind of program assessment that might need to take place, how the program could connect across schools and other disciplines, and how the new program is being marketed/promoted.

Professor Scalise indicated that they are in the preliminary stages of program assessment, focusing primarily at the course level. They are working on the mechanics of their curriculum and are in the process of consolidating some of the course requirements. He also indicated that the Dean of CAS is “nudging” them toward more inter-disciplinary, team-teaching with departments such as Communication Studies.

After Professor Scalise made a pitch for the annual Cinefest to be held on May 7 in the Quick Center, he was excused.

After this presentation, it was clear that some members of the EPC were unclear about the role we need to play, if any, with regard to this Five year Program Review. Were we expected to approve or endorse the program? To make recommendations about program changes or growth?

EPC Chair Yarrington indicated that with the declaration of a new major (in this case in January 2004) programs are required to make a Five Year Program review and report to the EPC.

6. Motion to Adjourn: Steve Bachelor with Michael Pagano Seconding. Motion passed.
TO: Academic Council
FM: Giovanni Ruffini
Chair, Faculty Athletics Committee
RE: Registration proposal for consideration
ON: October 26, 2011

At its meeting of October 19, 2011, the Faculty Athletics Committee addressed under old business the issue of reported irregularities in student-athlete course registration. Last year, the committee discussed reports from various faculty members that some student-athletes were (a) registering for classes without meeting with their academic advisors, and/or (b) being registered for classes without their knowledge by third parties.

Upon investigation, and consultation with representatives of the Athletic Division, the committee determined that the first situation was a result of a more widespread deterioration of the academic advising system, not specific to student-athletes, in which registration PINs are easily available to students without meeting with their academic advisors. The committee also determined that the second situation could in certain circumstances be explained by the Athletic Division providing registration assistance to student-athletes whose competitive travel schedules conflicted with registration.

The committee hopes to address both issues with the following motion, which it passed unanimously. In discussion at the October 19 meeting, the motion also received the support of attending guests from the administration and the Athletic Division. The (draft) minutes of that meeting are included for further information on this discussion.

MOTION

That the Faculty Athletics Committee ask the Academic Council to propose to the university administration the following change to the course registration procedure, that use of a student’s PIN not be activated to allow for registration until the student’s faculty academic advisor, department head or a dean has used his or her own Net ID login to verify that he or she has met with the student in person, issued the student’s PIN, and approved the student’s proposed course of study.

RATIONALE

The committee believes that this motion will strengthen the academic advising process. It will do so by making a technical modification to the registration system by which a student will not be able to register without appropriate personnel – an academic advisor, department head or dean – indicating electronically that he or she has advised the student in person and issued the student’s PIN. This will curb the increasing ease with which students get their PINs without academic advising. This in turn will strengthen the academic advising system for all students generally, and help to ensure that more robust academic advising is available to student-athletes specifically.
Faculty Athletic Committee – Excerpts from Minutes 10-19-11

Attending: Arendt, Huntley, Ruffini (chair), Rusu, Torres (recording)
Regrets: Salavei
Guests: Dawn Debiase-Quintiliani, Eugene Doris, Beth Magner-Garvey, Mary Ann Palazzi, Phil Palumbo

2:14 pm – Meeting comes to order

I. Announcements from chair
   - Introductions of members and invited guests
   - Charge of Athletic Committee was reviewed

II. Approval of minutes
   - Minutes approved: 4 in favor and 2 abstentions

III. Old Business
   - Proposed motion was discussed
   - Pros and cons were discussed
     * Addresses existing advising / registration problems and is not only specifically to student athletes
     * The only possible problem will be when student athletes travel
     * It was clarified that the “problem” the motion is trying to address is not necessarily the registration per se, but the advising process
   - The word “academic” was added to faculty advisor, to state “faculty academic advisor.”
   - Moved and seconded to approve motion
   - Motion approved unanimously

   - Next steps: Inform academic council that the committee approved the motion: “That the Faculty Athletics Committee ask the Academic Council to propose to the university administration the following change to the course registration procedure, that use of a student’s PIN not be activated to allow for registration until the student’s faculty academic advisor, department head or a dean has used his or her own Net ID login to verify that he or she has met with the student in person, issued the student’s PIN, and approved the student’s proposed course of study”