ACADEMIC COUNCIL
AGENDA
Monday, December 5, 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 11/7/2011 (attached)
   b. Correspondence
      i. Emails between Prof. DeWitt and AC Executive Committee (attached)
      ii. Document from SVPAA: The Essential features of Academic Programs at Jesuit Colleges and Universities Draft 2.1 (attached)
   c. Oral reports

4. Council Subcommittee Reports
   a. Subcommittee on University College matters (separately stapled)
   b. Subcommittee on voting rights (with packet for 11/7/2011 AC meeting)
   c. Subcommittee for considering remaining items from ad hoc JOR committee recommendations (with packet for 11/7/2011 AC meeting)
   d. Subcommittee to consider proposing IDEA form for administrators
   e. Subcommittee re: Workers’ Bill of Rights

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 (The AC Executive Committee is still drafting the language)

7. New business
   a. Proposals re: Early Childhood Education (with packet for 11/7/2011 AC meeting)
   b. Registration proposal from Faculty Athletics Committee (with packet for 11/7/2011 AC meeting)
   c. UCC motion on core language requirement for DSB (attachments)
   d. Report from Committee on Conference re December 2011 Board of Trustees’ meeting (ongoing Item 2)

• Lists of Attachments, Pending, and Ongoing Items are on page 2
List of Attachments:
For item 3.a Minutes from AC meeting of 11/7/2011 (pages 3-13)
For item 3.b.i Emails between Prof. DeWitt and the AC Executive Committee (pages 14-15)
For item 3.b.ii The Essential features of Academic Programs at Jesuit Colleges and Universities Draft 2.1 (pages 16-18)
For item 4.a Report from the Subcommittee on University College Matters (separately stapled)
For item 4.b Report from the AC Subcommittee on Voting Rights (with materials for 11/7/2011 AC meeting)
For item 4.c Report from the AC Subcommittee to consider remaining items from review of the JOR (with materials for 11/7/2011 AC meeting)
For item 7.a Proposals re: Early Childhood Education and supporting materials (with materials for 11/7/2011 AC meeting)
For item 7.b Registration proposal from Faculty Athletics Committee (with materials for 11/7/2011 AC meeting)
For item 7.c Proposal from DSB to UCC (undated) on foreign language requirements for DSB students (pages 19-24), Excerpted minutes of 1 DSB faculty meeting and 5 DSB Undergraduate Curriculum Committee meetings (pages 25-34), Excerpted minutes of 2 UCC meetings (pages 35-42), Relevant entries from the Journal of Record and Handbook (page 43-44)

Pending Items:
A. Recommendations in report in spring 2002 from Faculty Athletics Committee concerning (i) amounts of time student athletes are absent from classes for trips/athletic activities, (ii) demands placed on student athletes for year-round training, (iii) number of scheduled athletic events that conflict with the University’s final exam schedule, and (iv) amount of money spent on various athletic programs. (See agenda and attachments for 12/4/02 AC meeting; item 6.b of 3/3/03 meeting.)
B. Issues raised at the 10/4/99 AC meeting concerning faculty participation on the finance/budget committee. (See minutes of AC meeting of 11/4/99; 10/29/99 letter from Phil Lane attached to 5/1/00 AC agenda; excerpt of GF minutes of 11/13/92 attached to AC 5/1/00 agenda; AC motion of 11/6/00.)
C. Distance learning issues. (See item 7 of AC minutes of 5/5/03.)
D. Report from the Educational Technologies Committee on security, long-term feasibility, potential for integration, ownership, accessibility, etc. of servers containing faculty data. (See AC minutes of 2/5/2007; AC 4/2/2007 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 7e; AC 3/5/07 6a; AC 4/2/07 6a; AC 9/10/07 3b; AC 10/1/07 6a; AC 2/4/08 2bi).
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.
Faculty Members Present: Professors Jocelyn Boryczka, Steve Bayne, David Zera, David Sapp, Kathy Nantz, Joyce Shea, Debra Strauss, Phil Lane, Brian Walker, Elizabeth Petrino, Dennis Keenan, Cheryl Tromley, Susan Rakowitz (Executive Secretary), Vishnu Vinekar, Rona Preli (Chair), Irene Mulvey (Secretary of the General Faculty), Joe Dennin.

Administrators Present: SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald, Deans Suzanne Campbell, Robbin Crabtree, Don Gibson

Presenters: Professors Betsy Bowen, Rick DeWitt, Paul Lakeland

Regrets: Dean Jack Beal

Absent: Dean Susan Franzosa

1. Presidential Courtesy

SVPAA Fitzgerald reported that notifications regarding campus closures and delays due to inclement weather will no longer be communicated through television. Notifications, instead, will be provided via phone, website, and Stag Alert. Text messages instead of phone calls will be the source of notification. SVPAA Fitzgerald will still make the decision regarding delays and cancellations due to inclement weather. SVPAA Fitzgerald clarified that if campus security feels that turbos can start at 9 a.m., then classes will be held. SVPAA Fitzgerald further stated that the campus never technically closes so the issue is whether or not the campus is safe for people to move around. He continued that faculty live all over the place, so those who can’t make it to campus due to inclement weather, should not hold class.

SVPAA Fitzgerald further reported that early application numbers are currently at 4000, up from 3800 last year, and that campus tours are also up. SVPAA Fitzgerald added that the route and script for tour have been changed, and that faculty are encouraged to stop by tours and interact with the students. SVPAA Fitzgerald continued, noting that guidance counselors recently received a tour and that the deadline for early action decisions was extended due to bad weather and it would be left open until it makes sense to close it.

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

Prof. Keenan suggested that it would be easier for everyone and more clear if it was possible to state that the university would open at “x” time. Professor Zera addressed the similar issue of notification for evening graduate class closing.

SVPAA Fitzgerald responded that the time is based on 10 minutes before given time codes. Prof. Tromley added that Saturdays needed to be included as well.

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty.

Prof. Mulvey stated that there was nothing to report.

3. Report from the Executive Secretary

Prof. Nantz noted that the spelling on Prof. Bowen’s name needed correction.
MOTION [Lane/Dennin]: To approve the minutes of the Academic Council meeting of October 3, 2011 as corrected.

MOTION PASSED: 16 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention.

Prof. Rakowitz stated that there were no oral reports.

Chair Preli requested a Motion to Reorder the Agenda and, if needed at the end of the meeting, a Motion to Recess until Monday, November 21, 2011.

MOTION [Shea/Strauss]: To reorder the agenda for the Academic Council meeting on November 7, 2011 and move to New Business at this time.

MOTION PASSED: 16 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.


a. Report from Committee on Conference re October 2011 Board of Trustees’ (BOT) 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):

Prof. Bowen, Chair of the Committee on Conference, reported on the last meeting with the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees on October 6, 2011. Prof. Bowen reported that Profs. Bernhardt, Bowen, and Gill-Lopez met with the committee. The Committee’s chair summarized the goals for the year as monitoring the three goals of the strategic plan as they relate to academics and to collaborate between Academics and Student Affairs; to monitor progress on accreditation processes for the Schools of Engineering, Business and Nursing and the preparation of the five year NEASC report; and to monitor development of new academic programs in Arts and Sciences at the Graduate level in Public Administration and in Liberal Studies. Prof. Bowen continued that SVPAA Fitzgerald presented a short report on Fairfield’s status in the upcoming US News & World Report rankings as #2 in “Best Regional Universities” (up from #4) and on enrollment data.

Prof. Bowen also presented to the Academic Affairs Committee, the Committee on Conference’s concerns as instructed by the Academic Council: how can we preserve the quality of academics, which is the central mission of the University, in this time of economic pressure? The Academic Affairs Committee responded that they were determined not to erode academic quality in any decision they made. Additionally, Prof. Bowen reported that the Committee on Conference inquired as to what the BOT, in its unique role, is doing to increase revenue for the University? The AA members spoke to the work of BOT members in introducing the President to potential large donors, several events, and being approached for major donations. The AA reported to the Committee on Conference that the University would have to grow its way out of this situation and that it cannot be resolved with cuts.

Prof. Bowen then read and summarized the short reports that she received from the faculty liaisons from Handbook committees to the three BOT subcommittees: Student Life, Information Technology, and Advancement.

Chair Preli then opened the floor for questions.
Prof. Lane asked who was at the meeting and how much time did the Committee have to spend with them?

Prof. Bowen stated that the meeting was well-attended and most AA Committee members participated in the discussion.

Chair Preli asked if the Academic Council wished to give further guidance to the Committee on Conference.

SVPAA Fitzgerald mentioned a major item regarding the Health Sciences and the excitement regarding a new academic building as part of the new capital campaign. SVPAA Fitzgerald expressed that he wants to bring faculty in front of the BOT to discuss research and how to continue excelling in the area.

Prof. Petrinco recommended that Prof. Geoff Church be invited to speak, highlighting the fact that every Fairfield student who applied to medical school last year was accepted.

Prof. Lane recommended that the Committee on Conference have a conversation with the BOT regarding employment trends over the past twenty years that indicate a tilt of resources away from the Academic division.

Prof. Mulvey responded that at the last AC meeting, the group expressed resistance to such involvement on the micro-level of the BOT and inviting them into a discussion about such resource allocations may counter our previous discussion.

Prof. Bowen inquired as to what kinds of reports to the Academic Affairs Committee may concern Prof. Mulvey.

Prof. Mulvey responded that she was more concerned about reports from non-faculty presenters with detailed information on items such as Residential Colleges than reports by our faculty or its liaisons to the BOT.

Prof. Nantz asked Prof. Bowen if she had a sense of other things that needed to be discussed with the BOT? Prof. Nantz indicated that her sense was that the budgetary issues are the most pressing, particularly regarding the staff and future hiring in departments. Prof. Nantz suggested questions for the BOT should include future budget-related steps and what their role would be in these issues.

Prof. Bowen replied that clearly the budget was the most pressing thing at the BOT meeting. Yet, there was not something particular that the AC wanted the committee to ask of the BOT. Additionally, Prof. Bowen stated that the Committee on Conference attends the Academic Affairs Committee not the Finance Committee of the BOT. Prof. Bowen stated that the Academic Affairs Committee did discuss that the budget issues could not be resolved in the long-term with cuts and they did state that they may make cuts in academics but do not want them to erode academic quality and want to be informed if this is the case.

Prof. Nantz asked if the AC might want to provide the BOT with a prioritized list of the items which the AC believes to be most significant such as travel budgets and faculty lines?

Prof. Tromley stated that she agreed with Prof. Mulvey that advising the Committee on Conference in such a way may invite the BOT’s involvement on the micro-level.
Prof. Mulvey stated that a prioritized list may not be the most advantageous option. Rather, the faculty can respond to the BOT if it negatively impacts the academic mission.

Prof. Preli asked if there was anything further for the Committee on Conference?

Prof. Mulvey inquired about the other short reports from subcommittees that were not included with the memo from Prof. Bowen.

Prof. Bowen stated that the chairs of these subcommittees had been reminded to send them in.

Chair Preli stated that the Academic Council advises the Committee on Conference to communicate to the BOT that it proactively, instead of retroactively, engage with the AC or the faculty regarding how budget changes will impact the academic mission.

b. Request to reconsider the Workers’ Bill of Rights

Prof. Rick DeWitt provided an overview and background on how the Workers’ Bill of Rights became an issue for the General Faculty as a result of the Justice for Janitors campaign at Fairfield University in the early 1990s. Prof. DeWitt stated that the language “All campus workers employed under subcontracting (or ‘outsourcing’) agreements shall be accorded these same rights” in the Journal of Record (JOR) is a policy statement and is not outdated. Prof. DeWitt requested that the AC reconsider its decision on April 4, 2011 to eliminate the Workers’ Bill of Rights from the JOR. Prof. DeWitt indicated that the AC may want to consider other documents in which this statement should appear, yet, in the meantime, that this statement should be kept in the JOR. The group of faculty listed in the memo to the Academic Council on pg. 45 of the packet request that the AC amend the motion passed at the April 4, 2011 meeting.

Prof. DeWitt presented two motions that the Academic Council consider regarding amending the motion from the April 4, 2011 meeting and the JOR entry on the Workers’ Bill of Rights.

Prof. Rakowitz stated that a motion to amend did not seem to be in order given that the motion in question had already been implemented. Last spring, the AC Executive Secretary communicated to the SVPAA the Council’s motion to remove this item from the JoR and the SVPAA agreed with the Council’s decision. The item has been removed from the JoR. She also indicated that what the AC removed from the JOR was a statement about what the General Faculty endorsed, not a statement of university policy Prof. Rakowitz further stated that the Workers’ Bill of Rights is too vague to be policy although she is supportive of its principles.

MOTION [Rakowitz/Nantz]: that the Academic Council direct the ACEC to form a subcommittee of 3 faculty and 2 administrators to write policy language in the spirit of the Workers’ Bill of Rights language that the General Faculty endorsed on 4/17/98, and to recommend where this policy should be housed.

Chair Preli asked the AC whether or not Prof. DeWitt could speak for or against the motion and what his speaking privileges were.

Prof. Mulvey stated that with a motion on the floor, a non-member cannot speak on the motion.

MOTION [Lane/Bayne]: to grant speaking privileges to Prof. DeWitt as an invited speaker. MOTION PASSED: 16 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.
Prof. DeWitt stated that the language for the Workers’ Bill of Rights should not be taken out of the JOR and the language to amend it is not out of order since everything is amendable except in the most extreme situations.

SVPAA Fitzgerald spoke in favor of the motion, stating that all of the workers on-campus possess a right to unionize, although SunGuard is not unionized, and that President von Arx supports this Bill of Rights which is based on solid principles. SVPAA Fitzgerald asked, where might this Bill be best enshrined to speak to the values of this community: the JOR, Handbook, contracts – employees, contractors, etc. SVPAA Fitzgerald stated that it could be enshrined in many places such as our mission statement.

Prof. Dennin spoke in favor of the motion and asked about the inconsistency in Prof. DeWitt’s suggestion which involved leaving the Bill in the JOR “as is” and revising the language.

Prof DeWitt responded that it is a two-step process involving passing the first motion to put the language back in the JOR and then the second motion to amend the language put back in the JOR.

Dean Crabtree spoke in favor of the motion to create a subcommittee since this issue is complicated and supports a subcommittee that would give the issue due attention.

Prof. Mulvey spoke in favor of the motion, pointing out that the language has been removed from the JOR and the AC cannot unilaterally put it back in. Returning it to the JOR would need SVPAA Fitzgerald’s approval as well as the AC’s approval. Prof. Mulvey added that, as a member of the JOR subcommittee that worked for over two years on cleaning up the JOR, the subcommittee recommended and the AC approved of this removal because the Bill is not a policy statement. Prof. Mulvey stated that the General Faculty endorsed the statement of the Workers’ Bill of Rights and it was the position of the JOR Subcommittee that statements or positions of the GF are not appropriate for the JOR.

Prof. Nantz spoke in favor of the motion and, as a member of the JOR subcommittee, agreed with Prof. Mulvey regarding the JOR committee’s review of the Bill.

**MOTION [Nantz/Dennin]: to call the question.**

**MOTION to call the question PASSED:** 14 in favor, 2 opposed, 1 abstention.

**MAIN MOTION PASSED:** 16 in favor, 1 opposed, 0 abstentions.

**MOTION [Lane/Bayne]: that the motion from the 4/4/11 AC meeting, “The Academic Council accepts all of the items listed in bullet 3 with the exception of #22 and #44” be amended to read “The Academic Council accepts all of the items listed in bullet 3 with the exception of #22, #44, and the section of the Workers’ Bill of Rights under #55.**

Prof. DeWitt stated that he would be happy to sit on the subcommittee but that the language should not be taken out of the JOR.

Chair Preli asked if there was a ruling given by Roberts Rules of Order regarding whether or not a motion to amend is appropriate.

Prof. Rakowitz stated that motions to rescind a motion that has been implemented are in order only if the voting body is solely responsible for implementing the motion and that is not the case here.

**MOTION [Dennin/Rakowitz]: to call the question.**
MOTION to call the question PASSED: 11 in favor, 4 opposed, 1 abstention.

MAIN MOTION FAILED: 3 in favor, 9 opposed, 2 abstentions.

c. Two Proposed Motions from the Rank and Tenure Committee

Prof. Keenan introduced the first motion and offered background concerning its rationale as stated on p. 47 of the AC packet.

MOTION [Keenan/Rakowitz]: that the Executive Committee of the Academic Council form a subcommittee (consisting of an administrator and cross-school representation) 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.

SVPAA Fitzgerald spoke in favor of the motion, stating that we should be explicit in our rewards structure around this scholarship.

Prof. Nantz spoke in favor of the motion.

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

Prof. Lakeland, Chair of the Rank and Tenure Committee, referred the AC to the distributed handout (attached) that modifies the material in the AC packet. Prof. Lakeland stated that the first change removes reference to tenure-track positions and replace it with full-time positions, and the second change removes “consecutive.” Prof. Lakeland stated that these changes were made in order to better reflect AAUP standards. Prof. Lakeland stated that the Rank and Tenure Committee is responsible to the GF, and it did not want to include anything that would prevent its passage in the GF.

MOTION [Tromley/Zera]: 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 years in a full-time 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 appropriate faculty.

Prof. Tromley spoke strongly in favor of this motion, stating that the current policy allowing candidates to go up twice undermines their ability to achieve tenure.

Prof. Mulvey agreed that the language regarding going up for tenure more than once needed to be cleaned up. Prof. Mulvey indicated that the term “normally” may add too much wiggle-room and allow faculty to file a grievance with the AAUP. Prof. Mulvey questioned if “No one can be a candidate more than once” effectively shortens the probationary period agreed upon at the time of
hire. Prof. Mulvey stated that if someone comes up early, and gets turned down, then they get a terminal contract the following year, but the candidate may have a letter of appointment that says that they have a 6 year probationary period. Prof. Mulvey stated that she supported fixing the language so that the candidate applied once.

Prof. Nantz asked a point of information regarding whether there is such a thing as a 6 year contract.

SVPAA Fitzgerald responded that at the time of hire there is a discussion between the faculty member and the Dean regarding time toward probation and appointments at rank, and there can be negotiation at that point. SVPAA Fitzgerald stated that the initial letter of appointment may account for previous service and its applicability towards tenure, and a maximum probationary period is stated.

Prof. Walker asked a point of information regarding whether or not there would be grandfathering for current faculty members.

Dean Crabtree asked what is the will of the Rank and Tenure Committee regarding the grandfathering of current faculty.

SVPAA Fitzgerald stated that the initial letter to the faculty member is the most important, and they would be allowed to choose the better of the two; nothing would be done to change the conditions under which they began other than to make it better.

Prof Nantz turned to the second part of the motion and asked if those in an extraordinary position cannot reapply.

Prof. Keenan stated that the Rank and Tenure Committee does not want candidates to be able to reapply.

Prof. Lane asked for clarification regarding the fact that the first part of the motion refers to five years and the second says six years.

Prof. Lakeland stated that the first part of the motion indicates when a candidate can apply for tenure - in sixth year – and the second part of the motion applies to appointment.

Prof. Lane asked for clarification regarding the case where someone applies for tenure with approval of SVPAA and it is not given but they receive promotion.

SVPAA Fitzgerald stated that the Rank and Tenure Committee would decide and their recommendations go to the President which could allow for a promotion in rank but not tenure.

Prof. Sapp stated that he did not see a problem since the contract would be the actual date of employment.

Prof. Keenan asked a point of clarification regarding including the term “normally” to address the issue raised by Prof. Mulvey.

**MOTION [Mulvey/Sapp]:** to amend the main motion to delete “normally” in Section II.A.3.b.(3).

Prof. Mulvey spoke in favor of the motion, stating that “normally” means anything goes.
Prof. Sapp asked what if we hire a corporate person for the President – that person does not have tenure since they are not an academic.

Prof. Dennin stated that if “normally” is taken out, then the only choice is to complete five years before applying.

SVPAA Fitzgerald stated that a senior hire with rank and tenure at another university would have to give that up that and go through a two year period before receiving it here.

Prof. Shea stated that she was not sure if it helps at all to include “candidate for tenure is expected to have completed a probationary period.”

Prof. Walker stated that the language means that a candidate has to be here for two years before applying and that is the limit.

Prof. Tromley stated that she did understand the need to take “normally” out and supported removing it since she did not support having anyone move to tenure and promotion without at least five years in the academic profession.

SVPAA Fitzgerald posed a hypothetical to consider amending the text to read “with the exception of those who are tenured at the time of initial appointment” which would allow the university to bring in this person from another university as a senior hire.

Prof. Dennin returned to the language “shall have completed a period of five years” and the fact that there is not an extraordinary petition in second motion.

Prof. Mulvey asked for a point of clarification regarding whether or not a candidate can apply for extraordinary petition after one year.

Prof. Dennin stated that the term “normally” may be included so that people can come up early in extraordinary cases.

After discussion, the pending MOTION to amend was WITHDRAWN [Mulvey/Sapp].

MOTION [Nantz/Shea]: to amend the main motion, replacing "...shall have normally completed a probationary period..." with "...is expected to have completed a probationary period..."

Prof. Lane asked a point of information, is this consistent with the Handbook regarding the exceptional cases in which the Rank and Tenure Committee can determine this?

Prof. Lakeland stated that there is a line in the Handbook for unusual qualifications that allows the President to ask the Rank and Tenure Committee for a recommendation.

Prof. Keenan spoke against the motion, stating that he did not see how this changes the “normally” language, a term used pervasively throughout the Handbook.

MOTION [Mulvey/Petrino]: to recess the AC meeting to November 21, 2011.

MOTION PASSED: 16 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.

Respectfully Submitted,

Jocelyn M. Boryczka
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: November 7, 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 Executive Committee of the Academic Council form a subcommittee (consisting of an administrator and cross-school representation) 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 years in a full-time 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 appropriate faculty.

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).
MEMO

To: Academic Council
From: Rick DeWitt
Date: 11/15/11
Re: AAUP policies and recent proposals from the Rank and Tenure Committee

At the last Academic Council meeting (11/7/11) a number of statements were made concerning AAUP policies as they relate to a proposal under discussion from the Rank and Tenure Committee. Obviously, if AAUP policies are going to factor into a Council decision, it would be helpful for Council members to have an accurate understanding of those policies, and that is my main purpose in writing.

In a nutshell, the proposal under discussion at the last meeting, that is, the proposal concerning the minimum probationary period before applying for academic tenure, is not in any way at odds with AAUP policies. Neither do AAUP policies require that we adopt that proposal in order to be in accord with those policies. For example, our current policy, the one the Rank and Tenure proposal is intended to replace, is also consistent with AAUP policies. But it is worth noting that contrary to suggestions made at the AC meeting, the proposal from the Rank and Tenure Committee discussed at that meeting is not at odds with the policies of the AAUP.*

Below I have copied the most relevant section of the AAUP policy concerning probationary periods, and I have also provided links to a web page containing the full policy and a related AAUP statement. Although these statements are worth reading in their entirety, below is a summary of the key aspects of AAUP policies that relate most directly to the Rank and Tenure proposal under discussion.

- “After the expiration of a probationary period, teachers or investigators should have permanent or continuous tenure, and their service should be terminated only for adequate cause … or under extraordinary circumstances because of financial exigencies.”
- With limited exceptions, the maximum probationary period should not exceed seven years, including previous service in full-time positions at other institutions.
- The AAUP has no policy on minimum probationary periods. For example, it would be in keeping with AAUP policies to allow applications for tenure after a probationary period of 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 years, or to allow applications for tenure in each of those years, or to allow applications for tenure only after completing 5 years.
- One notable exception that might result in a probationary period exceeding the normal maximum of seven years would be if a new hire has served a probationary period of more than three years at one or more other institutions. In such cases it may be agreed in writing at the time of appointment that the probationary period at the new institution will be for a period of no more than four years. So, for example, our current policy of requiring a minimum probationary period of two years at Fairfield for those who have credit for service elsewhere, even when it results in the total probationary period exceeding the normal seven year maximum, is consistent with AAUP policy.
- Other exceptions noted in AAUP statements that might result in a probationary period exceeding seven years include cases where the previous service occurred many years in the past; situations in which prior service had significantly different responsibilities or was in a significantly different institutional setting; situations in which a faculty member is a primary coequal caregiver of newborn or newly adopted children; and situations where there is a scholarly leave of absence and there is a mutual agreement to stop the tenure clock or extend the probationary period.

As a final note, the probationary period is the maximum time before one has tenure, not the maximum time before one applies for tenure. So, for example, given Fairfield’s application process and barring exceptions to the normal maximum of seven years for the probationary period, the latest one could apply for tenure would be after his or her fifth year of full time service.

Here is an excerpt from the AAUP’s Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure. This is the main passage concerning probationary periods. The numbers in brackets refer to interpretive comments contained in the full document.
Beginning with appointment to the rank of full-time instructor or a higher rank,[5] the probationary period should not exceed seven years, including within this period full-time service in all institutions of higher education; but subject to the proviso that when, after a term of probationary service of more than three years in one or more institutions, a teacher is called to another institution, it may be agreed in writing that the new appointment is for a probationary period of not more than four years, even though thereby the person’s total probationary period in the academic profession is extended beyond the normal maximum of seven years.[6] Notice should be given at least one year prior to the expiration of the probationary period if the teacher is not to be continued in service after the expiration of that period.[7]

Links to the complete AAUP Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure from which the above statement is excerpted, as well as the AAUP’s Recommended Institutional Regulations on Academic Freedom and Tenure, can be found under the AAUP Policy Statements heading on the Publications page of the FWC/AAUP website:

www.faculty.fairfield.edu/rdewitt/FWC/Publications.html

Also of interest is the AAUP’s statement On Crediting Prior Service Elsewhere as Part of the Probationary Period. Copyright issues prevent me from posting this latter statement to the FWC/AAUP webpage; however, I have requested the needed permissions and will post the statement should I receive those permissions.

As always, thanks to all the Council members for your work.

* It is worth noting that I am not implying that all of our policies related to tenure are completely consistent with AAUP policies. For example, our policy allowing in some circumstances Professors of the Practice to serve nine years in a full-time position without tenure is not consistent with AAUP policies. But over the years our tenure policies have generally respected AAUP policies.

I should also note that this memo is not in any way an endorsement of the proposals before the Council. My only point is to clarify AAUP policies and how the Rank and Tenure proposal relates to those policies.

From: "Rakowitz, Susan" <srakowitz@fairfield.edu>
Date: November 17, 2011 3:07:51 PM EST
To: Richard DeWitt <rdewitt@fairfield.edu>
Cc: "Preli, Rona" <RPreli@fairfield.edu>, "Mulvey, Irene" <Mulvey@fairfield.edu>, "Fitzgerald, Paul" <pfitzgerald@fairfield.edu>
Subject: Re: Memo to AC members

Rick,

Our procedure is for correspondence to the Council to go in a packet as correspondence, which is what we will do with this memo to AC members. Official channels of communication are not typically used for individual faculty members to weigh in with their opinions about business under the Council's consideration. If there's a viewpoint you would like to see expressed at the meeting, you should convey it to one of your representatives on the Council.

Susan
AJCU institutions are committed to teaching and learning; scholarly research and creative activity; and service to local, regional and international communities; and in so doing, we fulfill our mission to promote the good of each and the good of all. Each of the 28 member institutions has its own unique history, and yet we also share a common tradition of Ignatian pedagogy with each other and with 200 plus Jesuit works of higher learning around the globe. We are communities of teaching scholars for whom the many ways of learning are pursued in a grand conversation that seeks to find mutually enlightening connections among the many academic disciplines. Study of the Humanities, the Arts, the Social and the Natural Sciences are integrated, not only for their mutual enrichment, but also to suggest a holistic appreciation of the nature of reality in general and a comprehensive view of human beings in particular. We design academic programs, including those in our professional schools, which call upon the creative and the imaginative, the rational and the analytical, the intuitive and the self-reflective, for the full development of every student.

As academic institutions…

We embrace academic freedom both because we are American universities and because academic freedom is a core expression of our traditional respect for the autonomy of reason and the sovereignty of well-formed conscience. We believe that the life of the mind and the pursuit of the good are both a duty and a vocation.

We live out this call to free inquiry in ways that honor our habits and customs of intellectual rigor and respectful engagement with all persons and cultures, both by our particular agendas of research / creative activity and by conceptualizing, offering and assessing the quality of a wide variety of academic programs.
As Jesuit institutions…

We find in Ignatius of Loyola, founder of the Society of Jesus, remains a touchstone for all Jesuit institutions and projects. A stargazer, a pilgrim, a spiritual master and a true friend, Ignatius sensed the interconnectedness of everything. Four foundational spiritual insights of St. Ignatius continue to animate our work:

- seeking and finding God in all things,
- care for the whole person (*cura personalis*),
- the art of discernment and
- the quest for the most excellent way of proceeding (the *Magis*).

The first two foundational spiritual insights about the nature of the cosmos and human beings promote ways of thinking and knowing and thus shape our academic programs. Seen within the context of the Catholic intellectual tradition of the Church in which the Jesuits have operated, "seeking and finding God in all things," properly understood, posits that the universe is meaningful rather than meaningless, that chaos, brokenness and finitude exist within a larger context of intelligibility and emerging order, and that human reason, while unable to exhaust the mysteries of the universe, has, can and will continue to advance the body of human knowledge about the nature and meaning of reality. Faculty colleagues from diverse religious and philosophical backgrounds may use diverse vocabularies to describe our shared mission, yet all contribute something essential to a project that engages our students, leading them to broaden their horizons, advance their intellectual abilities, and strengthen their confidence and capacity as ethical leaders of tomorrow.

The latter two Ignatian insights, discernment and the Magis, inspire the distinct Ignition pedagogy of our institutions. The first is a habit of integrating ways of learning/knowing with thoughtful decisions/actions. Ignatian formation led people to be "contemplatives in action," by which Ignatius did not mean alternate, discrete times of action and reflection but rather a mindfulness and an attentiveness in the midst of our full personal and professional engagement.
The active contemplative is fully present as a thinking and feeling person who is attentive to the needs of all the stakeholders in every decision, is just and ethical, practical and pragmatic, in a word, a person of integrity. Our academic programs build this capacity in our students. While perfection is not possible within history, yet it is always possible, when faced with real choices, to do the better thing. Ignatius' exhortation to the Magis is not to a quantitative "more" (as in more money or more prestige or more power) but rather a qualitative "more" (as in more apt, more just, more holy). The Magis gives rise to a habit of integrating mind and heart in the process of decision-making that is respectful of self, others and the world as a whole.

Therefore, the distinctive ways in which academic programs within Jesuit Colleges and Universities are excellent are based on these essential characteristics:

I. Integrative ways of thinking and knowing that fosters creativity.

II. Dialogue between faith and reason, religion and science.

III. Promoting the inalienable dignity of all persons and appreciating the social destiny of persons.

IV. Appreciating the diversity of human cultures as an invitation to mutually enriching dialogue.

V. Seeking the common good and just social structures.

VI. A passion for life-long learning.

VII. Habits of ethical reflection and moral courage.

VIII. A sense of generous solidarity in the exercise of thoughtful leadership.
Modern and Classical Languages Requirement for Charles F. Dolan School of Business Undergraduate Students

Motion: To change the Modern and Classical Languages requirement for Charles F. Dolan School of Business undergraduate students from two semesters at the intermediate level to two semesters of the same language at any level.

Rationale for a Proposed Change to the Foreign Language Requirement for DSB Students
Discussion regarding the foreign language requirement for business students began during the final Dolan School of Business (DSB) Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UCC) meeting of the 2008-2009 academic year, upon learning of the redefinition of the language placement requirements by the Department of Modern and Classical Languages. After evaluating the placement results for DSB students over the last two academic years, the committee has identified a number of supportive reasons to propose a change in the foreign language requirement. The DSB UCC asks that the University’s Undergraduate Curriculum Committee consider a change in the foreign language requirement for Dolan School of Business students from two semesters at the intermediate level to two semesters of foreign language at any level.

Background and Overview
Changes in the foreign language placement policies have resulted in a substantial increase in the number of DSB students placed in elementary level language. When Department of Modern and Classical Languages consolidated the previous levels of language into two levels and maintained a rigorous placement policy, the percentage of students continuing with the same language from high school who placed in the elementary level increased from less than 10% to over 60%. Students placed in the elementary level are required to take four semesters of language versus two semesters. DSB students have only four electives and, therefore, two of those electives are being used to fulfill their language requirement. This negatively impacts DSB students’ ability to pursue complimentary curricular and co-curricular learning opportunities, including minors or double majors in the College of Arts and Sciences disciplines. It also limits student abroad experiences because of the reduction in the number of free electives. Further, it raises the overall credit count for our students to 127, as the DSB requires 41 three or four credit courses and a minimum of 123 credits.

Placement Results for Class of 2014
The information below was pulled on 10/29/10 so the number of students not registered for language includes students who were never registered for language as well as those who withdrew from the course. Data includes transfer credits and/or AP Credit as well as “in progress” courses.
Languages Included: AR, CI, FR, GM, HE, IT, JA, RU, SP
Class of 2014 students who have credit for or are registered for Elementary Language (level 110 or 111) = 108

Class of 2014 students who have credit for or are registered for Intermediate Language (level 210 or 211) = 66

Class of 2014 who have no credit for and are not registered for any language course = 52

This information illustrates that the majority of the DSB freshmen class will be required to take 4 semesters of language (16 credits) in order to complete the core requirement.

**Two Semesters of a Language at any Level**

- Requiring students to complete two semesters of foreign language at any level provides students with greater flexibility to individualize their plan of study. With four free electives, they can pursue opportunities to double major and minor in complimentary programs in the College of Arts and Sciences, take advantage of internships in those programs, or pursue a double major or minor in a second Business area. Cross-school and cross-discipline curriculum integration are important to the quality of our students’ educational experience and is something that the University advocates through programs such as the Integration of the Core.

- Changing the language requirement to two semesters at any level would be advantageous in terms of international education opportunities. The current requirement places constraints on the ability of DSB students to study abroad. Of particular concern are the international business exchanges which are excellent opportunities for DSB students but often times require multiple electives because liberal arts core courses tend not to be offered. Such opportunities are limited for students who must complete four semesters of foreign language, thereby using two of their four free electives.

  In addition, foreign language would not have to be completed during the first year; the requirement could be satisfied during the sophomore year or immediately preceding international education. This would enable students to “intentionally” select their language and more effectively integrate foreign language with their international experience.

- A two semester language requirement might foster student study of non-traditional languages, such as Chinese and Arabic. In particular, students who place in the intermediate level of a language they took throughout high school might opt for a non-traditional language if it is a two semester requirement.

- When comparing the DSB language requirements with those of Fairfield University’s other professional schools, the DSB requirements are more restrictive. Currently, the School of Engineering does not require foreign language and the School of Nursing offers students a choice: two semesters of visual and performing arts or two semesters of intermediate foreign language.
DSB language requirements appear to be more extensive than other Jesuit business schools. Marquette University’s business school doesn’t require any foreign language, except for international business majors. Foreign language can be taken as an elective at Marquette. Gonzaga University’s business program requires only 3 hours or one foreign language course. Saint Joseph University requires only 1-2 language courses depending on placement. Xavier University requires six hours of a language or fewer if at the intermediate level and the College of the Holy Cross requires only two courses at any level.

The DSB UCC and the faculty in the DSB support a foreign language requirement. However, the benefits of a change to a two course language requirement at any level would enhance the educational experiences of our students on campus and abroad. It would enable our students to pursue double majors and minors across schools and within the DSB, afford opportunities to explore academic areas of interest, and enable students to study abroad and intentionally link their language to their abroad experience.

**ADDENDUM :**

**Placement Results for Class of 2015**

Languages Included: AR, CI, FR, GM, HE, IT, JA, RU, SP

- Class of 2015 students who have credit for or are registered for Elementary Language (level 110) = **168**
- Class of 2015 students who have credit for or are registered for Intermediate Language (level 210) = **87**
- Class of 2015 who have no credit for and are not registered for any language course = **27**

Sixty percent of the DSB Class of 2015 will be required to take 4 semesters of language (16 credits) in order to complete the core requirement.

The graphs below reflect the percentage of DSB students placed in the various language levels prior to the consolidation of the sequences (Classes 2009, 2010, 2011) and following the consolidation of the sequences (Classes 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015). The comparison illustrates the percentage increase of DSB students placed in Elementary and therefore, required to complete 4 semesters of language.
DSB Curriculum and Implications for Completion of Introductory Core Courses

- DSB graduation requirements – 41 3- or 4-credit courses and a minimum of 123 credits
  - DSB curriculum 1st year:
    - 10 required courses
- AC11-AC12; EC11-EC12; EN11-EN12; Calc I and II, Lang Sequence I and II

- DSB curriculum 2nd year:
  - 6 required courses for those who placed in intermediate language during their first year (8 for accounting majors/minors) + 4 core courses (2 for accounting majors/minors)
  - 8 required courses for those who placed in elementary language their first year + 2 core courses (10 for accounting majors, 0 core courses)
    - IS100, MG101, MK101, FI101, OM101, MA217
    - AC203-AC204 (accounting majors/minors)
    - Intermediate Language (for those students who were placed in elementary as 1st year students)
  - This leaves only 2 courses for required liberal arts core for those students who placed in elementary language (0 for accounting majors/minors)

- Changing the language requirement to 2 semesters gives DSB students the opportunity to take additional core courses including HI30, RS10, PH10, VPA, etc. during their first or second year.
- In cases where students postpone language until sophomore year, DSB students would have the opportunity to take introductory core courses during the 1st year along with their peers and increases their opportunities within the Cornerstone Program course offerings.
- This flexibility also reduces the number of upper-level DSB students enrolled in introductory core courses.

**Advising**

- Incoming first year students will be advised that 2 semesters of foreign language are required. Students may continue in the language they have been placed in or they may choose to begin a new language.
- Students will be advised that they may postpone the language requirement until sophomore year if they plan to begin a new language and if they plan to connect language study with international education.
- Students may complete 1 semester of language at Fairfield and 1 semester of language through an international program only if both courses are in the same language.
- Students will be advised during June Orientation to explore non-traditional languages.
Students will be advised to complete the language sequence during their first year if they plan to continue the same language they studied in HS and they must remain in the level they have been placed in.

Students will be strongly advised to continue with language study above and beyond the requirement in order to gain proficiency and to better prepare for international education.

**Change of School / Transfer Students**

- Students who begin in DSB and transfer to CAS, will be required to complete 2 semesters of foreign language at the intermediate level.
  - Currently, students who transfer to DSB from ENGR or NURS, must still complete 2 semesters at the intermediate level even though their original school did not require it.
- Students who begin in CAS and transfer to DSB, will apply 2 language courses toward the core requirement. Language courses above and beyond this requirement will satisfy free electives.
- Transfer students from outside of Fairfield may transfer foreign language courses from their previous institution pending a grade of C or higher (*current Fairfield policy*). Transfer students must complete 2 semesters of the same foreign language.
4. New Business

B. Motion of Foreign Language Study from Undergraduate Committee

**Motion:** To change the Modern and Classical Languages requirement for Charles F. Dolan School of Business undergraduate students from two semesters at the intermediate level to two semesters of the same language at any level was made by Professor Sharlene McEvoy and seconded by Professor Carl Scheraga. (attached)

Professor Cathy Giapponi presented the rationale for the proposed change to the language requirement for business students. Professor Giapponi explained the change in language placement over the last two years and the related implications for business students including the ability to complete various minors/majors, specifically in regards to CAS disciplines, as well as study abroad opportunities. Professor Giapponi did a comparison of other cohort business schools and most schools with a rigorous placement policy have a requirement of two semesters at any level. Professor Giapponi added that this change will give students greater flexibility and intentionality in selecting language courses and may also promote non-traditional languages as students better pair language study with international education. Currently, the School of Engineering does not require language and the School of Nursing offers students a choice between two semesters of intermediate language and two semesters of visual and performing arts. The Dolan School of Business UCC, in collaboration with the departments, continues to promote language study within the curriculum and is suggesting a change in the number of semesters required in lieu of the current placement policies.

Professor David Schmidt asked for an explanation of the language requirement and placement process before the change.

Professor Giapponi explained that the changes within the department condensed the various levels and the intermediate requirement became more rigorous thereby increasing the percentage of business students required to take 4 semesters of language. Assistant Dean Petraglia further explained that the previous levels, including Basic, Basic Review, Intermediate, and Continuing, was collapsed into Elementary and Intermediate. The redefinition of placement resulted in the majority of business students being placed into Elementary even if they had studied the language in high school. This has had a great impact on students’ ability to individualize their plan of study including international education opportunities, specifically business exchanges, due to the limited number of free electives within the business curriculum.

A discussion took place on the changes from the current language requirement to the proposed requirement and how it affects DSB students during the academic planning process. The promotion of language study including study in non-traditional languages was highlighted.

It was the consensus of the faculty that all were in favor of the change.

Dean Solomon called for the motion. The motion carried unanimously.
Fairfield University
DSB Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
April 20, 2011 @ 3:00 pm
DSB 1109A
Meeting Minutes [EXCERPTED]

Attended: Norm Solomon, Heather Petraglia, Ahmed Ebrahim, Cathy Giapponi, Nikki Lee-Wingate, Valeria Martinez, Camelia Micu, Yasin Ozcelik
Absent: None
Excused:

2. Discussion on the language proposal.

The Chairman of the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee agreed to put the DSB language requirement proposal on the agenda for their May 3rd meeting. Dean Solomon, Assistant Dean Petraglia, Professor Giapponi and Professor Gibson will be representing the Dolan School of Business at the meeting.

Faculty committee members discussed concerns expressed by their freshmen advisees during registration advising sessions this year. Many freshmen are now realizing the ramifications of taking four language courses and the limitation it is placing on their ability to complete a second major or a minor.

Professor Giapponi and Assistant Dean Petraglia have written a draft of the rationale to be voted on at the DSB full faculty meeting on April 26th. We will need a motion, rationale, minute notes and discussion from the April 26th DSB full faculty meeting for the UCC meeting on May 3rd.
Fairfield University
DSB Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
March 16, 2011 @ 2:30 pm
DSB 1109A
Meeting Minutes [EXCERPTED]

Attended: Norm Solomon, Heather Petraglia, Ahmed Ebrahim, Cathy Giapponi, Nikki Lee-Wingate, Valeria Martinez, Yasin Ozcelik
Absent: None
Excused: Camelia Micu

1. Vote on proposed change in the language requirement in order to forward on to DSB full faculty for vote.

We would like to vote today as a committee on a language proposal. The first option is the two semesters of the same language at any level. The second option is to adopt one of the approaches taken by the other professional schools. The School of Engineering has no language requirement and the School of Nursing offers a choice between two semesters of a language at the intermediate level or two visual and performing arts courses.

Feedback from all of the DSB departments indicates a preference for two semesters of the same language at any level. It would be our ideal situation to move forward to the faculty with the first option.

The growing concern among all departments over the language placement has created buzz around the University. The language department must ensure that enough sections will be offered to the incoming freshmen class this summer.

The committee voted to approve the proposal to change the language requirement for DSB students to two semesters of the same language at any level and agreed to put the proposal on the agenda for a vote at the next DSB faculty meeting on April 26, 2011. This is an important issue and it is best to present to the faculty rather than conduct an online vote. If approved by the DSB faculty, the proposal will be put on the agenda for the next meeting of the University’s Undergraduate Curriculum Committee.
Fairfield University
DSB Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
December 8, 2010 @ 11:00 am
DSB 1109
Meeting Minutes [EXCERPTED]

Attended: Norm Solomon, Cathy Giapponi, Ahmed Ebrahim, Nikki Lee-Wingate, Valeria Martinez, Yasin Ozcelik, Heather Petraglia
Absent: None
Excused: None

Cathy welcomed Prof. Carolan, Department Chair of Modern Languages, to the meeting. Cathy stated the purpose of this meeting was to discuss the foreign language requirement for the Dolan School of Business students and get Prof. Carolan’s thoughts on changing the requirement to two semesters of a language at any level.

Dean Solomon stated the Dolan School of Business’ request should be considered since there are exceptions to the language requirements for the other professional schools, the School of Nursing and School of Engineering.

Mary Ann inquired if we looked at other University core requirements for change?

Heather Petraglia mentioned that the Dolan School of Business is reviewing the math requirement as well. We require three math courses; one course above the University core requirement. We require statistics but in order to take it, the course requires two semesters of calculus. We will be having a meeting with the math department next semester.

Heather pointed out that two years ago when the language core courses were condensed and some removed, the number of students placed in elementary level skyrocketed. Two out of 4 free electives are now being used. This was the cause for the current discussion.

Dean Solomon indicated that the DSB needs to work within accreditation guidelines. Certain schools require three accounting core courses; we require only two accounting core courses. We require one intro course in each subject area. Our major core courses are standard six courses. Dean Solomon feels it is important to take language courses but now it is beginning to take up too many free electives for business students.

Mary Ann stated the position of the language department. Several years ago they were asked to re-examine their courses. The basic level was designed for students who had not taken the language in high school. The intermediate level was for students who took the language but were not competent in it. Some students are not even up to AP level. She indicated that students are less and less prepared to enter the intermediate level. As a department, they have to place students in the appropriate level. The department is not pleased with students’ language competency at the completion of intermediate level. It is ironic that the study abroad experience is constrained because of language requirement.
There was a discussion of the issue of linking language and the study abroad experience. Heather indicated that she has talked with the study abroad office. There is no real link between the language taken at Fairfield and where students go abroad. If we have two semesters at any level, students could have the option of taking language sophomore year, closer to when they go abroad.

Mary Ann felt that the four semesters could be retained by starting the language in the sophomore year and then taking intensive intermediate level abroad.

Heather indicated that there are sequencing issues with taking the language abroad and sometimes the language courses offered did not meet the requirements of the intermediate level at Fairfield. Students, therefore, lose another elective with the abroad language course.

Dean Solomon pointed out that many Jesuit schools require two language courses at any level. You want students to be competent and can argue students are less prepared coming out of high school. But in the end, we have to teach the students we have coming to the University. The language department wants to foster the critical languages – Chinese, Arabic, etc. Mary Ann’s colleagues feel strongly if we go to two courses at any level, students will most likely not take the second half of the course in that level. Staffing is a large problem for the department with only seven full-time faculty members and over thirty adjuncts.

Ahmed Ebrahim said the accounting department would like to give students more flexibility and more opportunities for experiences, but having students take four semesters of language might limit students.

Nikki Lee-Wingate said that you have to look at a student’s motivation. If a student is faced with taking four semesters of a language, that student will have a “hate it” mentality. Instead if you have a two semester at any level requirement, a student may be motivated to take a critical language and perhaps even link it with study abroad.

Cathy observed that the University is looking at integration of the core. We would like to foster such integration and afford the students the opportunity to be more intentional about their language selection. The opportunity to integrate their language more effectively into their business program would be greater with a two course requirement and would benefit the students. We pursued this type of integration with the English department and now certain sections of EN 11 and EN 12 are business focused. We want students to be more intentional in order to enhance their learning and see connections between courses. With the way the language requirement is currently structured, it is not intentional.

Mary Ann suggested encouraging students to take summer language courses prior to entering freshmen year. The committee felt this could be a turnoff to students and we could potentially lose more students during the summer melt. We risk losing some of our best students who opt for a program that doesn’t require summer courses prior to entering the University in the Fall.

Nikki Lee-Wingate asked Mary Ann how many students are currently enrolled in critical languages.
Mary Ann said that there are an average of 10 students in each of the critical languages, compared to 310 students in Spanish and 150 students in Italian. During June orientation, the department tried to encourage those students that placed out of the language requirement to try a critical language.

Dean Solomon felt that if you had two semesters at any level, it could encourage our better students to take up a critical language. How is what we have now building up the critical languages? Heather thought it might be interesting to see how many business students are in the critical languages.

Mary Ann asked why the business school is focusing on the language requirement. Why isn’t the committee focusing on other University core requirements such as Visual and Performing Arts or religion requirements to free up curriculum?

Cathy indicated that this is a problem that recently arose. Up until two years ago, most of our students placed into Intermediate and, therefore, took two language courses. With the change in placement, the percentage of business students requiring four semesters of the language increased from less than 10% to over 60%. This takes away 2 of their four free electives.

Yasin Ozcelik indicated that the Information Systems department believes that reducing the required number of language courses would provide our students with flexibility. Other committee members agreed and such flexibility would enable students to pursue minors or double majors and explore areas of interest.

Mary Ann conceded some students are just not good at languages and the teachers are doing their best to teach these students.

Dean Solomon was pleased that we voiced our concerns to Mary Ann and that she understands our concerns. He voiced to Mary Ann that in all fairness, it would’ve been helpful if department would’ve consulted with us when the changes were made. Now we are left to react to the implications of the placement changes. What do we do with the situation now? How do we best serve our students? Our hope is that we can work together to everyone’s satisfaction.

Mary Ann was taking back the DSB argument to her department.

Dean Solomon thanked Mary Ann for coming.

The committee stayed to debrief. Heather’s concern is that two years ago the intermediate level was redefined and by default the core changed. The DSB must focus on effectively servicing and meeting the needs of our students.

Cathy posed the question, “what next?”

Dean Solomon feels our proposal of two semesters of language at any level most likely will not be accepted by the language department based on Mary Ann’s reception. We may have to ask that the DSB be given the same consideration as the Nursing School: two courses in either
language or visual and performing arts. We would like DSB students to take language but if it causes them hardship, this would give students some flexibility.

Heather mentioned that the past two years, the School of Nursing students opted to take more visual and performing arts courses over the language.

The next step is to present a committee proposal to our faculty and then University UCC. The committee will take up the issue at the start of the Spring semester.

Meeting adjourned at 12:30pm.
Fairfield University  
DSB Undergraduate Curriculum Committee  
October 27, 2010 @ 2:30 pm  
DSB 1109  
Meeting Minutes [EXCERPTED]

Attended:  Cathy Giapponi, Ahmed Ebrahim, Nikki Lee-Wingate, Valeria Martinez, Yasin Ozcelik, Heather Petraglia  
Absent:  None  
Excused:  Norm Solomon

1. **Discussion of the feedback from the departments on the foreign language requirement.**

Nikki reported the marketing department has two different streams of thought. The benefit of changing the language requirement to two courses at any level is that it would create an opportunity for students to take up a new language. The downside is that students would not be as proficient in the language. Nikki asked how many students take courses in non-Spanish speaking courses abroad.

Heather feels this discussion is for the University as a whole, but we also need to see what our needs are as a business school.

The accounting department has a liberal opinion on the matter. They agree with two semesters of a language at any level. Further, they don’t object to two different languages. The department feels strongly that students should not lose the opportunity to have a double major or a minor.

The finance department agrees with two semesters of a language at any level. It must be the same language.

The information systems department likes flexibility so they also approve of two semesters of a language at any level. Their feeling is that students won’t become proficient in a language in only four courses anyways.

The management department is behind the idea although some members of the department felt they should link the language to the study abroad experience.

Logistically this would prove difficult. Most did like the idea of choice as long as both courses are taken in the same language. As already stated, if we’re talking proficiency, students are not going to achieve that in four courses. With the University focusing on theme of global citizenship, requiring language at the intermediate level puts Fairfield at a higher level of proficiency amongst its peer schools.

Heather pointed out that there is no direct link between what a student takes as a language and where the student goes abroad. Most students are going to Western Europe. Heather
will get us the number of students going to each program. The motivation behind revising the language requirement was the fact that students are using their free electives when they go abroad and also if they test at the elementary level of a language. So, they are using up free electives and are unable to double major or a minor. The idea of taking two semesters of a language at any level is not meant to short change proficiency but to allow flexibility. Further, anytime a student goes to a non-English speaking country, he or she must take one language course (each of the programs/schools has a language placement test). Implications? For those students who have already taken four language courses (elementary I, II and intermediate I, II), a student still needs to take a language course so now three out of four free electives are taken up.

All of the languages offered at Fairfield have an intermediate level. Heather mentioned that there used to be four levels of language: elementary, review, intermediate and continuing. The modern languages department did an internal review about two years ago and they eliminated two levels (review and continuing), but they didn’t change how they placed students. In fact, they even had a more rigorous placement test. To illustrate this point, two years ago 8% of students were placed into elementary compared to 40% of students this year.

Heather was asked to obtain information on the number of DSB students placed in elementary, intermediate and those not taking any language this semester. Debbie Chappell’s office has actual placement of student levels for the most part.

Ahmed asked if there was any reason why the modern language department would be against the proposed two semesters of a language, at any level? Heather feels that the modern language department would be in favor based on a past meeting on this issue. It would be a way for that department to promote non-traditional languages. You can make the argument for globalization.

Cathy asked the committee members to once again bring the language topic back to the departments for more discussion especially in light of finding out every student who attends a non-English speaking country must take a language course.
Attended:  Cathy Giapponi, Ahmed Ebrahim, Nikki Lee-Wingate, Yasin Ozcelik, Heather Petraglia, Norm Solomon
Absent:  None
Excused:  Valeria Martinez

3. **Discussion of Committee Work for Academic Year 2010-2011**

Language, English, writing and math courses will be ongoing discussions this year. The language issue was discussed at this meeting. This fall there were so many students placed in elementary language courses that there were not enough sections offered. The modern language department instructed students to postpone taking their language until the summer or following fall. The language requirement of 2 courses (of same language) at the intermediate level doesn’t encourage students to experiment with a new language. If a student wants to do a new language they will need 4 courses, which ties up their free electives. Along with the College of Arts & Sciences, we are the only professional school with this language requirement. The School of Engineering has no language requirement and Nursing offers the option of language or visual and performing arts. So there is precedent for the Business School to request to have the core modified. Two summers ago there seemed to be support for a language requirement consisting of 2 courses at any level, so there may still be some support for this today. Also, it would be helpful if students could intentionally link their foreign language courses to their abroad experience. Dean Solomon urged this committee to further encourage students to study abroad.

**The committee members will go back to their departments for discussion on the proposed language requirement of 2 courses of same language at any level. They will report back at the next meeting.**
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Present: Paul Fitzgerald, S.J. (SVPAA), Robbin Crabtree (Dean of College of A&S and UC interim Dean), Don Gibson (Dean of Dolan School of Business), Qin Zhang (Chair), Anita Fernandez, Johanna Garvey, Mousumi Bose Godbole, Jerelyn Johnson, Alison Kris, Scott Lacy, Doug Peduti, Vincent Rosivach, Giovannni Ruffini, Katsiaryna (Katya) Salavei Bardos, Janet Striuli, James He, Roxana Walker-Canton.

5. Proposed Revision to Core Language Requirement for Dolan School of Business

- Cathy Giapponi represented the Dolan School of Business to present the rationale of the proposed revision

The DSB is proposing to change the foreign language requirement from 2 semesters of the intermediate level to 2 semesters of foreign language at any level. Changes in the foreign language placement policies have resulted in a substantial increase in the number of DSB students placed in elementary level language. As a result, the percentage of students continuing with the same language from high school who placed in the elementary level increased from less than 10% to over 60%. Students placed in elementary level are required to take 4 semesters of language vs. 2 semesters. They would have to first take 2 semesters of elementary level language courses before they are allowed to take 2 semesters of intermediate level of the same language. However, since DSB students have only 4 free electives, taking 4 semesters of the same language would mean to use 2 of the 4 electives to fulfill language requirement, which negative impacts DSB students’ ability to pursue complimentary curricular and co-curricular learning opportunities, including minors or double majors in the College of Arts and Sciences disciplines. It also limits study abroad experiences because of the reduced number of free electives.

Moreover, the current 41-course curriculum (a total of 123 credits) already requires DSB students to take 5 courses per semester for 7 semesters and 6 courses in one semester in order to graduate in 4 years. The 2-semester intermediate level language requirement effectively raises the total credit from 123 to 127 for many DSB students. Taking Accounting students for example, if they have to take 4 semesters of foreign language, there will be no room for any free electives.

Furthermore, in comparing with many of our peer institutions in regarding to foreign language requirements, we found that DSB language requirements appear to be more extensive than other Jesuit business schools, such as Marquette University, Gonzaga University, Saint Joseph University, Xavier University, and College of the Holy Cross. We believe that 2 semesters of foreign language at any level would be more reasonable, which would allow DSB students to take a new language, such as Chinese, when they want to study abroad in China.

Don Gibson: We feel that foreign language requirement is important. As a result, we try to encourage our students to take language courses during orientation. However, the benefits of a change to a two-course language requirement at any level would enhance the educational experiences of our students on campus and abroad. It would enable our students to pursue double majors and minors across schools and within the DSB, afford opportunities to explore academic areas of interest, and enable students to study abroad and intentionally link their language to their abroad experience.
• **Mary Ann Carolan** represented the Modern Language Department to present the rationale of the current language requirement

There is a Core requirement in DSB. But why just the language requirement targeted, not any other areas, just to change the language requirement? The Modern Language Department feels strongly the need for foreign language based on the placement test at Fairfield University, i.e., to have 2 semesters of the intermediate level language and to eliminate the continuing level language. This change of the foreign language policy is in line with other institutions and the levels we are using are consistent with these of Xavier and Boston College, as well as many other peer institutions. We simply had lower bars in the past. One of the reasons that the increased number of DSB students placed at elementary level language is due to the factor that DSB admitted 72% students in 2011, as opposed to 50% in 2007.

Don Gibson: The DSB supports the Core. Our concern is just the foreign language requirement. As to the admission rate, it is an across the board change of higher admission rate for the entire university (e.g., Arts & Sciences: 72.4% vs. DSB: 72.1% in 2011), not just for DSB students. However, the language requirement is affecting more of the DSB students.

Robbin Crabtree: How many courses are required by AACSB accreditation?

Cathy Giapponi: It various by different major.

Don Gibson: If we reduce the major courses, we will not be competitive, comparing with peer institutions and in the job markets.

Katya Salavei: In finance for example, we have very little flexibility.

Cathy Giapponi: The core is very nice in liberal arts, but our major courses are already less than many of our peer institutions.

Giovanni Ruffini: How many DSB students are falling two semesters short due to language requirements?

Vincent Rosivach: (A question for Mary Ann Carolan) What is the base to allow students to test out, which is in violation of the core for language requirements based on JOR? We should follow the JOR, instead of otherwise.

**Mary Ann Carolan:** It is there from the department for 15 years as far as I can remember.

Robbin Crabtree: It is interesting to have this question raised. We need to revisit the issue. It is likely that one did not realize the policy implications when changing the wording or departmental policy.

Katya Salavei – In terms of measureable evidence, the current language requirements would limit DSB students’ opportunities of double majors, minors, or study abroad.

Roxanna Walker-Canton: Whether does this only affect the DSB students or elsewhere?

Don Gibson: DSB has 40% study abroad rate, but we have to balance the courses. The language a student is taking at the intermediate level is not necessary in line with the study abroad destination. We need flexibility to allow our students to take a new language, for example.
Alison Kris: If one nursing student is placed into the elementary level for 4 semesters, he or she will have not flexibility at all.

Vincent Rosivach: We should finish the discussion with the guests and have a motion in place.

Doug Peduti: How about the impact of the language requirements on DSB students’ job placement?

Don Gibson: We will certainly try to minimize the impact. When we have the data, we can make the argument later.

Jerelyn Johnson: Can DSB students fulfill the language requirements abroad?

Cathy Giapponi: The answer is “it depends” – students may or may not fulfill the language requirements abroad.

Jerelyn Johnson: Does DSB have any intention to take out other core requirements?

Don Gibson: No other core areas are currently on the table.

Paul Fitzgerald: Have we ever tested the students a year after they completed their language requirements?

Mary Ann Carolan: We only tested once in Italian.

The chair thanked Cathy Giapponi and Mary Ann Carolan for their presentations.

Giovanni Ruffini moved to approve the motion, seconded by Katya Salavei:

The Motion: To change the Modern and Classical Languages requirement fro Charles F. Dolan School of Business undergraduate students from two semesters at the intermediate level to two semesters of the same language at any level.

Mousumi Bose Godbole: Speaking in favor of the motion. In order to have career ready for DSB students, it is important to have the flexibility.

Robbin Crabtree: Speaking not against the motion, but would like to propose a revision to the motion – DSB students take 2 semesters of foreign language at any level.

Don Gibson: It was not supported in DSB faculty since we have about 40 top students usually placed out for foreign language requirements.

Katya Salavei: In comparing to peer business schools, we already have more language requirements.

Vincent Rosivach: Speaking against the motion. Studying 2 semesters of a foreign language is not enough. Credible alternative is to stop acting based on a single department to make any policy changes or to allow placing out for a core language requirement.

Paul Fitzgerald: Since DSB students have to take university core and DSB core in addition to their major courses, they will not be able to finish in 4 years if they are required to take 4 semesters of language courses and double major, minor, or study abroad. The strength of professional schools will enhance both the core and the professional areas.
Jerelyn Johnson: Speaking against the motion.

Katya Salavei moved to call the questions, seconded by Giovanni Ruffini:

Calling the questions failed: 6 in favor, 7 opposed, 0 abstentions.

Vincent Rosivach moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Roxanna Walker-Canton.
There was a tie to adjourn the meeting: 6 in favor, 6 opposed, 0 abstentions.
The chair, Qin Zhang, made a decision to extend the meeting for another 15 minutes.

Paul Fitzgerald: Speaking in favor of the motion. While language is important, we have to be realistic. As a comprehensive university, Fairfield University has to balance the language requirements in the core and special needs of the professional schools.

Robbin Crabtree: Understanding the situation that DSB is facing, but would like to push for a 2-semester language at any level.

Vincent Rosivach: Our obligations are to educate the students with meaningful courses. We have to be realistic about the core, not just for majors. It would be more appropriate for our students to take the language they already started.

Giovanni Ruffini: Speaking in favor of the motion.

Katya Salavei: Speaking in favor of the motion. If a DSB student has to take 4 semesters of the language, he or she will have very little flexibility to study abroad.
Roxanna Walker-Canton: Will this open the door for other departments to get rid of the core? Why is it the language?

Mousumi Bose Godbole: Because the change made by the language department (to require 2 semesters of the intermediate level language) is affecting the quality and competitiveness of our DSB students in the marketplace.

Paul Fitzgerald moved to adjourn the meeting, seconded by Vincent Rosivach. The meeting adjourned at 5:20 pm: 11 in favor, 1 opposed, 0 abstentions.

Respectfully submitted,
James He
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3. DSB Core Language Revision

Qin Zhang provided an overview of the status of this proposal, which the UCC was to discuss for a third meeting. The proposal was debated at length in the last meeting; a motion to approve is still on the floor. The Chair asked if there was further discussion.

Anita Fernandez argued that while she did not like language study and felt it was forced on her as an undergrad the requirement proved transformative and empowering; it is not worthless to have a second year of language study, and there is a cost if that is cut from the core for DSB students.

Katya Salavei reminded the committee that the proposal took four years and came in response to the changes made by the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures (MLL); none of the peer or “aspiration” level business schools requires language study. We need to be realistic in what we pursue.

Jerelyn Johnson said that the changes were made in order to be in line with the standards of the discipline and were realistic in MLL; she also argued that there are many other reasons for the summer “melt.”

Don Gibson provided statistics on the effects of the changes on students’ choices in the DSB. He commented that the feedback from Orientation for the Class of 2015 was that it was a “rough period”; many students find it difficult to do a second major and/or to add minors. It is a competitive environment; language is desirable; the motion gives students flexibility, choice.

Giovanni Ruffini proposed an amendment to the motion, passing out a sheet with the suggested language and rationale (drafted by Manyul Im).

Current motion:

To change the Modern and Classical Languages requirement for Charles F. Dolan School of Business undergraduate students from two semesters at the intermediate level to two semesters of the same language at any level.

Proposed amendment:

To change the Modern and Classical Languages requirement for Charles F. Dolan School of Business undergraduate students from "two semesters (at least at the intermediate level)" (as specified in the JOR)
to: either two semesters at least at the intermediate level* or successful completion of one of the following options:
  
  two semesters of the same language at the elementary level and, subsequently, one semester of study abroad in a location in which the target language is the primary language
  one semester of language at the intermediate level or higher, as judged by the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures, during studying abroad in a location in which the target language is the primary language

(*Note: DSB students who choose to complete the requirement through the "two semesters (at least at the intermediate level)" as specified in the JOR, may exercise the same departmental exam exemption for the core requirement as any other student, as specified in the JOR's "Policy for Advanced Placement" (JOR 11-2009, p. 36).)

Rosivach seconded.

Reasoning:
The reason that this is mostly an amendment, and not a whole new motion, is that it effectively splits the DSB's proposal of "two semesters of the same language at any level" into its two possibilities and introduces a condition and an option, respectively, to each possibility:

In 1 it adds a study abroad requirement that address some of the concerns about achieving core learning outcomes for students who take two semesters only at the elementary level

In 2, it adds an attractive option for DSB students who enter with better than elementary level ability but who would otherwise need to enroll in two semesters of intermediate level language to fulfill the core. The option accommodates even more than requested, DSB concerns about both freeing up credits for electives and participation in international education — while addressing some of the concern about achieving core learning outcomes.

James He asked for explanation of the first proposed (amended) option, "two semesters of the same language at the elementary level and, subsequently, one semester of study abroad in a location in which the target language is the primary language." He argued that it would reduce flexibility. Im clarified.

Salavei spoke against the amendment, saying that this first option would create an additional problem. Bose Godbole said that this amendment links study abroad to the language requirement: what if a student does not want to go abroad?

Perkus spoke against the amendment, saying that the linking of core to study abroad complicates the situation and does not respond to the question at hand. Ruffini spoke in favor of the amendment, saying that there is no necessary linkage. It is a tidy motion, preserving MLL requirement and adding flexibility for DSB students.

Gibson noted that there are five DSB students now studying abroad.

Im said that the amendment accommodates students: core area outcomes are not served by only two semester of a language; there are options for DSB students, who do not have to take four semesters.

Gibson liked the spirit of the amendment but said that administratively it would be difficult to implement, e.g., not much Spanish is offered in study abroad. It also assumes that a first year student can decide on study abroad, but if a student does not follow either option 1 or 2, that student will be stuck as a junior or senior.
Rosivach said that two semesters of a language is close to being wasted time. The real solution resides with MLL, who created the problem with the new levels. This amended motion is preferable to the original one. We can address the larger problem if the amendment passes.

SVPAA Fitzgerald spoke against the amended motion, agreeing with the spirit of it but offering several objections: our students typically take classes abroad in English, not another language; students of color are the least likely to go abroad, and the amended motion favors a particular socio-economic class, which is unfair; study abroad is not automatic—it requires at least a 2.80 GPA (which is likely to be raised); study abroad is a financial consideration for students.

Roxana Walker-Canton requested clarification of option 1. What happens if a student does not study abroad?

Salavei said of option 2 that the language often does not count (the level is not high enough) and thus this option does not solve the problem.

Johnson said that the change in placement numbers was not due to extreme levels of competency. Fairfield University’s are the same or even lower that those of our peer institutions. The changes were made for our students. She asked about the example of China that was raised at a previous UCC meeting: would option 1 benefit DSB students?

Doug Peduti said that the amendment seems to resolve the situation for some, but is not fair or practical. He spoke against the amended motion.

**Rosivach called the question. Salavei seconded. Vote: 10-4-1**

**Vote on Amended Motion: 4 in favor, 7 opposed, 4 abstentions. The motion fails.**

Return to original motion.

Im spoke against, saying that it does not address core learning objectives for the DSB.

He spoke in favor, saying that the DSB needs to be competitive as a professional school, competitive with its peers, and competitive with employers recruiting students.

Rosivach noted that learning outcomes are internal to CAS and do not bind the General Faculty. The motion seems the wrong way to approach a language requirement, which should be done in terms of competence, not classroom hours. He asked about the DSB’s competitors: do their students take four or five courses a semester? Discussion ensued on this question as well as the topic of the DSB as a professional school.

Johnson spoke against the motion, saying it is a question of the core. The DSB is a professional school but it is also part of a comprehensive Jesuit core curriculum.

Janet Striuli posed the question of whether there might be any other way to meet the core outcomes? Is there any possibility for negotiation. She spoke in favor of the motion due to flexibility that will help students to find jobs. Discussion ensued on issues of peer institutions, on number of semesters that would be useful for students, on the available choices, and on hopes for what students will choose to do in taking language(s) at Fairfield University. Les Shaffer said he would probably vote against the motion: if the
issue is competitiveness for DSB students, then Physics could argue similarly that their students would
benefit from taking more Physics courses to prepare for grad school instead of taking all of the core
requirements. Perhaps we need a change in the core across the University. Im continued this line of
argument and spoke against the motion, saying that the DSB should not seek an exception but should
propose to change the core for the whole University. Fitzgerald said that the DSB is parallel to the School
of Nursing and the School of Engineering (both of which have modifications to the University core),
which have a School core and the rest of the core.

Peduti called the question. Rosivach seconded. **Vote to call the question: 12-1-1**

**Motion on the floor:** *To change the Modern and Classical Languages requirement for Charles F. Dolan
School of Business undergraduate students from two semesters at the intermediate level to two semesters
of the same language at any level.*

**The motion passed:** 7 in favor, 6 opposed, 2 abstentions
For Agenda Item 7.c
Relevant entries from the Faculty Handbook and the Journal of Record

Faculty Handbook I.B.1 Purpose of the Academic Council

I.  B. THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL
    1. Purpose
    The Academic Council shall be the executive arm of the General Faculty. As such, it is
    empowered to consider, make decisions and make recommendations on any matter of
    academic concern that falls within the purview of the faculty, except for matters
    specifically reserved to the General Faculty.

Faculty Handbook I.B.3.b Function[s of the Academic Council]

b. To facilitate the operation of the entire committee system and to make decisions on the
    recommendations of the Committees of the Faculty; i.e., to reject, approve or forward them to the
    appropriate body for implementation.

Faculty Handbook I.C.b.4 Membership, General Purpose and Specific Duties of the UCC

4. Undergraduate Curriculum

Membership
Representation on the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee shall follow the same
pattern as representation from the undergraduate schools on the Academic Council,
with the addition of one member of the professional staff from University College, and
one student member (the Director of Academics from the Fairfield University Student
Association) with voting rights. The student representative shall serve for a one year
term. Other representatives shall be elected for three-year overlapping terms, not simply
as representative of their curriculum areas, but as resource persons to oversee the total
curriculum. The highest ranking Academic Officer of the University shall be a member
with voting rights. The Dean of the School whose interests are under discussion by the
Committee shall be an advisory member.

General Purpose
To keep under continual review the current curriculum patterns, to assess proposals
from any source, and to make recommendations to the faculty, and appropriate agents.

Specific Duties
To review and evaluate undergraduate curriculum: (a) the structure and content; (b)
special programs; (c) summer school and continuing education programs; (d) academic
requirements for, and quality of, undergraduate degrees. In these areas it shall
encourage and receive reports and recommendations from all sources. It shall also look
into such questions on its own initiative.

Journal of Record entry:

Undergraduate Curriculum:
To the extent possible and appropriate, departments and schools offering courses in the core should
provide as many options as possible, consistent with fulfilling their academic responsibilities within
the core program. It is the function of the individual department or school to determine how this
can best be done, subject to ratification by the general faculty. Any revisions in this approach (e.g.,
change in distribution between requirements and options) must be submitted to the UCC for its
recommendations and subsequent submission to the general faculty for final approval.
Some departments or schools may require their majors to select specific options within the core offerings, which are more valuable to their particular program.

GF: 03/19/1970
amended CR: 04/20/1987
AC: 02/25/1985

Recommendation from the Report to AC from the ad hoc Committee to review the Journal of Record that was approved by the AC (note the rationale):

7. Propose that this entry be deleted

General Education Core Curriculum:
The General Education program of the undergraduate schools is that which has been approved by the General Faculty of the University.

AC: 02/25/1985

Rationale: The fact that the core curriculum and any changes to the core curriculum must be approved by the faculty is so non-controversial that it may not need to be explicitly stated.

Journal of Record
Excerpt of Appendix 2: Routing for Approval of Undergraduate/Course/Program Revisions

Guidelines for the Routing and Approval of Proposed Course/Program Revisions in the Undergraduate Divisions:

The general principles for the following guidelines are the following:

Faculty review (at more than one level of responsibility) is required for all course/program revisions.

Moreover, UCC review is required for:
2. all changes having impact upon the present Core Curriculum.

Academic Council review is required of all EPC and UCC recommendations on curriculum policy.

[Routing]
6. Changes in Core Requirements

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

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

1. Curriculum Area Chair(s) to
2. UCC