ACADEMIC COUNCIL
AGENDA
Monday, February 6, 2012
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. i. Approval of minutes for meeting on 11/21/2011 (attached)
      ii. Approval of minutes for meeting on 12/5/2011 (attached)
   b. Correspondence
      i. Memo from Mary Ann Palazzi Re: Spring 2012 Semester Conflicts with Final Exams and Scheduled Athletic Contests (ongoing item 1)
      ii. Memo from the UCC requesting clarification of the UCC’s Responsibility in Changes in the Requirements for Majors/Programs
   c. Oral reports

4. Council Subcommittee Reports
   a. Subcommittee on University College matters (separately stapled; identical to report distributed with packet for the 12/5/2011 AC meeting)
   b. Subcommittee on voting rights (materials with 11/7/2011 AC packet)
   c. Subcommittee for considering remaining items from ad hoc JOR committee recommendations (separately stapled; identical to report in the 11/7/2011 AC packet)
   d. Subcommittee to consider proposing IDEA form for administrators
   e. Subcommittee re: Workers’ Bill of Rights
   f. Subcommittee on Community-Engaged Scholarship
   g. Subcommittee on Center for Continuing Studies

5. Petitions for immediate hearing

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

7. New business
   a. UCC motion on core language requirement for DSB (attachments)
   b. Registration proposal from Faculty Athletics Committee (attachment)
   c. Report from Executive Committee on new edition of Handbook (will be sent separately if available before the meeting)
   d. Proposal from the Faculty Welfare Committee/AAUP on language on academic freedom and freedom of expression in Fairfield governance documents (attachment)
   e. Proposal from UCC to modify Journal of Record entry on US Diversity requirement (attachment)
• Lists of Attachments, Pending, and Ongoing Items are on page 2
List of Attachments:
For item 3.a.i Minutes from AC meeting of 11/21/2011 (pages 3-8)
For item 3.a.ii Minutes from AC meeting of 12/5/11 (page 9)
For item 3.b.i Memo from Mary Ann Palazzi Re: Spring 2012 Semester Conflicts with Final Exams and Scheduled Athletic Contests (page 10)
For item 3.b.ii Memo from the UCC requesting clarification of the UCC’s Responsibility in Changes in the Requirements for Majors/Programs (pages 11-15)
For item 4.a Report from the Subcommittee on University College Matters (separately stapled and identical to report distributed with the 12/5/2011 AC packet)
For item 4.c Report from the AC Subcommittee to consider remaining items from review of the JOR (separately stapled; identical to report in 11/7/2011 AC packet)
For item 6.a Proposed JOR language to implement AC-approved UCC proposal re core credit approval for courses outside a particular core area (pages 16-19)
For item 7.a Proposal from DSB to UCC (undated) on foreign language requirements for DSB students (pages 20-25), Excerpted minutes of 1 DSB faculty meeting and 5 DSB Undergraduate Curriculum Committee meetings (pages 26-34), Excerpted minutes of 2 UCC meetings (pages 35-42), Relevant entries from the Journal of Record and Handbook (pages 43-44)
For item 7.b Registration proposal from Faculty Athletics Committee (pages 45-46)
For item 7.c Report from the Executive Committee on new edition of Handbook (separately stapled)
For item 7.d Proposal from the Faculty Welfare Committee/AAUP on language on academic freedom and freedom of expression in Fairfield governance documents (pages 47-49)
For item 7.e Proposal from UCC to modify Journal of Record entry on US Diversity requirement (pages 50-54)

Pending Items:
A. 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.)
B. Faculty Data Committee (AC 12/3/07).
C. MFA in Creative Writing, Five-Year-Review due in 12/2012 (AC 12/3/07).
D. 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)
E. 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)
F. AC revisits the accessibility of teaching evaluation data. Due spring 2012. (AC 4/19/10)
G. AC three year review of Merit Appeals Policy, fall 2013. (AC 11/1/10)
H. AC three year review of Intellectual Properties Policy, spring 2014. (AC 3/7/11)

Ongoing Items:
1. Report by SVPAA to AC each semester to inform the council of any approved exceptions to the Athletic Department’s policy of not scheduling athletic events that conflict with final exams.
2. Report from the Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees after each meeting with board members. At the end of each academic year, discuss items for the Conference Committee to put on the agenda for their meetings with members of the board the following year
Academic Council Meeting  
Monday, Nov. 21, 2011  
3:30 - 5:30  
CNS 200  

DRAFT  

Present: Professors: Steve Bayne, Joe Dennin, Donald Greenberg, Dennis Keenan, Phil Lane, Irene Mulvey (General Faculty Secretary), Elizabeth Petrino, Rona Preli (AC Chair), Susan Rakowitz (AC Executive Secretary), David Sapp, Joyce Shea, Debra Strauss, Cheryl Tromley, Vishnu Vinekar, David Zera.  

Administrators: Deans Robbin Crabtree, Susan Franzosa, Don Gibson, SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald.  

Guests: Professors Qin Zhang, David Crawford, Mark Scalese.  


Chair Preli reconvened the meeting at 3:35 and the AC took up the 11/7/2011 agenda where we left off with item 7.c.  

7.c. Two proposed motion from the Rank and Tenure Committee.  

The motion is from the memo from the R&T committee to the AC Executive Secretary, dated 11/7/2011 and handed out at the AC meeting.  

Motion [Tromley/Fitzgerald]: That the Faculty Handbook be amended in II.A.3.b.(3) additions boldface, deletions strikethrough: 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.  

SVPAA Fitzgerald spoke in favor because (1) the current language is ambiguous and this clarifies that the candidate must have five years when submitting the application and (2) ‘normally’ allows for exceptional early cases.  

Motion to Amend [Bayne/Lane] Delete the last sentence.  

Professor Bayne spoke in favor because (1) normally one can only come up in the 6th year which would be once and (2) someone who presents an extraordinary case and gets turned down may be normally acceptable but could not apply again.  

Professor Tromley spoke against saying it would open the door to candidates applying multiple times thinking they were extraordinary.  

Professor Mulvey spoke in favor expressing the concern that the consequences of leaving the sentence in would be that some people with bad advice would apply inappropriately and be done.
Professor Petrino spoke in favor for the same reasons as Professor Bayne. Professor Rakowitz spoke in favor saying people would get the idea that fifth year applications would now have a higher threshold, and there would be very few extraordinary applications.

**Motion to Amend Passed:** 7 in favor, 6 opposed.

**Motion to Amend** [Mulvey/Greenberg] remove the word ‘normally’.

Professor Mulvey spoke in favor

Professor Greenberg spoke in favor saying we already have mechanisms for exceptions to normal requirements.

**Motion to Amend Passed:** 14 in favor, 0 opposed.

**Motion to Amend** [Mulvey/Lane]: insert the word ‘teaching’ between full-time and position.

Professor Mulvey spoke in favor saying that all full-time teaching, including as a visiting professor, counts based on AAUP guidelines

**Motion to Amend Passed:** 13 in favor, 0 opposed.

**Pending Motion** (as amended) That the Faculty Handbook be amended in II.A.3.b.(3) additions boldface, deletions in strikethrough: That at the time of submitting the dossier, the candidate for tenure shall have completed served a probationary period of not less than five years in a full-time teaching position in the academic profession, not less than two of which years shall have been served at Fairfield University.

Professor Bayne spoke against the motion saying that in the current situation with merit raises, accepting the motion means no raise until one gets promoted.

Professor Dennin observed that there are raises, just not above the cost of living.

**Motion Passed:** 13 in favor, 1 opposed.

The next motion is also from the memo from the R&T committee to the AC Executive Secretary, dated 11/7/2011 and handed out at the AC meeting.

**Motion:** [Lane/Keenan]: That the Faculty Handbook be amended in II.A.1.b.(3) additions boldface, deletions in strikethrough: 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.

Professor Greenberg spoke against asking if there were a contradiction here with previous language.
SVPAA Fitzgerald responded that there is no contradiction, it is a question of when one can apply vs. when one is appointed. The application is after five years; but the appointment is after six.

Professor Bayne spoke against saying the issue is about tenure not promotion.

**Motion to Amend: [Mulvey/Fitzgerald]:** Delete the last sentence.

Professor Mulvey spoke in favor of the amendment, saying that two-thirds of a small department could be problematic, particularly in GSEAP. Also the previous motion makes this redundant.

Dean Crabtree spoke in favor with the same concern as Professor Bayne. She also asked, if one goes up for early tenure, is one eligible to apply for promotion at the same time?

SVPAA Fitzgerald answered that the practice is to apply for both together.

Professor Keenan spoke in favor for the reasons stated.

**Motion to Amend Passed: 14 in favor, 0 opposed.**

**Main Motion as Amended Passed: 14 in favor, 0 opposed.**

Professor Mulvey expressed thanks to the Rank and Tenure committee and looks forward to a solid presentation at the faculty meeting.

**7.d. Proposal from the UCC on incompletes.**

Questions: (1) What is the problem?
(2) How does the proposal address the problem?

Two concerns: (1) the JOR policy on Incompletes says nothing about why to give an incomplete. No language about procedure. Want to formalize what is in the University catalog and make consistent across schools (2) The time frame for completion of an incomplete is inconsistent from semester to semester.

**Motion: [Rakowitz/Petrino] To remove language about incompletes in the Journal of Record and replace it with the following:**

Incompletes: An incomplete is issued when, due to an emergency situation such as a documented illness, a student prearranges with the course instructor to complete some of the course requirements after the semester ends. Before an Incomplete grade can be issued for a student, the Instructor for the course must submit a completed “Application form for an Incomplete” to the student, the Dean of the student’s school and the registrar. The form includes the reasons for granting an incomplete, as well as a list of outstanding assignments and the grade to be submitted if the student fails to submit the required assignments. All coursework must be completed within the time frame specified by the Course Instructor, but no later than 30 days after the last day of the term. Any requests to extend the time period for completing an Incomplete requires submission of an additional Application form for an Incomplete.
Professor Rakowitz spoke in favor although the language is not appropriate for the JOR, the ACEC will clean it up.

Professor Greenberg spoke enthusiastically against the motion saying it was a huge mistake. Formalizing bureaucratic decisions can’t cover all possibilities. This area belongs to the individual faculty member and student and should be handled at the department level if abuse occurs.

Professor Petrino spoke in favor, wanting to put more burden on the student because students do not take requests for incompletes seriously.

Dean Crabtree spoke in favor saying faculty can always change a grade but now there is no clear document of what is expected of the student. A student can always negotiate after the fact.

Professor Greenberg spoke against saying he can’t conceive of a responsible faculty member not working the details out with a student.

Professor Tromley spoke against saying an organization does a disservice with a policy rather than guidelines; guidelines should not be a rule.

Professor Preli spoke against saying that incompletes are used differently in professional schools, for example to complete clinicals.

**Motion to Call the Question[Lakeland/Tromley]**

**Motion failed 6 in favor, 8 against.**

Professor Keenan had a Point of Information: What policy is left in the Journal of Record?

Professor Mulvey responded that the JOR talks about the time frame for incompletes, but not why they might be given. She is against the motion.

Professor Strauss spoke against because 30 days can be too burdensome and ignores individual circumstances.

Professor Preli was against because there still was a problem with the schedule.

**Motion failed: 2 in favor, 12 opposed, 2 abstentions.**

**Motion [Mulvey/Greenberg] Insert the following in front of the existing JOR text on completion of incompletes:**

An Incomplete is issued when, due to an emergency situation such as a documented illness, a student arranges with the course instructor to complete some of the course requirements after the term ends.

**Motion passed.**

**7.e. Recommendations from ACEC re Pending Items.**

Professor Mulvey pointed out that there are a large number of items carried over from previous years and that ACEC has addressed the issue both last year and this year with drafted recommendations.
Motion:[Mulvey/Keenan] That items A, C, D, and F be removed from the list of Pending Items on the Academic Council agenda.

Professor Bayne asked if there was a committee for item F (parking).

Professor Mulvey replied that there were 2 faculty members on an administrative committee about parking but it was not a subcommittee of the Academic Council.

Motion Passed.

Professor Mulvey asked if the Council should drop item B from the list of pending items. She felt it should be kept and Professor Lane agreed. The Council agreed to keep it on the agenda.

Similarly the Council agreed to keep item E on the agenda with Dean Crabtree pointing out that the Department of Labor says we need to keep better records.

The Council thanked Professor DeWitt for his work on these issues.

7.f. Proposal for a Minor in Anthropology.

Professor Crawford presented the proposal for a minor in Anthropology.

Dean Crabtree noted that there was a minor in Sociology but not in Anthropology and that this would appeal to Sociology majors with an interest in anthropology.

Some questions followed.

Professor Bayne: What courses count for what?

Professor Crawford: For Sociology majors with a minor in Anthropology, one course would double count so that 10(major) + 5 (minor) = 14.

Professor Greenberg: Do you have the people to teach the courses?

Professor Crawford: For all except one course which an adjunct from Yale now teaches.

Professor Tromley: Why not double count any course?

Professor Crawford: There is double counting in many places because student love labels and so double counting tends to grow like weeds.

Motion:[Lane/Keenan] To approve the minor in Anthropology.

Professor Zera asked if Professor Crawford should stay.

Chairperson Preli responded that he was welcome to.

Dean Crabtree spoke in favor of the motion saying it comes out of the external review and self-study by the department and the department is enthusiastic about it.

Motion passed: 14 in favor, 0 opposed.
Professor Rakowitz suggested reordering the agenda to consider 7.h. next which suggestion was accepted.

7.h. Five-Year Review of New Media Program.

Professor Mark Scalese summarized the report in the packet.

Professor Mulvey asked if the program was as successful as predicted?

Professor Scalese replied that it was estimated that there would be 75 majors and now there are 92 majors and 8 minors.

Dean Franzosa commented that all previous committees have endorsed it and it has fulfilled its responsibility excellently.

Professor Mulvey asked if there is a cap on the number of students.

Professor Scalese replied that there was a cap of 125 students but their target was about 20 per year or 80 to 100 overall.

SVPAA Fitzgerald said they had a strong faculty and students, good facilities and that the media center was also useful as a source of adjuncts.

**Motion:** [Greenberg/Keenan]: To endorse the report.

*Motion passed:* 14 in favor, 0 opposed.

**Motion to Adjourn:** [Dennin/Tromley].

Submitted by,
Joe Dennin
ACADEMIC COUNCIL
Draft Minutes
December 5, 2011

Meeting called to order at 3:32 PM
Present: Chair Professor Preli, Executive Secretary Professor Rakowitz, General Faculty Secretary Professor Mulvey, Professors Greenberg, Zera, Sapp, Bayne, Strauss, Vinekar, Lane, Walker, Petrino, Keenan, Tromley, Dennin, Shea, Nantz, Boryczka, Deans: S. Campbell, Beal, Franzosa, Crabtree, Vice President Fitzgerald, Guests: Professors Ruffini, Goldberg, Smith, G. Campbell, Associate Dean Perkus.

1. Presidential Courtesy
Vice President Fitzgerald reported that early action is running ahead of last year and that early decision applicants are about 180 so far. Vice President Fitzgerald indicated that the Jesuit schools are working on some common core issues and invited Fairfield faculty to be part of this ongoing discussion. Professor Walker asked why we had dropped early decision and then reinstated it. Vice President Fitzgerald answered that we are always experimenting to make the process of admittance more efficacious.

2. Report From the Secretary of the General faculty
General faculty meeting is scheduled for 12/9/2011 and documents will be going out on the 6th.

3. Report From Executive Secretary
Submitted minutes of the meeting of November 7, 2011 for approval.

Motion to accept [Lane/Walker]. Professor Tromley had a correction to the minutes on page 8 at bottom of page, the word “can” should go after the word “twice”, so that “undermines” is changed to “can undermine”.

Minutes as amended were approved.

At this juncture the agenda was reordered, and the Council discussed under new business Proposals for early childhood education.

7.a. Proposals re: Early Childhood Education
After extensive discussion, the following motion was approved.

MOTION. To approve the Masters in Childhood Education with Initial Certification (Certification in Elementary or early Childhood Education) with a five year review.

Motion Passed 11 in favor, 0 opposed, 6 abstentions.

4.a. Subcommittee on University College Matters.
The sub committee began a presentation of their report on the closing of University College. No motions were voted on at this meeting.

These minutes are truncated because the recording secretary, Donald Greenberg, lost his notes.
Respectfully submitted,
Donald Greenberg
To:    Fr. Paul Fitzgerald, Senior Academic Vice President
From:  Mary Ann Palazzi, Coordinator of Programs for Student-Athletes
Re:    Spring 2012 Semester Conflicts with Final Exams and Scheduled Athletic Contests

Men’s Basketball:  No Conflicts
Women’s Basketball  No Conflicts
Women’s Swimming  No Conflicts
Men’s Swimming  No Conflicts

Baseball        Saturday, May 5, 2012 – Finals (Home vs. Manhattan)
                 Sunday, May 6, 2012 – Reading Day (Home vs. Manhattan)
                 Friday, May 11, 2012 – Finals (@ Siena)

Softball        Saturday, May 5, 2012 – Finals (@ Manhattan)
                 Sunday, May 6, 2012 – Reading Day (Home vs. Siena)
                 Thursday, May 10, 2012 – Finals (MAAC Tournament)
                 Friday, May 11, 2012 – Finals (MAAC Tournament)

Women’s Lacrosse  No Conflicts
Men’s Rowing  No Conflicts
Women’s Rowing  No Conflicts
Men’s Tennis  No Conflicts
Women’s Tennis  No Conflicts
Men’s Golf  No Conflicts
Women’s Golf  No Conflicts
TO: Susan Rakowitz, Executive Secretary of Academic Council  
FROM: Qin Zhang, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Chair  
DATE: December 15, 2011  
RE: Clarification of the UCC’s Responsibility in Changes in the Requirements for Majors/Programs  

Contents:  
- Rationale  
- Motions approved by the UCC  
- UCC 12-6-11 minutes excerpts (draft)  
- Current documents on the UCC’s responsibility  

Rationale  
At the Dec 6, 2011 meeting, the UCC approved a motion to ask the Academic Council for clarification of the UCC’s responsibility insofar as the changes in majors/programs. The committee is not clear whether it is the UCC’s responsibility to review the program revision proposal of the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures (DMLL) that deals with changes in requirements for its majors. The UCC requests the Academic Council clarify whether changes in the requirements for a major are included under changes in degree requirements.

Specifically, we have three separate but related questions that need the clarification from the Academic Council:

First, the language description between Item 1 (new courses within the same school) on Page 64 in the Journal of Record and Item 7 (changes in degree requirements) on Page 65 seems to be inconsistent and conflicting.

According to Item 1, Page 64,

1. New Courses - Within the Same School  
   Included here are any course or program changes internal to a department or school, including new interdisciplinary courses.  
   1. Curriculum Area Chair to  
   2. School Curriculum Committee or Faculty of School to  
   3. Dean

But according to Item 7, Page 65,

7. Changes in Degree Requirements:  
   1. Curriculum Area Chair(s) to  
   2. School Curriculum Committee(s) or Faculty of School(s) to  
   3. Dean(s) to  
   4. UCC

The UCC is not clear whether changes in degree requirements cover changes in the requirements for a major. In light of the seemingly conflicting language, the UCC requests the Academic Council clarify the UCC’s responsibility in changes in the requirements for a major.
Question 1: Do changes in the requirements for a major fall under Item 1 (New Courses - Within the Same School) or Item 7 (changes in degree requirements)?

Second, according to the prefatory remarks relating to the UCC duties on Page 64 of the Journal of Record,

**UCC review is required for:**
1. all new programs, or changes in programs involving interdisciplinary or inter-school relationships; and
2. all changes having impact upon the present Core Curriculum.

Although the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures (DMLL) is not officially an interdisciplinary program, it allows courses from other departments to count towards its majors. The UCC is not clear whether this arrangement falls under Item 1 of the prefatory remarks (all new programs, or changes in programs involving interdisciplinary or inter-school relationships), which then needs the UCC approval.

**Question 2: Does the DMLL’s arrangement of allowing outside courses from other departments to count toward its majors fall under Item 1 of the prefatory remarks (UCC review is required for...changes in programs involving interdisciplinary...relationships)?**

Third, according to Faculty Handbook, Page 13, the specific duties of the UCC are:
- 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.

The UCC is not clear whether Item (d) (academic requirements for, and quality of, undergraduate degrees) covers changes in the requirements for a major.

**Question 3: Do changes in the requirements for a major fall under Item (d) (academic requirements for, and quality of, undergraduate degrees” cover changes in the requirements for a major)?**

**Motions approved by the UCC**
The UCC approved the following motion at our December 6, 2011 meeting:

**Motion:** To ask the Academic Council for clarification of Undergraduate Curriculum Committee’s responsibility insofar as the changes in majors/programs.

**UCC 12-6-12 minutes excerpts (draft)**

**Department of Modern Languages and Literatures Program Revisions**
Zhang introduces the Dept of Modern Languages and Literatures Program Revisions that Mary Ann Carolan explains and answer any of the UCC’s questions.

Rosivach claims that this is not the UCC’s business. It would put an excessive burden on our committee if we had to approve all internal changes in any major’s requirements. Johnson said that this was a concern she brought to Manyul Im after the A&SCC approved the revisions, due to confusing language in the JOR. According the JOR,

"Moreover, UCC review is required for:
1. all new programs, or changes in programs involving interdisciplinary or inter-school relationships; and
2. all changes having impact upon the present Core Curriculum.
Academic Council review is required of all EPC and UCC recommendations on curriculum policy.

1. New Courses - Within the Same School
Included here are any course or program changes internal to a department or school, including new interdisciplinary courses.
1. Curriculum Area Chair to
2. School Curriculum Committee or Faculty of School to
3. Dean

2. New Inter-School Courses
1. Curriculum Area Chair(s) to
2. School Curriculum Committee(s) or Faculty of School(s) to
3. Dean(s) to
4. UCC

So while under program revisions it seems to state that it needs to go to UCC, below in the new course proposals/program changes it seems it only needs ASCC approval. Especially confusing is the "interdisciplinary" marker: should we assume the 'terminal' ASCC routing pertains only to interdisciplinary courses? Since the DMLL changes do not affect the Core but are allowing courses in other Departments to count toward our majors, then it has 'interdisciplinary' relationships, so it needs UCC approval? The DMLL isn’t officially an interdisciplinary program.

Johnson said that Manyul Im then quoted another part of the JOR, saying the DMLL changes constituted a change of degree requirements, which goes like this (item #7 of the JOR routing guidelines):

Changes in Degree Requirements:

1. Curriculum Area Chair(s) to
2. School Curriculum Committee(s) or Faculty of School(s) to
3. Dean(s) to
4. UCC

Motion: To ask the AC for clarification of Undergraduate Curriculum Committee’s responsibility insofar as the changes in majors/programs. Rosivach; Ruffini seconded.

What is the relationship between the JOR and the Faculty Handbook?

Johnson speaks in favor the motion.
James speaks in favor of the motion. It is impossible to oversee every single major on campus. Sure, everything re: Core courses is UCC, because affects everyone across campus.
Perkus: speaks against, he doesn’t think it’s ambiguous; it’s clear in the Faculty Handbook. It has to go through the UCC. Just because some haven’t gone through us doesn’t mean they shouldn’t have.

Gibson: Would this also affect the creation of minors? Rosivach responded that yes it would.

Perkus: now speaking in favor of the motion because of discrepancy between the language in the Faculty Handbook and Journal of Record.

Rosivach: the preparatory remarks and routing procedures language is unclear.

Vote: The motion was approved unanimously.

Current documents on the UCC’s Responsibility
- Journal of Record, Pages 64-65
- Faculty Handbook, Page 13

Journal of Record

Page 64:
Moreover, UCC review is required for:
1. all new programs, or changes in programs involving interdisciplinary or inter-school relationships; and
2. all changes having impact upon the present Core Curriculum.

1. New Courses - Within the Same School
Included here are any course or program changes internal to a department or school, including new interdisciplinary courses.
   1. Curriculum Area Chair to
   2. School Curriculum Committee or Faculty of School to
   3. Dean

2. New Inter-School Courses
   1. Curriculum Area Chair(s) to
   2. School Curriculum Committee(s) or Faculty of School(s) to
   3. Dean(s) to
   4. UCC

Page 65, Item 7
Changes in Degree Requirements:
1. Curriculum Area Chair(s) to
2. School Curriculum Committee(s) or Faculty of School(s) to
3. Dean(s) to
4. UCC
Faculty Handbook

Page 13, Undergraduate Curriculum

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.
January 30, 2012
From: AC Executive Committee
To: Academic Council
Re: Agenda item 6.a.

The motion below, passed by the Academic Council at its meeting on 10/3/2011, is not in language appropriate for the Journal of Record. Per the Journal of Record, “If, after the Academic Council has approved a motion for inclusion in the Journal of Record, the Secretary of the General Faculty determines that the language is not expressed appropriately in the form of policy, the Secretary should return the matter to the Academic Council for review and possible revision. The Faculty Secretary, in consultation with the Executive Committee, may propose a revised text in the form of policy for the Council’s consideration.”

Following the motion below is language for the AC to consider that is proposed by the AC Executive Committee to be appropriate for the JoR and designed to implement the 10/3/2011 AC motion. The proposed language also addresses existing policies, not currently described in the JOR, regarding courses counting for core science credit.

**MOTION (passed by the AC on 10/3/2011):**

- to approve the process described in the Core Course Review Guidelines by which a course in a discipline outside of a particular core area counts for core credit in that area;
- to form a UCC Core Social Science Subcommittee of faculty from the respective disciplines (Politics, Economics, Psychology, Sociology and Anthropology, and Communication) and one outside faculty member to review which courses from outside the social and behavioral sciences should be designated for social-science core credit. Each department will nominate at least one individual to serve on the UCC Core Social Science Subcommittee who will then stand for election at the UCC.
- to request respective core learning outcomes from the following core area reviewing units:
  - Classical & Modern Languages
  - English
  - History
  - Mathematics
  - Philosophy
  - Religious Studies
  - Visual & Performing Arts
  - UCC Core Social Science Subcommittee, once its members are elected

- and amend Journal of Record as follows: In *Journal of Record*, Appendix 2 (pp. 64-65) “Routing for Approval of Undergraduate Course/Program Revisions in the Undergraduate Divisions,” item 6:
  6. Changes in Core Requirements
  Included here also are those situations where groups of students are to be excused from some part of the Core requirements, and those situations where courses are offered by one curriculum area but receive Core credit in another curriculum area.
  [Note: Individual student exceptions to the Core requirements would continue to be made]
upon the advice of the Faculty Advisor to the Dean of the appropriate School.]
1. Curriculum Area Chair(s) Core Reviewing Unit (see Table 1) to
2. UCC

Table 1: Reviewing units for each of the core areas

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

<<< END OF MOTION PASSED BY AC ON 10/3/2011 >>>

Two motions for the AC to consider on 2/6/12:

**MOTION 1.** The Academic Council approves the following language for inclusion in the Journal of Record.

**Core Credit Approval for a Course Taught Outside a Core Area.**

A department or faculty member may seek core credit approval for a course taught in a discipline outside a particular core area of the Core Curriculum. This procedure applies only to courses currently unapproved for core credit.

In order to have a course considered for core credit in the natural sciences* or in any core area outside of the offering department, a department or faculty member must submit a Core Credit
Application, consisting of (1) a course syllabus and (2) a Core Course Review Form, available from the UCC, to the respective Core Reviewing Unit and the chair of the UCC by October 1 for fall applications and February 15 for spring applications. The Core Course Review Form should describe in detail how the proposed course fulfills the learning objectives for the respective core area, available from the UCC.

The Core Reviewing Unit will review the application and submit to the UCC its Core Course Recommendation Form and minutes of the relevant meeting of the Core Reviewing Unit in which it describes why the course should or should not be granted core credit. Deadlines for this step are November 25 for fall applications and April 25 for spring applications.

The UCC reviews the Core Credit Application and the Core Course Recommendation Form and makes a decision by voting to either Accept or Reject the recommendation in the Core Course Recommendation Form. In the event of a negative outcome, the Core Reviewing Unit will work with the department or faculty member toward proposing a new course for a successful outcome whenever possible.

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

*Core Science Course Review Committee: The Core Science Course Review Committee*
(CSCRC), using guidelines available from the UCC, makes recommendations to the UCC regarding which natural science courses should be designated for natural science core credit. Courses designated for science majors automatically earn natural science core credit. Science courses for non-science majors, science courses offered outside of the natural science departments, and science courses offered through study abroad programs, are all reviewed by the CSCRC. The CSCRC consists of one member from each of the natural science departments (Biology, Chemistry, and Physics), along with one faculty member from outside of the natural sciences.

**The Social Science Core Reviewing UCC Subcommittee:**
The Social Science Core Reviewing UCC Subcommittee makes recommendations to the UCC regarding which courses from outside a social science department should be designated for social science core credit. This UCC Subcommittee consists of one faculty member from each of the social science departments (Politics, Economics, Psychology, Sociology and Anthropology, and Communication) and one faculty member from outside these departments. Each social science department nominates at least one of their faculty members to serve, and members are elected to three-year terms by the UCC each year. Members may serve consecutive terms.

**MOTION 2.** The Academic Council approves amending the Journal of Record Appendix 2 “Routing for Approval of Undergraduate Course/Program Revisions in the Undergraduate Divisions” routing described in number 6 from:

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

...to:

1. Curriculum Area Chair or faculty member to
2. Core Reviewing Unit to
3. UCC
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 Giaponi, 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.

Fairfield University
DSB Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
September 29, 2010 @ 3:00 pm
DSB 1109
Meeting Minutes [EXCERPTED]

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.
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 measurable 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 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.

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
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" in to 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**
Academic Council
December 5, 2011
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:

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
TO: Academic Council  
FM: Giovanni Ruffini  
   Chair, Faculty Athletics Committee  
RE: Registration proposal for consideration  
ON: October 26, 2011  

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

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

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

MOTION

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

RATIONALE

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

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

2:14 pm – Meeting comes to order

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

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

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

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

To: Academic Council

From: FWC/AAUP Executive Committee (Rick DeWitt, Joe Dennin, Bill Abbott, Rona Preli, Jocelyn Boryczka, Susan Rakowitz, Debra Strauss, Kathleen Wheeler)

Date: 11/20/11

Re: Academic Freedom language in light of the Garcetti Supreme Court Decision

Over the past year the FWC/AAUP has been working on proposed revisions to our language on academic freedom and freedom of expression. The motivation for these changes stems in large part from a 2006 Supreme Court case (Garcetti v. Ceballos) and subsequent lower court rulings.

The purpose of this memo is to propose language to the Academic Council that will address concerns arising from the Garcetti decision, explain the rationale for the language, and suggest how the Council might appropriately act on this language. Some brief background material should help clarify the need for the proposed language.

Background

In the Garcetti decision the Supreme Court ruled that when speaking “pursuant to their official duties,” the Constitution does not protect public employees from employer discipline. In short, the ruling allows employers to discipline employees for speech, so long as that speech is in some way related to the employee’s work.

Although the Supreme Court decision left open the question of whether the ruling should apply to situations involving higher education, lower courts nonetheless applied the Garcetti ruling to cases involving academic freedom and freedom of expression. For example, in one case a federal district judge ruled that the university in question “is entitled to unfettered discretion” in restricting statements made by professors when those professors are speaking about matters relevant to their positions as faculty members. This would include statements made in classrooms, in committee meetings, in faculty meetings, and in general any statements made that are related to one’s job. In another case a federal court of appeals applied Garcetti in ruling that a university has the right to terminate a professor for criticizing the university president. In short, there are now precedents based on the Garcetti decision that severely threaten the academic freedom and freedom of expression of a large portion of university and college communities.

Proposed Language

The FWC/AAUP Executive Committee proposes our current language on academic freedom and freedom of expression be modified as follows. The proposed language arose from discussions
including the FWC/AAUP Executive Committee, the senior counsel of the national AAUP (an expert on Garcetti-related issues and language to address those issues), and SVPAA Fitzgerald.

[Proposed academic freedom language. The language is as it appears in the Faculty Handbook. The same language appears in the Faculty Contract, with the exception of the first sentence which in the contract reads “The University and the Faculty Member agree to uphold the rights and responsibilities of academic freedom, as formulated in the 1940 Statement of Principles endorsed by the AAUP and incorporating the 1970 interpretive comments.” Proposed new language is shown in bold.]

The statement on academic freedom, as formulated in the 1940 Statement of Principles endorsed by the AAUP and incorporating the 1970 interpretive comments, is the policy of Fairfield University. Academic freedom and responsibility are here defined as the liberty and obligation both in and outside the classroom to study, to investigate, to present and interpret, and to discuss facts and ideas concerning all branches and fields of learning. Academic freedom also encompasses the freedom to address matters of institutional policy or action whether or not as a member of any agency of institutional governance. Faculty have the freedom to address the larger community with regard to any social, political, economic, or other interest, so long as they do not represent themselves as official spokespersons of the University. Academic freedom is limited only by generally accepted standards of responsible scholarship and by respect for the Catholic commitment of the institution as expressed in its mission statement, which provides that Fairfield University "welcomes those of all beliefs and traditions who share its concerns for scholarship, justice, truth, and freedom, and it values the diversity which their membership brings to the university community."

[Proposed academic freedom language, with changes incorporated.]

The statement on academic freedom, as formulated in the 1940 Statement of Principles endorsed by the AAUP and incorporating the 1970 interpretive comments, is the policy of Fairfield University. Academic freedom and responsibility are here defined as the liberty and obligation both in and outside the classroom to study, to investigate, to present and interpret, and to discuss facts and ideas concerning all branches and fields of learning. Academic freedom also encompasses the freedom to address matters of institutional policy or action whether or not as a member of any agency of institutional governance. Faculty have the freedom to address the larger community with regard to any social, political, economic, or other interest, so long as they do not represent themselves as official spokespersons of the University. Academic freedom is limited only by generally accepted standards of responsible scholarship and by respect for the Catholic commitment of the institution as expressed in its mission statement, which provides that Fairfield University "welcomes those of all beliefs and traditions who share its concerns for scholarship, justice, truth, and freedom, and it values the diversity which their membership brings to the university community."
Rationale

The Garcetti decision and subsequent lower court rulings have a potentially chilling effect on academic freedom and freedom of expression for a large segment of higher education. The AAUP national office has worked diligently to formulate and recommend language that will address concerns arising from these court decisions. Although the Garcetti and related decisions apply principally to public rather than private sector employees, nonetheless we and the national AAUP believe it is important for us to articulate clearly our commitment to academic freedom not only as it relates to research, but to academic freedom and freedom of expression involving teaching, committee work, and indeed all aspects of what we do as members of the Fairfield University community. The FWC/AAUP Executive Committee and the AAUP national office agree that the proposed language helps make clear that Fairfield University is committed to all these aspects of academic freedom and freedom of expression.

Recommended Action

We recommend the Academic Council discuss in which documents the proposed language would most appropriately reside, presumably the Faculty Handbook and/or Faculty Contracts, and then begin the process of moving the proposed language through the steps needed for approval and eventual incorporation into those documents.
TO: Susan Rakowitz, Executive Secretary of Academic Council

FROM: Qin Zhang, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Chair

DATE: December 14, 2011

RE: U.S. Diversity Criteria Language Modification

The UCC approved the following modifications to the language on U.S. Diversity Criteria in the *Journal of Record* on December 6, 2011 for the consideration of the Academic Council.

The current wording in the *Journal of Record* regarding U.S. Diversity is as follows (Page 11):

> In order to help students to develop a critical consciousness of self and society the required diversity courses/course sections will explore in a systematic manner connections among race, class, and gender in looking at issues of privilege and differences in U.S. society. These courses/course sections may also consider additional issues, such as religion, sexual orientation, and ethnicity.

The UCC approved the following modifications recommended by the U.S. Diversity Subcommittee and is now recommending to the Academic Council that it accept these changes for inclusion in the *Journal of Record*:

> In order to help students to develop a critical consciousness of self and society the required diversity courses/course sections will explore in a systematic manner connections among (three or more of) race, class, gender, sexuality, ethnicity, religion, and disability in looking at issues of privilege, differences, and discrimination in US society. Specifically, at least 50% of the graded assignments of the courses/course sections should reflect the said US Diversity criteria.

The UCC also approved a motion that directs the US Diversity Subcommittee to grandfather in the designation for those courses/course sections that currently have the U.S. diversity designation, and to apply the new language, once approved by the Academic Council, only to new submissions. The grandfathering directive is added for practical reasons: (1) reviewing all course sections currently designated would be an onerous burden for the subcommittee, and (2) requiring resubmission of courses that currently have the designation would be an onerous burden on the professors.

**History and Rationale**

The UCC first reviewed the U.S. Diversity criteria language at the May 3, 2011 meeting in response to the request from the U.S. Diversity Subcommittee to address the concern that the selection criteria the subcommittee has been using are not in line with the *Journal of Record*.
stipulation. To give equal footing to all criteria components and to highlight the importance of intersection of some components, the UCC approved the following modifications to the U.S. Diversity language:

In order to help students to develop a critical consciousness of self and society the required diversity courses/course sections will explore in a systematic manner connections among (two or more of) race, class, gender, sexuality, ethnicity, religion, and disability in looking at issues of privilege and differences in US society.

The U.S. Diversity Subcommittee later recommended the following modifications to the UCC-approved new language in September, 2011. The UCC reviewed the modifications at November 1 and December 6 meetings and approved them on December 6, 2011.

In order to help students to develop a critical consciousness of self and society the required diversity courses/course sections will explore in a systematic manner connections among (three or more of) race, class, gender, sexuality, ethnicity, religion, and disability in looking at issues of privilege, differences, and discrimination in US society. Specifically, at least 50% of the graded assignments of the courses/course sections should reflect the said US Diversity criteria.

Specifically, the subcommittee recommended three modifications:

1. Change TWO to THREE: to make the new language equally rigorous as the original wording in the Journal of Record that recommends the intersection of three components.

2. Include the word ‘discrimination’: to help students reflect on the issues related to power imbalance, injustice, and the US history of violence.

3. Include specific quantifying criteria for student outcomes: to help assess student learning outcomes.

UCC Minutes Excerpts

Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Meeting
May 3, 2011
3:30-5:00 p.m.
Dimenna-Nyselius Library Conference Room

US Diversity Subcommittee Report (carried over from April 5)

The Chair stated that UCC needs to approve or reject the education class which was modified and then recommend by the US diversity for approval (ED 200).

Zhang moved to approve, Miecznikowski seconded. Chair spoke briefly in favor of the motion.
The motion was approved unanimously.

On a related topic, the Chair indicated a request had been made from the US diversity subcommittee regarding the Journal of Record language. Apparently, what the committee had been using for selection criteria was not in line with the Journal insofar as they had been using the criteria disjunctively rather than conjunctively. The subcommittee requests the UCC address their concern regarding the current JoR language.

Current JoR language on US diversity:

In order to help students to develop a critical consciousness of self and society the required diversity courses/course sections will explore in a systematic manner connections among race, class, and gender in looking at issues of privilege and differences in U.S. society. These courses/course sections may also consider additional issues, such as religion, sexual orientation, and ethnicity.

Walker-Canton asked for clarification: should the criteria all have “equal footing” or intersection as shown by the conjunction?

Crabtree asked if past courses were approved based on intersectionality? The belief was that they were. She thinks that some intersection is important, but the intersection of all of them is untenable. There are six criteria currently in the JofR language—some intersection among them is important—and demonstrating evidence of intersection is important.

Kris concurred with Crabtree. Favors broadening the definition to a more equal footing without requiring with all topics.

Crabtree suggested the following language to replace the current JoR language:

In order to help students to develop a critical consciousness of self and society the required diversity courses/course sections will explore in a systematic manner connections among (two or more of) race, class, gender, sexuality, ethnicity, religion, and disability in looking at issues of privilege and differences in US society.

Miecznikowski moved to approve, Schaffer seconded. Motion was approved unanimously.

Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
DRAFT Meeting Minutes
1 November 2011
3:30-5:00 p.m.

U.S. Diversity Language Criteria Modification

Nikki Lee-Wingate, Chair of the U.S. Diversity Committee, presented the proposed language changes. See attachment. The proposed changes would be to the JOR language. She explained each of the three proposed changes: first, that a course must have substantial intersections among
the categories, and thus the need for at least three (not two as in current language); privilege and difference lead to the addition of “discrimination,” which gets at the negative effects on individuals, so that students are exposed to those effects, reflect on them, and do critical analysis of them; stipulating at least fifty percent (50%) of graded assignments and thus measurable outcomes (not just readings) pertain to U.S. Diversity provides concrete criteria. Thus what has been regular praxis of the committee in evaluating courses now would be implemented in the wording.

**Motion: to approve the changes in language:** Rosivach. Seconded: Fernandez

Fitzgerald asked if the committee would re-examine existing courses. Rosivach said that typically they would be grandfathered in. Fitzgerald suggested that they be grandfathered only for specific professors teaching the existing courses. He proposed an amendment to the motion: that those courses that already carry U.S. Diversity designation be grandfathered in for those instructors already teaching the courses. He seconded. Discussion ensued on precise language. Rosivach moved to table. Ruffini seconded.

**Vote to table passed: 15 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.**

---

**Undergraduate Curriculum Committee**  
**DRAFT Meeting Minutes Excerpts**  
6 December 2011  
3:30-5:00 p.m.

**US Diversity Language Criteria Modifications**

Zhang: Previously, the UCC approved an amendment to the original motion to the new US Diversity Language Criteria to grandfather older courses. The US Diversity committee voted against that amendment.

Lee-Wingate: The Committee was confused as to why the UCC sent an amendment to them. The grandfathering clause didn’t make sense to them because their new language is about moving forward. We’re asking the UCC where that is coming from, so we can understand the purpose of including it. In our opinion, we don’t think the current courses that have received designation will be hurt, or disadvantaged by this new language. These have been the operational guidelines under which we’ve been working.

Rosivach: The concern is: Would we have to review all current courses to make sure each current course fits the new proposed language? To avoid this, Fitzgerald wanted the grandfathering clause to be included, and only if taught by the same professor.

Lee-Wingate: The current courses won’t have to jump through any new hoops to be approved. Rosivach: Historically there have been problems getting diversity courses, and precisely because they have to jump through hoops.
Lee-Wingate: The subcommittee wants to increase the number of courses offered with this designation. Want to make the maintenance or renewal of this process as easy as possible.

Original motion: approve their original motion

Discussion about process ensued…

Original motion to approve:

In order to help students to develop a critical consciousness of self and society the required diversity courses/course sections will explore in a systematic manner connections among (three or more of) race, class, gender, sexuality, ethnicity, religion, and disability in looking at issues of privilege, differences, and discrimination in US society. Specifically, at least 50% of the graded assignments of the courses/course sections should reflect the said US Diversity criteria.

Approved unanimously.

New motion: Ruffini moves the UCC recommend to the US Diversity Subcommittee that the US Diversity Designation be grandfathered in for those courses/course sections that have already been so designated. Rosivach Seconds.

Perkus: does the word ‘recommend’ do anything? We should not recommend, but charge them to do it.

Perkus suggests a friendly amend to the motion to say the UCC directs the US Diversity Subcommittee. Kris seconds.

Motion approved: 13 – 0 – 1.

Rosivach calls the question on the original motion as amended: The UCC directs the US Diversity Subcommittee to grandfather in the Designation for those courses/course sections that have already been so designated.

The motion was approved unanimously.