ACADEMIC COUNCIL
AGENDA
Monday, March 5, 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. Approval of minutes for meeting on 2/6/2012 (attached)
   b. Correspondence: Memo dated 1/27/2012 re Concerns over Trends at Fairfield (attached); Emails re memo dated 1/27/2012 (attached)
   c. Oral reports

4. Council Subcommittee Reports
   a. Subcommittee for considering remaining items from ad hoc JOR committee recommendations (previously distributed; also online)
   b. Subcommittee on Center for Continuing Studies (attachment)
   c. Subcommittee to consider proposing IDEA form for administrators
   d. Subcommittee re: Workers’ Bill of Rights
   e. Subcommittee on Community-Engaged Scholarship
   f. Subcommittee on broader academic freedom language for governance documents

5. Petitions for immediate hearing

6. Old Business

7. New business
   a. Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees: report from last meeting and input for March meeting (Ongoing Item 2)
   b. Proposal from UCC to modify Journal of Record entry on US Diversity requirement (attachment)
   c. Appointment of faculty members to Student Conduct Board and Student Academic Grievance Board (attachment)
   d. Change to Journal of Record re philosophy core course numbering (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 2/6/2012 (pages 3-10)
For item 3.b.i Memo dated 1/27/2012 re Concerns over Trends at Fairfield (pages 11-19), Emails re memo dated 1/27/2012 (page 20)
For item 4.a Report from Subcommittee to consider remaining items from review of the Journal of Record (distributed with 11/17 packet and 12/6 packet; online at www.faculty.fairfield.edu/gfs/ac11_12.html with materials for the 3/5 meeting, agenda item 4.a)
For item 4.b Proposed Recommendations regarding a Center for Continuing Education (page 21)
For item 6.a Report from Executive Committee on new edition of Handbook (distributed on 2/27; separately stapled)
For item 7.b Proposal from UCC to modify JoR entry on US Diversity requirement (pages 22-26)
For item 7.c Proposed change to JoR re faculty appointments for Faculty Panel for Student Conduct Board and Student Academic Grievance Board (page 27)
For item 7.d Proposed change to course numbering for Philosophy core requirement (page 28)

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)
I. DSB core language requirement revisited, due April 2012 (AC 2/27/2012)

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
Draft Minutes of Meeting
Monday, February 6, 2012
CNS 200

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

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

Regrets: Dean Jack Beal

FUSA representative: Nicoletta Richardson

Guest: Alison Kris

Preli called the meeting to order at 3:31 p.m.

1. Presidential Courtesy

   **MOTION** [Fitzgerald/Rakowitz]: That the Academic Council go into executive session.

   **MOTION PASSED**: 15 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstention

   FUSA representative Richardson was asked to leave the room, and the Academic Council went into executive session until 3:45 p.m. At that time, Richardson was welcomed back to the meeting.

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty

   Mulvey reported that there was a collegial meeting of the General Faculty on 2/3/2012 and announced the next scheduled meeting is on March 2.

3. Report from the Executive Secretary

   **MOTION** [Lane/Walker]: To approve the minutes of the 11/21/2011 meeting of the Academic Council.

   Bayne made the following correction: On p. 2 of the minutes [p.4 of the packet] about two thirds of the way down, the sentence reads: “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.” It should read: “Professor Bayne spoke against the motion saying that in the current situation with merit raises, accepting the motion means that there would be no raises for new faculty until the beginning of their seventh year.” On p. 3 of the minutes [p. 5 of the packet] at the top, the sentence reads: “Professor Bayne spoke against saying the issue is about tenure not promotion.” The sentence should read: “Professor Bayne spoke against the motion saying it would be inappropriate to insert the last sentence of the motion into section II.A.1.b.(3) of the Handbook due to the fact that this section of the Handbook concerns promotion not tenure.”

MOTION PASSED: 15 in favor, 0 opposed, 3 abstentions

MOTION [Zera/Walker]: To approve the minutes of the 12/5/2011 meeting of the Academic Council.

MOTION PASSED: 16 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstentions

Rakowitz noted correspondence from Mary Ann Palazzi (Coordinator of Programs for Student-Athletes) reporting “Spring 2012 Semester Conflicts with Final Exams and Scheduled Athletic Contests,” and correspondence from Qin Zhang (Chair of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee). Rakowitz noted that the ACEC was in the process of trying to come up with a proposed response to the UCC's question. Rakowitz reported on the membership of various subcommittees of the Academic Council:

- Subcommittee on the Workers’ Bill of Rights: Bucki, Dewitt, Dohm, Reed, Rosivach
- Subcommittee on a Center for Continuing Studies: Bowen, G. Campbell, Perkus, Robert, Schmidt
- Subcommittee on Community-Engaged Scholarship: Boryczka, Calderwood, Keenan, O’Shea, Quan, Rusu, and VanHise

Lane asked if the correspondence from Palazzi required any action of the part of the Academic Council. Mulvey said that it was an ongoing item of the Academic Council and it was accepted that there would always be conflicts, but that this was an acceptable way to deal with the issue.

4. Council Subcommittee Reports

a. Subcommittee on University College Matters

Preli noted that the Academic Council needs to approve the “Agreed-upon underlying principles on part-time students and the BPS” recommended in the report to the Academic Council by the Academic Council Subcommittee on University College Matters.

Crabtree noted that the College of Arts and Sciences faculty had not yet voted on whether to adopt the Bachelor of Professional Studies (BPS) in the College of Arts and Sciences. The issue will be considered at the 2/10/2012 meeting of the College of Arts and Sciences faculty.
**MOTION [Mulvey/Shea]:** To approve principles 1, 2, and 3 of the “Agreed-upon underlying principles on part-time students and the BPS”:

1. Each school is entitled to decide whether or not to admit part-time students.
2. For a school that decides to admit part-time students, part-time *degree-seeking* students must be subject to the same admission criteria and curriculum requirements as their full-time counterparts.
3. Part-time *non-degree-seeking* students need not be required to meet regular admission criteria and should be allowed to take courses on a space-available basis. Part-time *non-degree-seeking* students must meet course prerequisites or have permission of the appropriate department chair. Part-time *non-degree-seeking* students may take up to two courses per semester.

Nantz could speak neither for nor against the motion. She was “struggling.” She said it seems as though we want part-time students, but we treat them like 2nd class citizens. She said we need a mission statement regarding part-time students.

Mulvey reported that the subcommittee thought that part-time students should *not* be treated like 2nd class citizens. She argued that the underlying principles of admission are pretty straightforward.

Campbell reported that the School of Nursing does not currently admit part-time students. She argued that perhaps the principles in question would not make it feasible for students who occasionally take courses.

**MOTION PASSED:** 15 in favor, 2 opposed, 1 abstention

**MOTION [Mulvey/Rakowitz]:** To approve principle 8 of the “Agreed-upon underlying principles on part-time students and the BPS”:

8. Advising for part-time *degree-seeking* students should be based in the relevant department. Part-time *degree-seeking* students should be assigned a faculty advisor in the same way as full-time students.

Crabtree reported that for the last few years we have been moving toward implementing principle 8. It is almost fully operational.

Nantz said that she was concerned about undecided students.

Fitzgerald stated that the office of exploratory academic advising, now directed by Jessica York, was designed to address this issue.

**MOTION PASSED:** 18 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions
**MOTION** [Mulvey/Lane]: To approve principle 12 of the “Agreed-upon underlying principles on part-time students and the BPS”:

12. The BPS is the only degree in which students would have a modified core.

Dennin asked if other students don’t already have a modified core.

Crabtree responded that certain majors have exceptions to the core.

Mulvey pointed out that principle 12 is meant to convey that students pursuing a BPS will continue to have the modified core as defined for BPS students in the Journal of Record.

**MOTION TO AMEND** [Nantz/Lane]: To amend the motion to read:

12. Only BPS students will have the modified core defined in the Journal of Record.

**MOTION TO AMEND PASSED**: 16 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

The question was called on the amended motion [Nantz/Lane]. The motion to call the question passed: 15 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.

**AMENDED MOTION PASSED**: 16 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions

**MOTION** [Mulvey/Rakowitz]: To approve principle 9 and the first sentence of principle 10 of the “Agreed-upon underlying principles on part-time students and the BPS”:

9. Part-time degree-seeking students may switch to full-time status at any time.

10. Permission of the appropriate dean is required for a full-time student to switch to part-time status.

Mulvey pointed out that this was current policy. She also noted that the second sentence of principle 10 (as it was written in the report to the Academic Council by the Academic Council Subcommittee on University College Matters) was intentionally left out of her motion because she did not think the principle was meant to be that strict.

Nantz asked: What if the appropriate dean did not give permission?

Dennin asked: Is permission routinely given?

Fitzgerald responded that a reasonable accommodation is always made.

Greenberg asked: Why is this principle even necessary? Isn’t simply a meeting with the appropriate dean sufficient?

**MOTION TO AMEND** [Nantz/Greenberg]: To amend the motion to read:
9. Part-time degree-seeking students may switch to full-time status at any time.
10. Consultation with the appropriate dean is required for a full-time student to switch to part-time status.

Crabtree spoke against the motion to amend because it was not strong enough to encourage students to follow through and actually meet with the appropriate dean.

**MOTION TO AMEND PASSED:** 15 in favor, 1 opposed, 2 abstentions

**AMENDED MOTION PASSED:** 16 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstentions

**MOTION [Mulvey/Boryczka]:** To approve principle 4 of the “Agreed-upon underlying principles on part-time students and the BPS”:

4. For day and evening classes, registration for part-time degree-seeking students is based on tuition rates in that students who pay a discounted tuition rate register after full-time students. Part-time degree-seeking students register first for online and ASAP (seven week) courses for the fall and spring semesters. Part-time non-degree-seeking students register after all other students on a space-available basis.

Nantz spoke against the motion arguing that we say we want diversity and then we discourage diversity.

Greenberg spoke against the motion arguing that the principle discriminates against part-time students.

Lane argued that all students should be treated equally.

Tromley spoke in favor of the motion arguing (1) that when you pay more, you get more, and (2) that part-time students have more flexibility in their schedules.

Richardson stated that it was unfair that all part-time students would have to register after full-time students.

Mulvey argued that she is for treating part-time students the same way as full-time students, but asked: When would they register, with what class?

Greenberg responded that Mulvey’s concern could easily be remedied. He also noted that if we follow Tromley’s logic (“when you pay more, you get more”), then we should merely auction off registration slots.

Nantz spoke against the motion speaking for a fully integrated rationale for registration.
Fitzgerald noted that there are already a number of prioritizations given in registration. He asked: Can we agree that we prioritize in a way that’s fair to the part-time students?

**MOTION [Mulvey/Fitzgerald]:** To send principle 4 to a subcommittee of the Academic Council. The Executive Committee of the Academic Council will form the subcommittee.

Greenberg spoke against the motion saying that there is a difference between reasonable and invidious discrimination. He argued that principle 4 did not need a subcommittee. It needs to be voted down.

Mulvev argued that someone needs to figure out what the principle for registration for part-time students should be.

Dennin said that the principle 4 seemed to be discriminatory.

The question was called on the motion [Lane/Dennin]. The motion to call the question passed: 15 in favor, 1 opposed, 1 abstention.

**MOTION PASSED: 16 in favor, 2 opposed, 0 abstentions**

**MOTION [Mulvey/Strauss]:** To approve principles 5 and 7 of the “Agreed-upon underlying principles on part-time students and the BPS”:

5. Part-time students should continue to have a per-credit tuition rate (currently $595/credit) that is competitive with other part-time programs in Fairfield’s market.

7. Rules (and their financial implications) for movement from full-time to part-time status should be clear at the time of matriculation.

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

Mulvev suggested that the Academic Council recess until the following Monday to consider other agenda items.

Gibson noted that there would be a problem with recessing until the following Monday given that the School of Business would be engaged in a reaccreditation meeting at that time.

Lane suggested that the Academic Council move forward.

**MOTION [Lane/Sapp]:** The Academic Council recommends to the General Faculty that the University College be closed.

**MOTION PASSED: 11 in favor, 3 opposed, 4 abstentions**
MOTION [Bayne/Patrino]: The Academic Council recommends that all undergraduate part-time students pay the same per credit hour rate.

Crabtree noted that when a student is in his/her 4th year, they have already benefited from a variety of programs offered during their first three years at Fairfield University.

Sapp spoke against the motion arguing that this was not part of the purview of the Academic Council.

Dennin spoke in favor of the motion arguing that we should (as much as we can) treat part-time students the same way as full-time students.

MOTION PASSED: 8 in favor, 3 opposed, 7 abstentions

A motion was made to reorder the agenda. The motion was passed unanimously. The next item considered was:

7. New Business

a. UCC motion on core language requirement for DSB

Alison Kris was invited to give a presentation. Kris first reported the main points of the School of Business:

- Changes in core language placement by the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures necessitated a revisiting of the core language requirement for School of Business students.

- The changes to the language placement generated substantial increases in the number of School of Business students being placed into “basic” level. The change increased the number of students placed in “basic” level language from less than 10% to more than 60%. This, in effect, increased the core requirement for many School of Business students from 2 semesters to 4 semesters.

- In order to remain competitive as a school, competitive with its peers, and competitive with employers, the School of Business needs to amend the core language requirement. Several peer institutions with 2 semester language requirements were cited including Marquette, Gonzaga, St. Joseph University, Xavier, and Holy Cross.

- Waiving the “intermediate level” requirement would encourage students to begin a new language, perhaps a non-traditional language.

- Changes to the language requirement would allow greater flexibility in terms of double majors and minors.

Kris then reported on the main points of the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures: The Department of Modern Languages and Literatures asserts that the changes to the language placement and leveling were necessary and responsive to accreditation
bodies. The point was made that the language placement scores differentiating
beginner from intermediate levels were, in fact, in-line with peer institutions.
It was suggested that the credit burden faced by School of Business could be eased in
many other ways, such as:
- Re-examining the need for other areas of the core instead of focusing on
the language core.
- Encouraging students to take two semesters of a language over the
summer prior to entering Fairfield.
- Trimming requirements within the major.
It was asserted that two semesters at a basic level is of limited utility as it would not
allow someone to be conversant in a meaningful way.
Kris then reported on the response of the School of Business:
Asking students to take language courses the summer prior to beginning at Fairfield
would contribute to “summer melt.”
It was the change in definition of what constituted “intermediate level” which
necessitated the change, which is why attention was focused on this area of the
core.
Trimming requirements within the major would make students less competitive in the job
market and would risk problems with accreditation.

Greenberg asked: Why weren’t other core courses considered?

Nantz noted that some majors have a higher core burden.

Rakowitz asked Kris if other possible alternatives were considered.

Kris reported that other alternatives did not come up.

**A MOTION [Greenberg/Shea] TO RECESS the meeting until 2/27/2012 PASSED
unanimously.**

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Keenan
MEMO

To: Fairfield University Faculty

From: Professors Richard DeWitt, Joy Gordon, Hugh Humphrey, Wendy Kohli, Philip Lane, Dee Lippman, Vincent Rosivach, Joan Van Hise

Co Signers: Listed at end of memo

Date: January 27, 2012

Re: Concerns over Trends at Fairfield

As the University faces an unprecedented financial crisis and calls upon all sectors of the University to make sacrifices, we believe it is important to understand the context in which this crisis evolved. The administration has explained the crisis as a result of a perfect storm resulting from external forces largely beyond their control. But a look at the data tells a different story. We believe that the current financial crisis was both foreseeable and avoidable. Furthermore, it is at least in part the result of long term negative trends in key University performance indicators.

The signers of this memo are deeply committed to Fairfield University, but we are deeply concerned about recent trends. It is our view that the faculty as a whole should be informed about these trends, so that we can fully meet our obligations to the university regarding governance and accountability; and also so that we will be in a position to make informed decisions about the proposals that affect us personally.

We note that it is possible that this year’s admissions data may show some improvement. The final data on yield rates will not be available until next September. However, our concern is not just one year’s performance of one indicator. Our concerns go to university policies and institutional priorities that have been in place for several years now.

Included among our concerns are the following:

• Yield rates are a crucial indicator of an institution’s health, and those rates at Fairfield have been trending in the wrong direction, in recent years reaching by far the lowest rates in our institution’s history.

• Admit rates are likewise a key indicator of institutional health and are also trending in the wrong direction, and in recent years we have had the most worrisome admit rates in Fairfield’s history.

• Until recent years we have never failed to meet our freshman enrollment targets. This is even more troubling given that in recent years we have been admitting our
historically highest percentages of our applicants.

- The difficulties with yield rates are not primarily a result of recent overall trends going beyond Fairfield, as evidenced by the fact that other institutions are generally not having enrollment difficulties on the scale that Fairfield is facing. For example, Sacred Heart, St. Joseph’s, St. Peter’s, Quinnipiac, Scranton and others have not had the difficulties with yield rates that Fairfield continues to face.

- In terms of overall spending, Fairfield continues to rank last or near last with respect to the percentage of our budget that goes to our core mission, that is, to education.

- Administrative positions in general continue to be added at a pace that far outstrips the growth in any other segment of the institution. Administration positions have increased by nearly 25% in the last six years, while faculty positions have increased by 10%, and all other positions have decreased.

- Not only has the overall number of administrative positions grown faster than any other segment of the university, but the number of vice president positions has increased substantially in recent years. Even facing an approximately $4 million budget shortfall, and at a time in which other campus employees were facing layoffs, the campus community learned of changes resulting in a net gain of vice president positions.

- In spite of the fact that key indicators of institutional health have been trending downwards, the salaries of our highest paid administrators have been trending upwards at quite high rates (they have increased 40-50% over the past six years). In comparison, the salaries of faculty and staff have barely kept up with cost of living increases.

The data indicates that our recent enrollment difficulties and subsequent budget shortfall are not the result of a perfect storm, but rather are a predictable outcome of management decisions that resulted in the trends summarized above and detailed below.

**Trends Involving Key Indicators of Institutional Health**

*Admit Rates and Yield*

As is generally known, the admit rate refers to the percentage of applicants Fairfield accepts, while the yield refers to the percentage of applicants Fairfield accepts that then accept us, that is, the number of accepted applicants that decide to come to Fairfield. It is very desirable to have a low admit rate and a high yield. Both of these rates have consistently been trending in the wrong direction. As recently at 2003, Fairfield was accepting less than 50% of applicants—among the lowest admit rates in the last forty years. But this rate has increased steadily, and our admit rate for 2010 was over 70%, one of the worst rates in the last forty years.

We see the same pattern in the yield rate. In 2002, our yield rate was nearly 25%—one of the
best rates Fairfield has had in the last twenty years. But that has declined steadily, and last year’s yield rate of 15.31% is the worst in forty years.

**Fairfield Admissions Trends (Undergraduate), 1970 to 2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Applications</th>
<th>Admitted</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>Admit Rate</th>
<th>Yield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>2,249</td>
<td>1,346</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>59.85%</td>
<td>51.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>2,646</td>
<td>1,541</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>58.24%</td>
<td>49.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>4,384</td>
<td>1,901</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>43.36%</td>
<td>39.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>5,689</td>
<td>2,189</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>38.48%</td>
<td>35.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>5,443</td>
<td>2,182</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>40.09%</td>
<td>35.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>5,711</td>
<td>2,257</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>39.52%</td>
<td>33.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>6,103</td>
<td>2,290</td>
<td>766</td>
<td>37.52%</td>
<td>33.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>5,917</td>
<td>2,375</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>40.14%</td>
<td>32.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>4,980</td>
<td>2,708</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>54.38%</td>
<td>27.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>4,762</td>
<td>3,030</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>63.63%</td>
<td>24.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>4,805</td>
<td>3,420</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>71.18%</td>
<td>25.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>4,784</td>
<td>3,346</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>69.94%</td>
<td>23.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>4,595</td>
<td>2,503</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>54.47%</td>
<td>32.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>4,841</td>
<td>3,425</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>70.75%</td>
<td>23.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>5,253</td>
<td>3,753</td>
<td>891</td>
<td>71.44%</td>
<td>23.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>5,494</td>
<td>3,747</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>68.20%</td>
<td>23.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>5,608</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>65.98%</td>
<td>23.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>6,457</td>
<td>3,966</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>61.42%</td>
<td>21.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>6,499</td>
<td>4,078</td>
<td>1,008</td>
<td>62.75%</td>
<td>24.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>7,128</td>
<td>3,504</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>49.16%</td>
<td>23.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>6,974</td>
<td>3,463</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>49.66%</td>
<td>24.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>7,655</td>
<td>3,782</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>49.41%</td>
<td>21.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>7,136</td>
<td>4,547</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>63.72%</td>
<td>19.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>6,895</td>
<td>5,130</td>
<td>982</td>
<td>74.40%</td>
<td>19.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>8,035</td>
<td>4,866</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>60.56%</td>
<td>19.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>8,557</td>
<td>4,686</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>54.76%</td>
<td>17.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>8,732</td>
<td>5,157</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>59.06%</td>
<td>17.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>8,315</td>
<td>5,328</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>64.08%</td>
<td>15.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>8,420</td>
<td>6,024</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>71.54%</td>
<td>15.31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are, of course, difficult economic times. But looking at a mixture of peer institutions, Jesuit universities, and others, we do not see difficulties on nearly the scale that Fairfield is facing with regard to admit rates and yield. It is understandable that schools such as Wesleyan, Holy Cross, and Georgetown might have better yield rates than Fairfield, but Sacred Heart, St. Joseph’s, St. Peter’s, Quinnipiac, Scranton and others have not had the difficulties with yield that Fairfield is having. The following chart compares a number of institutions with respect to admit rate and yield.
Admissions Data, Admit Rate and Yield, Comparison Schools
Data is from the administrations, for the most recent year publically available, generally fall 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Admit Rate</th>
<th>Yield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan</td>
<td>22.03%</td>
<td>33.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Cross</td>
<td>35.47%</td>
<td>29.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Connecticut</td>
<td>49.69%</td>
<td>29.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgetown</td>
<td>39.52%</td>
<td>28.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Delaware</td>
<td>50.57%</td>
<td>27.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villanova</td>
<td>45.16%</td>
<td>25.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Joseph's</td>
<td>82.36%</td>
<td>22.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacred Heart</td>
<td>65.12%</td>
<td>20.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>59.23%</td>
<td>17.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Peter's</td>
<td>48.37%</td>
<td>16.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinnipiac</td>
<td>71.98%</td>
<td>16.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scranton</td>
<td>74.38%</td>
<td>16.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyola Maryland</td>
<td>65.86%</td>
<td>16.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield University</td>
<td>71.54%</td>
<td>15.31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We are also concerned about the administration’s decisions to devote an inordinately high proportion of resources to priorities other than education. In addition to admit rates and yield, we do not seem to compare favorably when we look at the percentage of our budget that goes to our core mission, that is, to education. For example, Quinnipiac, a competitor, spends over half of its budget on education, and schools such as Marist and Scranton are similar, while Fairfield spends only about 38% of its budget on education. The following chart summarizes such data, again from the most recent data publically available. The table is based on data supplied by the administrations of the institutions to the government.

Percent of Budget Spent on Core Mission, Comparison Schools
Data is self reported data to the government, from the administration of each institution. Data is from the 2009-2010 Fiscal Year (the most recent data publically available).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>% Spent on Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Villanova</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quinnipiac</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U Delaware</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marist</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scranton</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy Cross</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Clara</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fordham</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacred Heart</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Growth in Administrative Positions Relative to Growth in Faculty and Staff

The administrative side of the institution has consistently been the fastest growing segment of our community, and that trend has continued in recent years. Not only has the overall number of administrative positions grown faster than any other segment of the university, but the number of vice president positions has increased substantially in recent years. At a time in which other campus employees were facing layoffs, and the University was faced with an approximately $4 million budget shortfall (which has since grown to over $6 million), the campus community learned of changes resulting in a net gain of two to three additional vice president positions. Administration positions have increased by nearly 25% in the last six years, while faculty positions have increased by 10%, and all other positions have decreased. Since 1990, administrative positions have increased by over 100%, while faculty positions have increased by one third, and other positions have declined by one quarter. The chart on the following page summarizes growth in administrative positions as compared to other segments of the university.

Trends in Administrative Growth

Full time positions. Data supplied by Fairfield University administration. The "Administration" category includes employees not classified as Faculty, Technical & Paraprofessional, Clerical & Secretarial, Skilled Crafts, or Maintenance. Until 2008 this category was referred to as "Administration;" since then as "Administration/Management" and "Other Professionals."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>All Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>712</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2001  n/a  
2002  269  223  243  735  
2003  257  221  246  724  
2004  262  227  245  734  
2005  276  230  244  750  
2006  299  243  240  782  
2007  310  239  244  793  
2008  302  252  234  788  
2009  326  253  211  790  
2010  326  250  208  784  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administration</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>All Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Change in Growth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-2010</td>
<td>365.7%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-2010</td>
<td>191.1%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>-1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-2010</td>
<td>101.2%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>-24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2010</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>-16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-2010</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>-15.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Growth in Administrative Salaries Relative to that of Faculty and Staff

In addition to the numbers of administrative positions, salary for senior administrators has grown at a substantially higher rate than that of the rest of the campus community. The salaries of the president and highest paid vice-presidents have increased substantially in the past 10 years, with by far the greatest increases coming in the last 6 years, during which time increases for the highest paid members of the administration ranged from 30% to 50%. Faculty salaries in the past six years have increased, at most, by 22%. As staff salary increases on average tend to mirror faculty salary increases, the average staff salary percent increase has likely been in the same range as faculty. The chart below summarizes salary trends in recent years.

Trends in Administrative Salaries and Faculty/Staff Salaries
Data from Fairfield University Form 990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>President</th>
<th>AVP / SVPAA</th>
<th>VP Finance</th>
<th>VP Advancement</th>
<th>VP Information Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001-2002</td>
<td>$187,000</td>
<td>$152,000</td>
<td>$165,000</td>
<td>$162,000</td>
<td>$140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002-2003</td>
<td>$190,740</td>
<td>$155,040</td>
<td>$168,300</td>
<td>$165,240</td>
<td>$142,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
% Increase

2001-2010  60.4%  55.6%  60.6%  57.8%  46.6%
2004-2010  50.0%  50.0%  44.8%  42.0%  32.4%

% Increase in Mean Faculty Salaries
(Staff % changes will be approximately the same).
Data is from faculty contracts.

2001-2010
Professors  32.6%
Associate Profs.  32.1%
Assistant Profs.  25.3%

2004-2010
Professors  22.3%
Associate Profs.  19.6%
Assistant Profs  15.9%

While we do not have data on the salaries of support staff, there is anecdotal evidence that in many cases support staff receive low salaries, with minimal raises, and are not being paid a livable wage, even when their work performance is high. There are secretaries, program assistants, and administrative assistants who have worked at Fairfield for over a decade; have a high workload with considerable responsibilities; do an excellent job; receive minimal annual raises; and whose current salary, after ten years or more, is approximately $30,000 annually.

We spoke with one person who worked at Fairfield for many years, and had a master’s degree. Her starting salary was $25,000 per year, and her salary when she left was $28,000. She was a single mother with two children, and she left because Fairfield did not provide a livable wage.

Concluding Remarks

We are concerned by the trends noted above in many regards. These trends raise deep concerns about the overall health of the institution, and they raise deep concerns about the management
decisions that led to these trends. And we wonder if the university has made the right choice by continuing to increase salaries and positions for administrators, especially in light of the trends in performance indicators noted above.

Even if there is some improvement in the university's performance this year, we are speaking to trends that have been ongoing for many years now, and we are speaking to issues of accountability that are of continuing concern and that need to be addressed.

As noted, the signers of this memo are deeply committed to Fairfield University. We invite the general faculty to join us in calling for a conversation within the university community as to how the university may better act in accordance with principles of good management, transparency, and accountability, as well as equity, respect, and social justice.
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From: Rakowitz, Susan  
Sent: Monday, February 20, 2012 3:34 PM  
To: Rosivach, Vincent  
Cc: Mulvey, Irene; Preli, Rona; Fitzgerald, Paul  
Subject: Trends Memo

Vin,

The ACEC has received your request that the Council take up relevant issues in the Trends memo. Would you please send us your source documents and an explanation of your intentions and goals so that we can figure out how best to proceed?

Thanks,
Susan, AC Exec Sec'y

From: "Rosivach, Vincent" <Rosivach@fairfield.edu>  
Date: Fri, 24 Feb 2012 13:51:36 -0500  
To: Susan Rakowitz <srakowitz@fairfield.edu>  
Subject: RE: Trends Memo

Dear Susan,

Thank you for your note. Below please find a list of the sources used to compile the data in our earlier memo.

Our intention is to promote a wider discussion among the faculty about the trends noted in our earlier memo. Our belief is that the University is at a critical juncture and that as we look to the future the University can only benefit from the broadest and most diverse discussion of the problems facing us. Our goal in requesting to meet with the Council (and with the relevant faculty committees) is to advance that wider discussion. If the Council is amenable to such a meeting we can work out the details of date, number of representatives from our committee, etc.

Thank you again for your kind attention,

Vin Rosivach

on behalf of the authors of the memo expressing concern over trends at Fairfield

Sources of data used in memo

1. Admissions data, percent of budget spent on core mission, and trends in administrative growth: IPEDS data and/or Fairfield Fact Books. The data in the Fairfield Fact Books reflect the data reported to the government and publically available from the IPEDS data center. The IPEDS data is available at http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds; Fairfield Fact Books are available at the Dimenna-Nyselius Library.

2. Administrative Salaries: IRS Form 990. These are publically available from a variety of sources, for example, guidestar.org.
Proposed Recommendations regarding a Center for Continuing Education

1. The proposal for a Center should be referred back to the Committee on University College (CUC) for reconsideration in light of changes that have occurred at Fairfield University since the original proposal was developed last year.

2. If the CUC would still like to recommend that a Center be established, that should be treated as a new proposal. Any proposal for a new Center should be presented by the CUC with a comprehensive business plan that shows expected benefits, costs and risks, along with an implementation timeline that shows next steps. The proposal would be routed as follows:

   CUC → EPC → Academic Council

3. For the time being, if University College is closed, responsibility for non-credit programs should reside in the schools. The distribution of existing non-credit programs should be taken up by the CUC. The CUC should be asked to collect data on existing non-credit programs within the schools. The potential for growth of existing programs and the development of new programs could also be explored by the CUC. The current makeup of the CUC (an elected faculty member from each of the five schools as well as ex officio membership from the administration) makes it an ideal location for such institutional planning and collaboration.

Rationale:
1. The climate at Fairfield University has changed significantly since the proposal for a Center was developed last year as part of the comprehensive motion to close University College. Recommendations from the CUC for the Center should be revisited in light of recent developments, such as the University’s financial issues and faculty concerns about trends such as increasing numbers of administrative positions.
2. If the CUC would still like to recommend a Center, they should put together a more complete proposal, including a summary of existing programs and the anticipated benefits of a Center. With representatives from all schools and the administration, the CUC would be an appropriate group for further developing the proposal. A timeline and description of next steps should also be included.
3. By locating non-credit programs in the schools for the time being, other aspects of the proposal to close University College that are not related to non-credit programs can continued to be considered separately, without having to wait for the concept of a Center for Continuing Education to be completely explored by the CUC. In the interim, the CUC can act as a think tank for strategic conversations among and between academic schools vis-à-vis non-credit programming.
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
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 JoR 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.
MEMORANDUM
Secretary of the General Faculty
Fairfield University

TO: Academic Council
FROM: Irene Mulvey, Secretary of the General Faculty
DATE: February 28, 2012
RE: Proposed changes to the Journal of Record re Student Academic Grievance Board and Faculty Panel for Student Conduct Boards.

Recently approved text for the Journal of Record described the purpose and composition of the Faculty Panel for Student Conduct Boards and the Student Academic Grievance Board (copied below with proposed changes). The approved language had faculty members for these boards elected by the General Faculty. I suggested to the Academic Council last fall that it would be better to have the new members of these boards appointed by the Committee on Committees each fall following a faculty-wide call for nominations, and that I would bring revised language for the Journal of Record back to the Council.

Student Academic Grievance Board:
The purpose of the Student Academic Grievance Board is to provide a pool of faculty from which faculty representatives are drawn to serve on a Grievance Committee, when a Grievance Committee is formed as described in the Student Academic Grievance Procedure. The Student Academic Grievance Board consists of nine tenured faculty members, each having at least three years of full time service at Fairfield University, elected from the General Faculty. New members are appointed each fall by the Committee on Committees. The term of service is three years; faculty may be reelected reappointed upon completion of a term.

AC: 03/01/2010

Faculty Panel for Student Conduct Boards:
The purpose of the Faculty Panel for Student Conduct Boards is to provide a pool of faculty from which faculty representatives are drawn to serve on Student Conduct Boards, when such boards are convened as described in the Student Handbook. The Faculty Panel for Student Conduct Boards consists of nine faculty members, each with at least four years full time service at Fairfield University, elected from the General Faculty. New members are appointed each fall by the Committee on Committees. The term of service is three years; faculty may be reelected reappointed upon completion of a term.

AC: 05/03/2010
Amended AC: 12/6/2010

Rationale:
- At the May General Faculty meeting, we elect faculty members to Faculty Handbook committees. The agenda for the May GF meeting is always overfull and adding new elections to that meeting would make the meeting even longer.
- Service on these boards does not rise the level of service on Handbook committees and does not require election by faculty colleagues.
- In the past, faculty members to these boards have been appointed by the Committee on Committees in the fall. This has the advantage of allowing newly appointed faculty members the opportunity for service, if appropriate, immediately.
Memo

To: Academic Council Executive Committee

From: Steven M. Bayne, Chair, Department of Philosophy

Date: 2/18/2012

Re: Change to Journal of Record

---------------------------------------------

Dear members of the Academic Council Executive Committee,

As Chair of the Department of Philosophy, I am writing to propose a small change to the
Journal of Record.

Proposed Change:

At the bottom of page nine of the November 2009 printing of the JoR it reads: Area III: Philosophy and Religious Studies

(1) 2 semesters of philosophy. PH 10 is required.

We are proposing that this passage be changed to (addition in **bold and underline**): Area III: Philosophy and Religious Studies

(1) 2 semesters of philosophy. PH 101 is required.

Rationale:

In our recently approved curriculum revision (our curriculum revision proposal as approved by the UCC on 12/6/2012 is separately attached as an appendix), PH 101: Introduction to Philosophy will be replacing PH 10: Questions in Ancient and Medieval Philosophy as the first core course in philosophy. The proposed change to the JoR simply reflects the approved change to the philosophy curriculum.