ACADEMIC COUNCIL
AGENDA
Monday, April 2, 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
      i. Meeting of 2/6/2012 reconvened on 2/27/2012 (attached)
      ii. Meeting of 3/5/2012 (attached)
   b. Correspondence
   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 to consider proposing IDEA form for administrators
   c. Subcommittee re: Workers’ Bill of Rights (attached)
   d. Subcommittee on Community-Engaged Scholarship
   e. Subcommittee on broader academic freedom language for governance documents

5. Petitions for immediate hearing

6. Old Business
   a. Report from Executive Committee on new edition of Handbook (separately stapled with
      materials for the 3/5 AC meeting; also online)
   b. Slightly revised JoR language for AC motions on part-time students approved by AC on 2/6
      (attached)
   c. Report from group formed at AC meeting on 2/27 to discuss DSB core language concerns
      (attachment)

7. New business
   a. Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees: report from 3/29/2012 meeting
      (Ongoing Item 2)
   b. Report from the NEASC subcommittee working on governance standard
   c. Proposed Handbook amendment from the Advancement Committee (attachment)
   d. Report from FDEC evaluating ongoing use of IDEA and yellow sheets (Pending Items D and
      E) (attachment)
   e. Women’s Studies name change to be recorded in the Journal of Record (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 reconvened on 2/27/2102 (pages 3-9)
For item 3.a.ii Minutes from AC meeting of 3/5/2012 (pages 10-13)
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; also online)
For item 4.c Report from the Subcommittee on the Workers’ Bill of Rights (pages 14-20)
For item 6.a Report from Executive Committee on new edition of Handbook (distributed at 2/27 meeting separately stapled; also online)
For item 6.b Revised JoR language for AC-approved motions on part-time students (page 21)
For item 6.c Report from group formed at 2/27 AC meeting to discuss DSB core language concerns (page 22)
For item 7.c Proposed Handbook amendment from Advancement Committee (pages 23-24)
For item 7.d Report from FDEC considering ongoing use of IDEA and yellow sheets (pages 25-27)
For item 7.e Women’s Studies name change to be recorded in JoR (pages 28-29)

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
D. Gibson spoke in favor of the motion and read the following statement:

In supporting this motion, the DSB would like to emphasize that our proposal pertaining to the language requirement arose because of the actions of another department that drastically affects our students. We are not interested in “changing the core,” but in following patterns that were already in place prior to this change. We tried to reach a mutually acceptable resolution to this issue four years ago when it first arose, and have been available for discussion of ideas ever since. Our proposal, which specifies a higher foreign language requirement than Fairfield’s other professional schools and is highly consistent with our peer competitive institutions, Jesuit and otherwise, was developed and approved in the DSB Curriculum Committee; went to the DSB full faculty where it was unanimously approved; went to the University Curriculum Committee where, after over three hours of discussion spanning three meetings, it was approved. It was the understanding of the UCC and SVPAA that the decision of the UCC was sufficient to implement the proposal. The Journal of Record stipulates under “Changes in Core Requirements,” that “Included here also are those situations where groups of students are to be excused from some part of the Core requirements...,” which is what the DSB is proposing, and the routing requirements are listed as from 1) Curriculum Area Chair(s) to 2) UCC (see JOR, p. 65, #6).

We understand that the Executive Committee and the Academic Council has the right of review of policies passed by the UCC, and needs to approve changes that will be entered into the Journal of Record, but it would be helpful if it was made clearer which kinds of decisions will go to the AC and General Faculty and which will not.

This is especially germane because substantial changes to the core routinely pass the UCC and are implemented immediately with no decision or review required of the Academic Council or General Faculty. To encourage the credibility and legitimacy of Fairfield’s governance structure and the processes necessary for changes to the curriculum, we recommend that the AC clarify these issues.”
S. Rakowitz agreed that there is some confusion in the JOR regarding routing and suggested that clarification might be made.

C. Tromley spoke in favor of the motion. She wondered why the recent changes in the Philosophy Department core courses went only to the UCC. It seems to her like policy has not been applied equitably across the schools.

I. Mulvey said that the Philosophy Department changes were a little different in that they were proposed by the core-offering department as opposed to the kinds of changes in core requirements asked for in this current case by the DSB.

R. Crabtree said that regarding core curriculum revisions, the changes in Modern Language Department core courses were the outcome of major departmental review processes resulting from comments and input from outside reviewers. We have to be flexible about fitting the review process to the significance of the changes and the student learning outcomes that are being addressed. Dean Crabtree supports some version of the DSB proposal, but wants to be clear that changes in Modern Language Department bring an antiquated curriculum up to date. The changes reflect current best practices in language instruction at the college level.

The motion passed, 15 in favor/0 opposed/0 abstentions.

2. Item 7.b. Registration proposal from Faculty Athletics Committee.

G. Ruffini, representing the Faculty Athletics Committee, reported that on occasion students show up for class saying they didn’t know what classes they were registered for. It came to light that someone else was registering some of our student athletes for their courses. After good conversations with administrators in the athletics department, the committee learned that there are often travel conflicts during the registration time period. However, FAC was concerned about the broader issue of students getting PIN codes without proper advising. The committee wants to address the student athlete problem by getting at the broader issue of students more closely adhering to the advising process that results in obtaining their PIN codes. At very least, student athletes will be required to have face-to-face conversation with someone in the academic area before they select courses.

D. Keenan asked how the students get their PIN without seeing advisor. G. Ruffini answered that there are a variety of methods; students tell the registrar things like, “I met with my advisor, but forgot to get my PIN” or “I can’t find my advisor, can you give me my PIN.” Some departments have lists of PINS and distribute them as needed by students.

Motion: That use of a student’s PIN not be activated to allow for registration until the student’s faculty advisor, department head or dean has used his or her own Net ID login to verify that he or she has consulted with the student, issued the student’s PIN, and approved the student’s proposed course of study. (Mulvey/Greenberg)

The motion passed, 15 for/0 against/0 abstention.

Reordered agenda (15 in favor/0 opposed)

3. Item 4a. Subcommittee on University College matters.

Motion: The Academic Council recommends to the General Faculty that University College be closed. (Greenberg/Shea)

The motion passed, 15 in favor/0 against/0 abstentions.
I. Mulvey said the General Faculty will vote on this motion on at its next meeting. The Academic Council has authority to decide other details. P. Fitzgerald said in item #6 the specific dollar figures would not go into the Journal of Record. I. Mulvey said bullets at bottom concerning the Center for Continuing Education are still being discussed.

B. Walker asked if the Handbook Committee on Continuing Education was still needed. I. Mulvey said there is still a Handbook committee that has business to discuss. R. Crabtree said that there is still work to do through transition, but that we may want to change the specific charge of the committee over time as its role changes.

R. Crabtree thanked I. Mulvey for the clear and concise document she put together that represents the work of many people over two years. Warm applause from the Council followed.

4. Item 4b. Subcommittee on voting rights.

Rick DeWitt, Steve Bayne, and Doug Lyon constituted the sub-committee charged with investigating the issue of voting rights. The sub-committee wanted to define voting rights across campus mirroring rights on the Academic Council. Full-time faculty are those who spend more than 75% of their time on teaching and research. The Faculty Handbook states that the faculty of each school should determine voting rights within that school. The sub-committee recommends that the Academic Council pass along recommendations to schools that they bring their own governance documents in line with the Academic Council rules for voting.

The recommendations are as follows:

1. That all schools review their governance documents to ensure that the document incorporates the following principle: Each school’s governance document should clearly define a full time faculty member as a member of the General Faculty who is under a full time faculty contract with the rank of Instructor or above.

2. That all schools review their governance documents to ensure that the document incorporates the following policy: Only full time faculty members who devote more than seventy five percent of their academic year’s duties to teaching and/or research have voting rights at faculty meetings of the school, standing faculty committees of the school (for example, school Curriculum Committees), departmental meetings or meetings of faculty in a curriculum area, departmental faculty committees (for example, search committees), and other faculty bodies within the school or department. Exceptions: General exceptions to this policy may be made within school governance documents in accordance with the emendation procedure specified in the school governance document. Individual exceptions to this policy, such as exceptions for a faculty committee within a school, department, or curriculum area, may be approved by a vote of the faculty body that formed the committee.

3. That all current exceptions to the principles and policies in Recommendations 1 and 2 within school governance documents be reviewed and voted on by the full time faculty members of the school

4. That the ACEC in fall of 2012 inquire of the Deans of each school as to changes made to the school’s governance documents in light of the above recommendations, review the governance documents of the schools, and report back to the Academic Council.

Questions were asked about the recommendations: B. Walker asked about tenured faculty members who are part time faculty members? R. Dewitt said this would be an exception. P. Fitzgerald suggested that faculty on phased retirement should maintain voting rights. C. Tromley asked about all chairs of
DSB departments on course reduction and so on 66% teaching time. I. Mulvey said it is up to each school to decide the policy. She said that these recommendations make it sound like the Academic Council is trying to dictate policy to the schools. R. DeWitt said that the committee is suggesting that the schools come in line with the Handbook with their policies. I. Mulvey asked if committee considered the definition of full-time faculty on page 1 of the Handbook, along with the later description. R. DeWitt said the committee did consider this. There are full-time faculty members who are members of General Faculty, but also some administrators with faculty status who have voting rights. The sub-committee wants to distinguish between these two groups.

D. Sapp asked if the recommendations are followed, how many folks would lose voting rights? R. Dewitt answered that this is really about school policies. He guessed that twenty or so administrators with faculty status would lose voting rights. D. Greenberg asked why we need this specificity, when schools already have the ability, according to Handbook, to set their own voting standards. Technical issues such as those raised here are too hard for the Academic Council to resolve for all of the schools. We should continue to allow schools to make their own policies. R. DeWitt said that this committee had been formed by the ACEC, and the committee is reporting back that there are lots of places where policy is unclear and unevenly defined across the schools.

I. Mulvey asked how these recommendations would be implemented. The General Faculty Secretary doesn’t have information about the different types of contracts that individual faculty members have. R. DeWitt said the SVPAA would clarify these alternative contract types for each faculty member. I. Mulvey said it seems odd to her that all this information would be distributed to school officers.

R. DeWitt continued the sub-committee report. He was puzzled by the resistance to these recommendations. Why the negativity towards sub-committee’s work when that work had been commissioned by the Council itself?

R. Crabtree asked why there was a goal of keeping administrators with faculty status from voting in schools, since they have great interest in what’s happening within their own schools. Schools should be able to fine-tune voting rights to deal with anomalous circumstances. R. DeWitt said that schools can of course fine tune their own policies. These recommendations ask schools to think this through and make their own decisions. He reiterated that these recommendations mirror voting rights on the Academic Council. Administrators with faculty status on AC don’t have voting rights, except for the SVPAA.

J. Dennin suggested that maybe what we want is for schools to look at governance documents and make sure that voting rights are functioning efficiently for the school. R. DeWitt said that the recommendations reflect the committee’s work.

Motion: The Academic Council thanks the subcommittee for their work. The Council decides to take no action on the recommendations at this time. (Greenberg/Sapp)

S. Bayne spoke against the motion. He argued that the problem that led to the charge for the subcommittee still remains. If the Academic Council takes no action, they haven’t solved the original problem.

S. Bayne made a motion to give R. DeWitt speaking privileges. (Nantz) (The motion passed, 10 in favor/1 opposed/4 abstentions.)

R. DeWitt argued that the sub-committee was put in place by the Academic Council and they did lots of work. Not voting on their recommendations doesn’t seem right to him.

Motion passed: 5 in favor/3 opposed/7 abstentions.
5. Item 7d. Proposal from the FWC/AAUP on language on academic freedom and freedom of expression.

R. DeWitt presented background on the Garcetti Supreme Court decision. In 2006, the Garcetti decision restricted free speech rights of public employees. The Garcetti decision did not address faculty speech, but soon after, courts began applying the Garcetti Rule to academics. The precedent seemed to be that universities can have unfettered discretion in disciplining faculty members. The Garcetti language has had negative impacts on academic freedom and freedom of expression in colleges and universities. The national AAUP is encouraging campuses to beef up their academic freedom language. Proposed language from the national office intends to expand the umbrella of academic freedom coverage to take into account what faculty might say in classrooms, committee meetings, as elected members of governance bodies, in meeting with students, etc. R. DeWitt wrote language after conversations with AAUP experts, and then incorporated suggestions from the SVPAA. He thinks it needs to go into the JOR, and then maybe into other documents upon further consideration. The following motion was suggested:

That the Academic Council approve for inclusion in the JOR the following academic freedom language (changes to current language 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.”

P. Fitzgerald agreed that he did discuss this, but he had not agreed on this final language. He has some concerns about this. First, the new language does not “fix” something that is “wrong” at Fairfield. Second, the second sentence, as it reiterates 1st Amendment rights, is not needed.

C. Tromley asked if we should pass this if the SVPAA has reservations. It would be better to agree on language, and then approve it. R. DeWitt said it was his understanding that the SVPAA had agreed to this language.

**Motion: That the ACEC form a subcommittee to work out mutually agreeable language on this matter consulting AAUP experts, as needed. (Dennin/Nantz)**

The motion passed, 13 in favor/0 against/1 abstention.

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

S. Rakowitz reported that the ACEC turned motions on core courses outside core areas, approved at the last meeting, into acceptable JOR language. They also incorporated language from the core science course approval process that has been in place for a number of years.
K. Nantz suggested that we leave dates out for JOR language to make it more flexible, and that the ACEC could make those adjustments without bringing the text back to the AC.

**Motion: That the GFS put the following language into the Journal of Record.** (Keenan/Tromley)

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

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

The motion was unanimously approved.


I. Mulvey provided background on this item. The President and GFS want to print a new edition of the Faculty Handbook. The AC charged the ACEC with reviewing the Handbook for clarity and consistency before a new edition is printed. The ACEC prepared a detailed report which she will introduce briefly in our remaining time.

The items have been divided into four sections: I = most trivial of changes (punctuations / typos / amendments added); the Academic Council can accept these changes and inform the Trustees. II = practical matters/information. III = more serious items, need discussion and debate. IV = no recommendations, really substantive issues that the Council will need to decide whether or not to take up.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathryn Nantz

Kathryn Nantz
ACADEMIC COUNCIL
Draft of Minutes of Meeting
Monday, March 5, 2012
Cansius Hall 200

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

Administrators: SVPAA Fr. Paul Fitzgerald S.J., Deans Jack Beal, Suzanne Campbell, Robin Crabtree and Don Gibson

Regrets: Kathy Nantz, Joyce Shea, and Brian Walker

Guests: Betsy Bowen, Alison Kris

Preli called meeting to order at 3:33 p.m.

1. Presidential Courtesy

Fr. Fitzgerald S.J. reported to the council regarding comments posted on “Barstool.com” that suggested incorrectly that the University had blocked students’ access to a “foam party” website that sold tickets to said event at the Webster Bank Arena. Rather, it was a problem with Ticket Master. He strongly condemned the anti-semitic language and other hate speech on the website, especially that which falsely characterized Fairfield University as a whole.

He provided an update on the enrollment outlook. Currently, there are 9203 applications for the incoming class. That number represents an 8.3% increase over last year. 60 Magis Scholars and their parents attended the first of two Magis Scholar events. Freshmen to Sophomore retention rate is tracking towards 88%, our recent average.

2. Report from Executive Secretary

MOTION [Dennin/Strauss]: To approve the minutes of the 2/6/2012 meeting of the Academic Council.

The spelling of "Petrino" was corrected on page 9.

MOTION PASSED: 15 in favor, 0 opposed

Rakowitz requested a re-ordering of the agenda with a second by Tromley that item 7a under new business, Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees be taken up by the council.

7. New Business

7a. Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees
Bowen requested guidance from the council in preparation for the upcoming meeting with the Academic Affairs sub-committee of the board. She reported that the committee had entertained the following topics:

- Closing of University College
- Update on cancelled faculty searches
- Memo from concerned faculty
- Changes to the core curriculum for the Dolan School of Business

Greenberg warned that the getting the board more involved is not sound; rather, they should have faith and trust in the senior administration.

Gibson cautioned to focus on new issues as well as current challenges.

Tromley stated that the board does not need to micromanage and should be kept out of day to day operations.

Fr. Fitzgerald has used these meetings to showcase the faculty and students to the board which hopefully is closing the gap between faculty and trustees.

Mulvey said that the current setup is problematic in that the Conference Committee seems compelled to come up with something to present. This should be a two-way conversation on broad strategic goals, the trustees should not expect a presentation.

Lane asked why there is no topic on the table for the committee.

Dennin stated that some topics have already been discussed such as University College, but cautioned that the conversations need to be both ways.

Tromley wants the focus to be strategic matters and to include the faculty for we are stakeholders. We need to know how we can help.

Bowen said that while the conversation was helpful, the council was not very clear in specific directions of topics to discuss.

Fr. Fitzgerald stated that he welcomes help on articulating strategic academic goals.

7b. Proposal from UCC to modify Journal of Record entry on US Diversity requirement

Kris representing the UCC, outlined the committee’s view that the new issues of diversity and need to extend language to include more areas as illustrated by the text present to the council.

**MOTION [Lane/Dennin]: To approve new language for the Journal of Record:**

In order to help students 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 U.S. society. Specifically, at least 50% of the graded assignments of the courses/course sections should reflect the said U.S. Diversity criteria.
Sapp asked why 3 or more as the minimum conditions and how many intersections in the various areas outlined are necessary.

Dennin questioned why age was not in the conversation.

**MOTION [Tromley/Sapp]: To add age to the language above:**

Tromley and Strauss both stressed the issue of age in management and legal issues.

**MOTION Passed 13 in favor, 1 opposed**

Greenberg questioned the original amended motion, for he wanted research to demonstrate whether the current diversity requirement had any impact on our students.

Concerns were expressed that broadening the language could result in courses counting as US Diversity courses but not including topics of race, class and gender.

Crabtree stated that council could either send back to UCC or the executive committee could attempt to draft language.

**MOTION failed 3 in favor, 11 opposed**

7c. Appointment of faculty members to Student Conduct Board and Student Academic Grievance Board.

Mulvey suggested the changes to be more operational and consistent with current practices as well as provide another opportunity for faculty service.

**MOTION [Lane/Mulvey]: To approve new language for the Journal of Record:**

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.

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.

**MOTION passed 15 in favor and 0 opposed.**

7d. Change to the Journal of Record regarding the philosophy core course numbering.

**MOTION [Bayne/Dennin]: To change numbering for PH 10 to be PH 101.**
Sapp asked why.

Bayne outlined that Philosophy would like to have a traditional three level course numbering system.

**MOTION passed 13 in favor and 1 abstention**

4b. Center for Continuing Studies

**MOTION [Greenberg/Lane]: To accept the recommendation of the Subcommittee on a Center for Continuing Studies that 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.**

Mulvey stated that this is the correct thing to do. Let the committee do the work.

**MOTION passed 15 in favor and 0 opposed**

4a. Some remaining items from the subcommittee on items in the Journal of record which was distributed to the council on October 25, 2011.

**MOTION [Mulvey/Sapp]: To remove from the Journal of Record:**

Rank and Tenure Applications by Committee Members:

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

Mulvey stated that the item is already covered in the handbook.

**MOTION passed 14 in favor and 0 opposed**

**MOTION [Fr. Fitzgerald/Sapp]: To remove from the Journal of Record:**

Research Applications by Research Committee Members:

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

**MOTION passed 14 in favor and 0 opposed.**

Motion to Adjourn: [Dennin/Lane].

Submitted by,
Phil Lane
Report from the Academic Council Subcommittee on Workers’ Bill of Rights
March 8, 2012

Contents
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Formation of and Charge to the Subcommittee

At the November 7, 2011 Academic Council meeting, the Council passed the following motion:

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

In January 2012 the Council’s Executive Committee formed a subcommittee with faculty representatives Professors Cecelia Bucki, Rick DeWitt, and Vin Rosivach; and administrative representatives Vice President of Administration Mark Reed and Senior Associate Dean Faith-Anne Dohm. At its first meeting on 1/18/12 the subcommittee elected Professor DeWitt chair. The subcommittee subsequently met on 2/1/12, as well as having extensive discussions by email.

Background Information

During the mid to late 1990s, a series of events largely involving the outsourcing of custodial services at Fairfield led to what was broadly referred to as the Justice for Janitors campaign. The campaign involved a broad section of the campus community, including campus workers, staff, students and faculty, culminating in the student occupation of Bellarmine Hall.

Largely as a result of the Justice for Janitors campaign, a Workers’ Bill of Rights was approved, and the Board of Trustees shortly afterwards approved University Guidelines for Contracted Services (see Appendix A). Subsequent to its approval, the Workers’ Bill of Rights was placed in the Journal of Record by the General Faculty Secretary, as follows:
Workers' Bill of Rights:
The General Faculty endorses the statement of the Workers' Bill of Rights:

Workers' Bill of Rights

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

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

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

During the 2010-2011 academic year, an ad hoc Committee on Review of the Journal of Record, consisting of faculty and administrators, recommended a number of changes to the JOR. Included among those recommended changes was the removal from the JOR of a group of 8 entries, with the justification that they were “either outdated or not policy statements.” Included among those entries was the Workers’ Bill of Rights, as it appears above. At the April 4, 2011 Academic Council meeting the Council voted to remove those eight entries as a group from the Journal of Record.

Subsequent to this meeting a group of faculty sent a memo to the Academic Council requesting the Council reconsider the vote to remove the Workers’ Bill of Rights from the JOR. The Council considered this request at its November 7, 2011 meeting, at which time the Council reaffirmed its decision to remove the Workers’ Bill of Rights from the Journal of Record and passed the motion above forming the current subcommittee.
Recommendations

At its first meeting on 1/18/12 the subcommittee had an extensive discussion of its charge. Of particular focus was whether it would be preferable to expand on the existing Workers’ Bill of Rights language, or rephrase that language in a somewhat minimalist way. Expanding the language might include, for example, further specification and clarification of concepts such as a living wage, benefits suitable to human dignity, and other terms found in the existing Workers’ Bill of Rights language. Alternatively, a minimalist rephrasing would primarily involve reworking the existing Workers’ Bill of Rights so that it is unequivocally phrased in the language of policy.

The consensus of the subcommittee was that the minimalist approach was the only option compatible with the Council’s charge to the subcommittee; however, the subcommittee also thought the minimalist approach was preferable. While there was some discussion in the Council concerning expanding and elaborating on the existing language, there was no consensus in the Council that they wished the subcommittee to formulate expanded language. Moreover, the motion passed by the Council directed the subcommittee to write “policy language in the spirit of” the existing Workers’ Bill of Rights language. As the existing Workers’ Bill of Rights language is clearly minimalist, the consensus of the subcommittee was that the Council motion called for language that was likewise minimalist.

As noted, regardless of the charge to the subcommittee, the subcommittee felt that circumstances differ so much from contract to contract and employee to employee that it would be impossible to formulate more specific guidelines that would be applicable to all employees of the University and all its subcontractors. The subcommittee also expects that in the vast majority of cases working conditions will be, as a matter of course, fully consistent with the principles articulated in this Workers’ Bill of Rights. On the rare occasions when there is a claim that a worker’s or workers’ right or rights have been violated, such claims would best be brought to an ongoing committee, which could then look at the specific conditions involved and determine if a violation has occurred and if so, recommend a remedy.

With respect to the charge to the subcommittee to recommend where this language should be housed, the consensus of the subcommittee was this policy should be housed in the Journal of Record. The rationale is straightforward. The charge to the subcommittee was to recommend policy language to the Academic Council. If approved by the Council (and subsequently approved by the administration), the consensus of the subcommittee is that the Faculty Handbook requires the language be included in the Journal of Record. (Page 3 of the Faculty Handbook seems unequivocal on this point: the Journal of Record “will include all policy decisions of the Academic Council and the General Faculty.”)

With this in mind, the subcommittee makes the following two recommendations.
Recommendation One

The subcommittee recommends the Academic Council approve the following motion:

MOTION: The Academic Council approves, for inclusion in the Journal of Record, the policy below concerning the Workers’ Bill of Rights.

Workers’ Bill of Rights

All campus workers, including those employed under subcontracting or outsourcing agreements, have the following inalienable rights as defined by Catholic Social Teaching:

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

Rationale for Recommendation One

As noted above, the charge to the subcommittee called for the subcommittee to formulate policy language in the spirit of the original Workers’ Bill of Rights. The language above is unequivocally policy language, and as required by the subcommittee’s charge, in the spirit of the original Workers’ Bill of Rights language.

Also as noted above, given the Faculty Handbook requirement that the Journal of Record contain all policy decisions of the Academic Council, the Journal or Record is the proper place for this policy, if approved, to be housed.

Recommendation Two

The subcommittee recommends the Academic Council approve the following motion:

MOTION: The Academic Council approves, for inclusion in the Journal of Record, the policy below concerning an Oversight Committee on Worker’s Rights.

Oversight Committee on Worker’s Rights

There shall be an Oversight Committee on Worker’s Rights consisting of two faculty members and two administrative members with staggered three year terms. The Academic Council shall arrange for the initial and ongoing membership on this committee.

Complaints of violations of policies on workers’ rights must first be addressed through normal administrative channels, informal and formal. In the event that an issue is not
satisfactorily resolved through normal channels, the function of the Oversight Committee will be as follows:

• To receive complaints of violations of policies on workers’ rights from any member of the University community;
• When a complaint is received, to make a determination as to whether a violation has occurred;
• To recommend a remedy in cases where the committee determines a violation has occurred.

The Oversight Committee may also receive relevant excerpts from the annual reports contractors are required to file in keeping with the University Guidelines for Contracted Services.

Rationale for Recommendation Two

The consensus of the subcommittee is that most if not all concerns about violations of policies on workers’ rights can reasonably be expected to be resolved through normal channels. Thus the Oversight Committee may rarely if ever be called on to make a determination concerning a possible violation of policies. However, it is important to have such a committee as a last step if normal procedures do not resolve the issues.
Appendix A: University Guidelines for Contracted Services

[Approved by the Board of Trustees 1999.]

UNIVERSITY GUIDELINES FOR CONTRACTED SERVICES

Introduction

Fairfield University, a Jesuit and Catholic institution, is committed to Ignatian values, of which the promotion of justice is a fundamental duty. In celebrating the God-given dignity of every human being, Fairfield University embraces its obligation to serve the wider community of which it is a part. Fairfield University seeks to exercise responsible stewardship of its resources as it meets economic needs and priorities in a manner consistent with its fundamental moral and religious convictions. Fairfield University welcomes companies who meet or exceed the following guidelines for working with and at the University.

Total Compensation

Contractors will pay employees total compensation (defined as wages, overtime, and/or benefits), which complies with applicable federal and state law and which is competitive within the industry and regional markets for the specific contracted service for similar positions in similar organizations. Qualified employees (employees who work at least 40 hours/week for the contractor at Fairfield University) must receive sufficient total compensation for that work to meet a minimum level that the University deems just. Just total compensation shall be arrived at in part by using the annual Department of Health and Human Services poverty guidelines for a family of four (4) in the 48 contiguous States and D.C., with due consideration for particular benefit programs and overtime policies provided by the contractor.

Qualified employees are further defined as persons working for a contractor with a minimum annual contract of $200,000 (in 1999 dollars), who have worked continuously for the contractor for a minimum of 90 days, and who are required to be present on the university campus to fulfill their job duties.

Unionization and Freedom of Association

The University recognizes, supports and respects the right of individual employees to express their own personal freedom of choice regarding union organization and membership.

For all contracts covered by these guidelines the University recognizes, supports and respects the right of individual employees to express their own personal freedom of choice regarding union organization and membership, using a process that is requested by the employees and agreed to by the contractor, subject to NLRB rules and procedures.
Conditions of the Job

The University requires that the contractor provide a working environment which is safe and healthy according to all local, state and federal regulations, and one which is free of discrimination and harassment.

Types of Labor Permitted

The University requires that the contractor not permit child or forced labor, or labor which is not consistent with applicable laws.

Protection of Workers When University Changes Contractors

When the University changes contractors, the University requires that qualified employees of the previous contractor will be automatically offered positions with the new contractor, except when the new contractor does not have sufficient openings to absorb all the qualified employees from the previous contract. In this case, the new contractor will offer to hire equally qualified employees on the basis of seniority. If the new contractor has new job openings within the first 90 days of the new contract, the contractor will notify qualified employees from the previous contract of those openings and give first consideration to any such qualified employees who apply for the new openings.

The new contractor is not obligated to hire or retain an employee from the previous contract if the employee has been convicted of a crime or the contractor can demonstrate to the University that the employee presents a danger to students, co-workers, or any other employee of the University.

Upon being hired by the new contractor, employees must be retained for a period of 90 days, except the employee can be terminated for cause as indicated above, and/or for failing to comply with the contractor’s personnel and performance policies.

Enforcement and Monitoring

The contractor will report annually that it is in compliance with the above guidelines. The contractor must agree that the University may take any corrective action deemed appropriate in the University’s discretion, up to and including termination of the contract, in response to any violation of these guidelines.

The contractor’s report will be received by the Finance Committee of the Board of Trustees. This committee may consult with the appropriate University personnel to ascertain and verify the facts pertaining to any possible failures to comply with these guidelines.
Academic Council Meeting
April 2, 2012
Agenda Item 6.b

The text approved by the AC on 2/6/2012 has been slightly revised to be in the form of policy language for the Journal of Record.

Policies and principles regarding part-time students at Fairfield:

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 will 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.
4. Advising for part-time degree-seeking students should will be based in the relevant department. Part-time degree-seeking students should will be assigned a faculty advisor in the same way as full-time students.
5. With regard to registration, to the greatest extent possible, part-time students will be treated the same as full-time students.
6. Part-time students should will continue to have a per-credit tuition rate that is competitive with other part-time programs in Fairfield’s market.
7. Part-time degree-seeking students may switch to full-time status at any time.
8. Consultation with the appropriate dean is required for a full-time student to switch to part-time status.
9. Rules (and their financial implications) for movement from full-time to part-time status should will be clear at the time of matriculation.
Agenda Item 6.c: Report from the group discussing DSB core language concerns

At the meeting on 2/27/2012, the AC passed a motion that representatives of the Dolan School of Business, the Department of Modern Languages and Literatures, and the AC Executive Committee meet to try to find a mutually acceptable resolution to the DSB’s concerns regarding the language core requirement, and report back to the AC at its April meeting.

The group consisted of the following members: Mary Ann Carolan, Robbin Crabtree, Paul Fitzgerald, Cathy Giapponi, Don Gibson, Jerelyn Johnson, Heather Petraglia, and Susan Rakowitz. The group met twice.

We agreed to move ahead with two small changes that will address some of the DSB concerns:

1. DMLL will develop "trailer courses". In other words, sections of the second semester of basic languages will be offered in the Fall so that students who have studied the language before, but have not placed into the intermediate level, may only need 3 rather than 4 semesters to complete the requirement. This change will take a year to put into place.

2. When students take 2 semesters of a language at the basic level at Fairfield and continue in that language in a study abroad program, the courses taken abroad will be counted as intermediate. Currently that is not always the case.

We did not reach further agreements. We discussed intensive language courses offered either during the semester or during the summer, but that did not seem to address DSB concerns. We also considered a university-wide change in the core to one year at any level for "critical" or non-European languages, and a year at the intermediate level for other languages, but the DMLL representatives felt this would impair their ability to offer upper level courses in the critical languages.

The proposal that gained the most traction, though we did not reach consensus on it, was to modify the UCC motion so that DSB students would not be able to place out of the requirement to take a year of language courses.

The original motion passed by the UCC and sent to the AC by the UCC is as follows:

**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.**

Full information on this matter is in the packet for the 2/6/2012 meeting (pages 20-44) and in the minutes of the 2/6/2012 AC meeting.
PROPOSED NEW TEXT FOR HANDBOOK: UNIVERSITY ADVANCEMENT COMMITTEE
Submitted by University Advancement Committee
(New text in bold, deletions struck through.)

Membership

Five members elected from the faculty for three-year overlapping terms, with membership to be elected from the following electoral divisions: one member from the College of Arts and Sciences; one member from the School of Business; and three members at large without restriction as to curriculum area or school, keeping in mind a preference for broad faculty participation among members of the Committee. The Vice President for University Advancement shall be an ex officio voting member. The Committee shall always include a minimum of three tenured faculty members.

Three members elected from the faculty for three-year overlapping terms. The Vice President for University Advancement shall be an ex officio voting member.

General Purpose

To inform and make recommendations to the faculty concerning the programs of the Division of University Advancement and to act as a liaison between the faculty and the Division in developing programs of public and community relations, with regard to alumni and alumnae relations, and annual and capital fund raising.

Specific Duties

To participate in the planning and program development activities of the Division of University Advancement as they pertain to community relations, fund raising and faculty/alumni and alumnae relations.

Reasons for Proposed Changes:

Membership: The new text reflects concerns on the Committee, discussed during the past 2.5 years, regarding the value of expanding the Committee and ensuring that committee membership: (a) includes a representative from DSB; (b) seeks to have members from different schools and departments; and (c) includes members with sufficient experience at the University. At the same time, we sought to keep the paragraph as simple as possible and avoid mandating that additional schools be represented when they are sometimes already overburdened with committee assignments.

General Purpose and Specific Duties: The original purpose and duties reflect when Public Relations and Marketing and Communications were still part of Advancement, not their own separate Division. Since the Committee no longer meets with or hears reports concerning public and community relations, the new text is more accurate.
University Advancement Committee  
Excerpt of Meeting Minutes  

5 March 2012

Present:
David Downie (chair); Stephanie Frost (ex officio); David Gudelunas; Katherine Schwab

Proposed new text for Handbook, regarding University Handbook Committee
a. DD noted that the new language (attached) to be submitted to the Academic Council, and previously circulated to the committee and revised via email, had also been drafted in consultation with former Advancement committee members.
b. A discussion followed focusing on why representation from the Schools of Engineering and Nursing were not specifically mandated. DD noted the small number of faculty members in those schools posed potential logistical problems for prescribing their participation.
c. KS suggested changing phrasing that referred to “diverse faculty representation” to “broad faculty representation.” This phrasing was deemed more favorable and precise.
d. Conversation followed concerning the importance of seeking representation from the hard sciences and nursing as future fundraising efforts could likely include targeted support for these areas.
e. Whether or not the new language would be overly prescriptive was raised by DG and this topic was discussed in relation to the role of the current committee in encouraging particularly well-qualified colleagues to seek election on the committee in the future.
f. A motion to approve the new handbook language was made by DG, seconded by KS and approved unanimously.
FDEC REPORT TO THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL ON THE USE OF IDEA©

In 2009, Fairfield University revised its course assessment process, which had been in place for several preceding decades. Given the current national push towards more scientific approaches to teaching assessment, the University believed strongly that a course assessment process should have supported validity and reliability; the previous assessment process had little or none. After much research, the University chose the IDEA© course evaluation system. IDEA was developed in 1975 as a nonprofit organization, for the purpose of continuous individual and institutional improvement and achievement. The advantages of IDEA over our previous course assessment system are vast. IDEA data are nationally normed and thus provide course instructors with institutional comparisons on student progress toward relevant objectives. In addition, IDEA helps faculty members solicit feedback and evaluate teaching as it relates to chosen curricular goals and the measurement of learning. The form takes into account both students’ motivation and their work habits by providing an adjusted score to accurately reflect the instructor’s contribution to learning. The IDEA form can also be administered either as a paper form or online. A final advantage of the IDEA form is the ability to use it to evaluate overall institutional effectiveness for the purpose of department, school, and University accreditation. The previous course evaluation system in place at Fairfield University had none of these advantages. The Academic Council charged the Faculty Development and Evaluation (FDEC) committee with assisting in the implementation and evaluation of IDEA. Specifically, the FDEC was asked to work with the Center for Academic Excellence (CAE) to implement training and was asked to report back after a period of two years with recommendations regarding whether or not to continue: 1) the use of both online and paper formats; 2) the use of the yellow forms for qualitative assessment of course effectiveness.

The CAE in conjunction with the FDEC began IDEA training and education for faculty. Starting from 2009, a total of eleven individuals have participated in IDEA’s “Train the Trainers” workshops, seven of whom have been faculty and four of whom have been administrators. Two pilot training sessions/discussions garnered 18 faculty participants. Twenty IDEA workshops have been offered by the CAE over the past two years with a total of 202 faculty participants. In addition, two department and/or school sessions were held and one workshop was held for Fairfield deans. Attendance at the general workshops decreased over the years of training. In response to this fact, the CAE in the future will be moving toward more department-based and one-on-one training with IDEA.

In fall 2010 the University implemented the IDEA form for the first time. The assessment was offered in both paper and online formats. The default was the paper format, so faculty who wanted the online option had to state as much. The majority of faculty chose the paper assessment, which was implemented without difficulty. However, from an administrative perspective, the amount of labor involved in coordinating and packaging the paper forms and mailing them to the IDEA center for processing was challenging. Moreover, one box of forms was damaged during transit and some of this data was lost. Due to the laboriousness of the process with paper, the lost data, and environmental concerns, the FDEC recommended that the default format be changed from paper to online in the spring 2011 semester. This change had a clear impact on the number of online assessments and resulted in less labor used in processing paper forms. There was also no lost data. The table below shows the number of paper vs. online users over the three semesters that IDEA has been in place. The rise in the number of online evaluations indicates that the online form of evaluation is becoming more acceptable, and the FDEC is optimistic that this trend will continue. However, the response rate to the online evaluation is still lower than the paper form and there are still a considerable number of faculty who choose the paper format. Thus, the FDEC recommends that both options continue to be offered to faculty for an additional two years, with re-evaluation in spring 2014.
Assessment Method | Fall 2010* | Response Rate | Spring 2011 | Response Rate | Fall 2011* | Response Rate
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Paper | 1379 | 85.3% | 216 | 82.2% | 262 | 84.7%
Online | 63 | 65.3% | 1215 | 60.31% | 798 | 57.1%

*The smaller number of total courses evaluated in fall 2011 resulted from an improved system of determining which courses should and should not be evaluated.

Over the past two years, the number of problems related to the implementation of IDEA has diminished greatly. Thanks to the tireless work of Tracy Immerso, the On-Campus Coordinator for IDEA (OCC), and Jay Rozgonyi from Computer and Network Services (CNS), a number of new enhancements have been made to facilitate faculty use of IDEA. In the fall of 2011, faculty were provided with course-specific URLs that they could use to control the point at which the students should complete the assessment. Currently, faculty may choose whether to provide students with a specific course URL to release to students or allow students to receive emails to take the assessment on their own, or both. In addition, for the first time this spring, faculty will be sent a URL to access their results, which will be stored in an online system for a period of no fewer than eleven years.

The use of the yellow forms for qualitative assessment of student feedback has been a valued tradition among Fairfield faculty for many years. These forms have continued to be administered along with the IDEA form without interruption. Even faculty who administered the online assessment have received yellow paper forms for course evaluation. The FDEC has recently considered that the questions asked on the yellow forms be added to the online assessment. This has the added advantage of providing qualitative data in the electronic form for cutting and pasting into merit and promotion and tenure applications as well as for analysis with qualitative software. Given the need to provide faculty with the greatest availability of data, as well as the lack of capacity to obtain meaningful data on student major, level, or gender, the FDEC is recommending the continued use of the yellow forms for both online and paper users for a period of two additional years.

In summary, the IDEA assessment presents a number of valuable advantages over Fairfield’s previous evaluation form at Fairfield University. The CAE has worked tirelessly to educate faculty regarding the use of IDEA in order to facilitate its effective use in merit and promotion and tenure applications and for the formative improvement of teaching. In the future the CAE will continue to educate on IDEA via department-based and one-to-one training with IDEA in the future. Over the past two years, the number of problems related to the implementation has diminished greatly, and the FDEC is optimistic that this trend will continue. To allow for continued effective integration of IDEA, the FDEC recommends the following:

1) That both paper and online assessment options with IDEA continue to be offered to faculty for an additional two years, with re-evaluation in spring 2014.
2) That the use of the yellow forms for qualitative assessment of student feedback continue to be administered for users of both online and paper forms for an additional two years, with re-evaluation in spring 2014.

Thank you for your thoughtful attention to this report.

Respectfully submitted,

William Abbott, Joel Goldfield, Meredith Wallace Kazer, Mary Frances Malone
FDEC Meeting March 1, 2012
FDEC Meeting 3/1/2012  9:00AM- 10:30am CNS8
Attendance: Meredith Kazer, William Abbot, Joel Goldfield, Mary Frances Malone, Valeria Martinez, Emily Smith, Jessica Davis, Aaron Perkus and Shah Etemad
Guests Present: Larry Miners
People with Action Items are underlined.

2. IDEA® Updates: Discussion of Yellow Form to be merged electronically with IDEA survey form
   o We have low response rate for on-line
   o Option of both on-line and electronic is inappropriate, i.e. students need to do it twice.
   o IDEA averages the responses and does not match response to each individual
     Recommend – Yellow form to be as paper for the next 2 years: 8 in Favors, 2 opposed. Approved.

3. Scholarship of Teaching – On Hold

4. IDEA Users Group Meeting RFP
   o IDEA conference is Oct 18-19, Nashville, Tennessee
   o Deadline to submit proposal and presentation: May 12, 2012.
   o Good opportunity for Fairfield University to have a higher visibility
   o Need mapping of IDEA outcome
   o Use Core Pathway or Department Outcomes and relate them to IDEA data
   o Suggestions for paper: How Grad Ed solved their problem. Ask Tracy Immerso and Angela Harkin for thoughts.
   o Jessica attended the conference. Some of IDEA questions may be changed. Jessica will provide a trip report.

5. Subcommittee reports
   a. Report to Academic Council:
      o Draft Report to the Academic Council on the Use of IDEA was distributed.
      o Mentioning of IDEA with ©once at the beginning of a report/memo is sufficient
      o Meredith modify the table as well as collect input/corrections
   b. Aligning IDEA objectives with program outcomes and course objectives – deferred to April meeting
   c. Educating R&T committee members on IDEA
      o We need to educate people who will evaluate us
      o Jean Lange attended the training. However, she left Fairfield.
      o Academic council overwhelmed with issues
      o CAE cannot afford to send more R&T members to training
      o Therefore CAE to approach R&T and give training

6. Peer Review of Teaching (PRoT) evaluation and plans for Spring workshops
   o Meeting day in May and CAE leading the meeting set up
   o University asked for extension from Davis foundation to 2012-12 (approved $10K).

7. Other Business:
   • Roben Torosyan has timing conflict to attend FDEC meeting. Suzanna Klaf to be invited to attend.

Adjourned at 10:05am

Minutes respectfully submitted by Shah Etemad
29 September 2011
Rationale for Program Name Change

The Program in Women’s Studies voted unanimously at the September 16, 2011 retreat to change the name of the minor from “Women’s Studies” to “Women, Gender and Sexuality Studies.”

The idea of a programmatic name change had been percolating for some time among the coordinating committee and the topic was discussed in detail at a two-day program review workshop held September 16-17. The consensus was that the name change simply caught up to existing curriculum that deals with topics that extends beyond traditional women’s history and encompasses issues relating to gender, sexuality, sex and other contemporary areas of scholarship. Given that many new courses have entered the curriculum since the program in Women’s Studies was established, this request is for approval of a name (and not curriculum) change.

Notably, the name of the program will now not only be in sync with the academic courses, programming and related initiatives already undertaken by the minor, but other programs at competitor and Jesuit institutions that have also added variations of “gender” and “sex” or “sexuality” to their program titles. A complete comparison was undertaken and is available for review. This request for a name change has also been voiced by students (who recently established their own student-led “Gender, Sex and Sexuality Center”) who wanted to have a more descriptive minor listed on their transcripts.

The coordinating committee hopes that this name change helps to revitalize the program, attract new minors and continue to keep pace with exciting theoretical developments in the area of women, gender and sexuality studies.

An excerpt of meeting minutes where this name change was discussed is appended here.

Respectfully submitted,

David Gudelunas, Ph.D.
Associate Professor of Communication
Director of Women’s Studies
Meeting minutes [just relevant excerpts here]

September 16, 2011

Present: Dr. David Gudelunas, Dr. Gita Rajan, Dr. Colleen Arendt, Dr. Sally O'Driscoll, Dr. Rose Rodrigues, Dr. Elizabeth Hass, Dr. Olivia Harriott, Dr. Elizabeth Hohl, Prof. Walker-Canton

Regrettably Absent: Dr. Johanna Garvey

Gudelunas brought up the issue of programmatic name change asking the coordinating committee to consider the name “Women, Gender and Sexuality Studies.” He noted this was brought to him by students and over the summer he worked with graduate students to compare programs at 20 some schools. He noted that Fairfield was currently in the minority with the name “Women’s Studies”

O’Driscoll questioned whether the name was accurate to what was being taught in the program and Arendt, Haas, Gudelunas, Harriott and others explained that their courses, many recently approved as WS courses, covered much more than simply issues central to women.

Hohl offered perspective on how this question has been dealt with at a national level through her experiences with national Women's Studies conferences. She noted it was occasionally a contentious issue but that she did think the Fairfield programming and curriculum did more than women’s history.

Rodrigues offered some historical perspective on getting the initial program approved and reflected on the progress that has been made in the past two decades.

Gudelunas noted that students were already thinking along the lines of gender and sexuality by establishing their own student-led initiative and regularly requesting courses that covered issues related to gender and sexual minorities.

Gudelunas made the motion “To request a name change from Women's Studies to Women, Gender and Sexuality Studies.” This was seconded by Haas. It was unanimously approved by the entire* coordinating committee.

Though not present for the vote, Garvey did later support this vote at the second day of meetings, making it a truly unanimous decision.

Women’s Studies Name Change:
Perkus moves to approve; Garvey seconds.
Robbin: Hallelujah! It’s about time!
The motion was approved unanimously.