ACADEMIC COUNCIL
AGENDA
Monday, April 30, 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 3/26/12 (attached)
      ii. Meeting of 4/2/12 (attached)
      iii. Meeting of 4/16/12 (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

7. New business
   a. 3 items from the Committee on Committees (attachment)
   b. Arrange for faculty membership on search committees for Deans of DSB and SOE
   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. Proposal to close the M.A. in Organizational Communication Cohort Program (attachment)
   f. Questions from UCC and proposed answers from ACEC (attachment)
   g. Women’s Studies name change to be recorded in the Journal of Record (attachment)
   h. Question about investigating costs and savings of changing athletic divisions
   i. Memo from FDEC regarding final exam policy (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 3/26/12 (pages 3-8)
For item 3.a.ii Minutes from AC meeting of 4/2/12 (pages 9-12)
For item 3.a.iii Minutes from AC meeting of 4/16/12 (pages 13-22)
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 23-29)
For item 7.a 3 items from the Committee on Committees (pages 30-31)
For item 7.c Proposed Handbook amendment from Advancement Committee (pages 32-33)
For item 7.d Report from FDEC considering ongoing use of IDEA and yellow sheets (pages 34-36)
For item 7.e Proposal to close the M.A. in Organizational Communication Cohort Program (pages 37-43)
For item 7.f Questions from UCC and proposed answers from ACEC (pages 44-48)
For item 7.g Women’s Studies name change to be recorded in JoR (pages 49-50)
For item 7.i Memo from FDEC regarding final exam policy (page 51)

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-hardecopy 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
March 26, 2012
CNS 200
3:30-5:00 p.m.

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

Administrators: SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald, S.J., Deans Don Gibson, Jack Beal, Robbin Crabtree

Invited Visitors: Professors Chris Bernhardt, Betsy Bowen, Wendy Kohli, Paula Gill Lopez

Regrets: Dean Suzanne Campbell

Absent: Dean Susan Franzosa, Professor Don Greenberg

Meeting was called to order at 3:33 p.m. Chair Preli announced that the emergency meeting would follow the regular agenda. The present meeting would continue a previous discussion with the Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees in preparation for their upcoming meeting on March 29, 2012 with the Board of Trustees.

1. Presidential Courtesy.
SVPAA Fitzgerald reported that he planned to meet with the Faculty Salary Committee and provide some language that would refer to the administration’s commitment to maintain the 95th percentile in faculty compensation in its proposal.

He reported on the current figures for the undergraduate admissions process. Among the roughly 9200 applications received for undergraduates to date, approximately 70% were accepted in the College, DSB and Engineering, and 40% in the School of Nursing. He also noted that there is an Open House planned to welcome prospective students and their parents on April 1.

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

Professor Bernhardt asked if the administration would maintain its commitment to 95th percentile for faculty compensation. SVPAA Fitzgerald responded that he was cautiously optimistic it would be maintained.

Professor Mulvey asked if SVPAA Fitzgerald could provide any reassurance that the administration would continue its commitment in this regard. SVPAA Fitzgerald responded that the language had yet to be determined regarding how this commitment would be phrased.

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty.
Professor Mulvey circulated copies of the recent Faculty Welfare Committee Newsletter that discussed “cuts in benefits” and the prospect of “abandoning our eighteen-year agreement to maintain compensation at the AAUP’s 95th percentile” (Faculty Welfare Committee/AAUP Newsletter [March 23, 2012], p. 1). In light of recent developments, she proposed reordering the agenda to take up the important business of advising the Committee on Conference.

MOTION [Mulvey/Nantz]: To reorder the agenda and dispense with the other business of the meeting to re-open discussion with the Committee on Conference
with the Board of Trustees regarding their upcoming meeting on March 29, 2012 with the Board.

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

3. New Business: Discussion with the Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees

Professor Dennin gave a brief update on the current status of the Salary Committee’s discussions with the administration. He noted that the administration had brought forth a proposal to provide a 1% raise in salary, but he explained this increase is accompanied by a proposed 2% deduction in retirement benefits. There is also a proposed rise in the individual faculty contribution to health insurance as well as in the co-payment. Finally, the administration proposed to reduce the amount of life insurance provided to faculty members and proposed removing the 95th percentile from the Memo of Understanding (MOU).

Professor Dennin explained that a subset of the Salary Committee and members of the AC Executive Committee met with President von Arx in an unproductive meeting. He noted, however, that the President mentioned working on an improved proposal that would be forthcoming to the general faculty. Professor Dennin noted that the Salary Committee would propose another plan to the administration that would tie the MOU to the 95th percentile and include additional funds to cover costs for the proposed budget year. He summed up his position that faculty should maintain “a polite but aggressive stance” with the administration and encourage their honoring a commitment to maintaining the 95th percentile.

Professor Kohli asked for clarification regarding the reasons the administration was hesitant to continue maintaining its commitment the 95th percentile.

Professor Dennin explained that the administration’s claim that it doesn’t want to make agreements that will then be impacted by later budgetary restrictions the following year. In twenty years, to his knowledge, this has happened once. Historically, such problems have been extremely rare.

Professor Gill-Lopez asked if the proposed change to the 95th percentile is intended to be temporary or permanent.

Professor Dennin responded that it the proposal is to make it permanent, although some commitment to maintaining other fiscal responsibilities would probably continue.

Professor Bernhardt asked if there was a plan to meet this year’s commitment to the 95th percentile in next year’s compensation.

Professor Dennin explained that the Salary Committee had suggested to tie next year’s compensation to this year’s MOU. He noted that there are ways to add income based on the current proposed changes, but he added that the Committee is looking for a way to tie the compensation package to a measurable number that involves the 95th percentile. One problem has been that the changes to compensation have come too quickly for the Salary Committee to make a unified proposal.

Professor Bernhardt asked if there is a clear approach to take were we to request the same or better terms.

In order to prepare for its upcoming meeting with the Board of Trustees, Professor Bowen noted that the Committee on Conference had three questions: How much does the Board of Trustees
already know about the faculty compensation issue? How much would the Academic Council suggest discussing the issue with the Board? Does the Academic Council recommend using (or not using) the liaisons of other committees that present to the Board of Trustees to discuss this issue? Members of other faculty committees may be more or less helpful regarding discussing compensation.

SVPAA Fitzgerald responded that the Board would probably not be current with these issues.

Professor Nantz reflected that the Board would pass a budget that has numbers regarding compensation and other issues. She questioned how they could not know about the impact of the budget.

SVPAA Fitzgerald noted that the Board will vote on the budget, but he pointed out that the numbers regarding final compensation can be adjusted in June, while tuition rates are determined now.

Professor Mulvey explained that the Board may not be aware of decisions that the Salary Committee only heard last Tuesday afternoon. She noted that the 95th percentile is the Board’s commitment, since the MOU mentions the university administration and the Board.

Professor Lane explained that, if one looks at compensation by rank and CPI, we are poorer than we were years ago. The general faculty gave up COLA in order to have an outside standard to which to hold our salaries. Originally, the standard was held to salary rather than compensation. Stepping away from 95th percentile is a slippery slope. He suggested that the faculty go back to a multi-year contract.

Professor Dennin explained that the importance of the commitment to 95th percentile lies both in its historical role and its impact on faculty and their discussions with the administration. We are in a better position with administration, and we need to keep the tension down.

Professor Bowen asked if he meant we are in a better position than we have been historically.

Professor Dennin responded that we have been willing to do things as a faculty, such as remove items from Handbook, because the 95th percentile has protected us. Professor Nantz explained that it is important for Board to understand the definition of 95th percentile. This figure does not refer to a percentage of all university professors’ salaries but to those at universities in our cohort of similar institutions (Carnegie IIA). She noted that the Committee on Conference is required in a small amount of time to convey the importance of this commitment historically and its future as to what we hope to maintain.

Professor Bowen asked if it is accurate to say we are at the 95th percentile of many schools but that many do not reside in such expensive parts of the country.

Professor Preli asked if the Academic Council believed we wish to share such specific information with the Board of Trustees.

Professor Nantz responded that she would like to encourage the Committee on Conference to stress the issue of trust. Many experts have discussed the importance of rebuilding trust on both sides of negotiation in order to move forward. She noted that she felt disappointed and naïve about removing benefits from the Handbook three years ago in thinking that there was an attempt to move forward together.
Professor Gill-Lopez recalled that when the *US News and World Report* came out, the 95th percentile was part of our ranking.

SVPAA Fitzgerald noted that salary of the faculty formed part of the ranking.

Professor Mulvey explained that the Academic Council needs to decide how we should proceed with the Board of Trustees. She would like to stress that the 95th percentile is an ongoing contractual commitment – it is in the MOU, and the contract letters mention that the MOU continues until superseded by a new MOU. With no new MOU, salary is set by the Board, the terms of faculty compensation are as stated in the current MOU.

Professor Keenan offered that we have to find a way for the Academic Council to express the idea of its commitment to the 95th percentile to the Committee on Conference. It has been a basis on negotiation, contractual commitment, historical impact, and so on.

**Motion [Keenan/Dennin]:** The Academic Council charges the Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees to communicate to the Trustees the importance of the 95th percentile for the following reasons. The 95th percentile

- serves as a Contractual commitment that cannot be unilaterally changed
- is the long-standing basis of negotiations between faculty members and administrators
- represents the importance of cohesion and partnership that this commitment promises
- attracts and retains new faculty
- Our negotiations as a faculty have been predicated on a trust that the administration is committed to upholding the 95th percentile
- The 2009 decisions regarding benefits and compensation were approved by the faculty because they believed the administration held an ongoing commitment to the 95th percentile. In addition, the 2007 NEASC Report highlighted relations between the administration and faculty as a major concern. If the commitment by the administration to the 95th percentile changes, this decision will threaten the progress that has been made in this area, and the five-year NEASC report that is under preparation will need to reflect accurately the current state of affairs.

Professor Tromley explained her concern that we are in a critical and turbulent time in a business organization’s life. She asserted that the faculty and administration need to work together and to survive by “rowing the boat in the same direction.” The Board of Trustees need to be put into the position of recognizing our need to work together for our survival.

Chair Preli added that Professor Dennin mentioned the importance of having cohesion between the faculty and administration.

Professor Kohli noted that trust and solidarity are cornerstones fundamental to any discussion of faculty compensation.

Professor Sapp noted that we are in the process of submitting the NEASC report and that Exec. VP Weitzer has also emphasized the importance of trust. He asserted that the report must reflect the current state of affairs regarding faculty and administration relations in order to be accurate.

Professor Bernhardt offered that the high cost of living should be reflected in our negotiations.
Professor Rakowitz added that we should have a Plan A and Plan B in case the Board of Trustees is not responsive to the commitment to the 95th percentile. She asked whether or not we wish to raise such issues as compensation with the Board.

Professor Lane considered the discussion of changing the 95th percentile unacceptable.

Professor Mulvey asserted that she would like to have the Committee on Conference bring copies of FWC newsletter to their meeting with the Board of Trustees in order to represent the position of the faculty. She spoke in favor of the motion on the floor and made a motion to call the question, which passed.

**Motion Passed:** 16 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention.

Several additional motions were made.

**Motion [Mulvey/Shea]:** To ask the Committee on Conference to bring copies of the FWC Newsletter to their meeting with the Board of Trustees.

**Motion Passed:** 16 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention.

**Motion [Mulvey/Walker]:** To authorize the Committee on Conference to keep in contact with the Faculty Salary Committee and to alter their presentation to the trustees as needed to keep up with rapidly changing events.

**Motion Passed:** 16 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.

**Motion [Sapp/Keenan]:** To ask the faculty members working on the governance part of NEASC report to discuss the NEASC Report currently in preparation and to report back to the Academic Council.

**Motion Passed:** 16 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.

Professor Kohli noted that she supports the bullet points expressed in the motion regarding the commitment to the 95th percentile.

Speaking on behalf of the Committee on Conference, Professor Bowen noted that she appreciated the Academic Council’s work in providing a set of parameters concerning points that should be raised and others that should not. She remains hopeful that there will be more discussion and that the administration will move away from a negative stance regarding compensation. She asked if there was anything else that should be discussed and specifically how to advise other committees.

Professor Nantz explained that the commitment to the 95th percentile is overwhelming and its purpose and nature should be discussed with the Board. The outcome of this issue will affect our ability to partner with the administration.

Professor Keenan explained that the gist of the motion is already that the 95th percentile is crucial. He stressed that the members of the Committee on Conference should discuss this issue with other members of Board as well.

Professor Lane noted that the University Budget Committee was never officially informed of this issue.

Professor Dennin asserted that the Committee on Conference should be careful not to offer a two-sentence definition of the 95th percentile so as not to put the Committee on the spot.
Professor Tromley asked if the Board’s reading of the newsletter would eliminate their lack of familiarity with this issue.

Professor Bowen asked if giving the FWC newsletters through liaisons to other committees that meet with the Board would be sufficient.

On reflection, Professor Nantz withdrew her suggestion regarding discussing the 95th percentile in detail with the Board.

Professor Mulvey reported on a recent meeting with President von Arx. She noted that the Council should be aware of two things: first, the President requested an electronic copy of the FWC newsletter, suggesting that he wished to distribute the information to others. Second, she noted that Professor Dennin told him that the Salary Committee was willing to restructure the commitment using the previous year’s 95th percentile, which would eliminate the danger of unforeseen circumstances in April.

SVPAA Fitzgerald suggested reordering the Academic Affairs agenda to put the Committee on Conference presentation early in the meeting with the Board of Trustees. He also agreed that we need to retain the idea of the 95th percentile in order to recruit faculty members.

Chair Preli asked Professor Bowen and other visitors if they received enough information. They responded affirmatively.

**Motion [Dennin/Lane]: To adjourn.**

**Motion Passed:** 17 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.

Respectfully submitted,

Elizabeth Petrino
Academic Council Minutes of April 2, 2012 (3:30-5:00 p.m. in CNS 200)

Faculty Attending (16): Profs. Bayne, Dennin, Keenan, Lane, Mulvey (Secretary of the General Faculty), Nantz, Petrino, Preli (Chair), Rakowitz (Executive Secretary), Sapp (Recording Secretary), Shea, Strauss, Tromley, Vinekar, Walker, Zera

Administrators Attending (5): SVPAA Fr. Fitzgerald S.J., Deans Campbell, Crabtree, Franzosa, Gibson

Absent (2): Dean Beal, Prof. Greenberg

Guests (1): Prof. Bowen

The meeting was called to order at 3:30 p.m.

1. Presidential Courtesy: SVPAA Fr. Fitzgerald S.J. reported good news resulting from the Open House event with over 2000 students and parents on campus. We have a strong applicant pool for next year’s class. He thanked the faculty, staff, and administrators who participated in this event and reminded us of another one in two weeks.

2. Report from the Secretary of the General Faculty: none

3. Report from the Executive Secretary

   3a. Minutes. Rakowitz requested motions to approve two sets of minutes.

   Approval of Minutes for Meeting of February 6, 2012, reconvened on February 27, 2012.
   Minor Corrections: Bayne asks for an adjustment on page 4 of the minutes, correcting the recorded vote to reflect one vote against the stated motion.
   
   MOTION, [Keenan/Walker] to approve the minutes as corrected.
   MOTION PASSED: 15-0-2

   Approval of Minutes for Meeting of March 5, 2012.
   Minor Corrections: none
   
   MOTION, [Rakowitz/Strauss] to approve the minutes as corrected.
   MOTION PASSED: 14-0-4

   3b. Correspondence. none

   3c. Oral Reports. none

4. Council Committee Reports:

   MOTION, [Rakowitz/Petrino] to reorder the agenda as follows: items 7a, 7b, 6c
   Discussion: none
   MOTION PASSED: 17-0-0.

7. New Business

   7a. Committee on Conference with the Board of Trustees: Report from Meeting on March 29, 2012
Report: Bowen summarizes the meeting between faculty and members of the Board of Trustees. The faculty based their presentation on issues outlined in recent motions passed by the Academic Council. The faculty shared documents including a list of IIA schools and a copy of the current MOU. A lengthy discussion followed the faculty’s presentation, including a conversation on the “portfolio” review of academic programs. While the conversation was “lively,” Bowen remains unsure if it was impactful.

Discussion of the Report: Dennin asked if the results have been released regarding the reaccreditation of the School of Engineering. The SVPAA answered that the accreditation process revealed no deficiencies but identified areas for improvement. The final decision regarding the maintenance of accreditation will be made by ABET this summer.

Kennan asked Bowen about questions asked by members of the Board of Trustees that seemed somewhat confrontational. Bowen acknowledged that some members were more confrontational than others and gave as an example one question from a Board Member who asked: “Don’t you know times are changing?”

Mulvey noted that she will soon be sending to the trustees all the materials from the “Concerned Faculty” per the motion passed at the last General Faculty meeting. It was noted that the Faculty Secretary is charged in the Handbook to be the official correspondent for the General Faculty in communication with the Board. Mulvey asked if the Council had any thoughts on what might go in a cover memo with all the materials from the “Concerned Faculty”. Nantz suggested mentioning the Handbook committees that the memo had been sent to and pointing out that the group of “concerned Faculty” is not an ad hoc committee with any formal standing.

7b. Report from the NEASC subcommittee working on governance standard

Report: Bowen provided an update on work by the subcommittee during their two recent meetings. The committee is making sure that content included in the report is up-to-date and includes everything NEASC needs in regards to issues impacting full- and part-time faculty as well as student participation in governance. Bowen added that there is time to make revisions based on recent developments regarding the Board of Trustees. She characterized the situation as “wait and see” in regards to the Board’s recent challenge to its commitment to the 95th-percentile.

Discussion of the Report: Nantz asked when the NEASC document is due. The SVPAA replied that the final draft is due in July. Bowen was thanked for her report.

6. Old Business

6c. Report from group formed at AC meeting on 2/27 to discuss DSB core language concerns

Report: Rakowitz reported that the group met twice and made very little progress beyond minor issues regarding study abroad, and moving toward second semester basic courses being offered both Fall and Spring. Rakowitz expressed disappointment that representatives from Modern Languages, the College, and the Dolan School of Business could not find more common ground. Nantz asked Gibson if he felt “happy” and if he thought the challenges could be overcome. Gibson expressed pessimism and said that the problem is not solved. With Gibson’s encouragement, Tromley repeated the same motion that was made at a previous meeting of the Academic Council.
MOTION [Tromley/Lane]: 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.

Discussion of the Motion: Lane spoke in favor of the motion. Gibson reminded the Academic Council that this issue has been debated for four years and that this solution—as stated in the motion—has been approved by the DSB faculty, its curriculum committee, and the UCC. Gibson explained said that this motion was motivated by a change in policy by Modern Languages that turned out to be problematic to DSB students, their ability to pursue academic minors and be competitive in the workforce. He spoke in favor of the motion. He also pointed out that the School of Engineering has no language requirement, and that the School of Nursing has a flexible language requirement. He emphasized that no business school anywhere has such a large language requirement. Gibson added that this requirement puts the program at a disadvantage in relation to the University’s peer institutions. Tromley pointed out that accreditation bodies agree with the motion. Shea expressed respect for Modern Languages but supported the motion. She explained that incoming first-year students often misunderstand the implications of the language placement test; she claimed that some School of Nursing students purposely fail the test so that they can be placed at easier levels.

Keenan asked Crabtree if CAS students also complain about this requirement. Crabtree said that CAS students “whine as much but with less consequence.” She said that first-year students are coming in less prepared in math and language from high school, and that reality has caused some difficulties. Students often misunderstand the incentive to do well on online placement tests. Rakowitz spoke against the motion and said that the Core should be similar across programs and that this motion removes some of the incentive to take languages. She added that it becomes tricky when students change majors, particularly among colleges. She suggested that we vote down this motion and look to create a broader university policy regarding the Core instead of making this change only in the professional schools. Mulvey noted that the policy was changed for the School of Nursing in 1989, and it was a decision made by the Academic Council, and did not go to the General Faculty; she spoke in favor of the motion and said that we should just “get on with it.” Dennin spoke in favor of the motion and said that he wants this motion to apply for all students, not just students in the DSB. He is not in favor of “two Cores.” Nantz remained “on the fence,” and said that studying language is important in our world. She also said that she favors uniformity: having the same core for everyone. She said, however, that she’d reluctantly support the motion.

MOTION. [Nantz/Lane] to Call the Question
MOTION FAILED: 11-6-0 (note: two-thirds majority needed to pass)

Continued Discussion of the Motion: Walker spoke against the motion and said that students in the natural sciences are just as busy as business students, and pointed out that “language is important” and the “Core is important.” He added “the Core is what makes us unique,” and proposed that having a strong language requirement in the DSB could set us apart in our marketing efforts. Crabtree explained that Modern Languages is also worried about enrollment management and, for many reasons, opposes this motion. Further, Modern Languages worries that by reducing the language requirement, we are sending the wrong message. Tromley pointed out that this is not an attack on the Core, but an attempt to rectify a wrong: the language requirement, she claimed, is a disadvantage for DSB students. She used a chart to explain that DSB students simply have to take too many classes, making it impossible for them to double major or minor. She ended with “it frightens me” and again emphasized that professional.
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schools have accreditation standards that they must follow, and the current Core places students in the professional schools at a competitive disadvantage. Gibson agreed.

Petrino said that the liberal arts curriculum is important and spoke against the motion. Petrino asked whether DSB students can fulfill the language requirement while they are abroad? Gibson said it is possible, but students don’t typically decide to study abroad when they arrive as first-year students and begin the curriculum. For example, many students study Spanish to fulfill the language requirement and then later decide to study abroad in Florence. Nantz spoke again in favor of the motion, but pointed out that even in the CAS, we have heavy Core requirements and warned her colleagues: “This is important because we send signals by these decisions.” She added, “Language is about culture, not ordering at a restaurant.” She ended by saying “This is not a trivial decision.”

MOTION. [Nantz/Lane] to Call the Question
MOTION PASSED: 17-0-0

MOTION: original motion, see above
MOTION PASSED: 10-7-0

MOTION. [Nantz/Lane] to ask the Academic Council to recommend that the College of Arts & Science Curriculum Committee take up the question of language requirements in the Core for the undergraduate students in the College of Arts & Sciences.

Discussion of the Motion: Dennin spoke in favor of the motion. Lane spoke in favor of the motion. Crabtree spoke against the motion (but understands why it was made), and suggested that the UCC instead revisit the entire Core instead, not just the language requirement. Crabtree said that it makes sense that everyone has same Core requirements, which they currently don’t. Tromley spoke in favor of the motion. Mulvey said that she plans to abstain, and said that she is not sure where this is headed, pointing out, for example, that perhaps we should revisit the Core requirement regarding Philosophy before we revisit the Core requirement about Modern Languages. Nantz spoke in favor of the motion and agreed that it may be the right time for a review of all Core requirements, but, in response to Mulvey’s comment, pointed out that the difference is most apparent in Modern Languages (based on the motion that was just passed), so we should start the process by exploring the language requirement.

MOTION. [Nantz/Lane] to Call the Question
MOTION PASSED: 12-4-0

MOTION: original motion, see above
MOTION PASSED: 15-1-1

8. Recess

MOTION [Rakowitz/Keenan]: to Recess the meeting
MOTION PASSED: 15-1-0

Respectfully submitted, David Sapp
Present: Professors Bayne, Boryczka, Dennin, Keenan, Lane, Mulvey (Faculty Secretary), Petrino, Preli (Chair), Rakowitz (Executive Secretary), Sapp, Shea, Strauss, Tromley, Vinekar, Walker, Zera; Deans Campbell, Crabtree; SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald, S.J.

Guest: Student Nicoletta Richardson

Observer: Professor DeWitt

Regrets: Professor Nantz and Dean Gibson

Meeting begun on April 2, 2012, reconvened by Chair Preli at 3:33 p.m.


Professor Mulvey reviewed the background of the charge and the work of the Executive Committee, having met 5 times in 2010-2011 Academic Year and at least 5 times along with numerous email contacts in 2011-2012 Academic Year. She described the four sections of items that the Executive Committee had recommended be brought back to Academic Council for motions and/or discussion.

Under Item I on Page 2 of the February 14, 2012, memo from the ACEC to the Academic Council, Prof. Mulvey identified a list of 22 straightforward changes that the ACEC had recommended be made to the Handbook, and she asked for any general questions.

Prof. Bayne asked for clarification about the phrase “consistent style” used in change #9.

Prof. Mulvey said that the same committees are often referred to in different ways throughout the Handbook.

MOTION [Lane/Walker] that the Academic Council accepts the editorial changes made for consistency of style or to avoid ambiguity and requests that the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs inform the Board of Trustees that these changes will be made in the 11th edition of the Faculty Handbook.

MOTION PASSED unanimously.

Under Item II on Page 3 of the February 14, 2012, memo from the ACEC to the Academic Council: Prof. Mulvey stated that these items were matters of practical information that, per the Handbook, did not have to go to the Board of Trustees (BOT). She further clarified the need for change #14, stating that the proposed change would bring the wording in the Handbook about time between a pre-tenure leave and the next sabbatical leave in line with current guidelines in the JoR.

Prof. Rakowitz said that the policy about the timing of the first sabbatical had been amended in another place in the Handbook but that this particular reiteration of the policy was not changed at this time.
MOTION [Walker/Lane] that the Academic Council approves the changes to matters of practical information and requests that the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs inform the Board of Trustees that these changes will be made in the 11th edition of the Faculty Handbook.

SVPAA Fitzgerald stated that, on page 30 of the 6/06 edition of the Handbook, the section related to the time between pre-tenure and subsequent sabbatical leave reads “ten semesters of active service”.

MOTION TO AMEND [Fitzgerald/Second] that the wording in change #14 would include the phrase “eligible to apply for a sabbatical after 10 semesters of active service at the University after the pre-tenure leave.”

Prof. Petrino asked if the term “active service” would affect all leaves that faculty might apply for.

Prof. Mulvey said yes, except for maternity leaves.

Prof. Dennin said that the policy would still say the same thing.

MOTION TO AMEND PASSED unanimously.

Prof. Zera asked if, in change #12, programs would be considered a department.

Prof. Mulvey said no, not for this section of the Handbook which concerns procedures related for promotion and tenure.

MOTION TO AMEND [Fitzgerald/Walker] that the word “Associate” would be dropped before “Vice President for Enrollment Management” in change #7. Seconded by Prof. Walker.

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

MAIN MOTION as amended PASSED unanimously.

Under Item III on Pages 4-6 of the February 14, 2012 memo from the ACEC to the Academic Council:
Prof. Mulvey noted seven revisions that the ACEC recommended that the AC propose as formal amendments to the General Faculty and the BOT. For the first suggested revision, she stated that the ACEC had noted inconsistencies in the language on schedule and notice of faculty meetings located on page 1 and 2 of the Handbook.

MOTION [Keenan/Dennin] to amend the Faculty Handbook by replacing fifteen with ten in I.A.3 (on page 1), by replacing twice with “at least once” in I.A.6.b (on page 2), and by replacing “Agendas must be published ten days in advance for the four regularly scheduled meetings, and fifteen days in advance for special meetings.” with “Agendas must be published at least ten days in advance.”

MOTION PASSED unanimously.

For the second suggested revision, Prof. Mulvey stated that the Handbook language mandates unnecessary restrictions on voting privileges for the Chairperson of the General Faculty.

Prof. Walker asked what happens if the faculty vote ends in a tie?
Prof. Mulvey said the Chairperson would then vote, but not otherwise. Our rules are more restrictive than Roberts Rules call for, and more restrictive than most similar bodies. She urged that we give standard voting privileges to the Chair.

**MOTION [Lane/Vinekar] to amend the Faculty Handbook section I.A.5 (page 2) by deleting, “The Chairperson votes only in case of a tie.”**

SVPAA Fitzgerald asked a Point of Information: at what point do these motions go to the BOT?

Prof. Mulvey said that these seven suggested revisions would all go to the BOT since they represented substantive changes to the Handbook.

**MOTION PASSED: 15 in favor, 0 opposed, 1 abstention.**

For the third suggested revision, Prof. Mulvey stated that the JoR indicates that faculty can sit on 2 standing committees along with being on AC. Language in the Handbook contradicts this.

Prof. Walker asked if standing committees meant handbook committees?

Prof. Mulvey said yes, they are so defined in the Handbook.

Prof. Tromley said that a standing committee that meets regularly is also equivalent to a Handbook committee, according to the Handbook.

**MOTION [Dennin/Tromley] Amend the Faculty Handbook section I.C.a.5 (page 8) by replacing the entire paragraph with the following: “No faculty member may simultaneously serve on more than two Standing Committees. Academic Council members may serve on two Standing Committees in addition to serving on the Council. Service by a faculty member on a special committee of the faculty that meets with regularity and carries a continuing responsibility shall be considered the equivalent of service on a Standing Committee.”**

Prof. Bayne asked if someone is on AC and 2 standing committees including Budget Committee, do they have to step down?

Prof. Mulvey said that the revision is trying to make the JoR and the Handbook the same.

Prof. DeWitt stated that the Budget Committee could be seen as equivalent to a Handbook Committee but we haven’t been following this.

Prof. Preli stated that the revision under consideration is not changing policy but clarifying the language used for consistency.

**MOTION PASSED: 13 in favor, 2 opposed, 1 abstention.**

For the fourth suggested revision, Prof. Mulvey stated that the voting rights of *ex officio* members of Handbook committees needed to be clarified.

Prof. Preli stated that this makes *ex officio* members non-voting unless otherwise noted.

**MOTION [Walker/Dennin] on page 10, insert under 6 and renumber as needed:**

7. Voting rights

*Ex officio* Handbook Committee members are non-voting members unless otherwise indicated in the *Handbook*. 
Delete the words “non-voting” with regard to *ex officio* members in the approved amendments to the *Faculty Handbook* concerning the Library Committee, Faculty Committee on Sustainability, and the Public Lectures and Events Committee.

SVPAA Fitzgerald asked if there had been *ex officio* members who have been voting in the past?

Prof. Mulvey said that we needed to make the language consistent regardless of what the practice had been.

SVPAA Fitzgerald said that it might be ambiguous to not clearly say that the *ex officio* members are voting or not.

Dean Crabtree stated that it was important to be clear about this issue, since there are differences between committees and that *ex officio* members are often asked to consult about an issue brought up on a committee.

Prof. Walker asked if there were *ex officio* members who are voting now and will then not be allowed to?

Prof. Mulvey said there should not be. As GFS, she sends each incoming chair a memo explaining all details of their committee work including information on membership and voting rights.

**MOTION PASSED unanimously.**

For the fifth suggested revision, Prof. Mulvey stated that there was a need to make the existing language concerning the process on appeals for the Rank and Tenure Committee consistent with the process for applications and remove the requirement for the Rank and Tenure Committee to *ask for* information from the appropriate faculty and Dean.

Prof. Lane asked if the members of the Rank and Tenure Committee approved this?

Prof. Mulvey said yes.

**MOTION [Walker/Strauss] On page 22, in II.A.2.a, third paragraph, replace the sentence “Before considering an appeal, the Rank and Tenure Committee shall ask the appropriate faculty in the candidate’s curriculum area and the appropriate Dean to comment in writing on the additional material and to state whether their initial recommendation to grant or withhold promotion has changed.” to “Before considering the appeal, the Rank and Tenure Committee shall receive written comments on the additional material from the appropriate faculty in the candidate’s curriculum area and the appropriate Dean, which will include a statement as to whether their initial recommendation to grant or withhold promotion has changed.”**

**MOTION PASSED unanimously.**

For the sixth suggested revision, Prof. Mulvey stated that there was variance with the actual process of recording when faculty members are involved in outside consultations and that we needed to make the process more consistent.

Prof. Bayne asked how it was decided if the record would be kept by the Dean or the SVPAA?

Dean Crabtree stated that she would prefer that it say both the Dean and the SVPAA, in order for the record to be kept in more than one place.

Prof. Lane asked if it shouldn’t just be kept by the SVPAA, and not the Dean?
MOTION [Mulvey/Walker] On page 32, in II.B.4 revise last two sentences as shown, “Faculty members serving clients in a consulting capacity are retained as individuals and the University takes no responsibility for such service. Records of all such activities of each individual must be kept on file by the person responsible for his or her curriculum area appropriate Dean or the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and be subject to continuing review.”

MOTION PASSED unanimously.

For the seventh suggested revision, Prof. Mulvey stated that language in the Handbook is outdated concerning faculty traveling outside of the continental U.S. and Canada.

MOTION [Walker/Tromley] On page 32, revise the last sentence in the first paragraph under II.B.5 as shown, “The limited University funds shall be made available within the continental United States and Canada in accordance with the following general principles:

MOTION PASSED: 15 in favor; 1 opposed; 0 abstentions.

Under Item IV on Pages 7-8 of the February 14, 2012, memo from the ACEC to the Academic Council: Prof. Mulvey noted that there were nine items for the Council to decide on whether the matters should be taken up by AC for further discussion, or possibly for a sub-committee to be formed next year. Items were reviewed one at a time.

1. The Grievance Procedure in Appendix I could be revised to conform to AAUP standards.

Prof. DeWitt spoke in favor of taking this item up for further discussion and that he has materials to start the work.

MOTION [Lane/Boryczka] to add Item 1 to future agenda of the Academic Council.

MOTION PASSED: 15 in favor; 0 opposed; 1 abstentions.

2. The language on voting rights for faculty members on leave (I.A.4 (a) (b) (c)) could be revisited and revised.

Prof. Mulvey stated that faculty members who were on leave were restricted to sending in votes only on certain issues or items.

MOTION [Dennin/Tromley] to add Item 2 to future agenda of the Academic Council.

MOTION PASSED: 15 in favor; 0 opposed; 1 abstentions.

3. The language in the Handbook on page 22, in II.A.2.a, paragraph 3 on appeals is, “A candidate whose promotion is not recommended by the Rank and Tenure Committee may appeal that recommendation to the Committee only if he/she has additional significant information that had not been submitted with the original application file.” This is not consistent with the Timetable and
Guidelines for Tenure and Promotion in the Journal of Record, which state that a candidate may appeal with additional information or clarification.

SVPAA Fitzgerald stated that Professor Paul Lakeland would be bringing forward a related motion in the near future. No action need be taken by AC at this time.

4. The language in the Handbook on page 24, in II.A.3.c. (2) may be problematic with regard to time on maternity leave counting towards tenure.

Prof. Mulvey said that maternity leave is not supposed to necessarily stop the tenure clock. The Handbook policy may not be consistent with the BPO. Faculty on maternity leave are given a semester off of teaching but are expected to continue with their other work.

**MOTION [Dennin/Petrino] Moved to add Item 4 to future agenda of the Academic Council.**

Dean Crabtree said that this issue would need to be clarified in relation to AAUP guidelines. Should faculty have an option to ask for a delay?

Prof. Petrino stated that the policy should be consistently applied.

Prof. Lane stated that he agreed this matter should be taken up, and that we need to follow AAUP guidelines.

Prof. Mulvey stated that AAUP typically doesn’t have proscriptive guidelines.

**MOTION PASSED: 15 in favor; 0 opposed; 1 abstentions.**

5. The language in the Handbook on page 25, in II.A.5.c. appears to refer to non-tenure track faculty, and we may not be adhering to it.

Prof. DeWitt stated that this issue was on the list for last year’s ACEC to consider but that it may not be a problem now.

SVPAA Fitzgerald said that we have one-year term appointments, and the Professors of the Practice (POP) who have one-year contracts renewable for three years.

Prof. DeWitt asked if the policy is adhered to for the POPs?

SVPAA Fitzgerald said yes.

No action taken by AC at this time.


**MOTION [Mulvey/Dennin] Moved to add Item 6 to future agenda of the Academic Council.**

**MOTION PASSED unanimously.**

7. The language in the Handbook on page 34, in II.C.4, on teaching load is, technically,
correct, but could be clarified to emphasize that a normal teaching load is 9 hours/week.

Prof. Mulvey discussed the difference between a “normal” and a “maximum” teaching load. Normal is 9 hours per week; maximum is 12 hours per week; “normal” is what most faculty teach and “maximum” is the amount no faculty member will exceed.

Prof. Tromley asked if POP’s teach 12 hours per week?

SVPAA Fitzgerald said yes.

**MOTION [Dennin/Walker] Moved to add Item 7 to future agenda of the Academic Council.**

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

8. There was discussion on whether or not it would be useful to clarify the definition of members of the General Faculty (I.A.2 on page 1).

I.A.2 (Existing language): The General Faculty is composed of all full-time University faculty members with the rank of Instructor or above, the President of the University, the Academic Vice President, the Academic Deans, and the University Librarian. Other persons may be appointed as members of the General Faculty by the President upon the recommendation of the Academic Council. All members of the faculty as described above have the right of vote at meetings of the General Faculty.

The 2010-11 AC Executive Committee had suggestions for this language which would define faculty based on the kind of contract they received. The 2011-12 AC Executive Committee’s conclusion was that the language was best left unchanged.

Prof. Mulvey stated that the current ACEC felt that the language was clear enough and that changes would complicate things too much.

Prof. Preli stated that part of the discussion dealt with Administrators with Faculty Status.

Prof. Bayne asked what was the issue?

Prof. Mulvey said that the language needed to be clear for voting purposes and it is.

Prof. DeWitt said that he would prefer to have further distinctions made, similar to what is made at institutions around the country: general faculty members versus Administrators with faculty status.

Prof. Lane asked who this involves at Fairfield?

Prof. Mulvey said there about 15 administrators who have faculty status which allows them to vote at GF meetings: President, 5 Deans, Mary Frances Malone, Richard Ryscavage, Geoff Church, Roben Torosyan, Jill Deupi, and others.

Prof. Denin asked what was the status of Associate Dean Weiss?

Prof. Mulvey said she’s a faculty member.
Dean Crabtree asked what was the goal of taking this up? Was it to take the voting rights away from some? Or to parse out when they can vote and not vote?

Prof. Preli said the goal was to decide if any further action was warranted.

Dean Campbell said that there is confusion when you take on roles like Associate Dean and can or can’t stay on Handbook Committees.

Prof. DeWitt said that he would like to look further into this, but that it may not be worth it.

No action taken by AC at this time.

9. There was discussion on whether or not it would be clarifying to delete the word “academic” when defining the term of a member of the Academic Council (I.B.2 in first paragraph) to indicate that the term of a Council member continues throughout the summer in the event that Emergency Summer Meetings are called per the process in the Journal of Record.

I.B.2 (Existing language): The term of a faculty member is two academic years. The 2010-11 AC Executive Committee agreed that deleting the word made sense. The 2011-12 AC Executive Committee felt that language later in the text made this unnecessary. Specifically the statement in I.B.2 paragraph 5 that “Newly elected members shall take office at the first meeting of the new academic year” implies that members serving in a given academic year continue to serve, if emergency meetings are called, throughout the summer.

Prof. Mulvey stated that the current ACEC feels that later language clarifies this issue, where it says that the term of an AC member begins in September.

Prof. DeWitt noted that the Academic Year ends on 5/31, but that the JoR mentions summer meetings. There is no harm in taking the word “academic” out.

Prof. Rakowitz stated that she doesn’t see the Academic year ending on 5/31 and that it is not an issue.

Prof. Dennin asked if the Academic Year is defined anywhere.

Prof. Mulvey said no.

MOTION [Dennin/Bayne] Moved to remove the word “academic” in I.B.2, paragraph 5, prior to “year”.

Prof. Mulvey spoke against the motion, stating that the intended meaning is obvious.

Prof. Dennin said that he felt it needed more clarification.

Prof. Mulvey felt that it made things more confusing.

Prof. Bayne stated that other Handbook committees specify a term of “2 years”.

MOTION FAILED: 5 in favor; 8 opposed; 2 abstentions.

No other action taken by AC at this time.
6.b. Slightly revised JoR language for AC motions on part-time students approved by AC on 2/6/12.

Prof. Mulvey stated that, in order for the approved policies to be in language appropriate for the JoR, the word “should” needs to be replaced with “will”.

MOTION [Lane/Vinekar] Moved to replace the word “should” with the word “will” in policy #3, 4, and 6 in text regarding part-time students approved by the AC on 2/6/12.

MOTION PASSED: 15 in favor; 0 opposed; 1 abstentions.

4.a. Subcommittee for considering remaining items from ad hoc JoR committee recommendations.

Concerning Item 22 from the Memo dated 10/25/11, Prof. Mulvey stated that the issue was about the stated policy being appropriate and clear, and she recommended the change.

MOTION [Tromley/Zera] to replace the current entry in the JoR about Missed Classes with:

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

MOTION PASSED: 14 in favor; 1 opposed; 0 abstentions.

Concerning Item 23 from the Memo dated 10/25/11, Prof. Mulvey suggested deleting the current wording about policy on missed exams and replacing it with the paragraphs that address policy on attendance.

MOTION [Rakowitz/Tromley] to replace the current entry in the JoR on makeup exams with:

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

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

Prof. Dennin asked about the need for a student to contact the professor.

Prof. DeWitt said that the word “should” covers this.
MOTION PASSED unanimously.

Concerning Item 36 from the Memo dated 10/25/11, Prof. Mulvey said that they needed to update the rules and processes for students taking a course as a “tutorial”.

Dean Crabtree asked if a tutorial is like an independent study? There are limits to this, with payment and budget implications. She prefers that the Deans be involved in the decision process.

Prof. Walker stated that this has happened in the Biology Department, and that the faculty felt that they had no choice.

Prof. DeWitt asked if the tutorial reimbursement is not specified now?

Dean Crabtree stated that it has been distributed among the Chairs at this point.

Prof. Mulvey stated that a faculty member can decide if they want to do it for free, but that the JoR needed to have clear policy which should not involve the budget matters.

MOTION [Mulvey/Lane] Moved to replace the current entry in the JoR on Tutorials with:
Tutorials.
In rare circumstances, students may be permitted to enroll in a course listed in the University catalog on a tutorial basis with the approval of the Area Coordinator/Chair and the faculty member offering the tutorial.

MOTION PASSED: 13 in favor; 0 opposed; 2 abstentions.

MOTION [Dennin/Lane] Motion to adjourn.

MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Joyce Shea
Recording Secretary
Report from the Academic Council Subcommittee on Workers’ Bill of Rights
March 8, 2012
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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.
MEMORANDUM
Secretary of the General Faculty
Fairfield University

TO:          Academic Council
FROM:        Irene Mulvey, Committee on Committees Chair
DATE:        April 24, 2012
RE:          Information from the Committee on Committees

1. General Faculty Secretary. Following the call for nominations, the following faculty members have been nominated for the office of General Faculty Secretary:  

   Susan Rakowitz
   Rick DeWitt

2. Committee on Committees. Following the call for nominations, the following faculty members have been nominated for Committee on Committees:  

   1 opening for DSB/Behavioral and Social Sciences
      Cheryl Tromley
      Joan van Hise

   1 opening At Large
      NONE

3. Handbook Committee slots for University College. There are three slots on Handbook Committees reserved for University College administrators. The Committee on Committee recommends that these slots be filled as follows during the upcoming transitional year and recommends that a permanent solution be sorted out during the transitional year by the Committees and forwarded to the Council.  

   • Undergraduate Curriculum Committee has “one member of the professional staff of University College”.

   • FDEC has “Dean of University College or appointee”.

Academic Council
Packet for Meeting
April 30, 2012
Page 30
• University College Committee has “The Dean of University College or the Dean’s delegate shall be a voting member.”

**MOTION.**
During 2012-13, the UC slot on UCC should be filled, by appointment of the SVPAA, with an administrator to represent the interests of UC students, part-time students and BPS students. The UCC should make a recommendation to the Council on the permanent disposition of this committee membership slot.

For 2012-13, the decision on whether or not the UC slot on FDEC needs to be filled should be determined by the 2012-13 FDEC. The FDEC should make a recommendation to the Council on the permanent disposition of this committee membership slot.

During 2012-13, the Committee on University College should continue to have UC representation, specifically, “the immediate past Dean of University College or the immediate past Dean’s delegate shall be a voting member.” The Committee should undertake an examination of their duties and functions and make a recommendation to the Council concerning the Committee’s future.
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
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.
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Method</th>
<th>Fall 2010*</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>Spring 2011</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>Fall 2011*</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paper</td>
<td>1379</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>1215</td>
<td>60.31%</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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.
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
M.A. in Organizational Communication Cohort Program

Final Review

Summary

In 2003 Dean Edna Wilson of University College and Professor James Kennan from the Department of Communication collaborated to create the M.A. in Organizational Communication Cohort Program at Fairfield University (see Appendix A). This 36 credit hour Master of Arts Program was developed to meet a need in the community for graduate education onsite at a corporation. Cohorts were recruited at the corporation and all teaching was done at the corporate facility. Faculty from Fairfield University, from the Department of Communication, Department of English, and the Applied Ethics Program taught the 30 hours of course work for each cohort. The students’ Master’s Theses were directed predominantly by Dr. James Keenan and Dr. Michael Pagano from the Department of Communication (see Appendix B). The program began in 2003 at Cendant Corporation in Danbury, CT and had cohorts at: Cendant Mobility (formerly Cendant) in Danbury, CT; Sikorsky Helicopter in Trumbull, CT; and Prudential in Shelton, CT. Students were required to have a Bachelor’s Degree to enter the program and had to successfully complete 12 credit hours of course work in order to matriculate into the M.A. Program. Upon successful completion of the first 4 courses in the 12-course program, students were awarded a Certificate in Organization Communication from University College. From its inception in 2003 to its final graduates in 2009, the M.A. in Organizational Communication Cohort Program had a total of 71 students enrolled. There are no outstanding students currently enrolled and no cohort courses are still in progress. With the successful opening of the M.A. in Communication Program on campus in Spring 2009, the Department of Communication at Fairfield University has decided that the Cohort Program will no longer be offered. Instead, interested corporate applicants are and will be encouraged to apply to the on campus M.A. in Communication Program. This Program Review is provided as part of the process needed to decertify the M.A. in Organizational Communication Cohort Program (see Appendix A & B for program and course descriptions).

Outcomes

Over the 6+ years (January 2003 – May 2009) that the M.A. in Organizational Communication Cohort Program was offered there were a total of 71 graduate students enrolled and 61 (86%) of them completed the 12 courses, including a Master’s Thesis, and graduated from Fairfield University. This retention rate is a testament to the students’ positive responses to the faculty, courses, and pedagogy in the Program. It is important to note that these graduate students were all working professionals who typically put in more than 40 hours/week at their organizations. In addition, over 75% were married with children and other obligations (sick parents, volunteerism, etc.). The time constraints of a graduate program was lessened by the faculty’s willingness to travel to the corporations and to the individualized attention the grad students received in the
classroom, online, and vis-à-vis independent interactions with their professors. Currently, countless graduates continue to correspond with faculty about their post-graduation experiences and the value they place on their Fairfield University education. As further evidence of the cohort graduates’ perspectives, several of our current on campus graduate students come from prior corporate cohort locations (Prudential, Sikorsky, and Cendant Mobility) and refer to their co-workers’ recommendations as a key reason they chose to travel to and attend our M.A. in Communication (on campus) Program.

However, as the economy became more difficult for corporations in 2007 and beyond, these organizations stopped offering financial incentives (stock and/or reimbursement) to their employees for graduate studies. Consequently, the demand for cohort programs ceased in 2008 (we graduated our final corporate cohort students in 2009). These economic issues occurred simultaneously with the Communication Department’s commitment to address President Von Arx’s strategic vision/plan with the creation of the M.A. in Communication (on campus) Program in spring 2009. Based on these realities, the faculty in the Department of Communication sees no reason to continue to offer an M.A. in Organizational Communication Cohort Program option. As mentioned above, corporate students have been, and are, encouraged to apply to the on campus Program. It should be highlighted, that the transition from cohort to our on campus Program went very smoothly and seamlessly, thanks to the collaborative efforts of then-dean of University College, Edna Wilson, then-chair of Communication, Jim Shanahan, and all members of the Communication Department.

Therefore this review is intended to provide information about the historical and reflective data of the five cohorts that were given an opportunity to earn an M.A. in Organizational Communication degree from Fairfield University between January 2003 and May 2009. Based on this data and review, the Communication Department seeks to decertify the M.A. in Organizational Communication Cohort Program as of November 2011, and no longer offer courses in an Organizational Communication Cohort Program.

Respectfully submitted with the unanimous approval of the Department of Communication:
Dr. Maggie Wills, Associate Professor & Chair
Dr. Sallyanne Ryan, Assistant Professor
Dr. David Gudelunas, Associate Professor
Dr. Gisela Gil-Egui, Associate Professor
Dr. Qin Zhang, Associate Professor
Dr. Colleen Arendt, Assistant Professor
Dr. Mike Serazio, Assistant Professor
Dr. Michael Pagano, Associate Professor & Graduate Program Director
Appendix A
Program Description

History

As part of an Executive Report, the following information summarizes the initiation of the Corporate Cohort Program.

University College was contracted to offer a Master of Arts Degree and certificate program by Cendant Mobility in 2001. After reviewing the GradComm program, both at its inception in 1966 and at its close in 1990, the decision was made to model the current graduate program after the original (inception) and not the latter (time of closing) program.

At its inception, GradComm, like the current program, was developed to highlight both the professional and theoretical aspects of Organizational Communication. The following reflect the key changes in the current program from the original GradComm version.

1. The current program is NOT a graduate school, but a curriculum to earn a Master of Arts Degree in Organizational Communication;
2. The focus of the current program is solely on pedagogy related to the theoretical and applied aspects of Organizational Communication;
3. This is a unique cohort, off-campus program and not an open-enrollment opportunity as it was previously;
4. The current program is administered by University College working with an Advisory Board and in collaboration with the Department of Communication;
5. Faculty chosen for the current program are selected based on their combined professional and academic backgrounds and approved by the Chair of the Department of Communication;
6. Enrollment is based on comparable criteria to other on-campus graduate programs;
7. Students must complete 12 credit hours in the program to earn a Certificate in Organizational Communication;
8. To matriculate in the program students MUST earn a B or better in the 12 credit hours required for the Certificate in Organizational Communication;
9. The program is completely funded by contracts with the corporations;
10. Because of the off-campus and contractual nature of the current program, NO additional resources (space, etc.) are required to administer this program;
11. To graduate, students must complete 36 credit hours with a B or better and author an approved Master’s Thesis (unlike the previous program, a Thesis, not a project, is required for graduation);

Because it was a cohort program, all members of the cohort would be required to complete the same 12 courses. In addition, students would be enrolled in the Program based on several requirements, including an official transcript documenting their coursework and attainment of a Bachelor’s Degree from an accredited college or university, a letter of recommendation from their manager/supervisor, an essay that discussed their interest in graduate studies, and a Résumé. In order to matriculate into the Program, students were required to complete four courses with a “B” or better average. Upon completion of the first four courses, students were issued a Certificate in Organizational Communication by University College and matriculated fully into the M.A. in Organizational Communication Cohort Program.

In the spring of 2003, Dr. Keenan began teaching in the Program and 10 students were initially enrolled at the Cendant headquarters in Danbury, CT. As the Program became
attractive to more corporations and with word-of-mouth from the Cendant graduate students—new cohorts quickly emerged. It is important to note that one of the key factors to the Cohort Program’s enrollment was the fact that corporations were willing to reimburse their employees for successful completion of their coursework. Therefore, applicants who previously had concerns about work:family:academic balance, travel time to a graduate program, and/or economic issues related to tuition, suddenly had far fewer reasons not to enroll.

As the initial Cendant Cohort quickly spawned a second cohort (Cendant Mobility), Dean Wilson and Dr. Robbin Crabtree, then-Chair of Communication Department, contacted then-AVP, Dr. Orin Grossman, who agreed to create a shared faculty line for a Visiting Assistant Professor in University College. Dr. Michael Pagano was hired to fill this role beginning in fall 2004 taught a 4:4 load shared between the undergraduate Communication Department and the M.A. in Organizational Communication Cohort Program. As the Program evolved and grew numerous faculty were engaged in teaching at one or more of the corporate cohort sites.

Faculty
Specifically, the following 10 Fairfield University full-time and adjunct faculty taught one or more of the 60 courses offered between spring 2003 and spring 2009:

- Dr. James J. Keenan, Department of Communication
- Dr. Michael P. Pagano, Visiting Assistant Professor, University College/Department of Communication
- Dr. Maria Aggestam, Adjunct, Department of Communication
- Dr. Robbin Crabtree, Department of Communication
- Dr. David Schmidt, Applied Ethics Department
- Dr. David Sapp, English Department
- Dr. Lisa Newton, Applied Ethics Department
- Dr. William Maloney, Adjunct, Department of Communication
- Dr. Mirjana Dedaic, Adjunct, Department of Communication
- Dr. Jim Shanahan, Department of Communication

These 10 faculty taught courses that were offered to the five cohorts during the 6+ years of the Cohort Program.

Corporate Cohorts
In addition to the initial spring 2003 Cendant Cohort; the Program developed four other cohorts at a variety of corporate locations:

- Cohort #2 = Cendant Mobility Cohort – started in summer 2004 (18 students enrolled), Danbury, CT
- Cohort #3 = Sikorsky Helicopter Cohort – started in fall 2004 (10 students enrolled), Trumbull, CT
- Cohort #4 = Prudential Cohort – started in spring 2006 (16 students enrolled), Shelton, CT
- Cohort #5 = Prudential-Mixed Cohort – started in spring 2007 (17 students enrolled, some from Prudential, some from Sikorsky Helicopter), Shelton, CT
Appendix B

Course Descriptions

Because it was a cohort program, the course offerings for each of the five cohorts were directly related to Organizational Communication and were determined by semester based on student interest and faculty availability. The curriculum for the five cohorts included the following courses:

**CO 410 Perspectives & Theories in Organizational Communication**
A critical analysis of theories that explain human communication. Perspectives from the arts, sciences, and technologies are examined. A constitutive approach is developed from multidisciplined research streams including, for example, rhetoric, information science, psychology, semiotics, anthropology, and critical studies. (3 credits)

**CO 420 Research Methods in Communication Studies**
A detailed review of research methods and procedures relevant to measuring the phenomena and characteristics of human communication behavior. Quantitative, qualitative, and critical approaches are reviewed and practiced in course projects. Applications of research methods to describing and evaluating communication and organizational practices are studied. (3 credits)

**CO 430 Written Communication in Organizations**
Prepares students to think and write cogently in the social sciences tradition, stressing clarity of thought and expression. This course builds a foundation for writing in the discipline and in preparation for the master’s thesis. Exploration of the differences between writing for academic research, writing for social influence, and writing for the organizational setting is included. The course can serve to identify student needs for special counseling and coaching that may be provided by extra intensive or remedial coursework. (3 credits)

**CO 440 Ethics and Communication**
Coursework includes a comprehensive overview of the development of ethics in ancient to contemporary thought and practices. Emphasis is placed on the ethical agenda, problems, and responsibilities of contemporary organizations in diverse cultures. Case studies and student research focus on contemporary issues in the ethical communicative performance. The relationship between Jesuit philosophy and applied communication work in organizations is also explored. (3 credits)

**CO 500 Interpersonal Communication**
This course is critical examination of the major theories of interpersonal communication and an exploration of interpersonal communication research in relational and organizational contexts. Student projects will use social science research methods to examine factors influencing interpersonal communication such as language, perception, nonverbal behavior, power, status, and gender roles. (3 credits)

**CO 502 Small Group and Team Communication**
This course is a study of the communication dimensions and dynamics of small groups, teams, and networks of organizational actors. Coursework and projects focus on interpersonal processes and structures for tasking and relating effectively in organizational settings. The special characteristics of virtual team and technology-enhanced decision-making work are investigated. (3 credits)

**CO 522 Communication and Organizational Leadership**
This course focuses on the communication behaviors that constitute leadership. Models explore interpersonal influence, power in organizations, leading decision-making teams and task-oriented groups, and developing situational leadership skills. Early and contemporary research perspectives on leadership are reviewed and critically analyzed. Student projects include case studies and reviews of role-model leaders. (3 credits)

**CO 524 Negotiation: Communication Approaches**
This course explores a selection of conflict situations with particular emphasis on organizational and community settings. Theoretical exploration focuses on the nature of conflict, and negotiation and dialogue as communication processes. Course privileges win-win and dialogic approaches and provides experiential learning in simulations in which teams of
students negotiate detailed and practicable outcomes for resolving contemporary organizational and societal problems. (3 credits)

**CO 526 Consulting and Problem-Solving in Organizational Communication**

This course focuses on the ways Communication Science may be used to solve organizational problems and accomplish organizational agendas. A survey of organizational issues provides the context for perceiving opportunities and requirements for internal and external consulting. Special attention is devoted to the consultant’s role in addressing both the presenting technical problem and the contextual organizational management situation. The course provides experiential learning in which teams of student consultants develop and present proposals responsive to the needs of the client. A comparison of consulting in for-profit and non-profit settings is included. (3 credits)

**CO 528 Professional Rhetoric and Presentations**

This course focuses on developing and practicing written and oral presentations for professional settings. Coursework includes reviewing strategies and tactics for enhancing interpersonal and social influence through the development of sound reasoning skills, audience analysis techniques, use of source materials, effective extemporaneous delivery, and the appropriate use of technological support within the organizational setting. Additional applications are considered for scholarly, scientific, policy, and public arenas. The course requires the preparation, practice and critical assessment of several written and oral presentations. (3 credits)

**CO 530 Organizational Communication and Globalization**

Globalization has produced the increased flow of goods, capital, people, knowledge, images, crime, pollutants, drugs, fashion, viruses, and beliefs across territorial and ideological boundaries of all kinds. This course is focused on organizational communication in a global economic environment and helps students prepare for cross-cultural management issues, decision-making for multinational organizational effectiveness, and a consideration of global economic and labor issues. (3 credits)

**CO 540 Intercultural and International Communication**

This course examines the relationship between communication behavior and cultural factors such as nationality, ethnicity, race, gender, class, sexuality, and religion. We will focus on cross-cultural sense making, relationships, problem-solving, and organizing with particular application to business, education, and health care encounters. The course reviews the social science research of variations in normative communication behavior, as well as the theoretical approaches to understanding the relationship between worldview/cultural values and preferred communication practices. Examples will be used of a variety of nations, as well as those within the diverse cultural landscape of contemporary United States. (3 credits)

**CO 550 Contemporary Topics in Communication**

This course is taught when a particular faculty member has a compelling proposal for a topic that has been approved by the department. Preference will be given to topics related to contemporary issues (e.g., risk management, crisis communication, responding to scandals, gender and communication in organizations, etc.) or to a current faculty research project. (3 credits)

**CO 560 Thesis Proposal Seminar**

This seminar focuses on the research projects students have selected for their thesis projects. The course uses weekly presentations to support student progress on literature reviews, rationale writing, and research design. The course culminates with a thesis proposal. (3 credits)

**CO 561 Thesis Research**

Students register for thesis credits and work independently and under the supervision of their faculty advisor/research mentor on project implementation, data collection and analysis, and writing. The cohort may meet periodically to share ideas, give progress reports, and support each other’s research. A thesis ready to be submitted to three readers is the culminating project. (1-3 credits)
Arts and Sciences Curriculum Committee
Meeting of February 14, 2012
Draft Minutes (Excerpts)

Present: Fernandez, Garvey, Johnson (chair), Rosivach, Ruffini (recording), Walker-Canton, Weiss, Xie, Zhang
Absent: Lacy, Peduti

1. Closure of the Communication Cohort Program: Zhang presents the rationale for the closure of the program. Ruffini moves to endorse the communication department’s decision to close the program. Rosivach seconds the motion. The motion passes with 7 votes in favor and none opposed, with one abstention.

Educational Planning Committee Minutes (Excerpts)
3/22/12

In attendance: Professors Steven Bachelor, Peter Bayers, Cathy Giapponi, Sheila Grossman, Barbara Welles-Nystrom, Michael Pagano, Chris Staecker, Carl Scheraga (chair) Dean Don Gibson, and SVPAA Paul Fitzgerald.
Absent: Olivia Hariott

Discussion of the closing of the M.A. in Communication Corporate Cohort Program
Members of the EPC had received prior to the meeting regarding the final Cohort Program Review, which clearly explained why history of the program and the reasons for its retirement. Dr. Schegara asked that Dr. Pagano give a brief historical review of the program that his department wants to retire. Previously, companies had funded cohorts of students in this degree program off campus, and it had run successfully until 2009. It was then brought on campus, which has been very successful, but the feeling is that there is no longer any interest in a community based program.

Dr. Pagano then made the motion to accept the closing of the program and Dr. Bayers seconded.

SVPAA Fitzgerald asked if the program could be left on the shelf in suspended animation for a time, and Dr. Pagano responded that there really was no need. The program could be reviewed and put into place later if necessary. Dr. Scheraga mentioned that if a program is suspended for 5 years, NEASC required that it be taken out of the catalogue. Dean Gibson added that even if this program is closed it doesn’t preclude having other similar programs later.

Dr. Scheraga then asked if the closing of the program would have any adverse affects on faculty. Dr. Pagano replied that only he and Dr. Keenen worked in this program so no one will be laid off as a result of the closing. Dr. Scheraga asked if there were any other comments. Dr. Grossman replied that it made sense.

The motion to close the M.A. in Communication Corporate cohort passed unanimously.
TO: Susan Rakowitz, Executive Secretary of Academic Council  
FROM: Qin Zhang, Undergraduate Curriculum Committee Chair  
DATE: December 15, 2011  
RE: Clarification of the UCC’s Responsibility in Changes in the Requirements for Majors/Programs  

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

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

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

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

According to Item 1, Page 64,  

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

But according to Item 7, Page 65,  

7. Changes in Degree Requirements:  
   1. Curriculum Area Chair(s) to  
   2. School Curriculum Committee(s) or Faculty of School(s) to  
   3. Dean(s) to  
   4. UCC
The UCC is not clear whether changes in degree requirements cover changes in the requirements for a major. In light of the seemingly conflicting language, the UCC requests the Academic Council clarify the UCC’s responsibility in changes in the requirements for a major.

**Question 1:** Do changes in the requirements for a major fall under Item 1 (New Courses - Within the Same School) or Item 7 (changes in degree requirements)?

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

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

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

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

Third, according to *Faculty Handbook*, Page 13, the specific duties of the UCC are: to review and evaluate undergraduate curriculum: (a) the structure and content; (b) special programs; (c) summer school and continuing education programs; (d) academic requirements for, and quality of, undergraduate degrees.

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

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

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

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

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

**Department of Modern Languages and Literatures Program Revisions**
Zhang introduces the Dept of Modern Languages and Literatures Program Revisions that Mary Ann Carolan explains and answer any of the UCC’s questions.
Rosivach claims that this is not the UCC’s business. It would put an excessive burden on our committee if we had to approve all internal changes in any major’s requirements. Johnson said that this was a concern she brought to Manyul Im after the A&SCC approved the revisions, due to confusing language in the JOR. According the JOR,

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

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

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

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

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

Changes in Degree Requirements:

1. Curriculum Area Chair(s) to
2. School Curriculum Committee(s) or Faculty of School(s) to
3. Dean(s) to
4. UCC
Motion: To ask the AC for clarification of Undergraduate Curriculum Committee’s responsibility insofar as the changes in majors/programs. Rosivach; Ruffini seconded.

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

Johnson speaks in favor the motion.
James speaks in favor of the motion. It is impossible to oversee every single major on campus. Sure, everything re: Core courses is UCC, because affects everyone across campus.

Perkus: speaks against, he doesn’t think it’s ambiguous; it’s clear in the Faculty Handbook. It has to go through the UCC. Just because some haven’t gone through us doesn’t mean they shouldn’t have.

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

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

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

Vote: The motion was approved unanimously.

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

Journal of Record

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

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

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

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

Faculty Handbook

Page 13,
Undergraduate Curriculum

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

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

Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
DRAFT Meeting Minutes (Excerpt)
6 December 2011
3:30-5:00 p.m.

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

To: Rona Preli, Chair, Academic Council  
    Susan Rakowitz, Executive Secretary, Academic Council
From: Meredith Wallace Kazer, Chair, Faculty Development & Evaluation Committee (FDEC)
CC: Larry Miners, Director, Center for Academic Excellence (CAE)  
    Roben Torosyan, Associate Director, CAE  
    Suzanna Klaf, Assistant Director CAE
Date: 4/25/12
Re: Final Exam as a Percentage of Total Grade

The following statement contained in the Journal of record and Instructional handbook has come to the attention of the FDEC as a problem for evidence-based teaching and learning practices at Fairfield University.

Final Exam as a Percentage of Total Grade:
The final examination should constitute approximately 1/3 of a grade with exceptions requiring written notification to student, dean, and chairperson.

CR: 11/02/1987

We believe this policy is detrimental to student learning. The scholarship on assessment supports the use of more frequent assessment, and avoids “show” assessments to instead favor “use” assessments—such as projects and papers, which themselves should be assessed along the way. While faculty may appeal for an alternative to the documented policy, evidence shows that many continue to ascribe to the 1/3 weight policy rather making a special appeal for an alternative. The current policy currently does harm because students do not learn as well with high stakes testing as they do with more frequent assessments. Prescriptive policies endorsing a large percentage weight on the final exam are not recommended. In some cases, large end-of-course projects or other assessments may weigh heavily, but best practices in teaching and learning recommend using several graded components with timely feedback to best maximize learning.

Possible rewording could look like the following:

No single formula should apply to all classes. In some cases large end-of-course projects or other assessments may weigh heavily, but best practices in teaching and learning recommend using several graded components with timely feedback to best maximize learning.

We would ask that the Academic Council consider the policy and whether or not it should be changed or considered by an appropriate handbook committee.

Thank you for your time and consideration.